

BRENNAN  

---

CENTER  

---

FOR JUSTICE  

---

VOTING LAW CHANGES IN 2012

Wendy R. Weiser and Lawrence Norden

## ABOUT THE BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE

The Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law is a non-partisan public policy and law institute that focuses on the fundamental issues of democracy and justice. Our work ranges from voting rights to campaign finance reform, from racial justice in criminal law to presidential power in the fight against terrorism. A singular institution—part think tank, part public interest law firm, part advocacy group—the Brennan Center combines scholarship, legislative and legal advocacy, and communications to win meaningful, measurable change in the public sector.

## ABOUT THE BRENNAN CENTER'S DEMOCRACY PROGRAM

The Brennan Center's Democracy Program works to repair the broken systems of American democracy. We encourage broad citizen participation by promoting voting and campaign reform. We work to secure fair courts and to advance a First Amendment jurisprudence that puts the right of citizens—not special interests—at the center of our democracy. We collaborate with grassroots groups, advocacy organizations, and government officials to eliminate the obstacles to an effective democracy.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Brennan Center gratefully acknowledges the Bauman Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Democracy Alliance Partners, Ford Foundation, The Joyce Foundation, The Irving B. Harris Foundation, Mitchell Kapor Foundation, Michael Kieschnick, Nancy Meyer and Marc Weiss, Open Society Foundations, Rockefeller Family Fund, Tides Advocacy Fund, and Wallace Global Fund for their generous support of our voting work.

This report is the joint product of hours of work by many Brennan Center staff. In particular, we owe a special thanks to Brennan Center attorneys Keesha Gaskins, Myrna Pérez, Lee Rowland, and Nic Riley, all of whom drafted or edited sections of the report and the attached appendix. We also thank Jonathan Brater and Nick Bauer, who reviewed and edited portions of the document.

The report could not have been completed without many hours of research and general assistance from current and former Brennan Center research associates, most especially Lianna Reagan, John Travis, Nhu-Y Ngo, and Maria Da Silva. Brennan Center interns Sarah Ferguson and Meredith McCoy also provided valuable assistance for the appendix.

This report benefited greatly from the insightful and thorough editorial assistance of Jeanine Plant-Chirlin and Andrew Goldston.

We also thank Brennan Center Executive Director Michael Waldman for his strategic insight, helping shape and frame the final product.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Wendy R. Weiser** directs the Democracy Program at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law, a non-partisan think tank and public interest law center. She founded and directed the center's Voting Rights and Elections Project, coordinating litigation, research, and advocacy efforts to enhance political participation and prevent voter disenfranchisement across the country. Her work and the work she directed protected the voting rights of hundreds of thousands of citizens in 2006, 2008, and 2010.

She has authored a number of nationally-recognized publications and articles on voting rights and election reform; litigated ground-breaking voting rights lawsuits; testified before both houses of Congress and in a variety of state legislatures; and provided policy and legislative drafting assistance to federal and state legislators and administrators across the country. She is a frequent public speaker and media contributor on democracy issues.

**Lawrence Norden** is Deputy Director of the Brennan Center's Democracy Program. He has authored several nationally recognized reports and articles related to voting rights, voting systems and election administration.

In April 2009, Mr. Norden completed his duties as Chair of the Ohio Secretary of State's bipartisan Election Summit and Conference, authoring a report that recommended several changes to Ohio's election administration practices and laws; the report was endorsed by most of the State's voting rights groups, as well as the bipartisan Ohio Association of Election Officials. In June 2009, he received the Usability Professional Association's Usability In Civic Life Award for his "pioneering work to improve elections." Mr. Norden is the lead author of the book *The Machinery of Democracy: Protecting Elections in an Electronic World* (Academy Chicago Press) and a contributor to the *Encyclopedia of American Civil Liberties* (Routledge 2007).

Mr. Norden is an Adjunct Professor at the NYU School of Law, where he teaches the Brennan Center Public Policy Advocacy Clinic.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>I. Voter Identification</b>	<b>4</b>
A. Background	4
B. Roundup of Legislative Developments	5
C. What the Bills Say	5
<i>Making it Harder for Students to Vote</i>	8
D. Legislative Battles	9
1. A High Priority After Years Without Success	9
a. Change in Partisan Control	9
<i>Focus: Rhode Island and Ohio—</i>	10
<i>Exceptions That Prove the Rule</i>	
b. Heightened Priority	11
<i>Focus: Texas</i>	11
c. Support by Conservative ALEC	11
2. The Debate	12
<i>The Costs of Voter ID</i>	15
3. When All Else Fails: Ballot Measures	14
<b>II. Documentary Proof Of Citizenship To Register Or Vote</b>	<b>16</b>
A. Background	16
B. Roundup of Legislative Developments	17
C. What the Bills Say	17
D. Legislative Battles	17
<b>III. Making Voter Registration Harder</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Part 1: Voter Registration Drive Regulations</b>	<b>19</b>
A. Background	19
B. Roundup of Legislative Developments	21
C. What the Bills Say	21
D. Legislative Battles	22
Florida History	22
<i>2011 Debate in Florida</i>	22
<i>Impact of New Voting Laws on Minority Voters</i>	24
<b>Part 2: Eliminating Same-Day Registration</b>	<b>25</b>
A. Background	25
B. Roundup of Legislative Developments	25
C. What the Bills Say	26
<i>The Special Case of Ohio's Referendum</i>	26
D. Legislative Battles	27
<i>Focus: Maine and the People's Vote</i>	27
<b>Part 3: Other Restrictions on Voter Registration</b>	<b>28</b>
<i>Focus: Florida</i>	28
<i>Focus: Wisconsin</i>	28

<b>IV.</b>	<b>Making Voting Harder: Restricting Early In-Person Voting And Mail-In Absentee Voting</b>	<b>29</b>
	A. Background	29
	B. Roundup of Legislative Developments	29
	C. What the Bills Say	30
	D. Legislative Battles	31
	The Debate	31
	<i>Early Voting on Sunday and the Black Vote</i>	33
<b>V.</b>	<b>Making It Harder To Restore Voting Rights</b>	<b>34</b>
	A. Background	34
	B. Roundup of Legislation and Executive Actions	34
	C. Content of Executive Actions	35
	D. The Debate	36
	<b>Endnotes</b>	<b>37</b>



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past century, our nation expanded the franchise and knocked down myriad barriers to full electoral participation. In 2011, however, that momentum abruptly shifted.

State governments across the country enacted an array of new laws making it harder to register or to vote. Some states require voters to show government-issued photo identification, often of a type that as many as one in ten voters do not have. Other states have cut back on early voting, a hugely popular innovation used by millions of Americans. Two states reversed earlier reforms and once again disenfranchised millions who have past criminal convictions but who are now taxpaying members of the community. Still others made it much more difficult for citizens to register to vote, a prerequisite for voting.

These new restrictions fall most heavily on young, minority, and low-income voters, as well as on voters with disabilities. This wave of changes may sharply tilt the political terrain for the 2012 election. Based on the Brennan Center's analysis of the 19 laws and two executive actions that passed in 14 states, it is clear that:

- These new laws could make it significantly harder for more than five million eligible voters to cast ballots in 2012.<sup>1</sup>
- The states that have already cut back on voting rights will provide 171 electoral votes in 2012—63 percent of the 270 needed to win the presidency.
- Of the 12 likely battleground states, as assessed by an August *Los Angeles Times* analysis of Gallup polling, five have already cut back on voting rights (and may pass additional restrictive legislation), and two more are currently considering new restrictions.<sup>2</sup>

States have changed their laws so rapidly that no single analysis has assessed the overall impact of such moves. Although it is too early to quantify how the changes will impact voter turnout, they will be a hindrance to many voters at a time when the United States continues to turn out less than two thirds of its eligible citizens in presidential elections and less than half in midterm elections.

This study is the first comprehensive roundup of all state legislative action thus far in 2011 on voting rights, focusing on new laws as well as state legislation that has not yet passed or that failed. This snapshot may soon be incomplete: the second halves of some state legislative sessions have begun.

## INTRODUCTION

Legislators introduced and passed a record number of bills restricting access to voting this year. New laws ranged from those requiring government-issued photo identification or documentary proof of citizenship to vote, to those reducing access to early and absentee voting, to those making it more difficult to register to vote. In total, at least nineteen laws and two executive actions making it more difficult to vote passed across the country, at least forty-two bills are still pending, and at least sixty-eight more were introduced but failed.

As detailed in this report, the extent to which states have made voting more difficult is unprecedented in the last several decades, and comes after a dramatic shift in political power following the 2010 election. The battles over these laws were—and, in states where they are not yet over, continue to be—extremely partisan and among the most contentious in this year’s legislative session. Proponents of the laws have offered several reasons for their passage: to prevent fraud, to ease administrative burden, to save money. Opponents have focused on the fact that the new laws will make it much more difficult for eligible citizens to vote and to ensure that their votes are counted. In particular, they have pointed out that many of these laws will disproportionately impact low-income and minority citizens, renters, and students—eligible voters who already face the biggest hurdles to voting.

This report provides the first comprehensive overview of the state legislative action on voting rights so far in 2011. It summarizes the legislation introduced and passed this legislative session, provides political and legal context, and details the contentious political battles surrounding these bills.


Overall, legislators introduced and passed the following measures:







- **Photo ID laws.** At least thirty-four states introduced legislation that would require voters to show photo identification in order to vote. Photo ID bills were signed into law in seven states: Alabama, Kansas, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin. By contrast, before the 2011 legislative session, only two states had ever imposed strict photo ID requirements. The number of states with laws requiring voters to show government-issued photo identification has quadrupled in 2011. To put this into context, 11% of American citizens do not possess a government-issued photo ID; that is over 21 million citizens.
- **Proof of citizenship laws.** At least twelve states introduced legislation that would require proof of citizenship, such as a birth certificate, to register or vote. Proof of citizenship laws passed in Alabama, Kansas, and Tennessee. Previously, only two states had passed proof of citizenship laws, and only one had put such a requirement in effect. The number of states with such a requirement has more than doubled.
- **Making voter registration harder.** At least thirteen states introduced bills to end highly popular Election Day and same-day voter registration, limit voter registration mobilization efforts, and reduce other registration opportunities. Maine passed a law eliminating Election Day registration, and Ohio ended its weeklong period of same-day voter registration. Florida,



Illinois, and Texas passed laws restricting voter registration drives, and Florida and Wisconsin passed laws making it more difficult for people who move to stay registered and vote.

- **Reducing early and absentee days.** At least nine states introduced bills to reduce their early voting periods, and four tried to reduce absentee voting opportunities. Florida, Georgia, Ohio, Tennessee, and West Virginia succeeded in enacting bills reducing early voting.
- **Making it harder to restore voting rights.** Two states—Florida and Iowa—reversed prior executive actions that made it easier for citizens with past felony convictions to restore their voting rights, affecting hundreds of thousands of voters. In effect, both states now permanently disenfranchise most citizens with past felony convictions.



-  Legislation introduced
-  Photo ID requirements passed
-  Proof of citizenship passed
-  Restrictions on voter registration passed
-  Restrictions on early/absentee voting passed
-  Executive action making it harder to restore voting rights

## I. VOTER IDENTIFICATION

### A. Background

By far the most widespread legislative development this session involved bills to impose stricter documentary identification requirements on voters. Voter ID laws—especially those that require voters to show one of a small number of government-issued photo IDs to vote—have been the subject of intense debate over the past few election cycles, and the debate heated up this year.

Proponents of strict voter ID laws maintain that they are reasonable measures to prevent fraud by persons improperly casting ballots in the names of other registered citizens, real or imagined. They dispute that such laws will discourage voting by any group, claiming that photo IDs are needed for many aspects of modern life, including boarding an airplane or entering certain government buildings.<sup>3</sup> Opponents maintain that photo ID laws exclude large swaths of the electorate, since 11% of citizens—and an even greater percentage of low-income, minority, young, and older citizens—do not have state-issued photo IDs.<sup>4</sup> They argue that photo ID requirements are similar to a poll tax, whether or not the IDs are offered for free, because to obtain the necessary IDs citizens must produce documents that cost money, like passports and birth certificates.<sup>5</sup> Opponents also claim that impersonation voter fraud—the only type of fraud prevented by voter ID laws—almost never happens since our laws adequately protect against and punish such fraud.<sup>6</sup> Although the best available study found that strict voter ID laws reduce turnout, neither side can definitively demonstrate the extent of the effect on voter turnout, since such laws have not been in effect long enough to permit accurate study.<sup>7</sup> Each side also questions the other's motives.

Voter ID is nothing new—indeed, federal law requires every new voter who registers by mail to show ID before voting,<sup>8</sup> and a variety of states have additional common-sense ID requirements.<sup>9</sup> What is new, however, is the degree to which the voter ID bills that were proposed and passed this session were restrictive, excluding many common forms of photo and non-photo IDs, such as student IDs and Social Security cards, and offering no alternative mechanisms for eligible citizens without the selected IDs to cast ballots that will count. What also is new is the extent to which such restrictive bills passed this session.

Prior to the 2006 elections, *no* state required its voters to show government-issued photo ID at the polls (or elsewhere) in order to vote. In 2006, Indiana became the first state in the nation to do so. Although Georgia and Missouri passed photo ID laws at around the same time, both states' laws were blocked by courts on the ground that they interfered with the right of eligible citizens to vote—under the U.S. Constitution in Georgia's case and the Missouri State Constitution in Missouri's case.<sup>10</sup> In 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld Indiana's voter ID law against a constitutional attack.<sup>11</sup> After lengthy litigation in response to which Georgia amended its voter ID law several times, Georgia's law was eventually upheld as well.<sup>12</sup> That law first went into effect in late 2007, making Georgia the second state in the nation to require its citizens to show photo ID at the polls.

Thus, as of the start of this legislative session, only two states had ever imposed strict photo ID requirements on voters, and only for a short period of time. Several other states—Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Michigan, and South Dakota—also requested, and still request, photo ID from their voters at the polls, but if a voter in those states does not have photo ID, she can still cast a ballot that

will count after an alternative verification procedure, like a signature match or a sworn affidavit. The remainder of the states had more flexible voting identification requirements.<sup>13</sup>

## **B. Roundup of Legislative Developments**

This year, at least thirty-four states introduced a record number of bills to require photo ID to vote.<sup>14</sup> As Jenny Bowser, senior fellow at the National Conference of State Legislatures, observed, “It’s remarkable ... I very rarely see one single issue come up in so many state legislatures in a single session.”<sup>15</sup>

Photo ID bills passed and were signed into law in seven states to date: Alabama, Kansas, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.<sup>16</sup> (The Alabama, South Carolina, and Texas laws cannot go into effect unless and until they are pre-cleared by either the U.S. Department of Justice or a federal court under the Voting Rights Act.) Bills also passed but were vetoed in five additional states: Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, and North Carolina.<sup>17</sup> A number of additional states—including Pennsylvania<sup>18</sup>—still have active photo ID bills pending in ongoing legislative sessions. In New Hampshire, legislators failed to override the Governor’s veto,<sup>19</sup> and in North Carolina, legislators could attempt to push a new voter ID bill despite the Governor’s veto.<sup>20</sup>

In addition, Missouri legislators passed a ballot measure to amend the state constitution to allow the state to impose photo ID requirements on voters; the measure will appear on the state ballot in November 2012.<sup>21</sup> (If the measure passes, legislators will have to enact further legislation before a photo ID requirement could be imposed.) Supporters of strict voter ID in Mississippi similarly introduced a ballot initiative that will appear on the November 2011 ballot.<sup>22</sup>

## **C. What the Bills Say**

In general, the photo ID bills that were introduced this session are more restrictive than those in prior sessions, including fewer forms of acceptable IDs, fewer exemptions, or fewer alternative mechanisms for eligible voters without the specified IDs to vote.

Those laws that have passed this session vary in several respects, including: (1) the types of photo ID that voters are permitted to show for voting; (2) whether the requirement to provide ID applies only to in-person voters or to those who vote by mail as well; (3) whether there are any exemptions from the requirement to provide ID; and, most importantly, (4) whether there is an alternative way for a voter who does not have an accepted form of photo ID to cast a ballot that counts. Detailed descriptions of each bill are included in the appendix to this report.

*The types of ID permitted.* With the exception of Rhode Island, each of the states that passed voter ID bills require voters to show government-issued photo IDs, though the list of acceptable IDs differs from state to state. All seven states accept an unexpired driver’s license, non-driver’s ID issued by a motor vehicle department, U.S. passport, or U.S. military photo ID. All states except for Kansas and South Carolina also accept U.S. naturalization documents bearing a photo. Alabama, Rhode Island, and Tennessee broadly accept any photo ID issued by state and federal governments, though Tennessee expressly excludes student IDs from consideration. Only Alabama, Kansas, and Rhode Island accept

student photo IDs issued by state institutions of higher education. Wisconsin purports to accept certain state-issued student IDs, but the state's new law imposes criteria for such IDs that few if any state schools' IDs meet. Kansas and Texas expressly allow concealed handgun licenses, and Alabama, Rhode Island and Tennessee accept such IDs as well. Only Alabama and Wisconsin accept a tribal ID card with a photo. Rhode Island is the only state that accepts non-governmental photo IDs for voting; indeed, any current ID with a voter's name and photograph suffices.

*Who must show photo ID.* All seven states require individuals appearing to vote in person at a polling place to show photo ID. Only Alabama and Kansas require all persons who vote absentee to submit a copy of their photo IDs with their mail-in ballots. Those states are now the first two states in the nation ever to require photo ID with absentee ballots. Wisconsin requires permanent absentee voters to submit a copy of their photo IDs, but only the first time they vote absentee. As a practical matter, all absentee voters in Wisconsin will have to provide a copy of their photo IDs when the law first goes into full effect in 2012.

*Exemptions.* Several states exclude certain categories of voters from the requirement to show photo ID for voting. Alabama exempts individuals who are entitled to vote absentee under federal laws protecting certain military and overseas voters and certain elderly and disabled voters. Wisconsin also exempts military and overseas voters, as well as voters designated as "confidential," such as police officers or domestic violence victims. It does not exempt elderly or disabled voters other than those indefinitely confined to certain care facilities. Tennessee exempts voters who are either hospitalized or in nursing homes. Texas exempts certain voters with disabilities who can produce a statement that they have been determined to be disabled by specified government agencies and do not have the required ID. And Kansas exempts only permanently disabled and absent military voters from its law, but allows persons over sixty-five to show expired photo IDs.


