



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

AGENDA ITEM
FOR MEETING OF
JUNE 21, 2001

June 14, 2001

AGENDA ITEM
For Meeting of: 6-21-01

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Commission

THROUGH: James Pehrkon, Staff Director

FROM: Penelope Bonsall, Director, Office of Election Administration

SUBJECT: Final Draft of the Fourth NVRA Report to the Congress

The National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993 requires the Commission to submit to the Congress, beginning in 1995, a report: (1) assessing the impact of the Act on the administration of elections during the preceding two-year period; and (2) recommending improvements in federal and State procedures, forms, and other matters. 42 U.S.C. 1973gg-7(a)(3). This report is due no later than June 30 of each odd-numbered year.

The attached report, our fourth to the Congress, provides a comprehensive view of the impact of the NVRA during 1999 through 2000 and is based on survey responses from 44 States and the District of Columbia. It provides four summary tables, reiterates three core recommendations which were made in the past two reports, and advances four additional recommendations for improving the administration of elections under the Act.

The Commission's Office of General Counsel, the Department of Justice, and the Commission itself have reviewed an earlier draft. Constructive comments have been incorporated into the attached document.

As with the last report, once this report is approved, the text will be reformatted in columns, a table of contents will be added, and the document will be photocopies and submitted to the Congress.

The Office of Election Administration staff are available to answer any questions you may have regarding this draft.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the attached report to the Congress documenting the impact of the National Voter Registration Act on the administration of elections during 1999 through 2000 and recommending improvements in the administration of elections under that Act.

Attachment

**The Impact of
The National Voter Registration Act of 1993
on the
Administration of Elections for Federal Office
1999-2000**



A Report to the 107th Congress

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is a report to the United States Congress on the impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA) on the administration of elections for federal office during the preceding two-year period, 1999 through 2000.

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

General

States reported a total of 149,476,705 active registered voters for the 2000 federal general election. Active voter registration in those States covered by the NVRA rose very slightly to 73.80% of the Voting Age Population in 2000 compared to 73.45% in 1996 while active voter registration nationwide (including those States not covered by the NVRA) declined very slightly to 72.63% in 2000 from the all-time high of 72.77% in 1996.

According to the highlights of the report, during 1999 and 2000:

- There were, in total, 45,654,673 registration applications or transactions processed nationwide.
- Nearly half, or 22,478,632 represented new registrations (i.e., registrations that were new to the local jurisdiction and registrations across jurisdictional lines).
- There was a 7.72% rate of duplicates.
- The remaining 43.04% of the total transactions, or about 19,652,575 were changes of name and address.
- A total of 13,014,912 names were deleted from the registration lists under the list verification procedures of the law, while another 18,274,197 registrants were declared "inactive" and will be removed after 2002 if they fail to respond by or vote in that election.

Highlights of this Report

Mail Registration

The mail registration provisions of the NVRA accounted for nearly one third of all voter registration applications from 1999 through 2000 reflecting, perhaps, the ready availability of the national and State registration forms on the Internet. States reported few problems with mail registration beyond the routine ones of incomplete, illegible, or ineligible applications – although a few private Internet sites offering the national voter registration form caused problems for some applicants.

Motor Voter

Voter registration applications received through motor vehicle offices during 1999-2000 continued the trend from previous years by again yielding the highest volume of applications among agencies mandated by the NVRA, accounting for 38.1% (17,393,814) of the total number of registration applications received in the United States. Unlike our two previous reports to Congress, survey results indicated numerous problems with completed voter registration applications being forwarded from motor vehicle offices to the appropriate election official in a timely manner during the most recent election cycle.

Agency Registration

Agencies mandated in Section 7 of the NVRA accounted for 7.58% (3,460,531) of voter registration applications received during this reporting period. State designated agencies accounted for 4.12% (1,881,984) of this figure, public assistance agencies represented 2.88% (1,314,500) of the total, disability service offices added .42% (190,009) of this figure, and armed forces recruitment offices accounted for the remaining .16% (74,038).

List Maintenance

The numbers reported by covered States for confirmation notices sent, responses received, deletions made, and number of “inactive” voters during 1999-2000 suggest an increasing effort by States to maintain up-to-date lists. Several States reported that they had made adjustments to improve their list maintenance program. The most commonly reported changes involved the use of computerized voter registries and computer-assisted techniques to update the voter registration file, and the States’ increasing role in the dissemination to local jurisdictions of information necessary to maintain accurate lists. A handful of States reported successes in implementing list maintenance requirements. Two of these focused on improvements made to their statewide computerized database to help track and

remove registrants who may have moved from the voter registrar's jurisdiction. Several States reported challenges in maintaining accurate voter registration lists that were similar to those reported for 1997-1998. More than one State focused on the high costs of list maintenance programs, the inability to quickly remove deadwood, inaccurate Postal Service change of address information used to identify registrants who may have moved, lack of responses to confirmation mailings, faulty felony conviction notifications or death notices that resulted in the erroneous removal of individuals from the voter registry, increased duplicate registrations, and local election officials' trouble mastering complicated list maintenance requirements. Most of the recommendations reported by the States focused on alleviating the high costs of list maintenance programs, on obtaining accurate and timely information from the U.S. Postal Service change of address information program, and on reducing inflated lists. A majority of those recommendations would require Congressional action; but a couple could be implemented by the Postal Service and at least one could be implemented by the States.

Fail-Safe Voting

A small number of States reported various adjustments to their procedures to improve the administration of fail-safe voting. A few reported varied successes in administering this program during 1999-2000, while a slightly increased number of States reported challenges. Most of these challenges involved either ensuring that poll workers followed proper procedures or using provisional ballots. None of the States made recommendations regarding fail-safe voting; however, one noted that State law may have to be changed to help the counties deal with the administrative aspects of provisional balloting.

Recommendations

The most significant problems reported by the States continue to group into three broad categories. Accordingly, the FEC reiterates the three core recommendations offered in the last two reports for improving the administration of the NVRA:

- that States which do not require all or part of the applicant's social security number voluntarily (1) amend their election codes to require only the last four digits from all new voter registration applicants, and (2) endeavor to obtain that same item of information from all current registered voters;
- that States which have not yet done so voluntarily (1) develop and implement a statewide computerized voter registration database; (2) ensure that all local registration offices are computerized; and (3) link their statewide computerized system, where feasible, with the computerized systems of the collateral public agencies relevant to the NVRA (motor vehicle offices, public assistance offices, etc.); and

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

In addition to these three general recommendations, the experience of the 2000 general election suggests four specific recommendations:

- that States develop and implement an on-going, periodic training program for relevant motor vehicle and agency personnel regarding their duties and responsibilities under the NVRA as implemented by the State's law.
- that States require motor vehicle and agency offices to promptly transmit information regarding voter registration applicants electronically to the appropriate election office with documentation to follow.
- that States devise a procedure whereby voters may cast a provisional ballot at the polls on election day under circumstances prescribed in State law but at least for the purposes of the fail-safe provisions of the NVRA.
- that States adopt the practice of mailing a forwardable notice to all persons who are removed from the voter registration list whose mail has not previously been returned as undeliverable.

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

**The Impact of
The National Voter Registration Act of 1993
on the Administration of Elections
for Federal Office
1999 - 2000**

**SECTION 1:
INTRODUCTION**

This document is a report to the United States Congress on the impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-31, 42 U.S.C. 1973gg) on the administration of elections for federal office during the period of 1999 through 2000. It is the fourth in a series of such reports to be submitted biennially by the Federal Election Commission pursuant to the provisions of that Act, which read in part:

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

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

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

The vast majority of State and local election officials were very cooperative in providing the information requested in our 2000 survey of the States -- although there were some difficulties in gathering and maintaining the data mostly in small, uncomputerized local registration offices.

**SECTION 2:
APPLICABILITY
OF THE NVRA**

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

- **North Dakota** does not have voter registration and therefore considers itself to be exempt from the NVRA under Section 4(b)(1) of the Act.
- **Minnesota and Wisconsin** each had election day registration at the polls in effect before March 11, 1993, and are therefore exempt from the NVRA under Section 4(b)(2) of the Act.
- **Wyoming** had enacted legislation before March 11, 1993 which had the effect of implementing election day registration at the polls upon the subsequent passage of the NVRA and is therefore exempt under Section 4(b)(2) of the Act.
- **Idaho and New Hampshire** enacted legislation subsequent to March 11, 1993 which implemented election day registration at the polls retroactive to March 11, 1993, and were therefore specifically exempted by a 1996 amendment to the NVRA.

SECTION 3: BACKGROUND

The Purposes and Requirements of the National Voter Registration Act

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

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

The Act pursues these objectives by:

- expanding the number of locations and opportunities whereby eligible citizens may apply to register to vote

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

Expanding the Number of Locations and Opportunities Whereby Eligible Citizens May Apply to Register to Vote

The locations and opportunities for eligible citizens to apply for voter registration had previously varied widely throughout the States. Based on two decades of State experimentation, however, evidence suggested that expanding the number of locations and opportunities for voter registration results in increased registration.

Accordingly, the Act requires that individuals be given an opportunity to apply for voter registration in elections for federal offices when they are applying for or renewing a driver's license, when they are applying for services at certain other public offices, and by mail. The reasoning behind these provisions can be found in the legislative history of the Act.

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

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

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

"By combining the driver's license application approach with mail and agency-based registration, the Committee felt that any eligible citizen who

wished to register would have ready access to an application" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 5].

Requiring Voter Registration File Maintenance Procedures That, in a Uniform and Nondiscriminatory Manner, Identify and Remove the Names of Only Those Individuals Who Are No Longer Eligible to Vote

While expanding voter registration opportunities, the House Committee "felt strongly that no legislative provision should be considered that did not at least maintain the current level of fraud prevention" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 5]. But at the same time, one of the purposes of the Act is "to ensure that once a citizen is registered to vote, he or she should remain on the list so long as he or she remains eligible to vote in that jurisdiction" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 18], [S.Rept. 103-6, at pages 17 & 19].

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

Mindful that list cleaning can sometimes be abused, however, the Act requires that any such program be "uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965..."[Section 8(b)(1)]. "The purpose of this requirement is to prohibit selective or discriminatory purge programs."

"The term 'uniform' is intended to mean that any purge program or activity must be applied to an entire jurisdiction. The term 'nondiscriminatory' means that the procedure complies with the requirements of the Voting Rights Act of 1965" [H.Rept. 103-9, at page 15].

Providing Certain "Fail-Safe" Voting Procedures in Order to Ensure That an Individual's Right to Vote Prevails Over Current Bureaucratic or Legal Technicalities

Prior to 1993, registrants were sometimes denied the right to vote on election day either because of some oversight on their part or even because of some clerical error by the election office. Registrants who changed residence within the registrar's jurisdiction, for example, often mistakenly assumed they were still entitled to vote -- only to discover on election day that their failure to re-register from their new address disenfranchised them. Similarly, registrants who may have failed to receive or return certain election office mailings were often purged from the lists. Even clerical errors, such as erroneous change of address in the registration files, often resulted either in the loss of the right to vote or else in an elaborate and daunting bureaucratic ordeal.

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

The History of the National Voter Registration Act

The history of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) dates back to the 1970's when some of its key provisions -- motor voter registration, agency registration, and mail registration -- were first separately introduced in Congress. Its current comprehensive form, however, dates back to 1989 when Representative Al Swift of Washington introduced H.R. 2190 in the House of Representatives and Senator Wendell Ford of Kentucky introduced a companion bill, S. 874, in the Senate. Although H.R. 2190 passed the House in 1990, the Senate took no action on either H.R. 2190 or S. 874.

In 1991, Senators Ford and Hatfield introduced S. 250 which closely resembled the previous S. 874. Although S. 250 passed both the Senate and the House a year after its introduction, President Bush vetoed the legislation. Lacking a veto-overriding majority in both the Senate and the House, the legislation died.

S. 250 was resurrected, however, on January 5, 1993 as H.R. 2, introduced by Representative Al Swift and others. In virtually every respect, H.R. 2 and its Senate companion, S. 460, introduced by Senator Wendell Ford were identical to S. 250.

The House of Representatives passed H.R. 2 on February 4, 1993 by a vote of 259 to 160. The Senate passed H.R. 2 with some amendments on

March 17, 1993 by a vote of 62 to 37. The Joint Conference Committee version of H.R. 2, retaining some but not all of the Senate amendments, passed the House on May 5, 1993 by a vote of 259 to 164 and the Senate on May 11, 1993 by a vote of 62 to 36. On May 20, 1993, President Bill Clinton signed the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 into law [Public Law 103-31, 42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.].

A copy of the law, with citations to the U.S. Code, is provided in Appendix A.

The Role of the Federal Election Commission

The National Voter Registration Act is something of an experiment in governance in that the federal responsibilities for its proper implementation are divided between two separate federal agencies. Section 11 of the Act places the responsibility for civil enforcement in the Department of Justice. Yet Section 9(a) of the Act states that the Federal Election Commission:

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

Accordingly, the Federal Election Commission, through its Office of Election Administration:

During 1993

- In June, one month after its enactment, arranged and conducted a 30-member Ad Hoc Discussion Group meeting (with an audience of twice that number) for the purpose of airing the wide range of views and concerns about the requirements of the Act. That group included representatives of many of the advocacy groups that were behind the Act,

State and local election officials, and representatives of the several federal agencies either directly or tangentially involved in the Act.

- In July and August, based on the results of the discussion group meeting and a painstaking analysis of the Act, produced the first draft of a detailed implementation guide for the States.
- In September and October, arranged and conducted a total of 5 two-day regional workshops around the country—in Seattle, Dallas, Chicago, Boston, and Atlanta—designed to carry the information contained in the guide to State officials prior to their January State legislative sessions.
- In October, published in the Federal Register an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking comments on the National Mail Registration Form and information to be reported by the States to the Commission.
- In November and December, on the basis of the regional conferences, refined and completed the implementation guide for the States.

During 1994

- In January and February, on the basis of responses to the Advance Notice, prepared a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
- In March, developed a first rough draft of the National Voter Registration Form and distributed to the States the final version of the implementation guide
- In April and May, on the basis of responses to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, submitted a draft of the Final Rules to the Commissioners who adopted them unanimously on June 8.
- In late June, distributed to the State election officials, to all commenters on the rulemaking, and to other interested parties copies of the Final Rules.
- On July 8, formally requested of the States a certification of their voter registration eligibility requirements needed to complete the National Voter Registration Form.
- On August 5, conducted the second and final meeting of the Ad Hoc Discussion Group.