*Alternative voting procedure.* Three states—Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Tennessee—offer an alternative way for all or many voters who are unable to produce photo ID to vote and have their votes count. In Rhode Island, citizens who do not have photo ID must vote by provisional ballot, and election officials are directed to count all such ballots so long as the signature on the provisional ballot envelope matches the signature on the voter's registration. In South Carolina, persons who have a "reasonable impediment" to obtaining a photo ID or a religious objection to being photographed may cast a provisional ballot along with an affidavit explaining why they do not have ID. Election officials are directed to count those ballots unless there are grounds to believe the affidavit is false. In Tennessee, persons who cannot afford a photo ID or who have a religious objection to being photographed can swear an affidavit of identity and vote a regular ballot. These alternative means of demonstrating one's identity and voting without a photo ID separate these states' laws from the much stricter laws of Alabama, Kansas, Texas, and Wisconsin.<sup>23</sup>

*Free IDs.* The U.S. Supreme Court has made it clear that states that require their voters to present government-issued photo IDs for voting must make such IDs available to voters free of charge.<sup>24</sup> And indeed, each of the seven state laws provides a mechanism for free IDs for persons who need them for voting. Kansas and Tennessee specify that free IDs will be available only to those who swear an affidavit saying they need the ID for voting purposes and do not have other qualifying photo ID. It is not clear

whether those states or the others will sufficiently advertise their free ID offers so that eligible but indigent voters can obtain such IDs. For example, it appears that Wisconsin officials have taken the position that prospective voters must expressly request free IDs before one is offered; according to a key transportation official, “the statutory language specifically puts the onus on the customer for getting the ID for free for voting.”<sup>25</sup> DMV officials reportedly turned away a Madison, Wisconsin voter when she did not have enough money to renew her photo ID because she did not specifically request a free ID for voting.<sup>26</sup> And a former state employee claimed that he was fired because he sent an e-mail to coworkers urging them to inform people that the free IDs had to be specifically requested.<sup>27</sup> It is unclear under the case law whether and under what circumstances states may be required to defray the costs of the documents voters need in order to obtain photo IDs—most notably birth certificates, which typically cost between \$15 and \$25.<sup>28</sup> Currently, only Kansas’s law allows voters born in the state to obtain a birth certificate free of charge if needed to obtain ID for voting.

*Effective Dates.* The ID provisions for all of the new ID laws have effective dates on or before 2012, with two exceptions. The photo ID requirements in Alabama will not go into effect until 2014, if they are pre-cleared under the Voting Rights Act. The Rhode Island law goes into effect in 2012, but only partially; it allows either photo or non-photo ID (including, but not limited to, social security cards and government-issued medical cards) prior to 2014. Beginning in 2014, Rhode Island will allow only photo IDs at the polls.

### States Where Voter ID Legislation Was Introduced



Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

## Making it Harder for Students to Vote

A fair amount of attention has been paid this year to the impact of voter ID laws on students. Three of the seven photo ID bills to have passed—South Carolina’s, Texas’s, and Tennessee’s—expressly do not allow students to use photo IDs issued by state educational institutions to vote, and Wisconsin’s bill effectively excludes most student IDs as well.

When **Wisconsin**’s photo ID bill was first introduced, it too excluded all student IDs.<sup>29</sup> After substantial public debate and controversy,<sup>30</sup> the bill was amended to permit student IDs that meet certain criteria. The problem is that the student IDs currently issued by the University of Wisconsin system and various other schools do not meet those criteria. The University of Wisconsin would have to spend an estimated \$1.1 million to issue new ID cards to students for its photo IDs to be accepted for voting purposes.<sup>31</sup>

Many question the fairness of voter ID laws that exclude government-issued photo IDs held by such a large segment of the population. This is especially the case with laws like Texas’s, which does not allow voters to use student IDs but does allow them to use concealed weapon licenses for voting.<sup>32</sup> Some read into the fact that these bills exclude student IDs as a partisan motive to exclude certain groups of voters more likely to Democratic.<sup>33</sup>

The legislative targeting of students this session was not limited to voter ID laws. In **New Hampshire**, for example, Republican lawmakers introduced highly controversial legislation that would have prevented students and members of the military who previously lived elsewhere from acquiring voting residency in the state.<sup>34</sup> No other state singles out students or any other group for special voting residency requirements—and for good reason; as the Brennan Center pointed out, such a discriminatory rule clearly violates the U.S. Constitution.<sup>35</sup> The Speaker of the State House was notoriously caught on tape telling a Tea Party group that he supported the bill because students tend to vote Democratic. He said, “the kids [are] coming out of the school and basically doing what I did when I was a kid. Voting as a liberal. You know, that’s what kids do. They don’t have life experience and they just vote their feelings.”<sup>36</sup> After strong public pressure, including opposition from both College Democrats and College Republicans, the bill failed on the House floor.<sup>37</sup>

The targeting of student voters has also gone beyond legislation. The newly-elected Secretary of State of **Maine** recently announced he was forwarding a list of 206 students who were registered to vote in the state but paid out-of-state tuition to law enforcement for voter fraud investigations.<sup>38</sup> But under Maine law, like in other states, the rules for tuition are very different from those for voting; many students meet the legal voting residency requirements while still being ineligible for in-state tuition.<sup>39</sup>

## D. Legislative Battles

The voter ID battles this session differed from the past not only because the proposed laws were more restrictive but also because those pushing the bills prioritized them far more than their predecessors and commanded far greater legislative support. Another new feature of the legislative landscape was the reported involvement of the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), a conservative group made up of state legislators and business and other interests. As in past sessions, voter ID bills were hotly contested along partisan lines, with Republicans largely supporting and Democrats largely opposing stricter ID requirements.

### 1. A High Priority After Years Without Success

State legislators across the country have been pushing strict photo ID requirements for almost a decade now, with little success before this year. In recent legislative sessions, a majority of states—though fewer than this year—saw the introduction of stricter voter ID bills.<sup>40</sup>

Although most voter ID bills did not advance very far in those years, there was a strong push in some states, especially where ID laws passed this year. Wisconsin's new voter ID law passed a decade after then-legislator and now-Governor Scott Walker first authored a photo ID bill; former Governor Jim Doyle vetoed the bill three times between 2002 and 2005.<sup>41</sup> In Kansas, legislators were successful in passing a voter ID bill in 2008, but it was vetoed by then-Governor Kathleen Sebelius. In Texas, strict voter ID bills came close to passage in both 2007 and 2009, but were blocked under a state procedure akin to the filibuster.<sup>42</sup> In 2009, legislators in the South Carolina House passed a photo ID bill over angry resistance from their Democratic colleagues,<sup>43</sup> inciting them to storm out of the session in protest.<sup>44</sup> In Tennessee in 2009, a voter ID bill passed the Senate, but died in the House.<sup>45</sup> In Mississippi in 2009, legislators fought so hard for a restrictive voter ID bill that they killed a compromise proposal to require photo ID because it was not strict enough—and the bill would have also permitted early voting.<sup>46</sup> In Alabama, a photo ID bill was part of the Republican Party's legislative agenda for more than a decade, with recent bills introduced in 2007, 2009, and 2010.<sup>47</sup> Following a failed bill in 2007,<sup>48</sup> Rhode Island's House passed a voter ID bill in 2009, but a Senate version stalled.<sup>49</sup>

In most states, however, strict voter ID bills did not advance very far before this year. Indeed, previously only two states (Indiana and Georgia) had ever implemented a photo ID requirement for voters. Between 2006 and 2011, no state passed a photo ID law. This year, in contrast, strict voter ID bills met with far greater success, passing twelve state legislatures—though ultimately vetoed in five—and passing one legislative chamber in at least six more.<sup>50</sup>

#### a. Change in Partisan Control

There are at least two major reasons for this change. The first is the stark shift in the partisan makeup of state legislatures after 2010. As noted, there is typically a sharp partisan divide over the issue of strict voter ID requirements, with Republicans generally pushing more restrictive measures and Democrats generally opposing them. This year, in every case but one, strict voter ID bills were introduced by Republican legislators. Newly elected legislators introduced about a quarter of these bills.<sup>51</sup>

As a result of Republican electoral success in state houses across the country in 2010, proponents of strict voter ID bills were able to garner much greater legislative support than in the past. In the 2010

elections, Republicans picked up at least 675 state legislative seats across the country.<sup>52</sup> Republicans therefore controlled both legislative chambers in twenty-six states, up from fourteen earlier in 2010.<sup>53</sup> In Wisconsin, for example, both houses switched to Republican control for the first time since 1998; Republicans gained fourteen seats in the Assembly and four in the Senate.<sup>54</sup> Similarly, in Alabama, Republicans won overwhelming majorities in both legislative chambers in 2010, and they made voter ID a priority.<sup>55</sup> With the exception of Rhode Island, every state that enacted stricter voter ID requirements this session had both houses and the governor's office controlled by Republicans.

**Focus: Rhode Island and Ohio—Exceptions That Prove the Rule.** As noted above, support and opposition to voter ID laws in state legislatures in 2011 fell almost entirely along partisan lines, with Republicans largely supporting and Democrats largely opposing stricter ID requirements. There were two notable exceptions.

In Rhode Island the photo ID bill that eventually became law was introduced by a Democratic legislator, passed two legislative chambers controlled by Democrats, and was signed by an independent governor. Senate sponsor Harold Metts said, “[I]n this day and age, very few adults lack one of the forms of identification that will be accepted, and the rare person who does can get a free voter ID card from the Secretary of State. While I’m sensitive to the concerns raised, at this point I am more interested in doing the right thing and stopping voter fraud.”<sup>56</sup> But Rhode Island’s bill is significantly less restrictive and differs substantially from the others that passed this session, in two major respects. First, unlike the other states that provide a narrow list of acceptable photo IDs, Rhode Island broadly accepts any ID with a voter’s name and photograph.<sup>57</sup> Second, although Rhode Island now requires that all voters present photo ID before receiving a ballot in person, a voter without photo ID may sign an affidavit that she does not have a photo ID and cast a provisional ballot that will count if the signature on the ballot matches the voter’s registration signature. In other words, a voter without photo ID can still cast a ballot that will count.

In Ohio the usual pattern was broken in a different way: a very restrictive photo ID bill was introduced by a Republican state legislator and uniformly opposed by Democrats, but it was ultimately defeated because of opposition from several prominent Republicans, including the Secretary of State.<sup>58</sup> In rejecting a proposal from the Ohio House that would only have allowed voters to present one of four types of government issued ID, Secretary Husted stated:

I want to be perfectly clear, when I began working with the General Assembly to improve Ohio’s elections system it was never my intent to reject valid votes. I would rather have no bill than one with a rigid photo identification provision that does little to protect against fraud and excludes legally registered voters’ ballots from counting.<sup>59</sup>

The reaction of Husted and some of his fellow Republicans in the state senate may have something to do with the fact that Ohio is several years ahead of most of the country when it comes to acrimonious partisan fighting over election administration. In particular, the passage of a voter ID bill in 2005 by a Republican-controlled legislature, in a partisan battle typical of this year’s fights, led to years of costly litigation and negative publicity about the new law.<sup>60</sup> That battle ultimately ended in a court-ordered settlement in 2009.<sup>61</sup> In the meantime, the new requirements received exceptionally harsh coverage from commentators and editorial boards across the state,<sup>62</sup> while election officials of both major parties complained that the



law was far too complicated and difficult to administer.<sup>63</sup> Given this history, it is perhaps not surprising that there were elected officials of both political parties who preferred to stay away from a proposal that would have imposed an even more restrictive set of ID requirements on Ohio voters.

### *b. Heightened Priority*

The second reason for the greater success of photo ID bills this year is that legislators made them more of a priority than they had been in the past. Many of the Republican legislators and election administrators swept into office in 2010 made voter ID a significant campaign issue as well as a major legislative priority. Previously, it was rare for voter ID to become a campaign issue; in 2010, in contrast, newly elected Secretaries of State Matt Schultz of Iowa, Kris Kobach of Kansas, Scott Gessler of Colorado, and Dianna Duran of New Mexico all made voter ID a prominent part of their campaign platforms.<sup>64</sup> Newly-elected Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker similarly made voter ID a campaign issue in 2010.<sup>65</sup> Even before the legislative sessions began, state lawmakers had already pre-filed voter ID bills in a number of states.<sup>66</sup>

**Focus: Texas.** The Texas example is illustrative. After Republicans gained twenty-six seats in the State House, Texas State Representative Debbie Riddle camped out overnight in the State Legislature to be the first to pre-file voter ID legislation.<sup>67</sup> (As it turns out, her proposed bill was not the legislation that eventually passed.) Eager lawmakers introduced so many voter ID bills—at least fourteen—that a new “House Select Committee on Voter ID and Voter Fraud” was established to review the legislation. To ensure that more stringent voter ID rules would pass quickly, Texas Governor Rick Perry used emergency powers to alter the usual legislative process, declaring voter ID an “emergency item,” allowing legislators to begin deliberation on voter ID bills immediately instead of waiting until after the first sixty days of the session, as is customary.

This rush came after at least six years of contentious and partisan debate in Texas on voter ID.<sup>68</sup> Democrats successfully blocked voter ID bills in the last three legislative sessions, under dramatic circumstances. In 2007, a Democratic senator on sick leave left his bed and rushed to the State Capitol to block a vote on proposed voter ID legislation. After casting the deciding vote to prevent debate, he went to the lounge and vomited.<sup>69</sup> That same session, another state senator rallied to block proposed legislation, despite the fact that he was suffering complications from a recent liver transplant and needed a hospital bed to be kept about one hundred feet from the Senate floor.<sup>70</sup> Two years later, in 2009, sparring<sup>71</sup> over a new voter ID proposal drove marathon hearings running for twenty-three hours straight.<sup>72</sup>

### *c. Support by Conservative ALEC*


A third possible reason for the success of voter ID bills this year is the reported involvement of the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), a powerful conservative group that brings together state legislators and private interests to develop and support state legislation and policy. According to the *New York Times*, “[m]any of [this session’s voter ID] bills were inspired by the American Legislative Exchange Council, a business-backed conservative group, which has circulated voter ID proposals in scores of state legislatures.”<sup>73</sup> In 2009, according to other media reports, not long after ALEC featured a cover story called “Preventing Election Fraud” in its member magazine, the organization adopted

model voter ID legislation and circulated it to its members across the country.<sup>74</sup> The voter ID bills that were eventually introduced and passed in the states this session all bear some resemblance to ALEC’s model legislation. Although the extent of ALEC’s involvement in voter ID legislation is unknown, the organization boasts that each year more than 1,000 bills based on its models are introduced in state legislatures, and that approximately 17% of those bills become law.<sup>75</sup> In addition to developing model bills, ALEC typically provides a range of support services to help advance the policies it supports, including trainings and seminars, studies, talking points, strategic plans, and action alerts.<sup>76</sup>

## 2. The Debate

As in previous legislative sessions, with the exception of Rhode Island, the debates over photo ID bills were highly charged and divided along partisan lines.


Nowhere was the debate more heated than in **Wisconsin**. There, Republican legislators considered passing the hotly contested photo ID bill while the Democrats were absent, boycotting the legislature to block the bill that eliminated collective bargaining rights for public employees.<sup>77</sup> Because the photo ID bill entailed significant costs for the state, state legislative rules prevented Republicans from proceeding unilaterally without a quorum. But the drama did not stop there. Once the Democrats returned, the State Senate passed the voter ID bill in a hasty and boisterous vote, denying opponents the opportunity to debate or speak out against the bill. Senate President Mike Ellis cut off the most senior member of the chamber, State Senator Fred Risser, to call a vote. Democratic members sought to stop the roll call, but President Ellis declared the bill passed once it had received enough votes. Some Democratic senators did not vote out of protest or confusion, and reportedly could not add their votes after the commotion was over.<sup>78</sup> Similarly, in **Alabama**, Senate leadership limited debate on the voter ID bill to twenty minutes.<sup>79</sup>



The debates were also characterized by a high level of mistrust between both sides. Opponents of voter ID accused proponents of attempting to shrink the electorate for partisan gain. Former President Bill Clinton, for example, asserted that voter ID laws are intended to specifically hurt Democratic voters, and that proponents “are trying to make the 2012 electorate look more like the 2010 electorate than the 2008 electorate.”<sup>80</sup> Columnist E.J. Dionne wrote that “[s]ometimes the partisan motivation” behind these efforts “is so clear.”<sup>81</sup> Proponents, on the other hand, accused opponents of trying to ignore or even foster voter fraud. According to one columnist, the Democrats’ “rhetoric is over the top, probably because voter ID does get at the problem of voter fraud which—for some Democrats—is not so much a theory as a turn out model, a key to winning close elections.”<sup>82</sup>

The content of the debate on voter ID bills was noteworthy for its consistency across the country. Proponents of photo ID bills consistently cited allegedly rampant voter fraud in their states and the need for greater ballot security to justify legislation. For example, in support of voter ID legislation, Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach relied upon 221 reported instances of voter fraud in Kansas between 1997 and 2010.<sup>83</sup> Similar claims were made by proponents of voter ID in other states.<sup>84</sup> Many also argued that voting is a “privilege” for which it is reasonable to require voters to expend effort.<sup>85</sup>

Opponents, on the other hand, argued that photo ID requirements will disenfranchise thousands of eligible Americans—especially low-income citizens, minorities, students, and older Americans.<sup>86</sup> They also pointed out that the kind of fraud addressed by ID requirements hardly ever occurs in American elections.<sup>87</sup> For opponents, voting is a fundamental right rather than a privilege. Thus, in explaining his veto of a photo ID bill, New Hampshire Governor John Lynch said, “[t]he right to vote is a



fundamental right ... [The voter ID bill] creates a real risk that New Hampshire voters will be denied their right to vote.”<sup>88</sup> And, as discussed below, opponents focused on the high costs of voter ID laws.

As voter ID laws were being considered across the country, members of Congress began weighing in on the issue, with a strong partisan divide. Upon achieving their new majority, House Republicans announced concerns about election administration and called for additional measures to “better protect the electoral process.”<sup>89</sup> Congressional Democrats, on the other hand, decried the new push toward restrictive voter ID requirements. Representative John Lewis (D-GA) said, “this year’s Republican-backed wave of voting restrictions has demonstrated that the fundamental right to vote is still subject to partisan manipulation.”<sup>90</sup> Some congressional Democrats took to the house floor to denounce the new legislative efforts on voter ID, raising questions about the motives underlying those efforts. Congresswoman Marcia Fudge (D-OH), a leading opposition voice, charged that “these efforts have an all-too familiar stench of the Jim Crow era.”<sup>91</sup> Representative G.K. Butterfield (D-NC) charged that the voter ID push “is a cynical and malicious Republican attempt to suppress minority and elderly voters who turned out in historical numbers for the ‘08 elections.”<sup>92</sup> One hundred and fifteen Democratic House members signed a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder asking him to oppose the new voter ID provisions.<sup>93</sup> Voter ID was a prominent topic in a September 8, 2011 hearing before a Senate Subcommittee chaired by Senator Dick Durbin examining the rash of new state voting laws that threaten to suppress voter turnout across the country.<sup>94</sup>

### *3. When All Else Fails: Ballot Measures*

Lawmakers who were unsuccessful in passing strict voter ID laws or whose laws were blocked by the courts have begun trying a new route: passing ballot measures to amend their state constitutions, as **Oklahoma** did in 2010. Oklahomans passed voter ID as a ballot measure in 2010, after a voter ID bill was vetoed by then-Governor Brad Henry. The new law—which is not nearly as restrictive as other measures introduced this year<sup>108</sup>—was implemented on July 1, 2011.

Though **Missouri** Governor Jay Nixon vetoed a photo ID bill this year, the Legislature passed a voter ID ballot measure, which cannot be vetoed, and which will be on the Missouri ballot in November 2012. The ballot measure would amend the State Constitution to allow the Legislature to impose stricter photo ID requirements on voters. This constitutional amendment effort comes five years after the Missouri State Supreme Court ruled a highly controversial voter ID law unconstitutional, noting that it would burden voters.<sup>109</sup> No state photo ID requirement can be imposed on Missouri voters unless the State Constitution is amended to overturn that decision. And even if the ballot measure passes, voters will not be required to show photo ID unless the Legislature passes and the Governor signs additional legislation.

Supporters of stricter voter ID have been pushing ballot measures in other states as well. A ballot measure requiring photo ID to vote will appear on the **Mississippi** ballot in November 2011.<sup>110</sup> In **Minnesota**, legislators in the House introduced a ballot measure to amend the State Constitution to require voter ID to counter this year’s veto; the measure has not yet been introduced in the Senate.<sup>111</sup>

## The Costs of Voter ID

The high cost of implementing voter ID laws was a big issue this session, when states were facing serious fiscal crises. States that pass voter ID laws must, according to court decisions, incur a range of costs, including the costs of providing free photo IDs to voters who do not have them, ensuring that IDs are reasonably accessible to all voters, and educating the public and election officials.<sup>95</sup> Although there was widespread agreement that voter ID laws entail necessary costs, there were disputes over what those costs would be, with bill opponents accusing proponents of dramatically understating the costs.<sup>96</sup>

The high cost of voter ID requirements caused local and county election officials in some states—including Iowa, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin—to oppose new voter ID laws.<sup>97</sup> They also deterred legislators in Nebraska and Iowa, two states that considered, but did not pass, voter ID legislation this year.

**Nebraska.** The fiscal note attached to Nebraska’s photo ID bill (L.B. 239), estimated negligible costs associated with its implementation, assuming that only voters who could prove they were indigent would be provided with free IDs.<sup>98</sup> Opponents argued that forcing voters to prove indigence before they could be provided with a photo ID could subject the bill to constitutional challenge, and argued that all IDs should be free.<sup>99</sup> The original sponsor of the bill, Senator Charlie Janssen, proposed an amendment to the bill that would have added non-photo ID and voter registration confirmation cards to the list of acceptable forms of voting identification.<sup>100</sup> This drew a rebuke from Larry Dix, director of the Nebraska Association of County Officials, who said the amendment would increase costs for the counties without providing any extra security. “I don’t see that the [proposed amendment] solves the problem at all,” he said, “there’s no security in that.”<sup>101</sup> Ultimately, the bill failed to leave committee and therefore died when the legislative session ended.<sup>102</sup>

**Iowa.** The Iowa State Association of County Auditors (ISACA)—a bipartisan organization representing county auditors, who are responsible for administering elections at the county level—opposed the voter ID bill proposed in their state.<sup>103</sup> ISACA conducted an independent study of the impact of voter ID measures in Indiana, and found that the proposed Iowa bill would impose too high a cost and burden on local election jurisdictions to justify its adoption.<sup>104</sup> As one county auditor put it, the legislation would be an “unfunded mandate” on counties, who would have to bear the brunt of meeting the obligation of “educating the public and the voter [about the bill’s requirements].”<sup>105</sup> As a result, the Association voted to officially oppose H.F. 95.<sup>106</sup> Both Democratic and Republican representatives in ISACA opposed the measure, with not one person voting to support it and with 16 of 60 county representatives choosing to remain neutral. According to Mike Gronstal, the Senate majority leader, the opposition from ISACA was one of the main reasons the bill ultimately failed.<sup>107</sup>

## II. DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP TO REGISTER OR VOTE

### A. Background

In general, except for certain local elections, a person must be a U.S. citizen over eighteen years old to be eligible to participate in American elections. A voter typically establishes her eligibility by swearing an affidavit, under penalty of perjury, that she is a U.S. citizen of voting age and meets all the other eligibility requirements of her state (such as residency and lack of disqualifying criminal convictions).<sup>112</sup> A non-citizen or other ineligible person who falsely claims eligibility and either registers to vote or votes is subject to serious criminal penalties—including five years in prison and \$10,000 in fines under federal law<sup>113</sup>—and also deportation.

Until recently, no state has ever required any voter to produce documentary proof of citizenship—or age or any other component of eligibility—to participate in elections. In 2004, however, as part of a broad-ranging ballot initiative, called Proposition 200, regulating the treatment of immigrants, Arizona for the first time passed a law requiring prospective voters to present documentary proof of citizenship in order to register to vote.<sup>114</sup>

**As of the start of this legislative session, only two states had ever sought to require documentary proof of citizenship for voter registration or voting.**

The Arizona law, which went into effect before the 2006 elections, specifically directs election officials to reject voter registration applications that are not accompanied by one of several specified citizenship documents,<sup>115</sup> thus denying those individuals the ability to vote. Until this year, this Arizona law was an outlier, unique in the country.

Arizona's proof of citizenship law sparked significant controversy from the outset. In March 2006, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, a bipartisan federal agency charged with regulating certain election administration matters, voted to reject Arizona's request to amend the federal voter registration application form to reflect the state's new rules.<sup>116</sup> Shortly afterward, the law was challenged in federal court;<sup>117</sup> it has been wrapped up in litigation ever since. In the most recent ruling in that case, a panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit held that the proof of citizenship requirement conflicts with federal law—specifically, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.<sup>118</sup> The Ninth Circuit agreed to rehear that case *en banc*, and oral argument was held before a larger panel on June 21, 2011. The court has not yet issued its decision.

Georgia became the second state to pass a proof of citizenship law in 2009, requiring prospective voters to provide documentary proof of citizenship in order to register to vote.<sup>119</sup> This came after the Department of Justice blocked implementation of an earlier Georgia policy for checking the citizenship of registered voters as unreliable and discriminatory.<sup>120</sup> The Department of Justice ultimately approved of Georgia's proof of citizenship law in April 2011,<sup>121</sup> but the state has not yet put the law into effect.

Thus, as of the start of this legislative session, only two states had ever sought to require documentary proof of citizenship for voter registration or voting, only one had implemented such a requirement, and the legality of the requirement had not yet been resolved (and still is not resolved) in the courts.

The push for proof of citizenship requirements should also be considered in the context of the bills targeting immigrants that swept the states this year. Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, Indiana, South Carolina, and Utah are among the states that passed laws supposedly designed to restrict benefits for, and crack down on, undocumented immigrants.<sup>122</sup> As with Proposition 200, Arizona was the national leader in this effort, with its highly controversial H.B. 1070.

## **B. Roundup of Legislative Developments**

This session, at least twelve states introduced legislation that would require documentary proof of citizenship to register or vote: Alabama,<sup>123</sup> Colorado,<sup>124</sup> Connecticut,<sup>125</sup> Kansas,<sup>126</sup> Maine,<sup>127</sup> Massachusetts,<sup>128</sup> New Hampshire,<sup>129</sup> Nevada,<sup>130</sup> Oregon,<sup>131</sup> South Carolina,<sup>132</sup> Tennessee,<sup>133</sup> and Texas.<sup>134</sup> Washington State introduced a resolution to request that any federal voting mandates make funding contingent upon the adoption of photo ID and proof of citizenship requirements.<sup>135</sup> Three proof of citizenship bills passed: in Alabama, Kansas, and Tennessee.<sup>136</sup> The new Kansas and Tennessee laws go into effect immediately; the Alabama law must await approval by the U.S. Department of Justice or a federal court under the Voting Rights Act.<sup>137</sup> To date, Alabama has not yet submitted the law for preclearance.<sup>138</sup>

## **C. What the Bills Say**

The new Alabama and Kansas proof of citizenship laws are virtually identical. Like the 2004 Arizona law, both laws require prospective voters to provide documentary evidence of U.S. citizenship with their voter registration applicants, and election officials to deny registration to any applicant who does not provide satisfactory documentation.<sup>139</sup> Acceptable documents include: any driver's or non-driver's ID that includes a notation that the person submitted proof of U.S. citizenship, a U.S. birth certificate, a U.S. passport or U.S. naturalization documents, certain tribal IDs, and other rare documents.<sup>140</sup> The Alabama and Kansas laws apply only to new registrants; they specifically exempt all people already registered in the state, even those who move and must update their voter registration records.<sup>141</sup> Neither law includes any exceptions for prospective voters who were not previously registered. Both laws specify that applicants whose registrations are denied because they failed to include satisfactory proof of citizenship may challenge election officials' determination in court.<sup>142</sup> The bills that did not pass this session similarly would have required documentary proof of citizenship to register to vote.


Unlike the Alabama and Kansas laws, the Tennessee law applies only to individuals flagged by state officials as potential non-citizens based on a database check. The Tennessee law therefore applies to a smaller number of prospective voters.

## **D. Legislative Battles**

Legislative debate over proof of citizenship bills was at times rancorous. For example, in Colorado, Democratic legislators and others pressed Republican Secretary of State Scott Gessler on his claims of widespread voter fraud by non-citizens. One Colorado Democratic representative demanded that Mr.

Gessler turn over evidence of actual instances of non-citizens voting.<sup>143</sup> Another representative insisted that Mr. Gessler prosecute actual instances of voter fraud of which he was aware, suggesting that Mr. Gessler did not actually have any cases that could be prosecuted.<sup>144</sup> County clerks also demanded that Gessler turn over evidence of voter fraud, insisting that they were not aware of any such instances.<sup>145</sup> The legislative debates over proof of citizenship mirrored those over voter ID. Proponents claimed that proof of citizenship requirements are needed to prevent non-citizens from illegally voting in elections. In several states, proponents claimed to have uncovered evidence of such illegal voting. Colorado Secretary of State Scott Gessler, for example, claimed that up to 11,805 non-citizens were registered to vote in Colorado,<sup>146</sup> while Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach claimed to have found 67 non-citizens illegally registered to vote in Kansas.<sup>147</sup> These claims were hotly disputed, and they have since been debunked.<sup>148</sup> Nonetheless, Representative Gregg Harper (R-MS) called the finding “shocking,” and at a hearing he chaired on the topic, said, “[w]e simply cannot have an electoral system that allows thousands of non-citizens to violate the law and vote in our elections ... [w]e must do more to protect the integrity of our electoral processes.”<sup>149</sup>

Opponents, on the other hand, claimed that proof of citizenship requirements exclude large numbers of eligible voters, pointing out that millions of eligible Americans—at least 7% according to a leading study by the Brennan Center<sup>150</sup>—do not have ready access to the documents needed to prove citizenship. As Tennessee State Senator Thelma Harper said, “[i]t hampers people who want to be a part of the system.”<sup>151</sup> Opponents further disputed the claim that there is a problem of non-citizen voting in American elections, pointing out that only a miniscule number of non-citizens have been found to have voted illegally, and that it is already easy to catch non-citizen voters since they leave a clear paper trail.<sup>152</sup>





### III. MAKING VOTER REGISTRATION HARDER

In every state but one, citizens must be registered in order to vote. Voter registration facilitates election administration by enabling election officials to more easily plan for elections, process voters, and prevent fraud. But registration requirements can also function as a barrier to many eligible voters, preventing them from participating because of technical hurdles or missed deadlines.<sup>153</sup>

Experts have long pointed out that the nation's outdated registration system is among the most significant barriers to voting, resulting in the disenfranchisement of millions of Americans during every federal election.<sup>154</sup> In 2001, the Carter-Ford National Task Force on Election Reform found that “[t]he registration laws in force throughout the United States are among the world’s most demanding ... [and are] one reason why voter turnout in the United States is near the bottom of the developed world.”<sup>155</sup> This impact has not abated: around 3 million Americans tried to vote in the 2008 Presidential election but could not, due to voter registration problems.<sup>156</sup>

The general thrust of the law over the past few decades has been to ease registration requirements to make it easier for eligible citizens to get on the voter rolls. The most significant advance was the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, also known as the “Motor Voter” law, which made voter registration opportunities widely available across the country.<sup>157</sup> More recently, states have taken the lead in modernizing their voter registration systems so that more voters are getting on the rolls and the rolls are getting more accurate.<sup>158</sup>

This year, the tide reversed. Instead of efforts to increase voter registration, this year new registration requirements have been instated that will make it more challenging for eligible citizens to ensure that they are registered to vote on Election Day. Voter registration regulations range from restrictions on individuals and groups who help register voters, to efforts to scale back Election Day and same-day registration, to new rules making it harder for voters to stay registered after they move.

#### Part 1: Voter Registration Drive Regulations

##### A. Background

Voter registration rates in the United States are routinely lower than they are in other democracies around the world: more than a quarter of voting-age Americans are not registered and thus cannot vote.<sup>159</sup> This is in part because, unlike in other democracies, U.S. state governments do not assume the responsibility of getting voters onto the rolls; instead, we rely on individual voters to ensure that they are registered. Community-based voter registration drives play an important role in encouraging and assisting other citizens to register to vote. Restrictions on voter registration drive activity have a direct impact on who has access to voter registration and who gets registered to vote.

Although community-based voter registration drives have been around in some form for decades, Congress helped expand such voter registration activity by passing the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA).<sup>160</sup> Among other things, the NVRA greatly simplified voter registration application

forms, required states to follow uniform rules for accepting those forms, and required them to make blank forms generally available “with particular emphasis on making them available for organized voter registration programs.”<sup>161</sup> As a result, civic groups were easily able to obtain and circulate voter registration forms to potential voters who might not otherwise register or become engaged in the electoral process.

Voter registration drives have become an increasingly important registration method in the past decade, especially for low-income citizens, students, members of racial and ethnic minority groups, and people with disabilities. For example, in the 2004 general election, large-scale voter registration drives report assisting almost 10 million citizens to register to vote, contributing to a surge in new registrations and increased turnout in that election. In one county in Florida alone, voter registration organizations were responsible for registering 62.7% of all newly registered voters.<sup>162</sup> Nationally, Census data show that Hispanic and African-American voters are approximately twice as likely to register to vote through a voter registration drive as white voters.<sup>163</sup>

Voting rights advocates point to increased voter registration rates, especially among minority, low-income, and younger citizens, as a positive effect of voter registration drives and a reason to expand them. They also cite recent falling voter registration rates as a reason to encourage voter registration drives. The 2010 election saw a plunge in new voter registrations, as new voter registrations in 2010 were down almost 17% from the 2006 cycle.<sup>164</sup> This was accompanied by a dramatic decrease in voter registration drive activity, for the first time in years. But voter registration drives have unfortunately become an increasingly controversial political topic.

Over the past few years, there has been a growing effort to push back against voter registration drives. Opponents have argued that voter registration drives are susceptible to fraud, citing allegations of fraud related to ACORN, a defunct organization that focused on registering low-income voters.<sup>165</sup> Presidential candidate John McCain cited allegedly fraudulent registration cards submitted by ACORN as “one of the greatest frauds in voter history in this country, maybe destroying the fabric of democracy.”<sup>166</sup> Other opponents have argued that voter registration should be made more difficult to reflect the importance of the right to vote.<sup>167</sup> At the extreme end of the spectrum, some have argued that by specifically empowering low-income voters to register, voter registration drives are “antisocial and un-American.”<sup>168</sup>

Recently, a number of state legislatures have pushed legislation to regulate and restrict community-based voter registration drives. This extensive regulation of voter registration drive activity is a unique government regulation of private political activity. These regulations have serious consequences for citizens’ ability to organize and conduct voter registration drives; for example, the recent Florida law imposing a set of new restrictions on third-party voter registration activity (discussed at length below) has resulted in the volunteer-based League of Women Voters placing a moratorium on all voter registration work because the law imposes too great a burden on voter registration. The type and extent of laws governing voter registration have a direct impact on who gets to participate in the process, and who is permitted to assist them in doing so.

## B. Roundup of Legislative Developments

Bills placing new restrictions on voter registration groups have been proposed in at least seven states—California (passed in both houses; awaiting governor’s action), Florida, Illinois (pending), Mississippi (failed), Nevada (restrictions removed by amendment), New Mexico (failed), North Carolina (pending), and Texas.

These bills have been signed into law in Florida and Texas. Florida and Texas stand out as two states that have long histories of restricting voter registration drives, and the new laws passed in this session will make both states further outliers in limiting this activity. Neither state had reported cases of registration fraud linked to voter registration drives in the past election cycle, nor any other apparent precipitating cause for the further regulations imposed by these bills.

## C. What the Bills Say

Although the bills seeking to regulate voter registration drives vary in their content, there are several recurring elements. Almost universally, these bills would require citizen registration groups to register with the state before undertaking a voter registration drive.<sup>169</sup> They may also require special training for volunteers; the use of special forms, disclosure, and reporting systems; or short deadlines for the submission of voter registration forms. Violation of these rules, or registering voters outside the mandated system, usually carries criminal or civil penalties. The legislation that succeeded this year is described below.

**Florida.** Florida’s House Bill 1355, a mammoth 158-page omnibus bill, was signed by Governor Rick Scott on May 19th.<sup>170</sup> The new law requires voter registration groups to pre-register with the state before engaging in any voter registration activity, requires every volunteer or employee to sign a sworn affidavit under penalty of perjury listing all criminal penalties for false registration, and mandates that every registration form collected by a voter registration group be physically received by county officials within 48 hours of signature or face strict civil penalties and fines. In order to comply with this tight turnaround time, groups must write the precise date and time when an individual completes a voter registration form on each registration form. The law also requires voter registration groups to place their government-issued organizational code on each form they obtain from elections officials or receive from a voter, to track the precise numbers of both state and federal voter registration forms that each group obtains or collects, and to submit those figures in monthly electronic reports to the state.