- In September and October, completed the design of the National Voter Registration Form which the Commission approved on November 3.
- On December 5, distributed to the States camera-ready copies of the English version of the National Voter Registration Form.

During 1995

- In January, distributed to the States a "starter kit" of 100 to 1000 printed copies of the English version of the National Voter Registration Form while having the Form translated, in accordance with the language minority requirements of the Voting Rights Act, into:
 - o Spanish
 - o Chinese
 - o Japanese
 - o Vietnamese, and
 - o Tagalog
- In February and March, developed the State reporting form covering the 1994 general federal election
- In March, distributed to the affected States both the 1994 reporting form and camera-ready copies of the appropriate translations of the National Voter Registration Form.

Throughout this same period, members of the staff of the Office of Election Administration spoke with hundreds of State and local election officials and State legislators -- both by telephone and through speaking engagements -- in an effort to help clarify some of the nuances and subtleties of the Act.

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

Since 1995

Since 1995, the Federal Election Commission, through its Office of Election Administration, has continued to provide the States with assistance

and guidance in understanding their responsibilities under the NVRA. In addition, of course, the FEC reported to the Congress on the impact of the NVRA on the administration of federal elections in 1996 and 1998 and provided the States a more detailed report in 1998.

SECTION 4: COMPARISONS OF THE 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998 AND 2000 DATA

The results of the 2001 survey of the States are provided in Section 5 below along with baseline figures from 1992, 1994, as well as the survey results from 1996 and 1998. But in order to interpret the data properly, it is important to bear in mind their limitations.

Cautions About Making Comparisons Across Years

The first major problem in making comparisons across years is the phenomenon that political scientists call “surge and decline.” This refers to the historical pattern that presidential elections always attract a greater registration and turnout than do non-presidential federal elections. The significance of this pattern is that any comparison across years must be made between elections of the same type. The figures from 2000 should therefore be compared to the figures from 1996.

The second major problem in making cross-year comparisons is the “apples and oranges” problem. In 1992 and 1994, the vast majority of States did not maintain lists of “inactive” registrants. Instead, registration lists were periodically purged of persons who had not voted during a length of time specified in State law. As a result, total registration figures in 1992 and 1994 included an unknown number of people who had moved to a new jurisdiction, registered there to vote, but remained on the list in their previous jurisdiction (since their absence had not yet been reflected in their failure to vote within the specified time frame). Hence, 1992 and 1994 registration figures in Table 1 are somewhat inflated – although no one can know to what extent.

The NVRA, in contrast, prohibits the removal of names from the registry solely for failure to vote and replaces that purging process with a positive verification of the registry (either through the mails or else through the U.S. Postal Service’s National Change of Address Files) at times and frequencies to be determined by the individual States. Persons reported by the USPS to have moved outside the registrar’s jurisdiction are sent a

confirmation mailing and may, at the option of the State, be placed on an "inactive" list (in order to permit them to vote should there have been a Postal Service error).

As a result of the NVRA, States covered by this report now conduct a positive verification of their registration lists – although at different times and in different ways. Moreover, only 35 States opted to establish an "inactive" list. The remaining 10 States did not distinguish between "active" and "inactive" registrants; hence, their active registration figures were inflated by the inclusion of the "inactives."

In order to simplify comparisons for the reader, we have deduced the number of "inactives" in those States that do not distinguish between "actives" and "inactives." We did so in the following manner: (1) We identified the number of confirmation notices that each such State mailed out and subtracted the number of responses to them that they received (on the conservative assumption that respondents were deleted from the list). (2) Since the remaining number would have been placed on an "inactive" list had there been one, we simply subtracted that number from the "total registration" number in order to arrive at an estimated "active registration" number. The numbers in Table 1 reflect this procedure in the following States: FL, IN, KS, MI, NE, OH, RI, VT, WA and WV.

Finally, it is important to note that the 2000 data provided by some of the States are incomplete for the reasons explained immediately below.

Cautions About Making Comparisons Across States

Apart from the previously noted differences in list verification frequencies and procedures, the most significant problem in making comparisons of 2000 data across the States is the problem of incomplete reporting. Indeed, only 25 of the 45 States covered by this report indicated that their data were fully complete. The remainder reported problems in obtaining data from some of their local jurisdictions -- either because these entities did not keep the necessary records or else did not provide the information to the State election authority. (See Table 4).

As a result of this incomplete reporting, the total registration figures for 2000 provided in Table 1 will in some cases be at variance with 2000 registration figures reported elsewhere by the FEC and by other authoritative sources. But in order to make the "actives" plus the "inactives" equal the total, some States reported only the figures they received from their cooperative localities rather than the statewide total they knew to be true.

With these limitations on the data in mind, the following Section summarizes the results of the 2001 survey.

SECTION 5: 1999 SURVEY RESULTS

What follows are highlights from the Federal Election Commission's survey of the States regarding the impact of the NVRA on the administration of elections for federal office from 1999 through 2000. The survey was conducted in March of 2001 pursuant to the requirements of the Act and regulations.

Any survey is essentially a photograph at a particular moment in time. And for the reasons cited above, there are noteworthy limitations on the quality and completeness of this photograph. Moreover, this is only the third survey conducted after the implementation of the NVRA, so that any conclusions drawn from it are necessarily tentative. Greater clarity of the NVRA's long term impact will emerge over time in future reports.

Regarding Overall Voter Registration Rates

According to the most conservative analysis, active voter registration in those States covered by the NVRA rose very slightly to 73.80% in 2000 compared to 73.45% in 1996 while active voter registration nationwide declined very slightly to 72.63% in 2000 from the all-time high of 72.77% in 1996.

Interestingly, voter registration in 2000 actually declined from 1996 levels in 19 of the States under the NVRA – apparently because some States conducted in the interim a strikingly effective and possibly first time ever verification of their voting lists in accordance with the NVRA. It is significant in this regard that the number of inactive registrants (those who have been mailed but have not responded to a verification notice) increased from 8,138,763 in 1996 to 18,274,197 in 2000.

Regarding Sources of Voter Registration Applications

The reporting requirements of the NVRA, as reflected in the FEC's survey of the States, provide a panoramic view of voter registration activity throughout the nation. (See Table 2). The covered States reported a total of

45,654,673 voter registration applications received from the close of the 1998 election to the close of the 2000 election.

It seems clear from the 2001 survey that, from 1999 through 2000, voter registration in motor vehicle offices continues to be the most productive feature of the NVRA. Registration in motor vehicle offices accounted for nearly two fifths (38.10%) of all new voter registration applications. This finding is hardly surprising, though, in light of the fact that, according to the Department of Transportation, 87% of the voting age population obtain drivers licenses.

Registration by mail proved increasingly productive -- yielding nearly a third (31.00%) of all new registration applications. This marked increase may reflect the ready availability of the national and state voter registration forms over the Internet. Some of these mail applications also resulted from voter registration drives and from people personally mailing in forms they obtained from public assistance agencies. In most States it is virtually impossible to detect where applicants obtained their mail-in forms.

About a quarter (23.97%) of all new registration applications came from "Other Sources" which included organized registration drives, deputy registrars, and in-person registrations. (It should be noted, however, that this number is slightly inflated since some local jurisdictions failed to track the sources of applications and therefore reported all new applications in this "Other" category).

All the remaining intake agencies taken together accounted for only around 7.58% of registration applications -- public assistance offices yielding 2.88%, other agencies designated by the State (libraries, schools, and such) yielding 4.12%, offices providing services to the disabled yielding .42%, and Armed Forces recruiting offices yielding .16%.

There was some initial concern that the NVRA's broad expansion of opportunities to register would result in significantly increasing the number of duplicates -- that is, applications from persons who were already registered under the same name at the same address. As it turned out, however, the number of duplicates reported (7.72%), while slightly up from last reporting period, was still not especially remarkable. Nor did any one category of intake agencies seem to be responsible for a significantly greater percentage of duplicates than any other -- although mail registration generated the most at 9.79%.

Finally, 19,652,575 -- nearly half (43.04%) of the total number of applications -- were changes to current voter registration information or else rejected applications. The FEC deduced this figure by subtracting the total

number of new registrations from the total number of non-duplicate applications received. The FEC had not wanted to burden local registrars by asking them to distinguish which applications were changes to the voter registration record versus which were rejected. Anecdotal evidence from conversations with election officials around the country, however, suggests that the overwhelming majority of these transactions were changes of name or address.

Thus, not only did active voter registration increase slightly in 2000 in the covered States, but the NVRA also facilitated millions of Americans in updating their current voter registration records.

Regarding Costs

A few people, during the rulemaking process, urged the FEC to collect data regarding the costs of the NVRA. But for several reasons, there is no practical way of determining what the added costs of the NVRA might be.

Most voter registration and election services are provided from a larger, multi-purpose public office -- such as the County Clerk or the County Auditor. Such offices almost invariably prepare an office-wide line item budget rather than a mission-oriented, activity based budget. As a result, they are in most instances unable to identify even their total election-related costs, let alone the costs of a change in voter registration procedures. Without imposing a terrible cost accounting burden on local registrars, the FEC would have had to rely on estimated costs. And past experience (with the bilingual provisions of the Voting Rights Act and with the polling place provisions of the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act) suggests that estimated costs tend to vary inversely with the estimator's opinion of the law in the first place.

In sum, true cost figures are just too murky. But instead of trying to wade through the minor costs, it seems more sensible to focus on the major cost factor that virtually all voter registrars noticed: mailing costs. That issue *can* be addressed, though only in terms of volumes rather than precise dollar figures (since the types of mailings and any special discount arrangements with the USPS have a direct bearing on the per item mailing costs and vary from place to place).

Perhaps the most dramatic cost associated with the NVRA is the requirement that voter registration lists be positively verified rather than passively purged for failure to vote. There are basically only two ways to accomplish this task: either running the entire voter list against the Postal

Service's computerized National Change of Address files (NCOA), or else mailing non-forwardable notices to everyone on the voter registry. The NCOA option is by far the less expensive approach. Yet it can be problematical; nor does it, by definition, capture either deaths or the 10% of the population who move but do not file a change of address with the Postal Service. Those folks may be captured by a direct mailing that entails a first class service (return if undeliverable, address correction requested) and, usually, first class postage.

States vary in how and when they periodically verify their voter registration lists. Some use a direct mailing to their entire registry. Others use the NCOA files. Still others leave the choice to their local registrars. The thriftiest thorough approach would be to alternate between the two strategies each two years. But even such a fiscally conservative policy would entail the cost of a direct mailing to the entire voter registration list each four years. And with a current total of around 144,000,000 active registered voters in the States covered by the NVRA, it is not difficult to see that local registrars would collectively incur millions of dollars in new mailing costs just for the verification mailing alone.

In addition to the verification mailing, however, the NVRA requires persons reported by the Postal Service to have moved outside the registrar's jurisdiction be mailed a forwardable confirmation notice containing a postage paid return postcard. Similarly, folks who are reported to have moved within the jurisdiction are to be mailed a notice indicating their change of address for voting purposes along with a postage paid response card. Because the outgoing mailings also entail first class service, they usually command first class postage (although the postage paid return postcard may be less expensive). In any event, from 1999 through 2000 a nationwide total of 18,892,331 confirmation notices were mailed out by registrars to persons who were reported to have moved outside the registrar's jurisdiction (along with an untold number of notices to those who had moved within the jurisdiction). These confirmation notices, in turn, induced 4,353,892 postcard responses with postage also paid by the registrars. At a very minimum, then, registrars collectively bore additional mailing costs for the confirmation process that easily reached into seven figures.

The NVRA also requires that all voter registration applications be acknowledged by the registrar, although many States already required this. Still, from 1999 through 2000, this procedure triggered around 45,654,673 acknowledgment mailings from registrars nationwide at a cost, again, in seven figures.

Viewed nationwide, then, with

- quadrennial verification mailings to a minimum of 150,000,000 people

- biennial confirmation mailings to a minimum of 15,000,000 people.
- biennial return postage on confirmation postcards from a minimum of 3,000,000 people, and
- biennial acknowledgment mailings to a minimum of 40,000,000 people

it is not hard to perceive that total postage costs (not to mention printing and handling costs) have now become and will continue to be a major item in every registrar's budget.

Regarding Mail Registration Programs

The NVRA requires States to accept and use a national mail voter registration form [Section 6(a)(1)]. This form was prescribed by the FEC in consultation with chief State election officials [Section 9(a)(2)]. The FEC also made the national form available on its Web site on the Internet so that it could be downloaded, completed, and mailed to one of the 26 States that will now accept paper reproductions of the form.

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

The NVRA specifically permits States to require that those persons who register by mail vote in person the first time. Seven States (Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Nevada, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) have chosen that option.

States reported very few problems with mail registration. And two of the problems are inherent in the mail registration process. First, there are continued complaints about the inevitable inadequate addresses, misdirected applications, underage applicants, ineligible applicants, practical joke names, and the like. Second, the United States Postal Service continued to draw a few complaints about applications being mangled by USPS equipment despite the fact that forms were designed in accordance with postal specifications.

Finally, a new and possibly intractable problem has emerged over the past two years. A number of private organizations have decided to make the national voter registration form available over their web sites. Most have

done so responsibly and, indeed, in cooperation with the FEC's Office of Election Administration. Some, however, have variously:

- failed to provide applicants with complete or accurate information
- required more information from applicants than is required by their State
- failed to advise applicants of when their State will not accept a flimsy printout copy of the form (as opposed to a form on heavy stock), or
- if it is part of their service, failed to properly process or deliver registration applications they have received by way of their internet service.

The result has been the disenfranchisement and disappointment of hundreds of citizens – especially the young.

There is, alas, no practical way of preventing such abuses of the Internet. We do hope, however, that the State and local election offices will join with the FEC each election year in warning the citizenry that voter registration using unofficial web sites can carry significant risks.

Yet on the whole, States seem to have had few difficulties in administering the mail registration provisions of the NVRA.

Regarding Motor Voter Registration Programs

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

Motor voter agencies continued the trend shown in previous reports by once again yielding the highest volume of registration applications among the various mandated agencies, accounting for 38.1% of the total number of registration applications in the United States during 1999-2000.

In marked contrast to the responses received from our last two surveys however, twenty-three of the forty-five States (including the District of Columbia) reported having significant problems with their motor voter registration programs during the last election cycle. Eighteen States reported problems with completed voter registration applications not being delivered to the appropriate election official in a timely manner. (Section

5(e) of the NVRA requires that applications be forwarded to the appropriate election official within ten days of acceptance, or, if accepted within five days of the close of registration, within five days of acceptance.) Several of these States also reported receiving complaints from a significant number of individuals who stated that they had completed voter registration applications at motor vehicle offices which were (apparently) never forwarded to the appropriate election official. These reports are supported by hundreds of calls received by the Federal Election Commission's Office of Election Administration on or around election day 2000 from individuals claiming to have registered at motor vehicle offices but who were told by poll workers that their application had never been received by the local election official. This problem should be particularly troubling to both election officials and motor vehicle agency officials as they represent a three-fold increase in the number of such instances since our last survey.