**Texas.** Texas introduced a series of bills that would limit the ability of persons to register others to vote, two of which were signed into law (H.B. 1570 and H.B. 2194).<sup>171</sup> H.B. 1570 requires that anyone who registers voters first be deputized and attend a mandatory training; the law delegates the development of the training to the Secretary of State, and explicitly permits an “exam” at the end of the training.<sup>172</sup> H.B. 2194 requires anyone registering others to be a Texas resident and qualified voter, and prohibits performance-based compensation for anyone who is paid to register voters.<sup>173</sup>

## D. Legislative Battles

The two bills signed into law in 2011 that restrict voter registration drive activity were uniformly supported by Republican legislators. In Florida, the law passed along straight party lines in the House of Representatives, with all Democrats opposing. Democrats were joined by two Republicans voting against the bill in the State Senate.<sup>174</sup> In Texas, which passed two companion bills restricting third-party voter registration, one bill passed unanimously,<sup>175</sup> while its companion bill passed only the Senate unanimously,<sup>176</sup> with seven House members, all Democrats of color, voting against the bill.<sup>177</sup>

### *Florida History*

Florida has a history of implementing restrictive rules for voter registration drives—rules that have been successfully challenged before. (The Brennan Center for Justice has litigated twice in the past on behalf of Florida civic groups to challenge these restrictions.<sup>178</sup>)

The first major imposition of restrictions on voter registration drives occurred in 2005, a year after ACORN's community organizing work resulted in enough signatures to place a citizen initiative on the ballot to increase Florida's minimum wage. The law required third-party voter registration groups to meet a new ten-day deadline to submit registration forms to election officials, no matter how far away the registration deadline, and imposed hefty and potentially unlimited fines for each form submitted after that time under a strict liability scheme. The law specifically excluded political parties from its new restrictions.

On May 18, 2006, the League of Women Voters of Florida and other voter registration groups and filed a lawsuit in federal court challenging as unconstitutional the 2005 Florida law regulating voter registration drives.<sup>179</sup> On August 28, 2006, a federal court in Miami blocked enforcement of the Florida law.<sup>180</sup>

After the state appealed that ruling, the Florida state legislature went back and reenacted a similar law with some changes in 2007, which the League and others also challenged.<sup>181</sup> During the lawsuit, the Secretary of State agreed not to implement the law before an administrative rulemaking process was completed. Civic groups were therefore able to resume their regular registration activities leading up to the 2008 election. In early 2009, the Florida Division of Elections proposed a final rule implementing the challenged statute in a way that reduced the negative impact on voter registration groups. The parties agreed to settle the lawsuit, and on June 17, 2009, the case was dismissed. The 2007 law has since been in effect.

### *2011 Debate in Florida*

Between 2009 and 2011, there was no controversy in Florida involving voter registration and indeed nothing to suggest why the state legislature again took up the subject of restricting voter registration drives. Proponents of H.B. 1355, the omnibus voting bill that included new restrictions on voter

registration drives, merely claimed that they sought to reduce fraud. They also made it very clear that they wanted to make voting harder. The bill's sponsor, Florida State Senator Mike Bennett (R-Bradenton), was quoted as saying "But I have to tell you, I don't have a problem making it harder. I want people in Florida to want to vote as bad as that person in Africa who walks 200 miles across the desert. This should not be easy. This should be something you should do with a passion."<sup>182</sup> Florida State Senator Ellen Bogdanoff agreed: "Democracy should not be a convenience," she said.<sup>183</sup>

The new Florida law garnered broad opposition from civic and minority rights groups and prompted tens of thousands of emails to Governor Rick Scott urging him to veto the bill. Nonetheless, the law quickly passed on straight party lines and was signed into law, over strong opposition and condemnation by the Democratic Party. Shortly after its enactment, the all-volunteer Florida League of Women Voters and a variety of other voter registration groups announced they would discontinue their voter registration activities in the state. The League explained that the new law "imposes an undue burden on groups such as ours that work to register voters,"<sup>184</sup> and that "we cannot and will not place thousands of volunteers at risk, subjecting them to a process in which one late form could result in their facing financial and civil penalties."<sup>185</sup>

The Florida law is currently being considered by a federal court for "preclearance," federal approval required for jurisdictions covered under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act because of a history of discrimination. Section 5 requires covered jurisdictions to supply evidence that changes to a state's election laws will not harm minority voters before those changes may go into effect. Five of Florida's sixty-seven counties are covered jurisdictions, where H.B. 1355 remains on hold awaiting preclearance; Secretary of State Browning has ordered election supervisors in the sixty-two non-covered counties to implement the law. Voting rights advocates have submitted evidence to both the Department of Justice and the federal court arguing that the new restrictions on voter registration drives, as well as the bill's other provisions reducing early voting days and eliminating cross-county address changes at the polls, will disproportionately impact Florida's minority voters.

## Impact of New Voting Laws on Minority Voters

Opponents of the bills and laws detailed in this report frequently point to their negative impact on the ability of African American and Latino citizens to vote, and with good reason: there is substantial evidence that these laws will make it far more difficult for minorities than whites to vote.

For instance, **Florida's** new law—which places so many new burdens on voter registration drive activity that most groups have discontinued their voter registration activities in the state—will almost certainly hit African American and Hispanic voters hardest. In Florida, U.S. Census Bureau data from the 2004 and 2008 election cycles show that both African-Americans and Hispanics rely more heavily than white voters on community-based voter registration drives; in fact, African-American and Hispanic citizens in Florida are more than twice as likely to register to vote through such drives as white voters.<sup>186</sup>

Similarly, the most restrictive voter ID laws, which only allow a small number of specified government issued photo IDs to vote, seem certain to create more burdens for minority citizens. According to one study, as many as 25% of African-American voters do not possess a current and valid form of government issued photo ID, compared to 11% of voters of all races.<sup>187</sup> And the kinds of government issued IDs that are permitted in the various state laws often put minorities at an even greater disadvantage. For instance, as noted above, the new **Texas** voter ID law, permits voters to use a concealed handgun license as proof of identity, but precludes voters from using a student ID, even if the student ID was issued by a state university. As the Texas Department of Public Safety recently noted, African Americans are significantly underrepresented among the state's handgun license holders. Of the more than 100,000 concealed handgun licenses issued in Texas last year, only 7.69% were issued to African Americans, even though African Americans constitute 12.1% of the state's voting age population. In contrast, African Americans are more likely to attend a public university in Texas than whites. According to the 2009 American Community Survey, 8.0% of voting-age African Americans in Texas attended a public university compared with only 5.8% of voting age whites.<sup>188</sup>

New restrictions on early voting will also have their biggest impact on people of color. Opponents of these restrictions have been particularly angered by the efforts to eliminate Sunday early voting, which they see as explicitly targeting African-American voters. **Florida** eliminated early voting on the last Sunday before Election Day, and **Ohio** has eliminated early voting on Sundays entirely. There is substantial statistical and anecdotal evidence that African Americans (and to a lesser extent Hispanics) vote on Sundays in proportionately far greater numbers than whites.<sup>189</sup> For instance, in the 2008 general election in Florida, 33.2% of those who voted early on the last Sunday before Election Day were African American and 23.6% were Hispanic, whereas African Americans constituted just 22.7% of all early voters for all early voting days, and Hispanics just 11.6%.<sup>190</sup>

## Part 2: Eliminating Same-Day Registration

### A. Background

Prior to 2011, eight states—Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Wyoming—allowed for Election Day registration (“EDR”), meaning that citizens could register and vote at their local polling place on Election Day.<sup>191</sup> Maine was the first state to adopt EDR, in 1973; Iowa was the most recent, in 2008.<sup>192</sup> In 2007, North Carolina adopted same day registration for the early voting period, but not on Election Day.<sup>193</sup> Beginning in 2008, Ohio allowed same day registration for the first week of early voting.<sup>194</sup> (Other states provide for EDR in certain circumstances; for instance, in Connecticut and Rhode Island, voters who register on Election Day may vote for presidential candidates only.)

Voting rights advocates have long praised EDR.<sup>195</sup> Because it has existed in some states for nearly forty years, there is a substantial record of its benefits. States with EDR have consistently had higher turnout than states without, and the top five states for voter turnout in 2008 were all EDR states.<sup>196</sup> There is also evidence that EDR specifically increases turnout among young voters.<sup>197</sup>

Proponents of EDR point out that it greatly reduces the use of provisional ballots<sup>198</sup> (under federal law, provisional ballots are provided to voters when there is a question about the voter’s eligibility, very often related to whether they are properly registered). Most voting rights advocates prefer the use of regular ballots to provisional ballots where possible, because a significant percentage of provisional ballots go uncounted in every election.<sup>199</sup>

The most common objection to EDR is that it “invites” voter fraud.<sup>200</sup> This has been the main public explanation provided by supporters of bills to end same day registration, though some have also argued that same day registration imposes administrative burdens on those running the polls on Election Day.<sup>201</sup>

Bills to eliminate same day registration in 2011 were uniformly sponsored by Republicans. The bills that passed the Montana and Ohio legislatures were unanimously opposed by Democratic legislators in the legislative chambers that voted on them.<sup>202</sup>

The partisan split over Election Day Registration has not always existed. When Maine became the first state to adopt EDR in 1973, the Republicans controlled both houses of the Legislature, and the proposal passed unanimously.<sup>203</sup>

### B. Roundup of Legislative Developments

Bills to eliminate EDR or same day registration were introduced in five states: Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina and Ohio. The bills in Maine and Ohio have been enacted, though both bills may be overturned in the coming months by ballot initiative processes currently underway in each state. The bill in Montana passed the legislature, but was vetoed by Governor Brian Schweitzer on March 4, 2011.<sup>204</sup> The bill in North Carolina is still pending.

## C. What the Bills Say

**Maine.** On June 21, Governor Paul LePage signed a bill to repeal Maine’s 38-year old law allowing same-day voter registration.<sup>205</sup> It was the oldest EDR law in the country. The Montana bill that was vetoed similarly would have eliminated EDR in that state.

**Ohio.** Beginning in 2008, the state of Ohio adopted what effectively became same day registration during the first week of early voting.<sup>206</sup> In both 2008 and 2010, the first week of early voting overlapped with the final week before the registration deadline, and meant that citizens were able to register and vote on the same day.<sup>207</sup> An omnibus election reform bill, signed by Governor John Kasich on July 1, substantially reduced the early voting period, thereby eliminating “Golden Week,” and Ohio’s *de facto* same day registration period.

**North Carolina.** Current law in North Carolina allows eligible voters to register to vote or update their registration information during the early voting period. A bill currently under consideration in the North Carolina Senate would eliminate same day registration (it would also reduce the early voting period, as discussed below) and the ability of voters to update their registration information during early voting.<sup>208</sup>

### The Special Case of Ohio’s Referendum

Ohio is no stranger to partisan fights over election law. With Republicans in control of both the Legislature and the executive branch this year, it is not particularly surprising that the state passed a new omnibus election law dramatically altering the state’s election code. It was signed by Governor Kasich on July 1 and passed along party lines—without a single Democratic vote.<sup>209</sup> The bill, supported by the current Republican secretary of state of Ohio, impacted many areas of election administration.<sup>210</sup> Among the most significant changes relevant to this report, it cut the in-person early voting period by two thirds, eliminated early voting on Sundays, eliminated the state’s *de facto* “same day registration” week during the early voting period, and forbade county boards of election from mailing out return-paid absentee ballot applications or absentee ballots.<sup>211</sup> Democrats argued that the bill would suppress votes, particularly votes of groups that traditionally favor Democrats, like African-Americans.<sup>212</sup>

Unlike minority parties in most other states, Democrats had a weapon that allowed them to fight changes to the election code even after they were passed into law: the Ohio referendum. Under the unique rules of that state, if opponents of the bill get enough signatures, all of the new provisions will be stayed until the referendum vote in November 2012.<sup>213</sup> Former Democratic Secretary of State Jennifer Brunner has led a petition drive to do just that.<sup>214</sup> If organizers gather enough signatures by September 29 to qualify for the referendum in November 2012, none of the bill’s provisions will go into effect before the referendum.<sup>215</sup> That would mean, among other things, that Ohio would continue to operate under its old rules for early and absentee voting in 2012.



## D. Legislative Battles

Efforts to repeal same day registration fell almost entirely along partisan lines. In states where repeal proposals received votes, most or all Republican legislators supported the repeal, and all Democratic legislators opposed it.<sup>216</sup>

A primary argument of those seeking repeal was that same day registration increased the possibility of fraud. “When you’re able to register and vote on the same day, there’s simply not the time to go and make sure that the registration is proper,” argued Ohio State Senator Mark Wagoner.<sup>217</sup> Legislators seeking repeal also frequently emphasized the responsibility of the voter to ensure she could vote on Election Day. Maine Senate Republican Nichi Farnham stated “If it is something that’s so important, our right to vote, then why would it be a problem to plan ahead to register?”<sup>218</sup>

In contrast to other states, proponents of the EDR repeal in Maine often placed more emphasis on the administrative burden of EDR than fraud, perhaps because of EDR’s long history there, and the absence of evidence of voter fraud during that time.<sup>219</sup> Republican Secretary of State Charles E. Summers, Jr. wrote in an op-ed that “I have never argued that this is a measure necessary to prevent voter fraud ... In fact, I have stressed repeatedly that this bill has been designed to relieve some of the stress on the system.”<sup>220</sup> Proponents of EDR in Maine have responded to this argument by pointing out that elimination of EDR means the state must adopt a system for provisional ballots,<sup>221</sup> which comes with its own additional costs and administrative burdens.<sup>222</sup>

---

**“The notion that same day voter registration leads to voter fraud is a myth . . . This is a solution in search of a problem.”**

**—Maine Rep. Mark Dion**

---

Not surprisingly, opponents of repeal were unanimous in disputing claims that same day registration invited fraud. Montana Representative Bryce Bennett pointed to the fact that the current Secretary of State and two of her predecessors all argued that EDR had not led to any fraud.<sup>223</sup> Maine Representative Mark Dion made similar comments about EDR in his state. “The notion that same day voter registration leads to voter fraud is a myth . . . This is a solution in search of a problem.”<sup>224</sup>

Opponents of repeal also pointed to the benefits of EDR, including increased registration among the young and those who moved shortly before Election Day, greater voter turnout, and greater convenience for voters. Montana Secretary of State Linda McColloch argued that since its passage in 2006, 19,000 people registered to vote on Election Day in Montana, and that the repeal attempt ran “counter to the core freedoms of our democracy ... [i]f you support freedom, and you support democracy, you cannot support a bill that will turn your neighbors away at the polls.”<sup>225</sup>

### Focus: Maine and the People’s Veto

Because Maine has a referendum process known as “the People’s Veto,” which allows Maine citizens to reverse a legislative decision, it is not clear that the repeal of EDR will be in effect on Election Day. On


June 21, the same day that Governor Paul LePage signed the bill to repeal EDR, a coalition led by the League of Women Voters of Maine filed papers to launch a People's Veto campaign. They have gathered enough signatures to get the question on the November 2011 ballot.<sup>226</sup> It will appear as question number one on the ballot.<sup>227</sup>

### Part 3: Other Restrictions on Voter Registration

While attempts to limit voter registration drives and same day registration were the most widespread efforts to restrict voter registration this year, there have been additional, state-specific efforts that will make it more difficult for voters to ensure that they are registered and able to vote at their current addresses on Election Day. We provide two examples of these new limitations below.

**Florida.** Though Florida does not have Election Day registration, it does have a longstanding policy permitting voters who changed their address before an election to update their new address at the polls on Election Day, where the voters' existing registrations were cross-checked in a state database before the voters were given a ballot. The Florida omnibus bill eliminated that right. This has the potential to disenfranchise a significant number of voters in Florida, especially those who move and are unaware of the change in law or who move within the state after the registration deadline.

**Wisconsin.** Wisconsin also worked to limit voter registration possibilities. Though commonly known for its voter ID provisions, there are other voter registration restrictions in the new Wisconsin election law, including extending the length of residency period before an eligible person may register to vote from ten to twenty-eight days.



## IV. MAKING VOTING HARDER: RESTRICTING EARLY IN-PERSON AND MAIL-IN ABSENTEE VOTING

### A. Background

For years, the growth of early voting—through in-person early voting sites and no-fault absentee voting by mail—has been dramatic, and seemed unstoppable. 2011 marks the first year that inexorable progress may have stalled. Early in-person and absentee voting have come under attack by legislatures around the country; these attacks have been particularly successful against early in-person voting.

The numbers tell the story of early voting's growth in just the last decade. In 2000, an overwhelming majority of Americans still voted at their local polling places on Election Day; less than 4% voted at early voting sites, and only 10% voted by mail. By 2008, more than a third of American voters voted early. The percentage of Americans voting at early voting sites had increased nearly five-fold, to 18%, and the percentage voting by mail nearly doubled to 19%.<sup>228</sup>

The primary benefit of early voting is convenience. Voters are provided more options and days during which they can vote.<sup>229</sup> While there is little evidence that early and absentee voting increase turnout,<sup>230</sup> there is strong anecdotal evidence that it makes election administration easier, reducing the crush of voters at the polling place on a single day.<sup>231</sup> In the past, that Election Day crush has led to hours-long lines, and resulted in the *de facto* disenfranchisement of tens of thousands of voters.<sup>232</sup>

Through much of its growth, early voting has had strong support from both Democrats and Republicans.<sup>233</sup> In 2011, most, though not all, of the new restrictions on early voting have been proposed by Republicans and adopted by Republican-controlled legislatures.

As discussed below, the reasons most often provided for restricting early voting were cost and administrative burden, though they sometimes also included arguments that the restrictions would reduce fraud.<sup>234</sup> Opponents of the new restrictions frequently disputed the alleged savings,<sup>235</sup> and many argued that the changes were really a response to the success in 2008 of Barack Obama's campaign to get the candidate's supporters—and in particular black voters—to vote before Election Day.<sup>236</sup>

### B. Roundup of Legislative Developments

At least nine states—Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, West Virginia—all considered bills to reduce their respective early voting periods this year.<sup>237</sup> At least four states—Georgia, New Jersey, Ohio, and Wisconsin—saw the introduction of bills to change or add new restrictions on absentee voting.<sup>238</sup>

Texas introduced a law that would omit early voting locations from official notices of a general or special election, but the measure did not pass.<sup>239</sup> In Wisconsin, a provision to eliminate no-excuse absentee voting was later removed from the state's voter ID bill.<sup>240</sup>

Ultimately, laws reducing early voting were passed and signed into law in five states: Florida, Georgia, Ohio, Tennessee, and West Virginia. Pending bills remain in North Carolina, Georgia, and New Jersey.