Other reported problems included seven States which had difficulties with incomplete or missing data on registration applications received from motor vehicle offices, including such important data as the applicant's signature. Two States reported problems with voter registration application forms not being provided to motor vehicle customers on a consistent basis and with motor vehicle office clerks not asking applicants if they wished to register to vote on a consistent basis. One State reported instances in which the required Spanish translation of the voter registration application was not being provided to motor vehicle customers in jurisdictions covered by the language minority provisions of the Voting Rights Act contained in 42 U.S.C. 1973aa-1a and 1973b(f)(4). And, finally, one State reported problems with new registrants filling out the change of address portion of the application form by mistake, assuming that their application would still be accepted by the election official.

As we noted in our initial report to Congress, one of the lessons learned from those States that had successful motor voter programs prior to the passage of the NVRA was the importance of adequate training for motor vehicle staff. The uniformly high turnover rate for staff in DMV offices throughout the nation appears to contribute significantly to the problem of implementing an effective motor voter program. This is especially true in those States that do not have procedures in place to provide training for new DMV staff in their responsibilities under the motor voter provisions of the NVRA, as well as for periodic re-training of permanent staff.

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

- *Colorado* is in the process of working with the State motor vehicle division to implement, before the 2002 general election, an electronic program whereby completed voter registration applications may be downloaded by the various county clerks throughout the State from motor vehicle offices on a daily basis, thereby eliminating the problem of timely transmittal of registration applications.
- *Massachusetts* developed a program that allowed each city and town election official to use the State central voter registry to review the electronic signature of a person who had registered at a motor vehicle office. Prior to the development of this feature, local officials had to request the State election office to retrieve signatures from voter registration applications.
- *Michigan* amended the State Vehicle Code in 2000 to clarify that a person's driver license/personal identification card address must correspond to his or her voter registration address. Any address change submitted by an individual on a voter registration form is automatically carried over to the individual's driver license or personal identification card. Similarly, an address change submitted by an individual to update his or her driver license record is automatically carried over to the individual's voter registration record.
- *Texas* is considering the development of a program that would require the State Department of Public Service to submit names of all registrants in electronic form in addition to delivering hard copy of completed voter registration applications. This system is expected to provide an additional check to assure that all applications are received by the appropriate election official.
- *Virginia* has added a prompt to their system which reminds DMV employees to ask a person if they would like to apply to register to vote or to change their address for voter registration purposes. DMV has also begun to give each customer who registers to vote an acknowledgement that lets the customer know that they have only applied to register to vote and that if they do not receive a voter card within 30 days to contact their local registrar or the State Board of Elections. In addition, DMV has begun retaining all unsigned applications for at least four years. This allows the DMV to verify whether or not an application was completed when an individual appears at a polling place believing they had registered to vote at a DMV office.

Regarding Agency Voter Registration Programs

The NVRA requires that individuals be given the opportunity to register to vote (or to change their voter registration address) in elections for federal office when applying for (or receiving) services or assistance: at any

office in the State that provides public assistance; at or through any office in the State that provides State funded programs primarily engaged in providing services for those with disabilities; at certain other offices designated by the State; and at armed forces recruitment offices.

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

1998 amendments to the Higher Education Act [Section 487(a) (20 U.S.C. 1094 (a))] mandated that post-secondary education institutions such as colleges, universities, and vocational schools that participate in federal student aid programs and are located in States not exempt from implementing the NVRA must provide voter registration services. The law requires covered institutions to request mail voter registration forms from the State before each federal and gubernatorial election, and to make a good faith effort to distribute them to each enrolled student. The law also specifically *prohibits* any officer of the executive branch from instructing these institutions in the manner in which this amendment is carried out. This prohibition presumably includes any federal record keeping requirements and the subsequent collection of data from institutions regarding this particular program.

Applications received at all agency sites combined to represent 7.58% of the total number of voter registration applications in the United States in 1999-2000. Agencies designated by the States (such as public libraries, public high schools, unemployment offices, tax revenue offices, marriage license bureaus and a variety of others) accounted for 4.12% of this figure; public assistance agencies accounted for 2.88%; disability service offices accounted for .42%; and armed forces recruitment offices accounted for .16%.

While the number of reported problems associated with the agency registration provisions of the NVRA were significantly less than those reported in motor vehicle offices, they did represent an increase from those reported for the 1997-1998 election cycle.

Six States reported problems with the timely transmittal of completed voter registration applications from agency offices to local election offices as required by Section 7(d)(1)&(2) of the Act. (As with motor vehicle agencies, all public assistance agencies covered under Section 7 of the NVRA are required to transmit completed applications to the appropriate election authority within ten days of acceptance, or within five days of acceptance if the applications are received within five days of the close of registration). In addition to delayed transmittals, two States reported having an unacceptably

high number of duplicate registrations from agency clients who felt compelled to fill out a new registration application each time they visited an agency office. One State reported instances of several agencies simply not complying with the provisions of the NVRA. One State reported that agency clients were hesitant to sign the declination form even if they did not wish to register or were already registered. One State reported difficulty in providing adequate training to agency staff because of extremely high staff turnover rate.

Although problems with agency voter registration programs as reported by State election offices have been relatively small, it should be noted that advocacy groups such as the National Organization on Disabilities (NOD) feel that there are significant problems with the implementation of the agency based provisions of the NVRA. NOD cites a poll done for their organization by the Harris Agency in 1998 which reported that only 25% of people with disabilities had been asked by a service provider to register to vote.

Four States submitted specific recommendations for Congress to eliminate the NVRA's provisions requiring the declination form and the need to retain these forms contained in Section 7(a)(6)(A)&(B). Comments echoed those submitted in our last report and included a request to "allow the agencies to focus attention to voter registration forms and eliminate the requirement for declination forms - boxes and boxes of these forms are filling our public records spaces." Another State commented that the declination form be eliminated because it was "cumbersome and inconsistently administered by agencies, and the records it produces serve no purpose." One State recommended that Congress amend the NVRA to limit the number of times that a frequent customer at a specific agency must be offered the opportunity to register to vote.

Several States reported increasing the number of agencies providing voter registration services during 1999-2000. These new agencies consisted primarily of private community-based mental health offices.

A number of States reported improvements made during 1999-2000 to increase the effectiveness of their agency voter registration programs:

- *Connecticut* reported an ongoing effort to notify agency coordinators of key election dates and voter registration deadlines. The Secretary of State's Office also developed materials to meet agency requests to increase the visibility of voter registration programs to "front line" employees, and the general public.

- *North Carolina* instituted periodic evaluations of State programs to ensure that newly established agencies were being provided training and other services. The State Board of Elections also revised the agency voter registration application from “free form” to individual letter blocks for more legible printing.
- *Virginia* reported that the State Health and Human Resources Secretariat created a new voter registration agency liaison position to work with the State Board of Elections and other voter registration agencies to improve the process and to assure compliance with the NVRA. Virginia also increased the amount of training provided to agency registration staff regarding their responsibilities under the NVRA.

Regarding List Maintenance Programs

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

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

The law requires registrars who receive information on a voter’s change of address to another location within the registrar’s jurisdiction to update the registrant’s voting address [Section 8(f)]. The House Committee report makes it clear that this is to be done without requiring the registrant to reregister or otherwise to notify the registrar of the change [H. Rept. 103-9, at page 18].

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

- upon their death [Section 8(a)(4)(A)];
- upon their written confirmation that their address has changed to a location outside the registrar’s jurisdiction [Sections 8(a)(4)(B) and 8(d)(1)(A)]; and

- upon their failure to respond to certain confirmation mailings along with their failure to offer to vote in any federal general elections subsequent to the mailing [Sections 8(a)(4)(B) and 8(d)(1)(B)]. (The confirmation mailings in this case are those mailed out to registrants who, based on information received from the Postal Service, have apparently changed their address to a location outside the registrar's jurisdiction.)

The NVRA also permits States to remove the names of registrants:

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

Other than these provisions, the law grants States wide latitude in the routine or systematic methods by which they may ensure the accuracy of their voter registration lists.

States reported mailing 18,892,331 confirmation notices and receiving 4,353,892 responses to those notices (a 23.05% response rate) during the 1999-2000 election cycle. This compares favorably to the 17,801,458 notices and 16.35% response rate in and 1997-1998 and the 11,469,948 notices and 19.5% response rate in 1995-1996.

States also reported deleting 7,216,397 persons from the lists of active registrants and 5,799,515 from the "inactive" list, for a total of 13,014,912 removed from registration lists during 1999-2000. This compares to total deletions of 9,063,326 in 1997-1998 and 8,723,301 in 1995-1996.

Furthermore, States reported that, as of the close of the November 2000 general election, 18,274,197 of the 162,680,962 registered voters remained on the "inactive" list (11.2%), many of whom will be removed from the lists after the 2002 general election. This compares to 9.6% of registered voters remaining on the "inactive" list in 1997-1998 and 5.6% in 1995-1996.

These figures suggest an increasing effort by the States to maintain up-to-date lists.

States covered by this report continued to approach list maintenance differently; however, it appears that many persisted in seeking the techniques that are most effective in their own communities. Twelve States indicated that they had made adjustments, since 1998, in order to improve their list maintenance program. While the nature of these alterations varied, the most commonly reported involved:

- the growing use of computerized voter registries and computer-assisted techniques to update the voter registration file, statewide or locally (5 States - Arizona, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Utah, and Virginia); and
- the States' increasing role in the dissemination to local jurisdictions of information necessary to maintain accurate lists through:
 - the conveyance of the death records, criminal conviction records, and lists of individuals apparently registered more than once within the State (4 States - North Carolina, Rhode Island, Virginia, Utah); and
 - training in NVRA requirements and list maintenance techniques (2 States - Mississippi, Utah).

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

- requiring all registrants to provide the last four digits of their social security number, to help identify duplicate registrations (Oklahoma);
- implementing a new State law requiring the address on the drivers license to correspond to the voter registration address, which meant that changes to voter registration addresses automatically affected drivers license addresses and vice versa (Michigan);
- sending confirmation notices when Postal Service information indicates that the person may have moved out of the jurisdiction (Hawaii);
- sending confirmation notices, along with a voter registration application, to persons who are listed on the voter registry as residing at the same address as a new registrant (one county in Arizona);
- having all local jurisdictions mail a specimen ballot to each registered voter, which triggered a confirmation notice if the mailing was returned and provided statewide uniform approach (Maryland); and
- delegating primary list maintenance activities back to the counties while still maintaining a statewide computerized voter registry (Arkansas).

Two other States declared their intention to make prospective changes, based on their past experiences. Kansas reported that, due to problems some counties are having with using the State-mandated U.S. Postal Service's National Change of Address program (NCOA), State law will be changed to allow counties the option of using either NCOA or mass mailings. Indiana reported its intention to establish a statewide voter registry within the next four years to help maintain an accurate voter registration list.

Five States reported successes in implementing the NVRA list maintenance requirements. Their accomplishments included the following specific achievements:

- *North Carolina* fielded software integrated barcode scanning technology to eliminate high-level administrative work when handling returned mailings. The system automatically assigns voter status based on returned mail and accounts for each individual voter record's place in the verification/confirmation process, which reduced the number of staff and time needed for processing.
- *Massachusetts* upgraded its statewide voter registration system to automatically delete "inactive" voters at the appropriate time.
- *Rhode Island*, which does not have a computerized statewide voter registration database, reported
 - removing approximately 18,000 duplicate registrations through a statewide review of possible duplicate registrations; and
 - finding the USPS change of address file to be an effective method of updating the registry when local jurisdictions make use of it.
- *Arizona* reported that:
 - one county had some success with poll workers helping to identify deceased or moved registrants and with candidates supplying their returned mailings, so that the election official can follow up with a confirmation notice¹; and
 - another county identifying many people who have moved through sending forwardable confirmation notices, along with a voter registration application, to registrants who are listed at the same address as a new registrant.
- *Maine* indicated that implementation of mandatory purge procedures under the NVRA has removed deadwood from the voter registries. (The State noted that the percentage of registered voters to Voting Age Population decreased from 106% in 1996 to 98% in 1998 and 2000.)

States reported a number of challenges in maintaining accurate voter registration lists during 1999-2000, many of which were similar to those reported for 1997-1998. Thirteen States reported problems in maintaining accurate lists. They expressed concerns about:

- the high costs of lists maintenance programs, in general, or costs of "unnecessary" mailings specifically (for confirmation mailings to undeliverable addresses or routine election mailings to all registrants, including those designated "inactive") under State implementation of NVRA requirements (5 States - Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, Ohio, Utah);

¹ States must exercise caution to ensure that list maintenance procedures are uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965. "This requirement may not be avoided by a registrar conducting a purge program or activity based on lists provided by other parties where such lists were compiled as the result of a selective, non-uniform, or discriminatory program or activity." [Hse. Rpt., Section 8, page 15.]

- the inability to quickly remove deadwood, and the associated adverse effects of inflated lists on reported voter turnout percentages (3 States - Alaska, California, Louisiana);
- inaccurate Postal Service change of address information used to identify potential movers (3 States - Kansas, Ohio, West Virginia);
- the lack of responses to confirmation mailings (2 States - Alaska, Ohio);
- faulty felony conviction notifications or death notices that resulted in the erroneous removal of individuals from the voter registry (2 States - Ohio, Virginia);
- the increasing problem of duplicate registrations (2 States - Indiana, Louisiana);
- the local election officials' trouble mastering complicated list maintenance requirements (2 States - Montana, Utah); and
- the potential discriminatory effect of using uniform address confirmation procedures after a natural disaster has displaced a high number of minority registrants (1 State - North Carolina).²

Eleven States forwarded recommendations to address list maintenance problems. Most of these would require Congressional action. Some would require national action by the Postal Service.

In response to the high costs of list maintenance programs:

- *California, Kentucky, and Ohio* recommended eliminating the requirement for a forwardable confirmation notice to be sent after a mailing has been returned undeliverable with no forwarding address;
- *Arizona, Hawaii, and Kansas* recommended reduced postal rates for election mailings, either through enforcing the intent of the NVRA postal rate provisions, providing a larger discount, or allowing postage free mailings;
- *Kentucky* also recommended that States be allowed to include the confirmation notice in any first notice mailed to registrants; and
- *Kansas* further recommended that federal funds be allocated for States to develop list maintenance programs.

Regarding the use of the U.S. Postal Service change of address information:

² The State also noted that the affected county is working closely with the State Board of Elections to "utilize as many resources as possible to locate the displaced registered voters and implement list maintenance in a uniform, nondiscriminatory manner."

- *Arkansas* recommended that USPS changes of address information automatically be provided to the voter registrar, so that the information is received sooner than it would be through election mailings.
- *West Virginia* recommended that the requirements for becoming an authorized vendor for the Postal Service's NCOA program be more stringent, so that the information is more accurate.

To address the challenge of inflated lists:

- *Arizona* recommended that election workers encourage voters to inform the local election official of changes of address.
- *Kansas* recommended allowing States to remove registrants for failure to vote in two consecutive federal elections.
- *Louisiana* recommended allowing the removal of "inactive" voters sooner.
- *South Dakota* recommended allowing confirmation notices to be sent based on the combination of not voting and no contact.
- *Vermont* recommended that small communities of less than 500 registered voters, where it is very obvious when someone has moved or left town, be permitted to remove persons from the registry sooner.

The Commission addressed a variety of list maintenance challenges in its March 1998 report entitled *Implementing the National Voter Registration Act: A Report to State and Local Election Officials on Problems and Solutions Discovered 1995-1996*. That report explored, in detail, the pros and cons of possible solutions to each problem.

Many concerns can be resolved by changing the way the State or local jurisdiction implements the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. Others problems are not so easily rectified. For example, while the U.S. Postal Service's national office continues to work with the Joint Election Officials Liaison Committee's Postal Service Task Force to try to resolve problems involving the Postal Service, the agency's financial state and the standards they employ to qualify mailings for reduced postage will continue to be an obstacle to reducing postal costs for many jurisdictions. Furthermore, States making good faith attempts to remove from the registry those persons no longer eligible to vote (e.g.; deceased, felons, movers) are stymied when they receive inaccurate, incomplete, or out of date information from the agencies that track the pertinent information or from contractors that provide it.

The Commission continues to make recommendations for the implementation of approaches that would improve the maintenance of accurate voter registration lists and reduce associated costs. These recommendations focus on the use of the last four digits of the registrant's social security number, the

development of a statewide computerized voter registration database, and the implementation of reduced postage rates for all mailings requisite to the NVRA. In addition, problems in the last election with the erroneous removal of eligible individuals from voter registries, and the subsequent denial of their right to vote, have prompted the Commission to offer two new recommendations regarding removal notifications and provisional ballots.

Regarding Fail-Safe Voting Programs

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

As in the past, the States continue to pursue different approaches to this matter, with four States reporting adjustments to their procedures in order to improve the administration of fail-safe voting. Hawaii started providing separate lists of "inactive" registrants to the polls. New Jersey began requiring by law that provisional ballots be used for voters who move outside their former precinct but within the voter registrar's jurisdiction. (Previously, the State had used provisional ballots in accordance with a State Attorney General directive.) North Carolina added a new category of fail-safe voter, entitled the "jurisdictional dispute" voter, who are voters whose assignment to a voting district is either disputed by the voter or by the voter registrar. Rhode Island introduced a revised affirmation form, which was designed to simplify the process for the voter as well as for the polling officials. The State noted that the response to the form was positive.

Three States reported some success in administering fail-safe voting. Arkansas disclosed that the State has been successful in implementing fail-safe voting due to continued poll worker training throughout the State by the State Board of Elections. Louisiana stated that the fail-safe program has been working. Virginia reported that, due to previous problems in determining eligibility to vote, the State Board of Elections provided additional reminders on the use of provisional ballots to local registrars and electoral boards, immediately prior to the November general election.

More States reported challenges in administering fail-safe voting during 1999-2000, compared to 1997-1998. Seven States reported problems, up from four in 1997-1998. Two of these appear to be related to poll workers implementing the fail-safe voting provisions:

- *Indiana* disclosed problems with poll worker mistakes; and

- *Rhode Island* noted that polling officials have difficulty grasping the concept of fail-safe voting.

Two highlight provisional ballots:

- *Kansas* noted that fail-safe voting is producing an ever-increasing number of provisional ballots that, in turn, increase the amount of administrative time and resources dedicated to processing such ballots and increase the difficulty of preparing for the post-election canvass and certification of results.
- *North Carolina* reported problems with political parties hauling unregistered individuals to the polls and demanding provisional ballots for them.

Some of the reported problems, however, relate more to the unique way the State chose to implement the fail-safe voting provisions or to State procedures that are not addressed by the NVRA at all:

- *Virginia* disclosed that there was confusion over determining eligibility when the State law prohibits registrants from voting if they have moved from one federal Congressional District to another, but allows them to vote if they have moved from one State legislative district to another so long as it is within the same Congressional District.³
- *Connecticut* reported a problem with an unprecedented number of persons applying for a Presidential ballot on election day, causing havoc at local town halls, after the State enacted a provision allowing "non-registered" citizens to apply to vote for President from 7 days prior to the election to 8:00 p.m. on election day.
- *Oregon* also noted lines of people at election offices at 8:00 p.m. on election day; but these people were waiting to update their voter registration information and vote. These registrants had nowhere else to go because the State had decided to conduct the election entirely by mail and no polls were open.

None of the States made recommendations regarding fail-safe voting; however, *Kansas* noted that State law may have to be changed to help the counties deal with the administrative aspects of provisional balloting.

The Commission addressed a variety of fail-safe voting challenges in its March 1998 report entitled *Implementing the National Voter Registration Act: A Report to State and Local Election Officials on Problems and Solutions Discovered 1995-1996*. That report explored, in detail, the pros and cons of possible solutions to each difficulty, including the importance of ensuring that fail-safe voting programs

³ This approach is due partly to *Virginia* considering the entire State as the registrar's jurisdiction, so that registrants who move from one county to another are not deleted from the registry and do not have to reregister.

meet the requirements of federal law. Furthermore, the refusal of some polling officials to provide a ballot in the last election to persons who were erroneously removed from voter registries has prompted the Commission to offer a new recommendation regarding provisional ballots at the polls.

SECTION 6: FEC RECOMMENDATIONS

The Federal Election Commission's survey of the 45 jurisdictions covered by the NVRA invited them to describe any problems they may have encountered and any ideas or recommendations they might have for improving the administration of the Act. The bulk of their responses focused on some of the more technical procedures associated with list maintenance, fail-safe voting, and the agency declination procedure. Many of these technical recommendations depend upon how individual States have chosen to implement various provisions of the Act. Since this report is directed to the United States Congress and not to individual State legislatures, we limit our recommendations to those universal enough to be applicable to all States covered by the Act.

The most significant problems reported by the States continue to group into three broad categories. Accordingly, the FEC reiterates the three core recommendations offered in the last two reports:

- that States which do not require all or part of the applicant's social security number voluntarily (1) amend their election codes to require only the last four digits from all new voter registration applicants, and (2) endeavor to obtain that same item of information from all current registered voters;
- that States which have not yet done so voluntarily (1) develop and implement a statewide computerized voter registration database; (2) ensure that all local registration offices are computerized; and (3) link their statewide computerized system, where feasible, with the computerized systems of the collateral public agencies relevant to the NVRA (motor vehicle offices, public assistance offices, etc.); and
- that the U.S. Postal Service (1) create a new class of mail for "official election material" that encompasses all mail items requisite to the NVRA

and provides the most favorable reduced rates affordable for the first class treatment of such mailings; and (2) provide space in their postal lobbies free of charge to State and local election officials for voter registration material.

In addition to these three general recommendations, the experience of the 2000 general election suggests four specific recommendations:

- that States develop and implement an on-going, periodic training program for relevant motor vehicle and agency personnel regarding their duties and responsibilities under the NVRA as implemented by the State's law.
- that States require motor vehicle and agency offices to promptly transmit information regarding voter registration applicants electronically to the appropriate election office with documentation to follow.
- that States devise a procedure whereby voters may cast a provisional ballot at the polls on election day under circumstances prescribed in State law but at least for the purposes of the fail-safe provisions of the NVRA.
- that States adopt the practice of mailing a forwardable notice to all persons who are removed from the voter registration list whose mail has not previously been returned as undeliverable.

The rationale for each of these recommendations follows.

RECOMMENDATION 1: that States, which do not require all or part of the applicant's social security number, voluntarily (1) amend their election codes to require but not divulge only the last four digits of their social security number from all new voter registration applicants; and (2) endeavor to obtain but not divulge that same item of information from all current registered voters.

Several election officials expressed their concerns about the problem of identifying multiple registrations by the same individual from different addresses. Others had problems identifying applications that were duplicates of registrants on file. Still others reported problems with changes of address when the applicant neglected to provide a former address. These problems are exacerbated when applicants provide incomplete names (such as using nicknames or initials instead of full names, providing no middle name or initial, or failing to indicate the appropriate suffix of "Jr." or "Sr."). There has also been some concern about the prospect of undocumented aliens registering to vote. And finally, there have been some concerns about the potentiality of persons voting in the name of others.

All of these problems have in common the issue of accurately ascertaining a registrant's identity. And to this end, the Federal Election Commission recommends the use of just the last four digits of each registrant's social security number. There are at least four significant advantages to this strategy: (1) the combination of name, date of birth, and last four social security digits is about as close to a practical, unique personal identifier as we are likely to get in the foreseeable future; (2) requiring just the last four digits would not necessitate a change in federal law; (3) requiring just the last four digits protects registrants against the inadvertent or illegal disclosure of their full social security number; and (4) the universal use of the last four digits would greatly facilitate intrastate and even interstate communications regarding registered voters.⁴ These four advantages warrant some further explanation.

There has for years been a search for some unobtrusive, inexpensive way of ascertaining individual identities. Yet none are at hand. Fingerprints, voice prints, retinal prints, and even DNA prints, though technically possible, are far too intrusive and expensive for all but the rarest applications. And none suit the election environment. Even photo IDs entail major expenses, both initially and in maintenance, and seem an undue and potentially discriminatory burden on citizens in exercising their basic right. Moreover, the opportunity to register to vote by mail imposes severe limitations on what can be practically required of the citizenry.

Some have suggested that "place of birth" might be a reasonable choice. Yet "place of birth" has some serious drawbacks. First, it is not as precise as the last four digits of the social security number since, as a practical matter, it is far more likely that there will be more John Smiths (or whatever) born on the same day in the same large jurisdiction than there will be John Smiths born on the same day with the same last four digits of their social security numbers. Second, "place of birth" (especially if that place of birth is outside the United States) could in some circumstances be used for discriminatory purposes -- subjecting applications from foreign born citizens

⁴ The Federal Election Commission considered requiring the last four digits of the social security number on the national mail voter registration form as a means of meeting privacy concerns while still allowing the use of these numbers for identification purposes. The Commission rejected this approach because it would have arbitrarily imposed on the States an identification system that might conflict with existing State needs and practices, such as established computerized voter registration systems that used the full social security number for records comparisons. The Commission, instead, provided a field for whatever identification number might be required or requested from the applicant's State of residence. This field would support any States that voluntarily implement a requirement for the last four digits.

to a greater scrutiny than those from citizens born inside the country. It should be noted, however, that undocumented aliens are unlikely to have a social security number and might thus be deterred from inadvertently or intentionally registering to vote. And finally, "place of birth" is a far more difficult data element to encode in a computer than is the straightforward last four digits of the social security number.

The Privacy Act of 1974 prohibits States from using the full social security number for voter registration purposes unless they did so prior to January of 1975. Today, seven States can and do *require* the full social security number. Two States *require* the last four digits of the social security number. Seventeen other States *request* the full social security number, and three States *request* the last four digits. The remainder employ alternatives (such as the State drivers license number) or require nothing at all. Reverting to a requirement for the entire social security number would necessitate a change in federal law in the face of all the arguments supporting the Privacy Act in the first place. Requiring only the last four digits of that number accomplishes the same objective without necessitating a change in federal law.

Related to that legislative issue is the advantage that requiring only the last four digits of the social security number protects registrants from the inadvertent or illegal disclosure of their full social security number. The public disclosure of social security numbers is a growing problem. Unscrupulous people have used them to pry into other people's employment records, manipulate their financial records, and even ruin their credit ratings. It is therefore incumbent on public offices to guard against such abuses; and requiring only the last four digits of registrants' social security numbers seems, for voter registration purposes, the easiest way to do that.

The complex issue of divulging such numbers, while somewhat less sensitive than the full social security number, should be examined by the individual States themselves, with emphasis on the risks and benefits and the degree of automation present in their local jurisdictions.

The final advantage to requiring the last four digits of each registrant's social security number is that, if universally employed, such a feature would facilitate intrastate and even interstate communications regarding registered voters. In combination with Recommendation 2 below, using the last four digits would enable States to check for multiple registrations by the same person not only within local jurisdictions, but also between local jurisdictions within the State -- an especially useful capability around large metropolitan areas. Further, it would facilitate the cancellation

of a new registrant's prior registration -- not only between local jurisdictions within the same State, but also among all local jurisdictions across all States.

All these matters taken together, then, requiring only the last four digits of the social security number from *all* registrants seems to be a highly desirable practice.

RECOMMENDATION 2: that States, which have not yet done so, voluntarily (1) develop and implement a statewide computerized voter registration database; (2) ensure that all local registration offices are computerized; and (3) link their statewide computerized system, where feasible, with the computerized systems of the collateral public agencies relevant to the NVRA (motor vehicle offices, public assistance offices, etc.)

A number of States reported problems in the timely transmittal of voter registration applications to their offices from motor vehicle and public assistance offices. Others, as noted, had difficulties in readily determining whether incoming applications were new or merely duplicative or else changes in name or address.

All of these problems have in common the issue of information transmittal, storage, and retrieval. In order to resolve these problems, as well as to gain a host of other benefits, the Federal Election Commission recommends that all States computerize their voter registration files both locally and statewide and further, that these computerized voter registration systems be linked where feasible with the collateral public agencies that are appropriate under the NVRA. In order to hasten this process, the Congress may want to consider providing some sort of financial assistance to the States -- perhaps in the form of a matching-fund grant program for them to develop or enhance such systems.

Possibly the most important role that a statewide computerized voter registration database can play in facilitating compliance with the NVRA lies in that Act's intake provisions -- specifically in the requirement that drivers license and public assistance offices offer their clients an opportunity to register to vote simultaneous with their other services. If these agencies are also computerized and are linked to the voter registration database, they can transmit new registration applications instantly to the appropriate registration official. Moreover, they can immediately ascertain whether applicants are already registered at their current address. Such a capability virtually eliminates duplicate applications from those agencies -- thereby easing a burden on voter registrars.