### C. What the Bills Say

**Ohio.** As already discussed, Governor Kasich of Ohio signed into law an omnibus election reform bill on July 1. Among other things, this new law also substantially reduced early in-person voting and access to vote by mail. Under the new law, the in-person voting period was cut by more than two thirds, from thirty-five days to eleven.<sup>241</sup> Early voting on Saturday afternoon and Sunday was eliminated entirely.<sup>242</sup>

Controversially, the new law also prohibited county boards from mailing absentee ballot applications to all voters, or prepaying postage on absent voter's ballot applications.<sup>243</sup> Both practices were employed by Franklin (Columbus) and Cuyahoga (Cleveland) counties in past elections, and were credited by some voting rights advocates and election officials with reducing congestion at the polls on Election Day, and eliminating equity issues associated with requiring voters to pay to mail in their ballots.<sup>244</sup> Proponents of this ban, including Secretary of State Jon Husted, supported it on the grounds that all counties should adopt the same practices with regards to absentee ballots, and some counties could not afford to mail absentee ballot applications to all voters or prepay postage on those applications.<sup>245</sup> The impact of this law may have been largely thwarted by the Cuyahoga County Council, which voted to have its public works department oversee mailings of absentee ballot applications to all voters (the ban only applied to elections boards). As a result, Secretary Husted—arguing that uniformity in county practices was of paramount concern—decided that the State will mail absentee ballot request forms to voters in *all* counties ahead of the 2012 presidential election.<sup>246</sup>

**Florida.** The same Florida law that led the League of Women Voters to discontinue its voter registration operations also reduces the early voting period from two weeks to one. Florida also eliminated the Sunday before Election Day as an early voting day.<sup>247</sup>

**Other states with new laws.** In **Georgia**, on May 13, Governor Nathan Deal signed H.B. 92 into law, which reduces the early voting period from forty-five to twenty-one days.<sup>248</sup> In **Tennessee**, in June, Governor Bill Haslam signed S.B. 923<sup>249</sup> which shortens the early voting period by two days. In **West Virginia**, on March 18, Governor Earl Ray Tomblin signed S.B. 581, which reduces early voting by five days, but allows early voting on Saturdays for the first time.<sup>250</sup>

**Pending bills.** In **Georgia**, H.B. 138 would limit when in-person absentee ballots may be cast by requiring that when an absentee ballot is requested in person during the early voting period, the absentee ballot must be cast within the registrar's office at that same time.<sup>251</sup> In **New Jersey**, S.B.1596 would end no-excuse absentee voting.<sup>252</sup> In **North Carolina**, S.B. 657 would cut down the early voting period by one week and eliminate Sunday voting.<sup>253</sup> Another election law bill, S.B. 47, also originally contained a provision that would eliminate Sunday early voting. That provision, however, has since been removed from the bill.<sup>254</sup>

## D. Legislative Battles


This year saw a substantial push in several states to reduce or, in some cases, eliminate these programs, and substantial resistance to those efforts. Of the five states that reduced early voting, four—Florida, Georgia, Ohio and Tennessee—saw sharp partisan divisions over those reductions. In all four cases, Republicans had uniform control over the legislative and executive branches, and passed the reductions over frequently vociferous objection by Democrats.<sup>255</sup> In the fifth state, West Virginia, the law reducing the early voting period also added early voting on Saturdays for the first time. It received bipartisan support.<sup>256</sup>

Until this year, the expansion of early voting seemed unstoppable. In 1972, just two states allowed no-fault absentee voting and five allowed early in-person voting. By 2010, thirty-two states and the District of Columbia allowed no-fault absentee voting, while thirty states and the District of Columbia allowed in-person early voting.<sup>257</sup>

### *The Debate*

While some of the bills that reduced in-person early voting also put new restrictions on absentee voting by mail, it was the reduction of in-person early voting that received the most attention, and was the source

### Legislation Affecting Early and/or Absentee Voting



of the most bitter disagreements between the political parties. Proponents of such reductions usually praised the convenience of early voting, while arguing that it needed to be limited to reduce costs and administrative burdens on election officials. In Georgia, Republican Representative Bill Hembree stated that “We need to maintain early voting, which is very popular, [but] we also need to keep in mind that cities and counties are having economic problems. This bill still allows people to vote early, but saves money.”<sup>258</sup> Supporters of a bill to reduce early voting in North Carolina made similar points. The *Herald Sun* editorialized “this is not a black and white issue, as some who want to inject race into everything are trying to say. This is a green and white issue ... as in saving the taxpayers a few greenbacks.”<sup>259</sup>

Democrats and others who opposed these measures were less sure of the motives behind the bills and disputed the cost savings. In Georgia, Democratic State Senator Donzella James said, “We must provide every way possible for people to vote. It’s not costing that much. The staff is already there and the facilities are available.”<sup>260</sup> In North Carolina, George Gilbert, Director of Elections for Guilford County, argued that a reduction of early voting would not bring any savings. “If early voting begins later, a crush of voters will require more early voting sites to accommodate the crowds. There won’t be any cost savings.”

Some Democrats and editorial boards argued that the real motivation for reducing early voting was the success of the Obama campaign in using early voting in 2008. Morgan Jackson, a Democratic consultant stated, “This is pure partisanship ... they see the numbers that Obama rolled up in early voting (and) they want to eliminate it.”<sup>261</sup> A *New York Times* editorial made a similar argument. “Early voting skyrocketed to a third of the vote in 2008, rising particularly in the South and among black voters supporting Barack Obama,” the *Times* wrote, adding “and that, of course, is why Republican lawmakers in the South are trying desperately to cut it back.”<sup>262</sup> The suspicion that partisanship, rather than cost savings, was the main motivation for new early voting restrictions was particularly strong for proposals that eliminated or significantly reduced early voting on Sundays, thought to be a day of high turnout for black voters.<sup>263</sup>

## Early Voting on Sunday and the Black Vote

Among the most controversial early voting reductions has been the partial or full eliminations of early voting on Sunday. Ohio has eliminated in-person early voting on Sundays entirely,<sup>264</sup> Florida has eliminated it on the last Sunday before Election Day,<sup>265</sup> and a North Carolina bill, proposes to eliminate all in-person early voting on Sundays.<sup>266</sup> Critics have cried foul, arguing that these measures are “aimed squarely at reducing African-American turnout.”<sup>267</sup> In particular, these critics charge, it is common for Black voters to go to the polls in large groups on Sundays, after church,<sup>268</sup> and for some African-American churches to organize “Souls to the Polls” voting drives.<sup>269</sup> In Florida, a local Democratic club leader noted that “Churches had either hired buses, or used their buses to take people to the polls, or even suspending [sic] the service on the Sunday before.”<sup>270</sup> The Palm Beach Post stated that “[m]ore than half of the black voters in the [November 2008] election voted before Election Day and many of them went on [the] final Sunday.”<sup>271</sup> In Ohio, WilliAnn Moore, coordinator of the northwest Ohio district of the NAACP, labeled Ohio’s new legislation “voter-suppression legislation,” taking specific aim at the part of the law that eliminated Sunday early voting, noting that it had become a regular practice in the black community for voters to “pile into vans after church to cast their ballots.”<sup>272</sup>

Where available, the evidence supports the contention that black (and to a lesser extent Hispanic) voters used Sunday early voting in numbers proportionally greater than other groups. For instance, in the 2008 general election in Florida, 33.2% of those who voted early on the last Sunday before election day were black and 23.6% were Hispanic, whereas blacks constituted 22.7% of all early voters statewide (for all early voting days) and Hispanics constituted 11.6%.<sup>273</sup>

Among those who supported these laws, which reduced early voting in additional ways, there was little public explanation of why Sunday was specifically targeted, other than the general argument that the elimination was needed to reduce costs and administrative burden. In North Carolina, Senator Jim Davis, the sponsor of his state’s bill, opined that “We were just trying to minimize the time early voting polls were open ... so the expense is not so great for local election boards ... [e]verybody who wants to vote still can vote.” One of his colleagues, Senate Leader Phil Berger, got closer to the issue of eliminating Sunday voting stating, “It’s my understanding that there are some folks who feel that Sundays should not be mixed politics and religion, that it’s probably better to have a day that folks take a day off from politics. That’s one of the comments that I’ve heard.”<sup>274</sup>

## V. MAKING IT HARDER TO RESTORE VOTING RIGHTS

### A. Background

Disenfranchisement after criminal conviction remains the single most significant barrier to voting rights in the United States. Nationally, 5.3 million American citizens are not allowed to vote because of a criminal conviction; of those, 4 million have completed their sentences and live, work, and raise families in their communities.<sup>275</sup> This disenfranchisement disproportionately impacts African-American men. Nationwide, 13% of African-American men have lost the right to vote, a rate that is seven times the national average.<sup>276</sup> Given current rates of incarceration, three in ten of the next generation of African-American men across the country can expect to lose the right to vote at some point in their lifetime.<sup>277</sup>

These voting bans are exceptional among democratic nations. The United States is one of only two countries that disenfranchise large numbers of persons for lengthy or indefinite periods after they have completed their time in prison.<sup>278</sup>

While the history of felon disenfranchisement laws in the United States dates to the nation's earliest days,<sup>279</sup> its greatest growth came in the decades after the Civil War. By 1900, thirty-eight states had some type of criminal voting restriction, most of which disenfranchised convicted individuals until they received a pardon.<sup>280</sup>

The last decade and a half saw a striking reversal of these restrictions. Since 1997, twenty-three states either restored voting rights or eased the restoration process; nine of these states repealed or amended lifetime disenfranchisement laws.<sup>281</sup> These changes occurred under both Republican and Democratic governors.<sup>282</sup>

Iowa and Florida saw the most recent dramatic restoration of voting rights. In Iowa, in 2005, Democratic Governor Tom Vilsack issued an executive Order ending the state's permanent disenfranchisement policy (at the time, Iowa was one of only three states with such a broad restriction on voting) and restoring voting rights to 80,000 Iowans.<sup>283</sup>

Like Iowa, Florida also had a notoriously severe law modified by executive action. Prior to 2007, nearly one million Floridians were permanently disenfranchised in the state; almost a quarter of them were African-American. In 2007, Republican Governor Charlie Crist amended the State's clemency rules in an attempt to streamline the restoration process for some individuals with non-violent convictions. Since restoration rules were streamlined, the voting rights of at least 150,000 Floridians were restored.<sup>284</sup>

### B. Roundup of Legislation and Executive Actions

Last year marked the end of fifteen years of progress restoring the right to vote to formerly incarcerated persons. Specifically, the dramatic changes in Iowa and Florida were reversed. By executive action, the Governors Terry Branstad of Iowa and Rick Scott of Florida, both Republicans, returned their state



policies to *de facto* permanent disenfranchisement for all citizens convicted of felonies. In Florida, this has meant that 87,000 persons who were in the “backlog” of cases waiting for restoration under Governor Crist’s new rules will not get their voting rights restored.

Also in 2011, Nevada Governor Brian Sandoval, also a Republican, vetoed a bill that would have automatically restored voting rights to anyone who honorably completed a felony sentence of imprisonment, probation, or parole. The bill had received bipartisan support in the Legislature.

Five states saw bills further restricting the ability of people with criminal convictions to participate in the political process: Alabama, Maryland, South Carolina, Washington, and West Virginia. None of these bills have passed.<sup>285</sup>

### C. Content of Executive Actions

**Florida.** Governor Scott changed Florida’s clemency rules, and the change denies the right to vote to hundreds of thousands, maybe as many as a million, Florida citizens. These changes make Florida the most punitive state in the country when it comes to disenfranchising people with criminal convictions in their past.

The Florida Constitution denies the right to vote for life to anyone with a felony conviction, unless he is granted clemency by the governor. It essentially gives the governor, an elected official, the power to decide who will (or will not) be allowed to vote in the next election.


The new clemency rules<sup>286</sup> not only roll back reforms<sup>287</sup> passed by former Governor Charlie Crist, but they are far more restrictive than those in place under former Governor Jeb Bush. Under the new rules, people with even nonviolent convictions must wait five years after they complete all terms of their sentence before even being allowed to apply for restoration of civil rights. The clock resets if an individual is arrested for even a misdemeanor during that five-year period, even if no charges are ever filed. Some people must wait seven years before being able to apply, and must appear for a hearing before the clemency board. A provision allowing people to apply for a waiver of the rules, in place under Governors Bush and Crist, is eliminated. Everyone applying for clemency must provide various documents with their application—Bush and Crist had made an exception for those applying for restoration of civil rights. Florida’s law is now the most restrictive in the country.<sup>288</sup>

**Iowa.** Governor Branstad, almost immediately after taking office, revoked Executive Order 42, a policy signed in 2005 by former Governor Tom Vilsack, which automatically restored voting rights to individuals with criminal convictions once they had completed their sentences.<sup>289</sup> Under the new policy, Iowa has become one of just four states that permanently disenfranchise all citizens after a criminal conviction. Prior to Executive Order 42, Iowa disenfranchised adults at a rate twice the national average, and had the nation’s highest rate of African-American disenfranchisement.<sup>290</sup>

**Nevada.** Governor Sandoval vetoed Assembly Bill 301, a bill passed with bipartisan support in the State Legislature. The bill would have streamlined and simplified Nevada’s complicated laws governing the restoration of voting rights after a criminal sentence, and would have automatically restored voting rights to anyone who honorably completed a felony sentence of imprisonment, probation, or parole.

## D. The Debate

Governor Scott's and Governor Branstad's actions to reverse recent voting rights gains for persons with felony convictions were the subject of considerable publicity and debate in their states. The debate in Florida and Iowa mirrored the debate nationally about restoring the voting rights of formerly incarcerated persons. Those favoring further restrictions argued that persons convicted of felonies needed to "earn" the right to vote again,<sup>291</sup> while those opposed to harsher restrictions argued that preventing these citizens from voting was counter-productive and anti-democratic,<sup>292</sup> further penalizing those who had already completed their prison sentence,<sup>293</sup> and undermining the state's interest in re-integrating such citizens into society and reducing recidivism.<sup>294</sup>



## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> This estimate is derived as follows: (1) New photo ID laws for voting will be in effect for the 2012 election in five states (Kansas, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin), which have a combined citizen voting age population of just under 29 million. 3.2 million (10.3%) of those potential voters do not have state-issued photo ID. Although Rhode Island's law will be in effect in 2012, the requirements are less onerous than those in the other states and so it was excluded. (2) New proof of citizenship laws will be in effect in three states (Alabama, Kansas, Tennessee), two of which will also have new photo ID laws. Assuming conservatively that those without proof of citizenship overlap substantially with those without state-issued photo ID, we excluded those two states. The citizen voting age population in the remaining state (Alabama) is 3.43 million. Of those potential voters, 240,000 (7%) do not have documentary proof of citizenship. (3) Two states (Florida and Texas) passed laws restricting voter registration drives, causing all or most of those drives to stop. In 2008, 2.13 million voters registered in Florida and, very conservatively, at least 8.24% or 176,000 of them did so through drives. At least 501,000 voters registered in Texas, and at least 5.13% or 26,000 of them did so via drives. (4) Maine abolished Election Day registration. In 2008, 60,000 Maine citizens registered and voted on Election Day. (5) The early voting period was cut by half or more in three states (Florida, Georgia and Ohio). In 2008, nearly 8 million Americans voted early in these states. An estimated 1 to 2 million voted on days eliminated by these new laws. (6) Two states (Florida and Iowa) made it substantially more difficult or impossible for people with past felony convictions to get their voting rights restored. Up to one million people in Florida could have benefited from the prior practice; based on the rates of restoration in Florida under the prior policy, 100,000 citizens likely would have gotten their rights restored by 2012. Other voting restrictions passed this year that are not included in this estimate.
- <sup>2</sup> The 12 states identified as "swing states" are Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Nevada, North Carolina, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania and Virginia. David Lauter, *Obama's Gallup Numbers Show 12 States in Play in 2012*, L.A. TIMES, Aug. 15, 2011, <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/aug/15/news/la-pn-inside-gallup-20110815>. The five of those states that cut back on voting rights are Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Nevada, and Ohio. The four of those states with pending legislation are Georgia, Iowa, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.
- <sup>3</sup> Kris W. Kobach, Op-Ed, *The Case for Voter ID*, WALL ST. J., May 23, 2011, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704816604576333650886790480.html>; *New State Voting Laws*, THE DIANE REHM SHOW (NPR radio broadcast, June 21, 2011), available at <http://thedianerehmshow.org/shows/2011-06-21/new-state-voting-laws/transcript>.
- <sup>4</sup> Opponents of strict voter ID laws argue that the impersonation of registered voters at the polls—the only type of voter fraud that voter ID bills have the potential to address—rarely occurs. They note that while there is no credible evidence that impersonation fraud occurs, reliable evidence proves that photo ID and proof of citizenship bills erect hurdles that prevent real citizens from voting. The citizens affected are predominantly elderly and indigent voters, and citizens from minority communities. BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, *CITIZENS WITHOUT PROOF* (2006), available at [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/citizens\\_without\\_proof\\_a\\_survey\\_of\\_americans\\_possession\\_of\\_documentary\\_proof](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/citizens_without_proof_a_survey_of_americans_possession_of_documentary_proof).
- <sup>5</sup> John Lewis, Op-Ed, *A Poll Tax by Another Name*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 26, 2011, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/27/opinion/a-poll-tax-by-another-name.html>.
- <sup>6</sup> JUSTIN LEVITT, *THE TRUTH ABOUT VOTER FRAUD*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (2007), available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/truthaboutvoterfraud/>.
- <sup>7</sup> The most rigorous study on voter ID and turnout to date, recently published in the leading political science methodology journal, found that stricter voter ID requirements depress turnout, particularly among less educated and lower income populations. See R. MICHAEL ALVAREZ ET AL., *AN EMPIRICAL BAYES APPROACH TO ESTIMATING ORDINAL TREATMENT EFFECTS* 26-30 (2010), available at [http://brennan.3cdn.net/a5782740e4185414a8\\_snm6bhfwg.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/a5782740e4185414a8_snm6bhfwg.pdf). Some studies suggest that voter ID laws have only a small or no effect on turnout. See Jason Mycoff et al., *The Empirical Effects of Voter-ID Laws: Present or Absent?*, 42 PS: POL. SCI. AND POL. 121 (2009), available at <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=3260872&jid=PSC&volumeId=42&issueId=01&aid=3260864&bodyId=&membershipNumber=&societyETOCSession=#>. But unlike the Alvarez study, these studies use aggregate data, which cannot provide any meaningful insight into how specific inputs—like voter ID—affect the behavior of individuals within a large group. For a comprehensive list of studies on voter ID, see *Research and Publications on Voter ID*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/research\\_on\\_voter\\_id/](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/research_on_voter_id/) (last visited July 15, 2011).