A statewide voter registration database can also greatly facilitate the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA in at least five ways. First, it can handily accomplish the otherwise messy business of removing names by reason of death, felony conviction, or legal declaration of non compos mentis. Second, it can readily run the statewide list against the NCOA files to identify persons who have moved and left a forwarding address with the postal service. Third, it can serve as the point of contact for receiving cancellation notices from their State motor vehicle files or from election jurisdictions throughout the nation. Fourth, it can perform internal checks to guard against multiple or improper registrations. And fifth, it could even handle any or all the mailings required under the NVRA including acknowledgment notices, confirmation notices, and verification mailings.

Finally, a statewide computerized voter registration database could easily generate much of the data required by the FEC under regulations pursuant to the NVRA -- thereby easing the data collection and reporting burden on local registrars.

Such systems are by no means new. In fact, over a dozen States already maintain some form of statewide computerized voter registration list. Whether their level of computerization is "state of the art" (such as the Kentucky system of direct on-line access between the election offices, the motor vehicle offices, and the public agency offices), or whether their computerization has been more modestly developed to include only a portion or even one of these offices, States such as Arkansas, Kansas, Massachusetts, and Missouri report that their initial investment in a computerized system has proven worthwhile.

The development of a completely integrated Statewide voter registration database is neither quick nor easy. It requires time, effort, and dedication by all the agencies involved at all levels of government -- from the State legislature, the State election office, other agency offices, and the local registration offices. Nor can the product or its benefits be expected overnight. Depending on the complexity of the environment, the model chosen, the frequency of intervening elections, and the resources and skills available, the project can take two to four years (or even longer if fundamental changes to the design occur during the development cycle).

Because of the fundamental importance of computerization, yet in view of the costs and time frames involved, we reiterate that the Congress may want to consider providing some sort of financial assistance to the States -- perhaps in the form of a matching-fund grant program for them to develop or enhance such systems. For although the NVRA does not mandate that State or local registration files be computerized, there can be no doubt that

computerization makes it easier on everyone to comply with the Act's requirements.

RECOMMENDATION 3: that the U.S. Postal Service (1) create a new class of mail for "official election material" that encompasses all mail items requisite to the NVRA and provide the most favorable reduced rates affordable for the first class treatment of such mailings; and (2) provide space in their postal lobbies free of charge to State and local election officials for voter registration materials.

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

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

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

In addition, some jurisdictions may employ

- "non-forwardable" mailings as a means of periodically verifying their registration lists as required by the Act.

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

Accordingly, the Postal Service revised its Domestic Mail Manual to read, in part "As with all matters authorized to mail at the special rates, only

third-class matter, deposited in prescribed minimum quantities and prepared in accordance with postal regulations, is eligible for these rates."

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

- the rates available to qualified nonprofit organizations apply only to outgoing mailings of at least 200 items or more that are sorted by zip code or other order convenient to the Postal Service and that are delivered to a special officer at the Post Office
- such items would have to be generic and devoid of references to personal or unique information (the very sort of information that a confirmation mailing would have to contain), and
- the rate applies only to the original outgoing mailing and would not pertain to any "forwardable" or "address correction" services. Such services would cause a surcharge for each piece of mail so treated to be assessed to the original mailer on top of the nonprofit rate.

It would appear, then, that the "Reduced Postal Rate" offered in Section 8(h)(1) of the NVRA would not pertain, either for technical or practical reasons, to most of the mailings required or authorized by the Act. And the volume of all mailings required by the Act results in substantial costs to local jurisdictions (see Section 5 above "Regarding Costs") which are, in most cases, borne by local property taxes.

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

In a related matter, a number of State and local election officials have remarked that they are now being charged for providing voter registration materials in post offices -- apparently because of a legally binding requirement to do so in the Postal Operations Manual (POM). In view of the other intake efforts required by the NVRA (in motor vehicle offices, public assistance agencies, and the like), the Commission recommends that the Postal Service provide space in their postal lobbies for voter registration materials free of charge to State and local election officials.

Recommendation 4: that States develop and implement an on-going, periodic training program for relevant motor vehicle and agency personnel regarding their duties and responsibilities under the NVRA as implemented by the State's law.

and

Recommendation 5: that States require motor vehicle and agency offices to promptly transmit information regarding voter registration applicants electronically to the appropriate election office with documentation to follow.

Several States reported that motor vehicle offices in some areas failed to transmit voter registration applications or changes of address to the appropriate election authorities in a timely manner. The result, unfortunately, was the effective disenfranchisement of those citizens who had duly applied but whose registrations were not processed by election day. Because we heard more of this in the 2000 election than in any election previous, it seems reasonable to suspect that it may have resulted both from personnel turnover in the motor vehicle offices and simple inattention now that the novelty of the process in motor vehicle offices has worn off. A few States are considering some form of "receipt" system for persons who register at motor vehicle or agency offices. But we feel (as noted in our proposed recommendations below) that at a minimum the problem needs to be addressed by an ongoing, periodic training program geared to new motor vehicle and agency employees.

In grappling with the same problem, a number of jurisdictions reported having success with a kind of double notification process whereby motor vehicle and public assistance agencies notify the appropriate election authority electronically (even by e-mail, if necessary) of all voter registration applications with paper documentation to follow. Because such a procedure appears to be a very effective protection against the original documentation being inadvertently delayed or lost in physical transmission, we recommend that all States adopt it.

Recommendation 6: that States devise a procedure whereby voters may cast a provisional ballot at the polls on election day under circumstances prescribed in State law but at least for the purposes of the fail-safe provisions of the NVRA.

And

Recommendation 7: that States adopt the practice of mailing a forwardable notice to all persons who are removed from the voter registration list whose mail has not previously been returned as undeliverable.

The 2000 federal election drew attention to a few of the more subtle aspects of election administration. Significant among these was the failure of some States to offer provisional ballots to persons who claim to be registered voters but whose registration status could not be confirmed at the polling place. The result was reports of some people being turned away from the polls and thus disenfranchised without ready recourse. Although this is part of a larger issue, it involves the NVRA insofar as it relates to the Act's fail-safe voting provisions affecting persons whose address has changed or is mistakenly thought to have changed. While the Act does not specifically require States to provide provisional ballots to persons voting under its fail-safe provisions, the House Report on the Act does note that "Under certain circumstances it would be appropriate, and in compliance with the requirements of this Act, to require that such a person vote by some form of provisional ballot." [Hse. Rpt., Section 8, page 18]. About half of the States covered by the NVRA already employ provisional ballots for this and sometimes other purposes. And we recommend that all States do so.

As a related nuance, some States do not send notices to persons who are being removed from the voter registration list for reasons other than failure to respond to and failure to vote within two general federal elections subsequent to an 8(d)(2) notice. The result is that that some persons, though properly removed from the registry, unknowingly appear at the polls and are turned away. Again, nothing in the NVRA requires States to send such removal notices. We did recommend in our Guide for Implementing the NVRA that such notices be mailed. And we repeat that recommendation as a way to avoid such embarrassments along with the attendant scenes and recriminations they may give rise to.

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
ALABAMA					
Total VAP	3,080,000	3,138,000	3,220,000	3,293,000	3,333,000
Total Active		2,306,419	2,477,355	2,316,598	2,539,902
% Active		73.50%	76.94%	70.35%	76.20%
Total Inactive		328,639	255,234	858,251	360,809
Total REG	2,367,972	2,635,058	2,732,589	3,174,849	2,900,711
% REG	76.88%	83.97%	84.86%	96.41%	87.03%
ALASKA					
Total VAP	405,000	429,000	426,000	437,000	430,000
Total Active		336,226	414,815	456,914	478,232
% Active		78.37%	97.60%	104.56%	111.22%
Total Inactive			54,216	46,054	107,699
Total REG	315,058	336,226	469,031	502,968	585,931
% REG	77.79%	78.37%	110.36%	115.10%	136.26%
ARIZONA					
Total VAP	2,812,000	2,923,000	3,146,000	3,547,000	3,625,000
Total Active		2,073,442	2,247,662	2,265,879	2,193,767
% Active		70.94%	71.47%	63.88%	60.52%
Total Inactive		242,320	254,932	327,104	454,386
Total REG	1,964,949	2,315,762	2,502,594	2,592,983	2,648,153
% REG	69.88%	79.23%	79.57%	73.10%	73.05%
ARKANSAS					
Total VAP	1,774,000	1,817,000	1,873,000	1,882,000	1,929,000
Total Active		1,274,885	1,369,459	1,412,617	1,441,213
% Active		70.16%	73.12%	75.06%	74.71%
Total Inactive				59,354	102,464
Total REG	1,317,944	1,274,885	1,369,459	1,471,971	1,543,677
% REG	74.29%	70.16%	73.12%	78.21%	80.02%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
CALIFORNIA					
Total VAP	22,521,000	23,225,000	22,826,000	23,665,000	24,873,000
Total Active		14,723,784	15,662,075	14,983,950	15,707,307
% Active		63.40%	68.62%	63.32%	63.15%
Total Inactive			1,025,952	2,415,236	3,190,481
Total REG	15,101,473	14,723,784	16,688,027	17,399,186	18,897,788
% REG	67.06%	63.40%	73.11%	73.52%	75.98%
COLORADO					
Total VAP	2,579,000	2,713,000	2,862,000	2,961,000	3,067,000
Total Active		2,033,094	1,911,651	2,099,364	2,248,856
% Active		74.94%	66.79%	70.90%	73.32%
Total Inactive			434,602	464,077	635,092
Total REG	2,003,375	2,033,094	2,346,253	2,563,441	2,883,948
% REG	77.68%	74.94%	81.98%	86.57%	94.03%
CONNECTICUT					
Total VAP	2,508,000	2,486,000	2,479,000	2,464,000	2,499,000
Total Active		1,791,685	1,881,323	1,806,750	1,901,203
% Active		72.07%	75.89%	73.33%	76.08%
Total Inactive			95,426	189,532	157,381
Total REG	1,961,503	1,791,685	1,976,749	1,996,282	2,058,584
% REG	78.21%	72.07%	79.74%	81.02%	82.38%
DELAWARE					
Total VAP	521,000	534,000	548,000	568,000	582,000
Total Active		348,122	419,508	445,067	477,593
% Active		65.19%	76.55%	78.36%	82.06%
Total Inactive			18,426	22,321	26,079
Total REG	342,088	348,122	401,082	467,388	503,672
% REG	65.66%	65.19%	73.19%	82.29%	86.54%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Total VAP	467,000	452,000	422,000	414,000	411,000
Total Active	361,890	361,890	361,419	353,503	354,410
% Active		80.06%	85.64%	85.39%	86.23%
Total Inactive			34,273	65,982	77,406
Total REG	340,953	361,890	395,692	419,485	431,816
% REG	73.01%	80.06%	93.77%	101.32%	105.06%
FLORIDA					
Total VAP	10,422,000	10,856,000	11,030,000	11,383,000	11,774,000
Total Active	6,559,598	6,559,598	7,484,341	7,494,005	8,430,260
% Active		60.42%	67.85%	65.84%	71.60%
Total Inactive			593,536	726,261	322,457
Total REG	6,541,825	6,559,598	8,077,877	8,220,266	8,752,717
% REG	62.77%	60.42%	73.24%	72.22%	74.34%
GEORGIA					
Total VAP	5,006,000	5,159,000	5,418,000	5,678,000	5,893,000
Total Active	3,003,527	3,003,527	3,811,284	3,910,740	3,856,676
% Active		58.22%	70.34%	68.88%	65.45%
Total Inactive				281,967	791,534
Total REG	3,177,061	3,003,527	3,811,284	4,192,707	4,648,210
% REG	63.47%	58.22%	70.34%	73.84%	78.88%
HAWAII					
Total VAP	866,000	900,000	890,000	878,000	909,000
Total Active	488,889	488,889	544,916	601,404	533,860
% Active		54.32%	61.23%	68.50%	58.73%
Total Inactive		61,620	17,127	0	103,489
Total REG	464,495	550,509	562,043	601,404	637,349
% REG	53.64%	61.17%	63.15%	68.50%	70.12%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
IDAHO					
	<i>(exempt from the NVRA)</i>				
Total VAP	750,000	803,000	858,000	888,000	921,000
Total Active		625,803	700,430	661,433	728,085
% Active		77.93%	81.64%	74.49%	79.05%
Total Inactive					
Total REG	611,121	625,803	700,430	661,433	728,085
% REG	81.48%	77.93%	81.64%	74.49%	79.05%
ILLINOIS					
Total VAP	8,598,000	8,712,000	8,754,000	8,755,000	8,983,000
Total Active		6,119,001	6,663,301	6,493,881	7,150,468
% Active		70.24%	76.12%	74.17%	79.60%
Total Inactive			797,513	1,186,143	1,790,076
Total REG	6,600,358	6,119,001	7,460,814	7,680,024	8,940,544
% REG	76.77%	70.24%	85.23%	87.72%	99.53%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
INDIANA					
Total VAP	4,209,000	4,298,000	4,374,000	4,410,000	4,448,000
Total Active		2,976,255	3,488,088	3,377,956	3,830,096
% Active		69.25%	79.75%	76.60%	86.11%
Total Inactive				316,026	170,713
Total REG	3,180,157	2,976,255	3,488,088	3,693,982	4,000,809
% REG	75.56%	69.25%	79.75%	83.76%	89.95%
IOWA					
Total VAP	2,073,000	2,112,000	2,138,000	2,157,000	2,165,000
Total Active		1,640,533	1,741,949	1,763,827	1,841,346
% Active		77.68%	81.48%	81.77%	85.05%
Total Inactive			34,464	97,593	127,353
Total REG	1,703,532	1,640,533	1,776,433	1,861,420	1,969,199
% REG	82.18%	77.68%	83.09%	86.30%	90.96%
KANSAS					
Total VAP	1,840,000	1,889,000	1,897,000	1,925,000	1,983,000
Total Active		1,314,213	1,438,894	1,403,682	1,505,714
% Active		69.57%	75.85%	72.92%	75.93%
Total Inactive				110,003	117,909
Total REG	1,365,847	1,314,213	1,438,894	1,513,685	1,623,623
% REG	74.23%	69.57%	75.85%	78.63%	81.88%
KENTUCKY					
Total VAP	2,798,000	2,857,000	2,928,000	2,990,000	2,993,000
Total Active		2,132,152	2,391,190	2,512,318	2,556,815
% Active		74.63%	81.67%	84.02%	85.43%
Total Inactive			4,896	48,021	165,742
Total REG	2,076,263	2,132,152	2,396,086	2,590,339	2,722,557
% REG	74.21%	74.63%	81.83%	86.63%	90.96%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
LOUISIANA					
Total VAP	3,045,000	3,100,000	3,131,000	3,149,000	3,255,000
Total Active	2,151,955	2,480,033	2,480,033	2,511,141	2,566,602
% Active	69.42%	79.21%	79.21%	79.74%	78.85%
Total Inactive	2,292,129	2,151,955	78,638	175,420	229,949
Total REG	75.28%	69.42%	81.72%	2,686,561	2,796,551
% REG				85.31%	85.92%
MAINE					
Total VAP	932,000	931,000	945,000	957,000	968,000
Total Active	940,569	1,001,292	1,001,292	882,329	947,189
% Active	101.03%	105.96%	105.96%	92.20%	97.85%
Total Inactive	974,603	940,569	1,001,292	60,200	117,179
Total REG	104.57%	101.03%	105.96%	942,528	1,064,368
% REG				98.49%	109.96%
MARYLAND					
Total VAP	3,705,000	3,750,000	3,820,000	3,824,000	3,925,000
Total Active	2,299,580	2,577,191	2,577,191	2,569,316	2,725,184
% Active	61.32%	67.47%	67.47%	67.19%	69.43%
Total Inactive	2,463,010	2,299,580	110,060	241,884	265,584
Total REG	66.48%	61.32%	70.35%	2,811,200	2,990,768
% REG				73.51%	76.20%
MASSACHUSETTS					
Total VAP	4,616,000	4,564,000	4,649,000	4,731,000	4,749,000
Total Active	3,153,341	3,494,927	3,494,927	3,378,165	3,447,595
% Active	69.09%	75.18%	75.18%	71.40%	72.60%
Total Inactive	3,351,918	3,153,341	329,749	340,363	329,556
Total REG	72.62%	69.09%	82.27%	3,718,528	3,777,151
% REG				78.60%	79.54%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
MICHIGAN					
Total VAP	6,947,000	6,983,000	7,072,000	7,256,000	7,358,000
Total Active		6,207,662	6,677,079	6,838,858	6,810,367
% Active		88.90%	94.42%	94.12%	92.56%
Total Inactive				76,755	48,965
Total REG	6,147,083	6,207,662	6,677,079	6,915,613	6,859,332
% REG	88.49%	88.90%	94.42%	95.18%	93.22%
MINNESOTA					
	<i>(exempt from the NVRA)</i>				
Total VAP	3,272,000	3,362,000	3,422,000	3,483,000	3,547,000
Total Active		2,857,463	3,067,802	2,667,692	3,265,324
% Active		84.99%	89.65%	76.59%	92.06%
Total Inactive					
Total REG	3,138,901	2,857,463	3,067,802	2,667,692	3,265,324
% REG	95.93%	84.99%	89.65%	76.59%	92.06%
MISSISSIPPI					
Total VAP	1,873,000	1,905,000	1,967,000	2,014,000	2,047,000
Total Active		1,625,640	1,731,852	1,729,200	1,496,414
% Active		85.34%	86.05%	85.86%	73.10%
Total Inactive			94,101	77,918	243,444
Total REG	1,640,150	1,625,640	1,825,953	1,807,118	1,739,858
% REG	87.57%	85.34%	92.83%	89.73%	85.00%
MISSOURI					
Total VAP	3,851,000	3,902,000	3,995,000	4,042,000	4,105,000
Total Active		2,952,642	3,342,849	3,240,657	3,415,236
% Active		75.67%	83.68%	80.17%	83.20%
Total Inactive				395,334	445,436
Total REG	3,067,955	2,952,642	3,342,849	3,635,991	3,860,672
% REG	79.67%	75.67%	83.68%	89.96%	94.05%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
MONTANA					
Total VAP	600,000	623,000	656,000	658,000	668,000
Total Active		514,051	590,751	494,763	512,516
% Active		82.51%	90.05%	75.19%	76.72%
Total Inactive				144,478	185,744
Total REG	529,822	514,051	590,751	639,241	699,260
% REG	88.30%	82.51%	90.05%	97.15%	104.53%
NEBRASKA					
Total VAP	1,164,000	1,192,000	1,211,000	1,231,000	1,234,000
Total Active		919,321	1,015,056	981,160	1,040,023
% Active		77.12%	83.82%	79.70%	84.28%
Total Inactive				75,191	45,194
Total REG	951,395	919,321	1,015,056	1,056,351	1,085,217
% REG	81.73%	77.12%	83.82%	85.81%	87.94%
NEVADA					
Total VAP	1,011,000	1,088,000	1,212,000	1,314,000	1,390,000
Total Active		625,842	722,608		762,894
% Active		57.52%	59.62%		54.88%
Total Inactive			56,416		116,086
Total REG	649,913	625,842	779,318		878,970
% REG	64.28%	57.52%	64.30%		63.24%
NEW HAMPSHIRE (exempt from the NVRA)					
Total VAP	838,000	843,000	871,000	890,000	911,000
Total Active		677,620	754,771	763,845	856,519
% Active		80.38%	86.66%	85.83%	94.02%
Total Inactive					
Total REG	660,985	677,620	754,771	763,845	856,519
% REG	78.88%	80.38%	86.66%	85.83%	94.02%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
NEW JERSEY					
Total VAP	5,964,000	5,974,000	6,034,000	6,075,000	6,245,000
Total Active	3,905,435	3,905,435	4,111,031	4,126,782	4,266,216
% Active		65.37%	68.13%	67.93%	68.31%
Total Inactive			198,789	406,470	447,329
Total REG	4,060,337	3,905,435	4,309,820	4,533,252	4,713,545
% REG	68.08%	65.37%	71.43%	74.62%	75.48%
NEW MEXICO					
Total VAP	1,121,000	1,167,000	1,224,000	1,250,000	1,263,000
Total Active	713,645	713,645	738,525	821,006	883,052
% Active		61.16%	60.34%	65.68%	69.92%
Total Inactive			99,269	95,180	90,481
Total REG	706,966	713,645	837,794	916,186	973,533
% REG	63.07%	61.15%	68.45%	73.29%	77.08%
NEW YORK					
Total VAP	13,705,000	13,646,000	13,564,000	13,590,000	13,805,000
Total Active	8,818,691	8,818,691	9,567,988	9,553,665	10,027,385
% Active		64.62%	70.54%	70.30%	72.64%
Total Inactive			592,135	1,187,123	1,235,431
Total REG	9,193,391	8,818,691	10,160,123	10,740,788	11,262,816
% REG	67.08%	64.62%	74.91%	79.03%	81.59%
NORTH CAROLINA					
Total VAP	5,190,000	5,364,000	5,519,000	5,685,000	5,797,000
Total Active	3,635,875	3,635,875	4,225,765	4,349,290	4,722,355
% Active		67.78%	76.57%	76.50%	81.46%
Total Inactive			92,243	403,323	483,696
Total REG	3,817,380	3,635,875	4,318,008	4,752,613	5,206,051
% REG	75.55%	67.78%	78.24%	83.60%	89.81%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
NORTH DAKOTA <i>(exempt from the NVRA)</i>					
Total VAP	462,000	467,000	476,000	476,000	477,000
Total Active					
% Active					
Total Inactive					
Total REG					
% REG					
OHIO					
Total VAP	8,207,000	8,313,000	8,347,000	8,401,000	8,433,000
Total Active		6,250,545	6,842,272	6,058,808	6,514,723
% Active		75.19%	81.97%	72.12%	77.25%
Total Inactive				1,055,497	830,071
Total REG	6,542,931	6,250,545	6,842,272	7,114,305	7,344,794
% REG	79.72%	75.19%	81.97%	84.68%	87.10%
OKLAHOMA					
Total VAP	2,352,000	2,394,000	2,426,000	2,463,000	2,531,000
Total Active		1,706,194	1,985,535	1,737,229	1,736,490
% Active		71.27%	81.84%	70.53%	68.61%
Total Inactive		337,398		320,944	502,748
Total REG	2,302,279	2,043,592	1,985,535	2,058,173	2,239,288
% REG	97.89%	85.36%	81.84%	83.56%	88.47%
OREGON					
Total VAP	2,220,000	2,311,000	2,411,000	2,484,000	2,530,000
Total Active		1,254,266	1,962,155	1,965,981	1,954,006
% Active		54.27%	81.38%	79.15%	77.23%
Total Inactive		578,509	140,394	191,325	185,817
Total REG	1,775,416	1,832,774	2,102,549	2,157,306	2,139,823
% REG	79.97%	79.31%	87.21%	86.85%	84.58%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
PENNSYLVANIA					
Total VAP	9,161,000	9,212,000	9,197,000	9,118,000	9,155,000
Total Active	5,879,093	5,879,093	6,747,839	6,966,461	7,128,926
% Active		63.82%	73.37%	76.40%	77.87%
Total Inactive			57,749	292,361	633,071
Total REG	5,993,002	5,879,093	6,805,612	7,258,822	7,781,997
% REG	65.42%	63.82%	74.00%	79.61%	85.00%
RHODE ISLAND					
Total VAP	768,000	764,000	751,000	751,000	753,000
Total Active		552,638	602,692	629,786	665,424
% Active		72.33%	80.25%	83.86%	88.37%
Total Inactive				3,169	6,188
Total REG	554,664	552,638	602,692	632,955	671,612
% REG	72.22%	72.33%	80.25%	84.28%	89.19%
SOUTH CAROLINA					
Total VAP	2,669,000	2,740,000	2,771,000	2,886,000	2,977,000
Total Active	1,499,589	1,499,589	1,814,776	2,021,763	2,270,013
% Active		54.73%	65.49%	70.05%	76.25%
Total Inactive		103,950	213,599	63,407	83,663
Total REG	1,537,140	1,499,564	1,814,777	2,085,170	2,353,676
% REG	57.59%	54.73%	65.49%	72.25%	79.06%
SOUTH DAKOTA					
Total VAP	505,000	522,000	535,000	538,000	543,000
Total Active		430,539	462,858	452,785	471,152
% Active		82.48%	86.52%	84.16%	86.77%
Total Inactive			16,087	43,001	49,729
Total REG	448,292	430,539	478,945	495,786	520,881
% REG	88.77%	82.48%	89.52%	92.15%	95.93%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
TENNESSEE					
Total VAP	3,796,000	3,913,000	4,035,000	4,120,000	4,221,000
Total Active		2,693,003	3,011,195	3,057,008	3,181,108
% Active		68.82%	74.63%	74.20%	75.36%
Total Inactive			86,141	187,254	219,379
Total REG	2,726,449	2,693,003	3,097,336	3,244,262	3,400,487
% REG	71.82%	68.82%	76.76%	78.74%	80.56%
TEXAS					
Total VAP	12,681,000	13,166,000	13,697,000	14,299,000	14,860,000
Total Active		8,641,848	9,551,191	9,582,505	10,267,639
% Active		65.64%	70.24%	67.02%	69.14%
Total Inactive			989,487	1,955,730	2,097,596
Total REG	8,440,143	8,641,848	10,540,678	11,538,235	12,365,235
% REG	66.56%	65.64%	77.52%	80.69%	83.27%
UTAH					
Total VAP	1,169,000	1,246,000	1,333,000	1,432,000	1,465,000
Total Active		921,981	1,070,586	1,045,071	1,120,761
% Active		74.00%	80.31%	72.98%	76.50%
Total Inactive				112,159	183,474
Total REG	965,211	921,981	1,070,586	1,157,210	1,304,235
% REG	82.57%	74.00%	80.31%	80.81%	89.03%
VERMONT					
Total VAP	429,000	429,000	446,000	448,000	460,000
Total Active		373,442	385,328	389,191	421,561
% Active		87.05%	86.59%	86.87%	91.64%
Total Inactive				11,030	5,793
Total REG	383,371	373,442	385,328	400,221	427,354
% REG	89.36%	87.05%	86.59%	89.34%	92.90%

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
VIRGINIA					
Total VAP	4,855,000	4,967,000	5,083,000	5,165,000	5,263,000
Total Active		3,000,560	3,180,862	3,470,660	3,824,676
% Active		60.41%	62.58%	67.20%	72.67%
Total Inactive			140,910	255,261	270,511
Total REG	3,045,662	3,000,560	3,321,772	3,725,921	4,096,676
% REG	62.73%	60.41%	65.35%	72.14%	77.84%
WASHINGTON					
Total VAP	3,812,000	4,000,000	4,115,000	4,257,000	4,368,000
Total Active		2,896,519	3,078,128	3,119,562	3,147,814
% Active		72.41%	74.80%	73.28%	72.07%
Total Inactive			147,233	268,108	185,900
Total REG	2,814,680	2,896,519	3,225,361	3,387,670	3,333,714
% REG	73.84%	72.41%	78.38%	79.58%	76.32%
WEST VIRGINIA					
Total VAP	1,376,000	1,389,000	1,417,000	1,406,000	1,416,000
Total Active		884,315	950,548	951,581	1,031,736
% Active		63.67%	67.08%	67.68%	72.86%
Total Inactive			20,197	56,230	34,613
Total REG	956,172	884,315	970,745	1,007,811	1,066,349
% REG	69.49%	63.67%	68.51%	71.68%	75.31%
WISCONSIN					
		<i>(exempt from the NVRA)</i>			
Total VAP	3,675,000	3,777,000	3,824,000	3,877,000	3,930,000
Total Active					
% Active					
Total Inactive					
Total REG					
% REG					

Table 1 - Voting Age Population and Voter Registration

	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000
WYOMING					
	<i>(exempt from the NVRA)</i>				
Total VAP	329,000	343,000	356,000	354,000	358,000
Total Active		337,863	228,554	230,360	220,012
% Active		98.50%	64.20%	65.07%	61.46%
Total Inactive					
Total REG	234,260	337,863	240,711	230,360	220,012
% REG	71.20%	98.50%	67.62%	65.07%	61.46%
TOTALS FOR ALL STATES					
Total VAP	189,529,000	193,650,000	196,498,000	200,929,000	205,815,000
Total Active		129,431,244	142,983,699	140,946,508	149,476,705
% Active		66.84%	72.77%	70.15%	72.63%
Total Inactive		1,652,436	8,138,763	14,640,557	18,274,197
Total REG	133,801,584	130,979,705	151,122,462	156,685,527	167,750,902
% REG	70.60%	67.64%	76.91%	77.98%	81.51%
TOTALS FOR THE NVRA STATES					
Total VAP	179,774,000	183,626,000	186,246,000	190,961,000	195,671,000
Total Active	0	124,659,053	136,791,845	136,623,178	144,406,765
% Active	0	67.83%	73.45%	71.55%	73.80%
Total Inactive	0	1,652,436	8,138,763	14,640,557	18,274,197
Total REG	128,772,946	126,107,514	144,680,496	151,973,006	162,680,962
% REG	71.63%	68.68%	77.68%	79.58%	83.14%