- <sup>8</sup> See 42 U.S.C. § 15483(b) (2010).
- <sup>9</sup> See generally VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, NAT'L CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES (NCSL), <http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=16602> (last updated July 13, 2011).
- <sup>10</sup> Common Cause/Ga. v. Billups, 406 F. Supp. 2d 1326, 1369-70 (N.D. Ga. 2005); Weinschenk v. Missouri, 203 S.W.3d 201 (Mo. 2006).
- <sup>11</sup> The Court upheld Indiana's law on the ground that the "evidence in the record [was] not sufficient" to justify striking down the whole statute. Crawford v. Marion Cnty. Election Bd., 553 U.S. 181, 200-203 (2008). The Court expressly left open the possibility of future constitutional challenges to Indiana's law and other voter ID laws.
- <sup>12</sup> Common Cause/Ga. v. Billups, 544 F.3d 1340 (11th Cir. 2009); Democratic Party of Ga. v. Perdue, 707 S.E.2d 67 (Ga. 2011) (upholding Georgia's voter ID law against a challenge under the state constitution) Georgia's initial voter ID law was previously blocked by a federal court in October 2005. Common Cause/Ga. v. Billups, 406 F. Supp. 2d 1326 (N.D. Ga. 2005). The court blocked an amended version of that law in July 2006 and again in September 2006. See Common Cause/Ga. v. Billups, 544 F.3d 1340, 1347-48 (11th Cir. 2009) (discussing injunctions in 2006). A state trial court had also blocked enforcement of the 2006 version of Georgia's voter ID law; this decision was later overturned by the Georgia Supreme Court due to the plaintiff's lack of standing. Perdue v. Lake, 647 S.E.2d 6 (Ga. 2007).
- <sup>13</sup> See BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, ID REQUIREMENTS DISCOURAGE VOTERS (Jan. 1, 2011) (map of state voter ID laws prior to the 2011 legislative session), available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/Democracy/Voter%20ID%202010%20States.pdf>; Voter Identification Requirements, NCSL, <http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=16602> (last updated July 13, 2011) (information on previous and existing voter ID statutes).
- <sup>14</sup> These states are: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. See generally NHU-Y NGO & KEESHA GASKINS, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, VOTER ID LEGISLATION IN THE STATES, [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/voter\\_id\\_legislation\\_in\\_the\\_states/](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/voter_id_legislation_in_the_states/), (last updated July 6, 2011).
- <sup>15</sup> Fredreka Schouten, *More States Require ID to Vote*, USA TODAY (June 20, 2011), [http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2011-06-19-states-require-voter-ID\\_n.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2011-06-19-states-require-voter-ID_n.htm).
- <sup>16</sup> H.B. 19, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess., Act No. 2011-673 (Ala. 2011), available at <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2011RS/Printfiles//HB19-enr.pdf>; H.B. 2067, 2011 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Kan. 2011), available at [http://kslegislature.org/li/b2011\\_12/year1/measures/documents/hb2067\\_enrolled.pdf](http://kslegislature.org/li/b2011_12/year1/measures/documents/hb2067_enrolled.pdf); S.B. 400 Sub. A, 2011 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2011), available at <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/BillText11/SenateText11/S0400A.pdf>; H. 3003, 119th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (S.C. 2011), available at [http://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess119\\_2011-2012/prever/3003\\_20110511.htm](http://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess119_2011-2012/prever/3003_20110511.htm); S.B. 16, 107th Gen. Assemb., 2011 Reg. Sess. (Tenn. 2011), available at <http://www.capitol.tn.gov/Bills/107/Bill/SB0016.pdf>; S.B. 14, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2011), available at <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/82R/billtext/pdf/SB00014F.pdf#navpanes=0>; Assemb. B. 7, 2011 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Wis. 2011), available at <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/2011/data/acts/11Act23.pdf>.
- <sup>17</sup> S.F. 509, 87th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Minn. 2011), available at <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bin/bldbill.php?bill=S0509.6.html&session=ls87>; S.B. 3, 96th Gen. Assemb., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mo. 2011), available at <http://www.senate.mo.gov/11info/pdf-bill/tat/SB3.pdf>; H.B. 152, 62d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Mont. 2011), available at <http://data.opi.mt.gov/bills/2011/billpdf/HB0152.pdf>; S.B. 129, 2011 Gen. Ct., 2011 Reg. Sess. (N.H. 2011), available at <http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2011/SB0129.html>; H.B. 351, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2011), available at <http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Sessions/2011/Bills/House/PDF/H351v6.pdf>.
- <sup>18</sup> H.B. 934, Reg. Sess. 2011-12 (Pa. 2011), available at <http://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/billinfo/billinfo.cfm?year=2011&kind=0&body=H&type=B&BN=0934>. Other states with pending bills that are less likely to succeed include Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Ohio. S.B. 2035, 97th Gen. Assemb. (Ill. 2011), available at <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/billstatus.asp?DocNum=2035&GAID=11&GA=97&DocTypeID=SB&LegID=58180&SessionID=84>; H.B. 3058, 97th Gen. Assemb. (Ill. 2011), available at <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/billstatus.asp?DocNum=3058>

- &GAID=11&GA=97&DocTypeID=HB&LegID=60409&SessionID=84; H.B. 1113, 187th Gen. Ct. (Mass. 2011), available at <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/House/H01113>; H.B. 1115, 187th Gen. Ct. (Mass. 2011), available at <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/House/H01115>; H.B. 2731, 187th Gen. Ct. (Mass. 2011), available at <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/House/H02731>; S.B. 316, 187th Gen. Ct. (Mass. 2011), available at <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/Senate/S00316>; S.B. 318, 187th Gen. Ct. (Mass. 2011), available at <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/Senate/S00318>; S. 2996, 214th Leg. (N.J. 2011), available at [http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2010/Bills/S3000/2996\\_I1.PDF](http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2010/Bills/S3000/2996_I1.PDF); A.B. 3373, 2011-12 Reg. Sess. (N.Y. 2011), available at [http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?default\\_fld=&bn=A03373&term=&Summary=Y&Actions=Y&Votes=Y&Text=Y](http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?default_fld=&bn=A03373&term=&Summary=Y&Actions=Y&Votes=Y&Text=Y); H.B. 159, 129th Gen. Assemb. (Ohio 2011), available at [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/bills.cfm?ID=129\\_HB\\_159](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/bills.cfm?ID=129_HB_159).
- <sup>19</sup> State Senate Kills Voter ID Bill, WMUR N.H. (Sept. 7, 2011), <http://www.wmur.com/r/29108560/detail.html>; Kevin Landrigan, *Senate Veto Vote on Tap This Week*, NASHUA TELEGRAPH, Sept. 4, 2011, <http://www.nashuatelegraph.com/news-statenewengland/931511-227/senate-veto-vote-on-tap-this-week.html>. New Hampshire's bill is still pending for the next legislative session.
- <sup>20</sup> Mike Raley & David Horn, *Voter ID Bill Still Has Life*, N.C. NEWS NETWORK, Sept. 6, 2011, <http://www.ncnn.com/edit-news/7232-voter-id-bill-still-has-life>.
- <sup>21</sup> S.J.R. 2, 96th Gen. Assemb., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mo. 2011), <http://www.senate.mo.gov/11info/pdf-bill/tat/SJR2.pdf>.
- <sup>22</sup> *Initiative Measure No. 27*, MO. SEC'Y OF STATE, <http://www.sos.ms.gov/page.aspx?s=7&s1=1&s2=51> (last visited July 15, 2011).
- <sup>23</sup> Alabama allows voters without photo ID to vote if identified by two election officials at a polling place, ALA. CODE § 17-9-30(e) (2011), but it is unlikely that many voters will be able to take advantage of that procedure. Texas also has a very limited exception for voters who either have religious objections to being photographed or who lost their IDs in a federal or state-declared natural emergency within forty-five days of an election, allowing them to execute an affidavit and cast a provisional ballot in order to have their vote counted. *Bill Information for SB 14*, TEX. LEG. ONLINE, <http://www.legis.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=SB14> (last visited Sept. 7, 2011).
- <sup>24</sup> Crawford v. Marion Cnty. Election Bd., 553 U.S. 181, 198 (2008).
- <sup>25</sup> Shawn Doherty & Jessica Vanegeren, *Top DOT Official Tells Staff Not to Mention Free Voter ID Cards to the Public, Unless They Ask*, MADISON.COM (Sept. 7, 2011), [http://host.madison.com/ct/news/local/govt-and-politics/capitol-report/article\\_335f59fa-d8fe-11e0-8a23-001cc4c03286.html](http://host.madison.com/ct/news/local/govt-and-politics/capitol-report/article_335f59fa-d8fe-11e0-8a23-001cc4c03286.html); Brad Friedman, *Video: WI Citizen Jumps Through DMV Hoops to Get Photo ID in Order to Cast Legal Vote*, BRAD BLOG (July 26, 2011, 5:58 PM), <http://www.bradblog.com/?p=8626>.
- <sup>26</sup> She eventually returned and received a free card after learning of the option from someone outside the DMV. Doug Erickson, *Need a Free Photo ID to Vote? Be Prepared to Wait*, WIS. ST. J., July 2, 2011, [http://host.madison.com/wsj/news/local/govt-and-politics/article\\_e1412868-a434-11e0-bc0c-001cc4c002e0.html](http://host.madison.com/wsj/news/local/govt-and-politics/article_e1412868-a434-11e0-bc0c-001cc4c002e0.html).
- <sup>27</sup> Patrick Marley, *State Employee Fired After Telling Co-Workers About Photo ID Policy*, MILWAUKEE J.-SENTINEL, Sept. 8, 2011, <http://www.jsonline.com/blogs/news/129469023.html>.
- <sup>28</sup> *Texas Vital Statistics – Birth Certificates*, TX. DEP'T OF STATE HEALTH SERVS. [http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/vs/reqproc/certified\\_copy.shtm](http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/vs/reqproc/certified_copy.shtm) (last visited July 18, 2011) (\$22); *Ordering Birth Certificates*, KAS. DEP'T OF HEALTH AND ENV'T, [http://www.kdheks.gov/vital/birth\\_howto.html](http://www.kdheks.gov/vital/birth_howto.html) (last visited July 18, 2011) (\$15); *Vital Records*, GA. DEP'T OF PUB. HEALTH, <http://health.state.ga.us/programs/vitalrecords/birth.asp> (last visited July 18, 2011) (\$25).
- <sup>29</sup> A.B. 7, 2011 Leg., Reg. Sess. (as introduced, Wis. 2011), available at <https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2011/related/proposals/ab7.pdf>.
- <sup>30</sup> Alison Bauter, *Wisconsin Students Take Aim at Voter ID Bill*, ISTHMUS, Feb. 17, 2011, <http://www.isthmus.com/isthmus/article.php?article=32291>; Andrew Averill, *After Months in Limbo, Voter ID Bill Will Include University Cards*, BADGER HERALD, May 1, 2011, [http://www.badgerherald.com/news/2011/05/01/after\\_months\\_in\\_limb.php](http://www.badgerherald.com/news/2011/05/01/after_months_in_limb.php).
- <sup>31</sup> Memorandum from the Wis. Legislative Fiscal Bureau to the Members of the Joint Comm. On Fin. (May 9, 2011), available at [http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb/2011-13Bills/2011\\_05\\_09JFC\\_AB7.pdf](http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb/2011-13Bills/2011_05_09JFC_AB7.pdf).

- <sup>32</sup> S.B. 14, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2011), available at <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/82R/billtext/pdf/SB00014F.pdf#navpanes=0>.
- <sup>33</sup> See, e.g., Molly Redden, *As 2012 Elections Loom, Partisans on Both Sides Argue the Effect of Voter-ID Laws on Students*, CHRON. OF HIGHER EDUC., July 11, 2011, <http://chronicle.com/article/As-2012-Elections-Loom/128189/?key=Sm8hIF A2MXwabCllZWxKYDpUPXY8Nxxh1YnBOOHArbltSEg%3D%3D>; Peter Wallsten, *In States, Parties Clash over Voting Laws That Would Affect College Students, Others*, WASH. POST, Mar. 8, 2011, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/06/AR2011030602662.html>.
- <sup>34</sup> *Bill Status System: HB 176*, N.H. GEN. COURT, [http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill\\_status/bill\\_status.aspx?lsr=717&sy=2011&sortoption=&txtsessionyear=2011&txtbillnumber=hb176&q=1](http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/bill_status.aspx?lsr=717&sy=2011&sortoption=&txtsessionyear=2011&txtbillnumber=hb176&q=1) (last visited Sept. 7, 2011).
- <sup>35</sup> *An Act Relative to Eligibility to Vote: Hearing on H.B. 176, Before Election Law Comm.*, N.H. H.R. (Feb. 24, 2011) (written testimony of Lee Rowland, Counsel, Brennan Center for Justice & Peter Couto, Law Student Intern, Brennan Center for Justice), <http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/Democracy/NH%20HB%20176%20Testimony%202.23.11.pdf>.
- <sup>36</sup> Peter Wallsten, *“Foolish” College Kids “Just Vote Their Feelings,” New Hampshire Speaker Says*, WASH. POST: POLS. & POL’Y BLOG (Mar. 8, 2011, 10:06 AM), <http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2011/03/video-foolish-college-kids-jus.html>.
- <sup>37</sup> *Bill Status System: HB 176*, N.H. Gen. Court, [http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill\\_status/bill\\_status.aspx?lsr=717&sy=2011&sortoption=&txtsessionyear=2011&q=1](http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/bill_status.aspx?lsr=717&sy=2011&sortoption=&txtsessionyear=2011&q=1) (last visited September 7, 2011); Gavin Huang, *Student voting bill denied in N.H. House*, THE DARTMOUTH (Mar. 9, 2011), <http://thedartmouth.com/2011/03/09/news/bill>.
- <sup>38</sup> Press Release, Me. Sec’y of State, Secretary of State Charles E. Summers, Jr.’s Remarks Concerning Possible Voter and Identity Fraud (July 28, 2011), <http://maine.gov/sos/news/2011/possible-voter-fraud-.html>.
- <sup>39</sup> Letter from Lee Rowland, Counsel, Brennan Center for Justice, to Charles E. Summers, Jr., Me. Sec’y of State (Aug. 16, 2011), [http://brennan.3cdn.net/208a6341e17c03ad3c\\_o3m6y9xyu.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/208a6341e17c03ad3c_o3m6y9xyu.pdf). The state Republican Party, which had devised and forwarded the list of students, followed up this investigation with a widely-publicized announcement that it had “uncovered” 19 voters who had registered on Election Day with the same Holiday Inn residence. See Press Release, Me. Republican Party, *Maine GOP Uncovers 19 Election Day Registrations From One Maine Hotel* (Sept. 9, 2011), [http://campaign.r20.constantcontact.com/render?llr=szrdsybab&v=001w9ieBxA0tWs05BvXMg11UnmBYspIv9iWprj5ziiCqyfzTbbTKGVeTjR8dMOcCCqN0DK6seD9VQ2O\\_XsGsPI8cyPHMUkqVIREuT2u50DyQo0%3D](http://campaign.r20.constantcontact.com/render?llr=szrdsybab&v=001w9ieBxA0tWs05BvXMg11UnmBYspIv9iWprj5ziiCqyfzTbbTKGVeTjR8dMOcCCqN0DK6seD9VQ2O_XsGsPI8cyPHMUkqVIREuT2u50DyQo0%3D). Calls to the hotel made by the state Democratic Party confirmed that these voters were a group of students – legally eligible to vote in Maine – who were temporarily housed at the hotel after their dorm had been destroyed by a hurricane. See Press Release, Me. Democratic Party, *Charlie Webster Continues Campaign of Voter Intimidation* (Sept. 9, 2011), <http://mainedems.org/571.html>.
- <sup>40</sup> See, e.g., BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, *CAST OUT: NEW VOTER SUPPRESSION STRATEGIES 2006 and BEYOND* 23 (2006), available at [http://brennan.3cdn.net/1d92eef94232a9031\\_zdm6b6okf.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/1d92eef94232a9031_zdm6b6okf.pdf); see also Ian Urbina, *Fraudulent Voting Re-Emerges as a Partisan Issue*, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 26, 2010, at A17, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/27/us/politics/27fraud.html?ref=ianurbina>.
- <sup>41</sup> *State Senate Passes Voter ID Bill*, CHANNEL 3000 (May 20, 2011, 8:32 AM), <http://www.channel3000.com/politics/27948966/detail.html>.
- <sup>42</sup> See *Texas House Democrats Stop Voter ID Bill*, KBTX (May 27, 2009, 9:00 PM), <http://www.kbtx.com/home/headlines/46232967.html>; Gary Scharer, *Lawmaker risks health to stop voter ID bill*, HOUS. CHRON., May 22, 2007, <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/special/07/legislature/4824361.html>.
- <sup>43</sup> Editorial, *No Need for Photo ID Bill*, ROCK HILL HERALD, Mar. 5, 2009, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/337/story/63347.html>.
- <sup>44</sup> Gina Smith, *Voter ID Wins Key Approval: House Democrats Walk out in Protest*, THE STATE, Feb. 27, 2009, available at <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2195258/posts>.
- <sup>45</sup> S.B. 150, 106th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tenn. 2009), available at <http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/Billinfo/default.aspx?BillNumber=SB0150&ga=106>.