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
ALABAMA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	35,835	8.89%	1,240	3.46%	
By mail	122,291	30.34%	2,848	2.33%	
Public Assistance Offices	16,362	4.06%	1,480	9.05%	
Disability services	3,223	0.80%	146	4.53%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,538	0.38%	36	2.34%	
State Designated Sites	9,342	2.32%	385	4.12%	
All other sources	214,427	53.21%	5,113	2.38%	
TOTAL	403,018		11,248	2.79%	312,960
ALASKA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	50,666	18.85%	839	1.66%	
By mail	34,392	12.79%	971	2.82%	
Public Assistance Offices	211	0.08%	10	4.74%	
Disability services	67	0.02%	1	1.49%	
Armed Forces Offices	23	0.01%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	37,071	13.79%	3,037	8.19%	
All other sources	146,370	54.45%	1,961	1.34%	
TOTAL	268,800		6,819	2.54%	
ARIZONA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	158,993	17.29%	4,610	2.90%	
By mail	503,414	54.74%	23,636	4.70%	
Public Assistance Offices	32,137	3.49%	1,432	4.46%	
Disability services	10,613	1.15%	305	2.87%	
Armed Forces Offices	12,012	1.31%	1,471	12.25%	
State Designated Sites	31,488	3.42%	1,410	4.48%	
All other sources	171,019	18.60%	4,467	2.61%	
TOTAL	919,676		37,331	4.06%	407,473
ARKANSAS					
Motor Vehicle Offices	84,234	36.46%	7,343	8.72%	
By mail	58,547	25.34%	2,171	3.71%	
Public Assistance Offices	9,214	3.99%	273	2.96%	
Disability services	683	0.30%	23	3.37%	
Armed Forces Offices	830	0.36%	33	3.98%	
State Designated Sites	5,232	2.26%	104	1.99%	
All other sources	72,289	31.29%	4,103	5.68%	
TOTAL	231,029		14,050	6.08%	160,558

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
CALIFORNIA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	922,358	17.59%	126,355	13.70%	
By mail	2,781,495	53.03%	574,980	20.67%	
Public Assistance Offices	62,288	1.19%	3,259	5.23%	
Disability services	9,993	0.19%	1,559	15.60%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,054	0.02%	42	3.98%	
State Designated Sites	321,704	6.13%	25,597	7.96%	
All other sources	1,145,879	21.85%	132,933	11.60%	
TOTAL	5,244,771		864,725	16.49%	3,335,694
COLORADO					
Motor Vehicle Offices	626,964	62.47%	50,161	8.00%	
By mail	139,715	13.92%	23,549	16.86%	
Public Assistance Offices	9,905	0.99%	617	6.23%	
Disability services	639	0.06%	65	10.17%	
Armed Forces Offices	789	0.08%	131	16.60%	
State Designated Sites	3,241	0.32%	229	7.07%	
All other sources	222,304	0.00%	4,243	1.91%	
TOTAL	1,003,557		78,995	7.87%	464,201
CONNECTICUT					
Motor Vehicle Offices	29,988	9.62%	2,046	6.82%	
By mail	129,284	41.48%	2,703	2.09%	
Public Assistance Offices	9,951	3.19%	878	8.82%	
Disability services	337	0.11%	9	2.67%	
Armed Forces Offices	886	0.28%	16	1.81%	
State Designated Sites	6,298	2.02%	244	3.87%	
All other sources	134,932	43.29%	1,424	1.06%	
TOTAL	311,676		7,320	2.35%	264,608
DELAWARE					
Motor Vehicle Offices	121,310	83.62%	2,117	1.75%	
By mail	2,532	1.75%	109	4.30%	
Public Assistance Offices	3,317	2.29%	179	5.40%	
Disability services	1,438	0.99%	103	7.16%	
Armed Forces Offices	514	0.35%	21	4.09%	
State Designated Sites	2,201	1.52%	143	6.50%	
All other sources	13,753	9.48%	191	1.39%	
TOTAL	145,065		2,863	1.97%	63,922

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	277,276	85.70%	2,743	0.99%	
By mail	28,539	8.82%	351	1.23%	
Public Assistance Offices	2,586	0.80%	59	2.28%	
Disability services	96	0.03%	1	1.04%	
Armed Forces Offices	98	0.03%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites		0.00%			
All other sources	14,935	4.62%	146		
TOTAL	323,530		3,300	1.02%	56,779
FLORIDA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	1,173,874	41.18%	18,434	1.57%	
By mail	921,010	32.31%	22,047	2.39%	
Public Assistance Offices	31,619	1.11%	1,155	3.65%	
Disability services	4,526	0.16%	96	2.12%	
Armed Forces Offices	4,716	0.17%	279	5.92%	
State Designated Sites	53,463	1.88%	946	1.77%	
All other sources	661,139	23.20%	10,150	1.54%	
TOTAL	2,850,347		53,107	1.86%	1,622,595
GEORGIA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	632,521	49.60%	57,059	9.02%	
By mail	397,320	31.15%	26,254	6.61%	
Public Assistance Offices	41,165	3.23%	2,550	6.19%	
Disability services	1,105	0.09%	64	5.79%	
Armed Forces Offices	7	0.00%	1	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	67,512	5.29%	4,958	7.34%	
All other sources	135,674	10.64%	10,357	7.63%	
TOTAL	1,275,304		101,243	7.94%	455,503
HAWAII					
Motor Vehicle Offices	68,582	29.65%	16,016	23.35%	
By mail	64,711	27.98%	3,895	6.02%	
Public Assistance Offices	738	0.32%	28	3.79%	
Disability services	495	0.21%	22		
Armed Forces Offices	1,020	0.44%	74		
State Designated Sites	1,969	0.85%	78	3.96%	
All other sources	93,756	40.54%	7,129	7.60%	
TOTAL	231,271		27,242	11.78%	48,456

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
IDAHO					
<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					
ILLINOIS					
Motor Vehicle Offices	950,365	48.74%	88,908	9.36%	
By mail	244,110	12.52%	15,073	6.17%	
Public Assistance Offices	26,490	1.36%	4,000	15.10%	
Disability services	9,014	0.46%	969	10.75%	
Armed Forces Offices	981	0.05%	133	13.56%	
State Designated Sites	2,318	0.12%	224	9.66%	
All other sources	716,499	36.75%	35,377	4.94%	
TOTAL	1,949,777		144,684	7.42%	1,261,336
INDIANA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	372,222	47.05%	6,208	1.67%	
By mail	276,807	34.99%	25,599	9.25%	
Public Assistance Offices	18,594	2.35%	1,890	10.16%	
Disability services	1,934	0.24%	223	11.53%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,487	0.19%	215	14.46%	
State Designated Sites	17,300	2.19%	2,248	12.99%	
All other sources	102,742	12.99%	6,208	6.04%	
TOTAL	791,086		42,591	5.38%	394,477
IOWA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	228,853	33.11%	11,550	5.05%	
By mail	192,717	27.88%	3,368	1.75%	
Public Assistance Offices	8,259	1.19%	255	3.09%	
Disability services	766	0.11%	18	2.35%	
Armed Forces Offices	278	0.04%	1	0.36%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	-	
All other sources	260,344	37.66%	7,050	2.71%	
TOTAL	691,217		22,242	3.22%	270,175
KANSAS					
Motor Vehicle Offices	188,582	39.95%	16,873	8.95%	
By mail	136,278	28.87%	19,075	14.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	7,585	1.61%	830	10.94%	
Disability services	1,216	0.26%	217	17.85%	
Armed Forces Offices	510	0.11%	62	12.16%	
State Designated Sites	6,864	1.45%	750	10.93%	
All other sources	131,048	27.76%	18,060	13.77%	
TOTAL	472,083		55,857	11.83%	239,836

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000					
	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
KENTUCKY					
Motor Vehicle Offices	720,058	50.77%	-	0.00%	
By mail	14,981	1.06%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	24,993	1.76%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	2,033	0.14%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	80	0.01%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	13,627	0.96%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	642,455	45.30%	-	0.00%	
TOTAL	1,418,227			0.00%	216,164
LOUISIANA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	192,691	49.50%	16,226	8.42%	
By mail	99,760	25.62%	4,933	4.94%	
Public Assistance Offices	15,869	4.08%	860	5.42%	
Disability services	2,433	0.62%	73	3.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	384	0.10%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	20,473	5.26%	753	3.68%	
All other sources	57,701	14.82%	351	0.61%	
TOTAL	389,311		23,196	5.96%	353,460
MAINE					
Motor Vehicle Offices	125,733	40.50%	4,622	3.68%	
By mail	42,771	13.78%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	10,419	3.36%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	127	0.04%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	122	0.04%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	3,876	1.25%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	127,370	41.03%	4,233	3.32%	
TOTAL	310,418		8,855	2.85%	172,330
MARYLAND					
Motor Vehicle Offices	192,934	40.65%	20,600	10.68%	
By mail	178,802	37.68%	10,231	5.72%	
Public Assistance Offices	32,250	6.80%	2,818	8.74%	
Disability services	381	0.08%	3	0.79%	
Armed Forces Offices	183	0.04%	6	3.28%	
State Designated Sites	26,649	5.62%	2,010	7.54%	
All other sources	43,376	9.14%	2,643	6.09%	
TOTAL	474,575		38,311	8.07%	474,575

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
MASSACHUSETTS					
Motor Vehicle Offices	818,936	63.74%	-	0.00%	
By mail	226,975	17.67%	15,973	7.04%	
Public Assistance Offices	26,984	2.10%	1,892	7.01%	
Disability services	3,582	0.28%	315	8.79%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	3,983	0.31%	293	7.36%	
All other sources	204,339	15.90%	12,461	6.10%	
TOTAL	1,284,799		30,934	2.41%	598,871
MICHIGAN					
Motor Vehicle Offices	1,074,352	84.45%	214,202	19.94%	
By mail	42,781	3.36%	5,898	13.79%	
Public Assistance Offices	51,123	4.02%	9,867	19.30%	
Disability services	5,868	0.46%	1,117	19.04%	
Armed Forces Offices	2,084	0.16%	483	23.18%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	-	
All other sources	96,021	7.55%	12,635	13.16%	
TOTAL	1,272,229		244,202	19.19%	747,793
MINNESOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
MISSISSIPPI					
Motor Vehicle Offices	11,469	7.18%	1,875		
By mail	44,566	27.89%	2,500	5.61%	
Public Assistance Offices	13,241	8.29%	6,262	47.29%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	6,427	4.02%	2,132	0.00%	
All other sources	84,082	52.62%	-	0.00%	
TOTAL	159,785		12,769	7.99%	182,734
MISSOURI					
Motor Vehicle Offices	414,686	35.93%	12,835	3.10%	
By mail	163,208	14.14%	3,794	2.32%	
Public Assistance Offices	51,951	4.50%	2,523	4.86%	
Disability services	721	0.06%	19	2.64%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,144	0.10%	14	1.22%	
State Designated Sites	2,491	0.22%	40	1.61%	
All other sources	519,964	45.05%	5,986	1.15%	
TOTAL	1,154,165		25,211	2.18%	536,994

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
MONTANA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	53,375	50.74%	1	0.00%	
By mail	18,155	17.26%	588	3.24%	
Public Assistance Offices	3,286	3.12%	203	6.18%	
Disability services	166	0.16%	5	3.01%	
Armed Forces Offices	147	0.14%	18	12.24%	
State Designated Sites	581	0.55%	-		
All other sources	29,491	28.03%	919	3.12%	
TOTAL	105,201		1,734	1.65%	59,019
NEBRASKA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	107,127	43.97%	4,866	4.54%	
By mail	34,891	14.32%	1,181	3.38%	
Public Assistance Offices	3,063	1.26%	144	4.70%	
Disability services	786	0.32%	34	4.33%	
Armed Forces Offices	830	0.34%	42	5.06%	
State Designated Sites	115	0.05%	9	7.83%	
All other sources	96,835	39.74%	1,035	1.07%	
TOTAL	243,647		7,311	3.00%	148,776
NEVADA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	101,597	71.47%	-	0.00%	
By mail	30,242	21.27%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	2,883	2.03%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	62	0.04%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	7,365	5.18%	-	0.00%	
TOTAL	142,149		-	0.00%	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
NEW JERSEY					
Motor Vehicle Offices	229,836	11.17%	1,031	0.45%	
By mail	81,573	3.96%	696	0.85%	
Public Assistance Offices	27,771	1.35%	380	1.37%	
Disability services	8,165	0.40%	33	0.40%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,373	0.07%	-		
State Designated Sites	620,677	30.16%	11,389	1.83%	
All other sources	1,088,630	52.90%	2,089	0.19%	
TOTAL	2,058,025		15,618	0.76%	446,449

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
NEW MEXICO					
Motor Vehicle Offices	19,831	11.41%	99	0.50%	
By mail	78,814	45.35%	12,743	16.17%	
Public Assistance Offices	5,088	2.93%	25	0.49%	
Disability services	707	0.41%	6	0.85%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,007	0.58%	15	1.49%	
State Designated Sites	4,640	2.67%	22	0.47%	
All other sources	63,713	36.66%	22,835	35.84%	
TOTAL	173,800		35,745	20.57%	139,111
NEW YORK					
Motor Vehicle Offices	823,124	19.70%	145,025	17.62%	
By mail	2,661,272	63.71%	350,000	13.15%	
Public Assistance Offices	225,660	5.40%	43,776	19.40%	
Disability services	12,635	0.30%	1,307	10.34%	
Armed Forces Offices	256	0.01%	14	5.47%	
State Designated Sites	73,484	1.76%	10,822	14.73%	
All other sources	380,890	9.12%	49,038	12.87%	
TOTAL	4,177,321		599,982	14.36%	1,347,764
NORTH CAROLINA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	719,766	42.36%	16,669	2.32%	
By mail	353,580	20.81%	15,611	4.42%	
Public Assistance Offices	42,125	2.48%	1,777	4.22%	
Disability services	5,475	0.32%	132	2.41%	
Armed Forces Offices	11,680	0.69%	99	0.85%	
State Designated Sites	107,653	6.34%	1,497	1.39%	
All other sources	458,783	27.00%	10,574	2.30%	
TOTAL	1,699,062		46,359	2.73%	837,936
NORTH DAKOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
OHIO					
Motor Vehicle Offices	501,866	27.85%	49,402	9.84%	
By mail	398,777	22.13%	40,692	10.20%	
Public Assistance Offices	28,712	1.59%	2,947	10.26%	
Disability services	1,793	0.10%	195	10.88%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,423	0.08%	68	4.78%	
State Designated Sites	198,155	11.00%	15,311	7.73%	
All other sources	671,393	37.26%	50,895	7.58%	
TOTAL	1,802,119		159,510	8.85%	903,417

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
OKLAHOMA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	170,796	26.47%	810	0.47%	
By mail	170,913	26.48%	848	0.50%	
Public Assistance Offices	11,777	1.82%	116	0.98%	
Disability services	149	0.02%	2	1.34%	
Armed Forces Offices	27	0.00%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	2,822	0.44%	7	0.25%	
All other sources	288,867	44.76%	1,576	0.55%	
TOTAL	645,341		3,359	0.52%	298,140
OREGON					
Motor Vehicle Offices	159,497	18.27%	1,168	0.73%	
By mail	376,788	43.16%	1,825	0.48%	
Public Assistance Offices	51,714	5.92%	257	0.50%	
Disability services	2,078	0.24%	39	1.88%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	-	
State Designated Sites	4,311	0.49%	165	3.83%	
All other sources	278,683	31.92%	249	0.09%	
TOTAL	873,071		3,703	0.42%	31,287
PENNSYLVANIA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	762,818	40.98%	105,583	13.84%	
By mail	583,838	31.36%	41,466	7.10%	
Public Assistance Offices	45,967	2.47%	2,802	6.10%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	4,756	0.26%	373	7.84%	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	464,157	24.93%	30,224	6.51%	
TOTAL	1,861,536		180,448	9.69%	1,061,531
RHODE ISLAND					
Motor Vehicle Offices	40,286	36.53%	556	1.38%	
By mail	9,472	8.59%	260	2.74%	
Public Assistance Offices	1,646	1.49%	53	3.22%	
Disability services	995	0.90%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	-	0.00%	-	-	
State Designated Sites	-	0.00%	-	-	
All other sources	57,879	52.48%	-	-	
TOTAL	110,278		869	0.79%	38,657

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
SOUTH CAROLINA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	126,100	41.85%		0.00%	
By mail	127,515	42.32%			
Public Assistance Offices	13,428	4.46%		0.00%	
Disability services	3,141	1.04%		0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	243	0.08%		0.00%	
State Designated Sites	562	0.19%			
All other sources	30,319	10.06%			
TOTAL	301,308			0.00%	243,933
SOUTH DAKOTA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	5,493	7.17%	90	1.64%	
By mail	25,196	32.91%	333	1.32%	
Public Assistance Offices	10,276	13.42%	533	5.19%	
Disability services	677	0.88%	2	0.30%	
Armed Forces Offices	916	1.20%	11	1.20%	
State Designated Sites	2,896	3.78%	141	4.87%	
All other sources	61,429	80.23%	819	1.33%	
TOTAL	76,562		1,929	2.52%	60,645
TENNESSEE					
Motor Vehicle Offices	134,202	21.47%	5,967	4.45%	
By mail	238,613	38.17%	9,296	3.90%	
Public Assistance Offices	49,636	7.94%	3,469	6.99%	
Disability services	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	6,906	1.10%	176	2.53%	
State Designated Sites	38,763	6.20%	1,472	3.80%	
All other sources	157,069	25.12%	3,093	1.97%	
TOTAL	625,189		23,472	3.75%	442,661
TEXAS					
Motor Vehicle Offices	2,470,120	57.94%	243,022	9.84%	
By mail	1,347,656	31.61%	71,816	5.33%	
Public Assistance Offices	19,108	0.45%	9,320	48.78%	
Disability services	5,547	0.13%	455	8.20%	
Armed Forces Offices	7,524	0.18%	968	12.87%	
State Designated Sites	132,041	3.10%	6,775	5.13%	
All other sources	280,948	6.59%	15,763	5.61%	
TOTAL	4,262,944		348,109	8.17%	2,209,827

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
UTAH					
Motor Vehicle Offices	151,970	35.65%	9,876	6.50%	
By mail	120,367	28.24%	2,993	2.49%	
Public Assistance Offices	4,349	1.02%	202	4.64%	
Disability services	271	0.06%	20	7.38%	
Armed Forces Offices	3,700	0.87%	721	19.49%	
State Designated Sites	36,605	8.59%	721	1.97%	
All other sources	109,005	25.57%	5,662	5.19%	
TOTAL	426,267		20,196	4.74%	220,404
VERMONT					
Motor Vehicle Offices	13,884	52.15%	5,426	39.08%	
By mail	3,122	11.73%	-	0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	5,724	21.50%	-	0.00%	
Disability services	27	0.10%	-	0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	194	0.73%	-	0.00%	
State Designated Sites	202	0.76%	-	0.00%	
All other sources	3,471	13.04%	-	0.00%	
TOTAL	26,624				32,600
VIRGINIA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	1,043,901	64.83%	133,965	12.83%	
By mail	288,040	17.89%	21,386	7.42%	
Public Assistance Offices	14,953	0.93%	1,085	7.26%	
Disability services	2,673	0.17%	66	2.47%	
Armed Forces Offices	1,234	0.08%	72	5.83%	
State Designated Sites	828	0.05%	71	8.57%	
All other sources	258,519	16.06%	8,394	3.25%	
TOTAL	1,610,148		165,039	10.25%	619,882
WASHINGTON					
Motor Vehicle Offices	266,794	33.49%	19,764	7.41%	
By mail	350,853	44.04%	23,413	6.67%	
Public Assistance Offices	22,167	2.78%	6,206	28.00%	
Disability services	1,909	0.24%	534	27.97%	
Armed Forces Offices	429	0.05%	180	41.96%	
State Designated Sites	10,330	1.30%	2,892	28.00%	
All other sources	144,108	18.09%	-	0.00%	
TOTAL	796,590		52,989	6.65%	626,561

Table 2 - Sources of Voter Registration Applications 1999-2000

	Number of Applications	Percent of Total Apps	Number of Duplicates	Percent Duplicates	Total New Registrations
WEST VIRGINIA					
Motor Vehicle Offices	17,949	29.06%		0.00%	
By mail	4,050	6.56%		0.00%	
Public Assistance Offices	27,907	45.18%		0.00%	
Disability services	7,487	12.12%		0.00%	
Armed Forces Offices	591	0.96%		0.00%	
State Designated Sites	3,791	6.14%		0.00%	
All other sources	-	0.00%		0.00%	
TOTAL	61,775				58,538
WISCONSIN	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
WYOMING	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>				
UNITED STATES					
Motor Vehicle Offices	17,393,814	38.10%	1,420,756	8.17%	
By mail	14,150,732	31.00%	1,385,105	9.79%	
Public Assistance Offices	1,314,500	2.88%	116,412	8.86%	
Disability services	190,009	0.42%	8,178	4.30%	
Armed Forces Offices	74,038	0.16%	5,774	7.80%	
State Designated Sites	1,881,984	4.12%	96,875	5.15%	
All other sources	10,943,962	23.97%	490,366	4.48%	
TOTAL	45,654,673		3,523,466	7.72%	22,478,632

Table 3 - Deletions from Voter Registration Lists 1999-2000

	Number of Confirmation Notices Sent	Number of Responses Received	Percent	Number Deleted from Active List	Number Deleted from Inactive List	Total Number Deleted
ALABAMA	494,361	494,361	100.00%	194,895	161,771	356,666
ALASKA	134,748	11,956	8.87%	34,009	-	34,009
ARIZONA	3,713,476	380,356	10.24%	110,449	74,049	184,498
ARKANSAS	-	-	-	62,243	12,609	74,852
CALIFORNIA	1,385,491	557,504	40.24%	1,299,065	958,812	2,257,877
COLORADO	418,763	55,505	13.25%	109,734	79,271	189,005
CONNECTICUT	243,289	114,226	46.95%	119,991	40,754	160,745
DELAWARE	23,417	9,854	42.08%	4,531	2,119	6,650
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	81,793	10,260	12.54%	21,682	46,840	68,522
FLORIDA	454,994	132,537	29.13%	767,637	-	767,637
GEORGIA	850,000	325,562	38.30%	-	325,562	325,562
HAWAII	135,904	16,328	12.01%	14,429	-	14,429
IDAHO	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					
ILLINOIS	524,165	301,501	57.52%	357,248	273,459	630,707
INDIANA	195,651	24,938	12.75%	202,884	-	202,884
IOWA	-	-	0.00%	126,113	36,283	162,396
KANSAS	196,040	78,131	39.85%	124,178	-	124,178
KENTUCKY	138,715	4,562	3.29%	202,818	-	202,818
LOUISIANA	342,411	69,296	20.24%	-	43,624	43,624
MAINE	80,591	22,133	27.46%	119,118	-	119,118
MARYLAND	270,630	68,904	25.46%	189,354	73,989	263,343
MASSACHUSETTS	379,945	47,294	12.45%	404,875	267,912	672,787
MICHIGAN	65,880	16,915	25.68%	402,939	-	402,939
MINNESOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					
MISSISSIPPI	212,731	48,003	22.57%	243,444	110,562	354,006
MISSOURI	307,282	138,395	45.04%	-	296,598	296,598
MONTANA	129,568	21,584	16.66%	22,271	24,564	46,835
NEBRASKA	96,954	51,760	53.39%	119,910	-	119,910
NEVADA	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW HAMPSHIRE	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					
NEW JERSEY	433,283	33,335	7.69%	329,041	-	329,041
NEW MEXICO	79,318	3,965	5.00%	59,575	21,133	80,708
NEW YORK	1,607,552	134,737	8.38%	-	1,201,201	1,201,201
NORTH CAROLINA	873,510	31,619	3.62%	245,883	59,225	305,108
NORTH DAKOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					

Table 3 - Deletions from Voter Registration Lists 1999-2000

	Number of Confirmation Notices Sent	Number of Responses Received	Percent	Number Deleted from Active List	Number Deleted from Inactive List	Total Number Deleted
OHIO	1,273,088	448,017	34.80%	426,152	-	426,152
OKLAHOMA	327,687	38,967	11.89%	89,661	21,511	111,172
OREGON	316,426	41,068	12.98%	231,804	23,875	255,679
PENNSYLVANIA	416,523	41,985	10.08%	292,483	39,667	332,150
RHODE ISLAND	6,434	246	3.82%	45,564	-	45,564
SOUTH CAROLINA	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTH DAKOTA	292,264	2,352	0.80%	30,593	6,826	37,419
TENNESSEE	199,130	47,249	23.73%	186,091	100,345	286,436
TEXAS	1,455,610	269,871	18.54%	-	1,121,760	1,121,760
UTAH	98,432	19,110	19.41%	-	39,104	39,104
VERMONT	19,003	13,210	69.52%	-	-	-
VIRGINIA	266,431	100,968	37.90%	-	320,176	320,176
WASHINGTON	291,225	105,325	36.17%	190,980	177,685	368,665
WEST VIRGINIA	59,616	25,003	41.94%	28,648	-	28,648
WISCONSIN	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					-
WYOMING	<i>is exempt from the NVRA</i>					-
UNITED STATES	18,892,331	4,353,892	23.05%	7,215,397	5,799,515	13,014,912

Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reporting in 2000

ALABAMA	Data are complete.
ALASKA	Data are complete.
ARIZONA	A few counties did not report all requested data.
ARKANSAS	Data on responses to confirmation notices are missing because there is no statewide program for keeping track of or reporting them.
CALIFORNIA	Data are incomplete because 3 of 58 counties failed to report and others developed new voter registration systems that are incapable of retrieving certain information.
COLORADO	Data on intake agencies, 8(d)(2) notices, and deletions are incomplete because 3 counties failed to report complete data.
CONNECTICUT	Data are complete.
DELAWARE	Data are complete.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Data are complete.
FLORIDA	Data are complete.
GEORGIA	Data are complete.
HAWAII	Data are complete.
IDAHO	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>

Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reporting in 2000

ILLINOIS	Data are complete.
INDIANA	Data are incomplete because only 89 of 92 counties reported and because some counties did not report every month..
IOWA	Data are incomplete with regard to 8(d)(2) notices and responses.
KANSAS	Data are complete.
KENTUCKY	Data are complete.
LOUISIANA	Data are not fully accurate due to a programming matter with the State computer system which is expected to be corrected by the next report.
MAINE	Data are incomplete because only 495 of 519 local jurisdictions reported figures for both years and because Maine has developed no method of identifying the origin of voter registration applications.
MARYLAND	Data are complete.
MASSACHUSETTS	Data incomplete because two of 351 local jurisdictions do not properly employ the statewide computerized voter registration system.
MICHIGAN	Data incomplete because 491 of 1514 local jurisdictions failed to provide data.
MINNESOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
MISSISSIPPI	Data are incomplete because 72 of the 82 counties failed to report and a few others reported only partial data.
MISSOURI	Data are virtually complete

Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reporting in 2000

MONTANA	Data are incomplete because 5 of 56 counties failed to provide data and a few others do not track the requested information.
NEBRASKA	Data are complete.
NEVADA	Data are incomplete because counties failed to report the requested information.
NEW HAMPSHIRE	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
NEW JERSEY	Data are complete.
NEW MEXICO	Data are complete.
NEW YORK	Data are complete.
NORTH CAROLINA	Data are virtually complete
NORTH DAKOTA	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
OHIO	Data are complete
OKLAHOMA	Data are complete
OREGON	Data on armed forces not collected because of parallel data collection by the Department of Defense.
PENNSYLVANIA	Data are complete except that public assistance agencies also includes some disability numbers since they were not always recorded separately.

Table 4 - Completeness of Numerical Data Reporting In 2000

RHODE ISLAND	Data are virtually complete.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Data are complete.
SOUTH DAKOTA	Data are incomplete because two of the 66 counties failed to report.
TENNESSEE	Data are complete.
TEXAS	Data are incomplete because 12 of 254 counties failed to report the requested data (although these 12 are small counties).
UTAH	Data are virtually complete less a few monthly reports from a few counties because of computer and other technical problems.
VERMONT	Data are incomplete because 146 of 246 local jurisdictions failed to report to the State.
VIRGINIA	The number of duplicate applications is underreported by some local jurisdiction owing to confusion over changes in data reporting procedures.
WASHINGTON	Data are complete.
WEST VIRGINIA	Data are incomplete since 10 of 50 counties failed to report. Duplicates by agency are unavailable because agency generated applications are received centrally by the State but are processed locally.
WISCONSIN	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>
WYOMING	<i>is exempt from the NVRA.</i>