- <sup>46</sup> Maggie Baron, *No Compromise on Voter ID*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (Mar. 6 2009), [http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/no\\_compromise\\_on\\_voter\\_id/](http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/no_compromise_on_voter_id/).
- <sup>47</sup> H.B. 381, 2007 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2007), *available at* <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2007rs/bills/hb381.htm>; H.B. 400, 2009 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2009), *available at* <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2009rs/bills/hb400.htm>; H.B. 227, 2010 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2010), *available at* <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2010rs/bills/hb227.htm>.
- <sup>48</sup> Michael P. McKinney, *Voter ID Bill Splits Panel*, PROVIDENCE J., Mar. 29, 2007, [http://www.projo.com/news/content/Election29\\_03-29-07\\_GI526P3.33b24fe.html](http://www.projo.com/news/content/Election29_03-29-07_GI526P3.33b24fe.html).
- <sup>49</sup> Cynthia Needham, *R.I. House Approves 'Voter ID' bill; Senate Version Stalled*, PROVIDENCE J.: POLITICS BLOG (May 28, 2009, 8:10 PM), <http://politicsblog.projo.com/2009/05/house-approves.html>.
- <sup>50</sup> Those states are Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.
- <sup>51</sup> Kerry Rich (Alabama H.B. 19 and H.B. 63), Gerald Allen (Alabama S.B. 86), Mike Morrell (California A.B. 663), Gene Ward (Hawaii H.B. 1359), Bill Anderson (Iowa S.F. 142), Kathy Afzali (Maryland H.B. 288), Shaunna O'Connell (Massachusetts H. 1113), Richard Ross (Massachusetts S. 316), Michael Rush (Massachusetts S. 318), Mike Benson (Minnesota H.F. 89), Roger Chamberlain (Minnesota S.F. 354), John Howe (Minnesota S.F. 479), Ira Hansen (Nevada A.B. 431), Cresent Hardy (Nevada A.B. 434), Mark Sherwood (Nevada A.B. 435), Michael Roberson (S.B. 373), Jim Belanger (New Hampshire H.B. 515), Cathrynn Brown (New Mexico H.B. 577), Wesley Meredith (North Carolina S.B. 352), Stacey Campfield (Tennessee S.B. 133), Charles Perry (Texas H.B. 186), Charles Anderson (Texas H.B. 539), Jason Isaac (Texas H.B. 1596), Van Taylor (Texas H.B. 4160). *See generally* Nhu-Y Ngo & Keesha Gaskins, *VOTER ID LEGISLATION IN THE STATES*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/voter\\_id\\_legislation\\_in\\_the\\_states/](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/voter_id_legislation_in_the_states/) (last updated July 6, 2011).
- <sup>52</sup> *Map of 2010 Post-Election Party Control of State Legislatures*, NCSL, <http://www.ncsl.org/tabid/21253/default.aspx> (last visited July 19, 2011).
- <sup>53</sup> Fredreka Schouten, *More States Require ID to Vote*, USA TODAY, June 20, 2011, [http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2011-06-19-states-require-voter-ID\\_n.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2011-06-19-states-require-voter-ID_n.htm). Notably, Republicans gained control of the Minnesota Senate and House for the first time since the legislature switched back to partisan elections in 1974. *See* Tim Storey, *Updated – GOP Gains in Legislature are Historic*, THICKET (Nov. 4, 2010, 1:21 PM), [http://ncsl.typepad.com/the\\_thicket/2010/11/by-tim-storey-updated-at-thursday-nov-4-1115am-mdt-republicans-have-added-over-675-seats-to-their-ranks-in-this-elec.html](http://ncsl.typepad.com/the_thicket/2010/11/by-tim-storey-updated-at-thursday-nov-4-1115am-mdt-republicans-have-added-over-675-seats-to-their-ranks-in-this-elec.html). Republicans also won control in Alabama, which had not been in GOP control since Reconstruction, and the North Carolina Senate, which had not been Republican since 1870. *See Pre-Election Party Control of State Legislatures*, NCSL, <http://www.ncsl.org/?tabid=21314> (last visited July 19, 2011).
- <sup>54</sup> *See* Pablo Martinez Monsivais, *Republican Party Chair Reince Priebus: What's His Record in Wisconsin?*, CHRISTIAN SCI. MONITOR, Jan. 16, 2011, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2011/0116/Republican-Party-chair-Reince-Priebus-What-s-his-record-in-Wisconsin>; *Pre-Election Party Control of State Legislatures: Wisconsin*, NCSL, <http://www.ncsl.org/?tabid=21314&stateid=wi#data> (last visited July 19, 2011); *Post-Election Party Control of State Legislatures: Wisconsin*, NCSL, <http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=21253&stateid=wi#data> (last visited July 19, 2011).
- <sup>55</sup> Phillip Rawls, *Alabama Legislature Halfway to Passing Photo ID Law*, AL.COM (Mar. 27, 2011, 1:39 PM), [http://blog.al.com/wire/2011/03/alabama\\_legislature\\_halfway\\_to.html](http://blog.al.com/wire/2011/03/alabama_legislature_halfway_to.html); *2010 Post-Election Party Control of State Legislatures: Alabama*, NCSL, <http://www.ncsl.org/?tabid=21317&stateid=al#data> (last visited July 19, 2011).
- <sup>56</sup> Press Release, R.I. Gen. Assembly, *Voter ID Bill Signed Into Law* (July 6, 2011), *available at* <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/News/pr1.asp?prid=7528>.
- <sup>57</sup> S.B. 400 Sub. A, 2011 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2011), *available at* <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/BillText11/SenateText11/S0400A.pdf>.
- <sup>58</sup> *Ohio House Leader Says Voter Photo ID Bill is Dead*, WLWT.COM (July 29, 2011), <http://www.wlwt.com/t/28703682/detail.html>.

- <sup>59</sup> John Michael Spinelli, *Ohio SOS Husted at Odds with GOP Lawmakers over Photo ID Bill, Kasich on SB5*, EXAMINER.COM (June 25, 2011), <http://www.examiner.com/government-in-columbus/ohio-sos-husted-at-odds-with-gop-lawmakers-over-photo-id-bill-gov-kasich-on-sb>.
- <sup>60</sup> Editorial, *Ohio Voter ID Law Isn't Needed*, CINCINNATI ENQUIRER, Dec. 14, 2005, at 6C.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ne. Ohio Coal. for the Homeless v. Brunner*, 652 F. Supp. 2d, 871 (S.D. Ohio 2009).
- <sup>62</sup> Editorial, *Ohio Voter ID Law Isn't Needed*, THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER, Dec. 14, 2005, at 6C; Editorial, *Ohio Voter ID Picture Keeps Getting Uglier*, DAYTON DAILY NEWS, Nov. 1, 2006, at A18; *Ohio's Voter ID Rule Could be Worse*, DAYTON DAILY NEWS, Jan. 17, 2008, at A18.
- <sup>63</sup> LAWRENCE NORDEN & JESSIE ALLEN, FINAL REPORT: 2008 & 2009 OHIO ELECTION SUMMIT AND CONFERENCE 41 (2009), available at [http://brennan.3cdn.net/9ccb57cb5de1711173\\_nkm6bqc3y.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/9ccb57cb5de1711173_nkm6bqc3y.pdf).
- <sup>64</sup> *See Voter Fraud*, MATT SCHULTZ FOR IOWA SEC'Y OF STATE, <http://votemattschultz.com/voter-fraud/> (last visited Sept. 6, 2011); Kris Kobach on the Issues, KRIS KOBACH FOR SEC'Y OF STATE, <http://www.kriskobach.org/index-4.html> (last visited Sept. 6, 2011); Aaron Couch, *Voter ID Becomes an Issue in Kansas Secretary of State Race*, KAN. CITY STAR, Oct. 25, 2010; On the Issues, SCOTT GESSLER, <http://www.scottgessler.com/issues.html> (last visited Sept. 6, 2011).
- <sup>65</sup> He said: "Voter fraud and other Chicago style politics should have no place in the upcoming elections here in Wisconsin. I urge Mayor Barrett to join me in supporting voter ID proposals because the people of Wisconsin deserve to have their votes counted equally as part of a smooth and lawful election." Press Release, Scott Walker, Walker to Barrett: Stop Ignoring Voter Fraud in Your Own Backyard (June 8, 2010), available at <http://www.scottwalker.org/press-release/2010/06/walker-barrett-%C2%93stop-ignoring-voter-fraud-your-own-back-yard%C2%94>; see also *On the Issues: Photo ID at the Polls*, MILWAUKEE J.-SENTINEL, <http://www.jsonline.com/blogs/news/103292569.html>.
- <sup>66</sup> As of early December 2010, voter ID bills had been pre-filed in at least five states: Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Texas. See Ngu-Y Ngo, *Voter ID a Misguided Effort*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (Dec. 13, 2010), [http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/voter\\_id\\_misguided/](http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/voter_id_misguided/).
- <sup>67</sup> Bob Price, *Tomball State Rep. Debbie Riddle Camps Out at the Capital*, TX. GOP VOTE (Nov. 9, 2010 10:21 AM). <http://texasgopvote.com/2011-legislative-session/tomball-state-rep-debbie-riddle-camps-out-capital-first-gate-6-bills-targeting-i-002094>.
- <sup>68</sup> Daniel Setiawan, *After Six-Year Fight, Perry Signs Voter ID*, TX. OBSERVER, May 27, 2011, <http://www.texasobserver.org/component/k2/item/17879-voter-id-signed-into-law>.
- <sup>69</sup> Gary Scharrer, *Senator Leaves Sick Bed to Vote*, HOUS. CHRON., May 16, 2007, <http://www.chron.com/dispatch/story.mpl/special/07/legislature/4807864.html>.
- <sup>70</sup> Gary Scharrer, *Lawmaker Risks Health to Stop Voter ID Bill*, HOUS. CHRON., May 22, 2007, <http://www.chron.com/dispatch/story.mpl/special/07/legislature/4824361.html>.
- <sup>71</sup> Adam Skaggs, *Voter ID & THE DIVIDE*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, March 17, 2009, [http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/voter\\_id\\_the\\_divide/](http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/voter_id_the_divide/).
- <sup>72</sup> W. Gardner Selby, *After Marathon Session, Senate Advances Bill to Toughen Voter ID Requirements*, AUSTIN AM.-STATESMAN, Mar. 12, 2009, <http://www.statesman.com/news/content/region/legislature/stories/03/12/0312voterid.html>.
- <sup>73</sup> Editorial, *The Republican Threat to Voting*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 26, 2011 at A26.
- <sup>74</sup> See, e.g., John Nichols, *ALEC Exposed: Rigging Elections*, THE NATION, July 12, 2011. The liberal watchdog *Campus Progress* obtained and published a copy of the model legislation, see Tobin Van Ostern, *Conservative Corporate Advocacy Group ALEC Behind Voter Disenfranchisement Efforts*, CAMPUS PROGRESS (Mar. 8, 2011), [http://www.campusprogress.org/articles/conservative\\_corporate\\_advocacy\\_group\\_alec\\_behind\\_voter\\_disenfranchise/](http://www.campusprogress.org/articles/conservative_corporate_advocacy_group_alec_behind_voter_disenfranchise/) (hyperlink to model legislation available at [http://images2.americanprogress.org/campus/web/ALEC\\_voter\\_ID\\_model\\_legislation.pdf](http://images2.americanprogress.org/campus/web/ALEC_voter_ID_model_legislation.pdf)), which the organization made available only to its members.



- <sup>75</sup> See *How to Join ALEC*, ALEC, [http://www.alec.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=How\\_to\\_Join\\_ALEC](http://www.alec.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=How_to_Join_ALEC) (last visited June 10, 2011); ALEC, PRIVATE SECTOR MEMBER BROCHURE, [http://www.alec.org/am/pdf/Corporate\\_Brochure.pdf](http://www.alec.org/am/pdf/Corporate_Brochure.pdf) (last visited June 10, 2011).
- <sup>76</sup> See, e.g., AMY KJOSE, ALEC, TORT REFORM BOOT CAMP (2011), available at <http://www.alec.org/AM/pdf/civiljustice/TortReformBootCampGuideFinal.pdf>; CHRISTIE HERRERA, ALEC, THE STATE LEGISLATOR'S GUIDE TO REPEALING OBAMACARE (2011), available at [http://www.alec.org/AM/pdf/hhs/State\\_Leg\\_Guide\\_to\\_Repealing\\_ObamaCare.pdf](http://www.alec.org/AM/pdf/hhs/State_Leg_Guide_to_Repealing_ObamaCare.pdf); RAEGAN WEBER, *Tennessee Legislators Gather in Nashville to Learn and Discuss Comprehensive Tort Reform Legislation*, ALEC (Feb. 15, 2011), [http://www.alec.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=tennessee\\_legislators](http://www.alec.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=tennessee_legislators); Raegan Weber, *Congratulations to ALEC's Wyoming Leadership Team*, INSIDE ALEC, May, 2011, at 22, [http://www.alec.org/am/pdf/InsideALEC/InsideALEC\\_may2011.pdf](http://www.alec.org/am/pdf/InsideALEC/InsideALEC_may2011.pdf).
- <sup>77</sup> Patrick Marley & Jason Stein, *GOP Raises the Stakes*, MILWAUKEE J.-SENTINEL, Feb. 21, 2011, <http://www.jsonline.com/news/statepolitics/116595118.html>.
- <sup>78</sup> Nicknice, *WI Senate Vote on Voter Suppression Bill*, DAILYMOTION (May 19, 2011), [http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xisu29\\_wi-senate-vote-on-voter-suppression-bill-5-19-11\\_news](http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xisu29_wi-senate-vote-on-voter-suppression-bill-5-19-11_news); Mary Spicuzza, *Legislature Passes Voter ID bill; Walker to Sign it Wednesday*, WIS. ST. J., May 29, 2011, [http://host.madison.com/wsj/news/local/govt-and-politics/article\\_ceaa2760-822c-11e0-887b-001cc4c03286.html](http://host.madison.com/wsj/news/local/govt-and-politics/article_ceaa2760-822c-11e0-887b-001cc4c03286.html).
- <sup>79</sup> Tim Lockette, *Voter ID Bill Passes Alabama Senate*, ANNISTON STAR, June 9, 2011, [http://www.annistonstar.com/view\\_full\\_story/14027325/article-Voter-ID-bill-passes-Alabama-Senate-](http://www.annistonstar.com/view_full_story/14027325/article-Voter-ID-bill-passes-Alabama-Senate-).
- <sup>80</sup> Paige Lavender, *Bill Clinton: Voter ID Laws Are Worst Effort to Disenfranchise Voters Since Jim Crow Laws*, HUFFINGTON POST (July 7, 2011, 1:23 PM), [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/07/bill-clinton-voter-id-disenfranchise-jim-crow\\_n\\_892252.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/07/bill-clinton-voter-id-disenfranchise-jim-crow_n_892252.html).
- <sup>81</sup> E.J. Dionne Jr., *How States Are Rigging the 2012 Election*, WASH. POST, June 19, 2011, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/how-states-are-rigging-the-2012-election/2011/06/19/AGCdB3bH\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/how-states-are-rigging-the-2012-election/2011/06/19/AGCdB3bH_story.html).
- <sup>82</sup> Peter Roff, *Despite What Democrats Claim, Voter Fraud is Real*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., July 29, 2011, <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/peter-roff/2011/07/29/despite-what-democrats-claim-voter-fraud-is-real>.
- <sup>83</sup> Kobach, *supra* note 3. Kobach's claim of voter fraud is misleading. A review of the 221 allegations of reported "voter fraud" over 13 years revealed only seven convictions—two for electioneering too close to the polls and five for double-voting between states or counties. None would have been prevented by the introduction of photo ID requirements. See Keesha Gaskins, *Debunking Misinformation on Photo ID*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (June 9, 2011), [http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/debunking\\_misinformation\\_on\\_photo\\_id/](http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/debunking_misinformation_on_photo_id/).
- <sup>84</sup> For instance, Pennsylvania Republican Party Chairman Rob Gleason said: "Unfortunately, voter fraud is a real problem in Pennsylvania and it is incumbent upon our Legislature to protect the sanctity of our electoral process." Linda Finarelli, *House Passes Bill Requiring Photo ID to Vote*, MONTGOMERY MEDIA, July 9, 2011, [http://www.montgomerynews.com/articles/2011/07/09/north\\_penn\\_life/news/doc4e15dfb4ab1b2865778317.txt?viewmode=default](http://www.montgomerynews.com/articles/2011/07/09/north_penn_life/news/doc4e15dfb4ab1b2865778317.txt?viewmode=default). South Carolina House Speaker Bobby Harrell said, "If we do not protect that voting right from fraud and abuse, we are not protecting the ideals of democracy." Press Release, S.C. Statehouse Blog, *House Again Passes Voter ID* (Jan. 26, 2011), available at <http://sc.statehouseblogs.com/2011/01/26/house-again-passes-voter-id-press-release/>.
- <sup>85</sup> For example, Minnesota House Speaker Kurt Zellers said in a radio interview, "I think [voting is] a privilege, it's not a right. Everybody doesn't get it because if you go to jail or if you commit some heinous crime your rights are taken away. This is a privilege." See Eric Roper, *Zellers: Voting Is "Privilege, Not Right"*, MINNEAPOLIS STAR TRIB.: HOT DISH POLITICS (Apr. 21, 2011, 5:50 PM), <http://www.startribune.com/politics/blogs/120393764.html>.
- <sup>86</sup> Press Release, John Lynch, Governor, State of N.H., *Governor Lynch's Veto Message Regarding SB 129* (June 27, 2011), available at <http://www.governor.nh.gov/media/news/2011/062711-sb129.htm>.
- <sup>87</sup> Letter from Mark Dayton, Governor, State of Minn., to Hon. Michelle L. Fischbach, President of the Senate, State of Minn., (May 26, 2011), available at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/56415356/Ch-69-SF509>; Lynch, *supra* note 86.

- <sup>88</sup> *Id.*; see also Dayton, *supra* note 87; Jason Hancock, *Nixon Vetoes Missouri Photo ID Legislation*, ST. LOUIS TODAY, June 19, 2011, [http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/article\\_1219dc24-9908-11e0-bf91-0019bb30f31a.html](http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/article_1219dc24-9908-11e0-bf91-0019bb30f31a.html).
- <sup>89</sup> See Press Release, 112th Congress House Administration, Study Finds 5,000 Non-Citizens Likely Voted in Colorado, Mar. 10, 2011, *available at* [http://cha.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=368&Itemid=366](http://cha.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=368&Itemid=366); see also Press Release, 112th Congress House Administration, Harper: Report on Non-Citizen Voting is a Disturbing Wake-Up Call, March 31, 2011, *available at* [http://cha.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=375&Itemid=366](http://cha.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=375&Itemid=366).
- <sup>90</sup> John Lewis, *supra* note 5.
- <sup>91</sup> Peter Kasperowicz, *House Dems Say State Voter-ID Laws a GOP Plan to Suppress Minority Votes*, HILL: FLOOR ACTION BLOG (July 19, 2011, 11:45 AM), <http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/172211-house-dems-say-state-voter-id-laws-a-gop-plan-to-suppress-minority-votes>.
- <sup>92</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>93</sup> Ryan Reilly, *House Dems Join Senate in Urging DOJ to Fight Voter ID Laws*, TPM MUCKRAKER (July 27, 2011, 1:10 PM), [http://tpmmuckraker.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/07/house\\_dems\\_join\\_senate\\_in\\_urgening\\_doj\\_to\\_fight\\_vote.php](http://tpmmuckraker.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/07/house_dems_join_senate_in_urgening_doj_to_fight_vote.php); Letter from Rep. Marcia L. Fudge, et al., to Hon. Eric Holder, U.S. Attorney General (July 25, 2011), *available at* <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/documents/2011/07/house-democrats-urge-eric-holder-to-use-dojs-power-to-intervene-on-voter-id-laws.php>.
- <sup>94</sup> Press Release, Senator Dick Durbin, Durbin to Chair Hearing Examining New State Voting Laws that Threaten to Suppress Turnout Nationwide (Sept. 2, 2011), *available at* <http://durbin.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/pressreleases?ID=16aa6ae3-91ad-4671-85fe-b901fccdf24>.
- <sup>95</sup> VISHAL AGRAHARKAR, WENDY WEISER & ADAM SKAGGS, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, THE COST OF VOTER ID LAWS: WHAT THE COURTS SAY (2011), *available at* [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/the\\_cost\\_of\\_voter\\_id\\_laws\\_what\\_the\\_courts\\_say/](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/the_cost_of_voter_id_laws_what_the_courts_say/).
- <sup>96</sup> Minnesota: The projected cost for now-vetoed Minnesota H.F. 89 was under \$5 million, but according to Minnesota Common Cause and Citizens for Election Integrity Minnesota, the actual cost of H.F. 89 would be closer to \$25 million (with the inclusion of potential costs to local election offices). COMMON CAUSE MINN., THE HIGH COST OF VOTER ID MANDATES (2011), *available at* <http://www.commoncause.org/atf/cf/%7Bfb3c17e2-cdd1-4df6-92be-bd4429893665%7D/VOTER%20ID%20COST%20REVIEW.PDF>.
- Texas: “The fiscal note says it will cost about \$2 million to implement, but Democrats say it could be much costlier, particularly for local governments.” Brandi Grissom, *Senate Approves Voter ID Bill*, THE TEXAS TRIBUNE, Jan. 26, 2011, <http://www.texastribune.org/texas-politics/voter-id/tribblog-senate-approves-voter-id-bill>.
- South Carolina: “The state estimate is ‘purely wishful thinking,’ said Barbara Zia, president of the state’s League of Women Voters. ‘It will send us, the taxpayers spiraling down a fiscal rabbit hole.’” Seanna Adcox, *Opponents Call S.C. Voter ID Bill too Costly for Taxpayers*, SUN NEWS, Mar. 30, 2011, <http://www.thesunnews.com/2011/03/30/2069077/opponents-call-sc-voter-id-bill.html>.
- <sup>97</sup> See, e.g., Jennifer Jacobs, *Iowa County Elections Officials Oppose Bill to Require a Photo ID to Vote*, DES MOINES REG.: AUTHOR BLOG (Feb. 14, 2011, 5:55 PM), <http://blogs.desmoinesregister.com/dmr/index.php/2011/02/14/iowas-county-elections-officials-oppose-bill-to-require-photo-id-to-vote/>; Hearing on HB 934 & HB 647 Before the H. St. Gov’t. Comm. (Pa. 2011) (statement of Douglas E. Hill, Executive Director, County Comm’rs Ass’n of Pa.); Hearing on SB-6 Before the S. Comm. On Transp. & Elections (Wis. 2011) (statement of Diane Hermann-Brown, President, Wis. Municipal Clerks Ass’n).
- <sup>98</sup> SCOTT DANIGOLE, FISCAL NOTE: LB 239, NEB. LEG., (Jan. 26, 2011), *available at* <http://nebraskalegislature.gov/Floor-Docs/Current/PDF/FN/LB239.pdf>.
- <sup>99</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>100</sup> Martha Stoddard, *Voter Bill Faces Changes*, OMAHA WORLD-HERALD, Mar. 3, 2011, <http://www.omaha.com/article/20110303/NEWS01/303039891>.

- <sup>101</sup>. *Id.*
- <sup>102</sup>. L.B. 239, 102d Leg., 1st Sess. (Neb. 2011), *available at* [http://nebraskalegislature.gov/bills/view\\_bill.php?DocumentID=12209](http://nebraskalegislature.gov/bills/view_bill.php?DocumentID=12209).
- <sup>103</sup>. Amy Erickson, *Auditors Oppose Current Voter ID Bill*, LE MARS DAILY SENTINEL, Feb. 17, 2011, <http://www.lemarssentinel.com/story/1703969.html>.
- <sup>104</sup>. ISACA PHOTO ID EXPLORATORY COMM., A REPORT ON PHOTO ID FOR VOTING PURPOSES (2011), *available at* [http://www.iowaauditors.org/index\\_files/ISACAVoterIDReport020211final.pdf](http://www.iowaauditors.org/index_files/ISACAVoterIDReport020211final.pdf).
- <sup>105</sup>. Jennifer Jacobs, *Iowa County Elections Officials Oppose Bill to Require a Photo ID to Vote*, DES MOINES REG.: AUTHOR BLOG (Feb. 14, 2011, 5:55 PM), <http://blogs.desmoinesregister.com/dmr/index.php/2011/02/14/iowas-county-elections-officials-oppose-bill-to-require-photo-id-to-vote/>.
- <sup>106</sup>. Roxanna Moritz, *Iowa State Association of County Auditors Rejects Photo ID Bill*, SCOTT CNTY. IA. AUDITOR'S BLOG (Feb. 15, 2011), <http://scottcountyauditor.wordpress.com/2011/02/>.
- <sup>107</sup>. Andrew J. Nelson, *Iowa Vote ID Plan Stymied*, OMAHA WORLD-HERALD, Apr. 2, 2011, <http://www.omaha.com/article/20110402/NEWS01/704029858/1009>.
- <sup>108</sup>. Oklahoma's law requires voters to present photo identification in order to vote, but if a voter does not have photo ID, she may use a voter registration card issued by her county elections board. If she has neither a photo ID nor a voter registration card, or declines to present proof of identity, she may sign a sworn statement affirming her identity and vote by provisional ballot. Her provisional ballot will be counted if it is cast in the correct precinct and she is registered. OKLA. STAT. tit. 26, § 7-116.1C (2011); OKLA. STAT. tit. 26, § 7-114 (2011).
- <sup>109</sup>. *Weinschenk v. State*, 203 S.W.3d 201 (Mo. 2006).
- <sup>110</sup>. MISSISSIPPI VOTER IDENTIFICATION PETITION, BALLOTPEDIA, [http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Mississippi\\_Voter\\_Identification\\_Petition\\_%282011%29](http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Mississippi_Voter_Identification_Petition_%282011%29) (last visited July 19, 2011); INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 27, MO. SEC'Y OF STATE, <http://www.sos.ms.gov/page.aspx?s=7&s1=1&s2=51> (last visited July 19, 2011).
- <sup>111</sup>. *HF 1597 Status in Senate for Legislative Session 87*, Minn. Leg. [https://www.revisor.mn.gov/revisor/pages/search\\_status/status\\_detail.php?b=House&f=HF1597&ssn=0&y=2011](https://www.revisor.mn.gov/revisor/pages/search_status/status_detail.php?b=House&f=HF1597&ssn=0&y=2011) (last visited September 7, 2011); *see generally* Tim Pugmire, *Push Begins to Get Voter ID on Ballot*, MINN. PUB. RADIO NEWS (June 7, 2011, 2:22 PM), [http://minnesota.publicradio.org/collections/special/columns/polinaut/archive/2011/06/push\\_begins\\_to.shtml](http://minnesota.publicradio.org/collections/special/columns/polinaut/archive/2011/06/push_begins_to.shtml).
- <sup>112</sup>. *See* U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMM'N, NATIONAL MAIL REGISTRATION FORM (2006), *available at* <http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/national%20mail%20voter%20registration%20form%20english%20February%2015%202011.pdf>.
- <sup>113</sup>. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 1973i(c).
- <sup>114</sup>. ARIZ. REV. STAT. §§ 16-152(A)(23), 16-166 (2011).
- <sup>115</sup>. *Id.* § 16-166.
- <sup>116</sup>. Letter from Thomas R. Wilkey, Exec. Director, U.S. Election Assistance Comm'n, to Jan Brewer, Ariz. Sec'y of State (Mar. 6, 2006), *available at* <http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Page/EAC%20Letter%20to%20Arizona%20Secretary%20of%20State%20Jan%20Brewer%20March%206%202006.pdf>.
- <sup>117</sup>. *See* *Gonzalez v. Arizona*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 997 (2006), *rev'd in part*, 624 F.3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2010), *reh'g en banc granted*, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 8573 (9th Cir. Apr. 27, 2011).
- <sup>118</sup>. *Gonzalez v. Arizona*, 624 F.3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2010), *reh'g en banc granted*, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 8573 (9th Cir. Apr. 27, 2011).
- <sup>119</sup>. 2009 Ga. Laws 712 (Ga. 2009) (codified at GA. CODE ANN. § 21-2-216(g) (2011)), *available at* [http://www1.legis.ga.gov/legis/2009\\_10/fulltext/sb86.htm](http://www1.legis.ga.gov/legis/2009_10/fulltext/sb86.htm).

- <sup>120</sup>. After extensive negotiations and modifications, the Department of Justice eventually approved Georgia's citizenship verification program. *See* Letter from T. Christian Herren, Chief, Voting Section, U.S. Dep't of Justice, to Ann W. Lewis, Esq. (Aug. 18, 2010); *see also* Joint Motion to Dismiss, *Georgia v. Holder*, 748 F. Supp. 2d 16 (D.D.C. 2010), *available at* <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/electionlaw/litigation/documents/Georgia-Motion-8-20-10.pdf>.
- <sup>121</sup>. *See* Bill Rankin, *DOJ Approves Proof of Citizenship Requirement for Voter Registration*, ATLANTA J.-CONST., Apr. 4, 2011, <http://www.ajc.com/news/georgia-politics-elections/doj-approves-proof-of-898132.html>.
- <sup>122</sup>. NAT'L CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES, 2011 IMMIGRATION-RELATED LAWS AND RESOLUTIONS IN THE STATES (2011), *available at* [http://www.ncsl.org/documents/statefed/IMMIG\\_REPORT\\_FINALAUG9.pdf](http://www.ncsl.org/documents/statefed/IMMIG_REPORT_FINALAUG9.pdf).
- <sup>123</sup>. S.B. 256, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2011), *available at* <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2011RS/Printfiles/SB256-int.pdf>.
- <sup>124</sup>. S.B. 11-018, 68th Gen. Assemb., 1st Reg. Sess. (Colo. 2011), *available at* [http://www.leg.state.co.us/clics/clics2011a/csl.nsf/fsbillcont3/BAED7B3078F4007E8725781500271318?open&file=018\\_01.pdf](http://www.leg.state.co.us/clics/clics2011a/csl.nsf/fsbillcont3/BAED7B3078F4007E8725781500271318?open&file=018_01.pdf).
- <sup>125</sup>. H.B. 5231, Sess. Year 2011 (Conn. 2011), *available at* [http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill\\_num=HB05231&which\\_year=2011](http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB05231&which_year=2011).
- <sup>126</sup>. H.B. 2067, 2011 Sess. (Kan. 2011), *available at* [http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011\\_12/year1/measures/hb2067/](http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011_12/year1/measures/hb2067/).
- <sup>127</sup>. S.P. 241, 125th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2011), *available at* [http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/display\\_ps.asp?snum=125&paper=SP0241&PID=1456](http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/display_ps.asp?snum=125&paper=SP0241&PID=1456).
- <sup>128</sup>. H. 194, 187th Gen. Court (Mass. 2011), *available at* <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/House/H00194>.
- <sup>129</sup>. H.B. 515-FN, 2011 Sess. (N.H. 2011), *available at* [http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill\\_status/bill\\_status.aspx?lsr=326&sy=2011&sortoption=&txtsessionyear=2011&txtbillnumber=hb515&q=1](http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/bill_status.aspx?lsr=326&sy=2011&sortoption=&txtsessionyear=2011&txtbillnumber=hb515&q=1),
- <sup>130</sup>. S.B. 178, 76th Sess. (Nev. 2011), *available at* <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/76th2011/Reports/history.cfm?ID=428>.
- <sup>131</sup>. H.B. 2804, 76th Leg. Assemb. (Or. 2011), *available at* <http://www.leg.state.or.us/11reg/measures/hb2800.dir/hb2804.intro.html>.
- <sup>132</sup>. S. 304, Sess. 119 (S.C. 2011), *available at* [http://www.scstatehouse.gov/cgi-bin/web\\_bh10.exe?bill1=304&session=119&summary=T](http://www.scstatehouse.gov/cgi-bin/web_bh10.exe?bill1=304&session=119&summary=T).
- <sup>133</sup>. S.B. 352, 107th Gen. Assemb., 2011 Sess. (Tenn. 2011), *available at* <http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=SB0352>.
- <sup>134</sup>. H.B. 1338, 82d Leg. Sess. (Tex. 2011), *available at* <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=HB1338>.
- <sup>135</sup>. S.J. Memorial 8001, 62d Leg., 2011 Sess. (Wash. 2011), *available at* <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?bill=8001&year=2011>.
- <sup>136</sup>. S.B. 256, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2011), *available at* <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2011RS/Printfiles/SB256-int.pdf>; H.B. 2067, 2011 Sess. (Kan. 2011), *available at* [http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011\\_12/year1/measures/hb2067/](http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011_12/year1/measures/hb2067/).
- S.P. 241, 125th Me. Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2011), *available at* [http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/display\\_ps.asp?snum=125&paper=SP0241&PID=1456](http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/display_ps.asp?snum=125&paper=SP0241&PID=1456); S.B. 352, 107th Gen. Assemb., 2011 Sess. (Tenn. 2011), *available at* <http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=SB0352>.
- H.B. 1338, 82d Leg. Sess. (Tex. 2011), *available at* <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=HB1338>.
- <sup>137</sup>. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

- <sup>138</sup>. As of this drafting, the entire law has been temporarily enjoined by a federal court and cannot be implemented until the court lifts the injunction. *Hispanic Interest Coal. of Ala. v. Bentley*, No. 5:11-cv-02484 (N.D. Ala. Aug. 29, 2011) (order granting preliminary injunction) (consolidated with *Parsley v. Bentley*, No. 5:11-cv-2736 (N.D. Ala.) and *United States v. Alabama et al.*, No. 2:11-cv-2746 (N.D. Ala.)).
- <sup>139</sup>. H.B. 56, § 29(c), 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2011), *available at* <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2011RS/Printfiles/HB56-enr.pdf>; H.B. 2067, § 8(l), 2011 Sess. (Kan. 2011), *available at* [http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011\\_12/year1/measures/hb2067/](http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011_12/year1/measures/hb2067/).
- <sup>140</sup>. H.B. 56, § 29(k) (Ala. 2011); H.B. 2067, § 8(m) (Kan. 2011).
- <sup>141</sup>. H.B. 56, §§ 29(d) and (f) (Ala. 2011); H.B. 2067, § 8(n) and (p) (Kan. 2011).
- <sup>142</sup>. H.B. 56, § 29(m)(7) (Ala. 2011); H.B. 2067, § 8(m)(6) (Kan. 2011).
- <sup>143</sup>. John Tomasic, *Sec of State Gessler Lands on Legislative Loser List for Voter ID Debacle*, COLO. INDEP., May 12, 2011.
- <sup>144</sup>. Joseph Boven, *Levy Call Gessler's Bluff: Says He Should Prosecute Those Who Vote Illegally*, COLO. INDEP., APR. 8, 2011.
- <sup>145</sup>. Nancy Lofholm, *County Clerks Want Illegal-Voting Proof*, DENVER POST, Apr. 13, 2011.
- <sup>146</sup>. SCOTT GESSLER, COLO. SEC'Y OF STATE, COMPARISON OF COLORADO'S VOTER ROLLS WITH DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE NON-CITIZEN RECORDS (Mar. 8, 2011), *available at* [http://cha.house.gov/images/stories/documents/co\\_non\\_citizen\\_report.pdf](http://cha.house.gov/images/stories/documents/co_non_citizen_report.pdf).
- <sup>147</sup>. Kris W. Kobach, *supra* note 3. Mr. Kobach, however, was unable to identify a single instance of a non-citizen illegally casting a vote, or any successful prosecution for voter fraud in the state. Keesha Gaskins, *Debunking Misinformation on Voter ID*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (June 6, 2011), [http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/debunking\\_misinformation\\_on\\_photo\\_id/](http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/debunking_misinformation_on_photo_id/).
- <sup>148</sup>. *See* Keesha Gaskins, *Smoke and Mirrors: Alleged Non-Citizen Voting in NM and CO*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (Apr. 1, 2011), [http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/smoke\\_and\\_mirrors\\_alleged\\_non-citizen\\_voting\\_in\\_new\\_mexico\\_and\\_colorado/](http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/smoke_and_mirrors_alleged_non-citizen_voting_in_new_mexico_and_colorado/). Congressman Charles Gonzalez (D-TX) questioned Mr. Gessler's claims, saying "No attorney would go before a judge with a report in which the main claims are preceded by such terms as 'inconclusive', 'incomplete', and 'impossible to provide a precise number' ... Ensuring the integrity of our elections is far too important a matter to base decisions on a study that mischaracterizes empirical data, neglects even the most obvious analysis of that data, and hides these failings behind terms like 'tentative' and 'preliminary.'" Press Release, Kyle Anderson, Colorado Voter Registration Study Questioned during House Administration Hearing On a Look Back at What Went Right and Wrong with the 2010 Election (Apr. 1, 2011), *available at* <http://democrats.cha.house.gov/press-release/colorado-voter-registration-study-questioned-during-house-administration-committee>.
- <sup>149</sup>. Press Release, House Comm. on House Admin., Harper: Report on Non-Citizen Voting is a Disturbing Wake-Up Call (March 31, 2011), *available at* [http://cha.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=375&Itemid=4](http://cha.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=375&Itemid=4).
- <sup>150</sup>. CITIZENS WITHOUT PROOF, *supra* note 4.
- <sup>151</sup>. *Tennessee Debates Bill to Require Proof of Citizenship to Vote*, HUFFINGTON POST, May 12, 2010, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/12/tennessee-debates-bill-to\\_n\\_573170.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/12/tennessee-debates-bill-to_n_573170.html).
- <sup>152</sup>. *See, e.g.*, Keesha Gaskins, *Smoke and Mirrors*, *supra* note 148.
- <sup>153</sup>. *See generally* WENDY WEISER ET AL., BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, VOTER REGISTRATION MODERNIZATION, 3-5 (2009), *available at* [http://brennan.3cdn.net/b75f13413388b2fcc\\_ynm6bn1l2.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/b75f13413388b2fcc_ynm6bn1l2.pdf).
- <sup>154</sup>. *See id.* at 3; CALTECH/MIT VOTING TECHNOLOGY PROJECT, VOTING: WHAT IS, WHAT COULD BE 3 (2001), *available at* [http://www.vote.caltech.edu/drupal/files/report/voting\\_what\\_is\\_what\\_could\\_be.pdf](http://www.vote.caltech.edu/drupal/files/report/voting_what_is_what_could_be.pdf); Stephen Ansolabehere, Testimony Before the Senate Rules Committee, Mar. 11, 2009, *available at* [http://www.vote.caltech.edu/drupal/files/news/03112009Ansolabehere\\_Testimony.pdf](http://www.vote.caltech.edu/drupal/files/news/03112009Ansolabehere_Testimony.pdf).

- <sup>155</sup> John Mark Hansen & Michael A. Neblo, *Report of the Task Force on the Federal Election System: Voter Registration*, in NAT'L COMM. ON FED. ELECTION REFORM, TO ASSURE PRIDE AND CONFIDENCE IN THE ELECTORAL PROCESS 119, 131 (2002), available at [http://tcf.org/publications/pdfs/pb246/99\\_full\\_report.pdf](http://tcf.org/publications/pdfs/pb246/99_full_report.pdf)<http://books.google.com/books?id=QLHhCtmIZCUC&pg=PA134&lpg=PA134&dq#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- <sup>156</sup> See Ansolabehere, *supra* note 154, at 19.
- <sup>157</sup> 42 U.S.C. §§ 1973gg to 1973gg-10.
- <sup>158</sup> See generally CHRISTOPHER PONOROFF, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, VOTER REGISTRATION IN A DIGITAL AGE, (Wendy Weiser, Ed., 2010), available at [http://brennan.3cdn.net/806ab5ea23fde7c261\\_n1m6b1s4z.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/806ab5ea23fde7c261_n1m6b1s4z.pdf).
- <sup>159</sup> See JENNIFER ROSENBERG & MARGARET CHEN, EXPANDING DEMOCRACY: VOTER REGISTRATION AROUND THE WORLD, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE 3 (2009), available at [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/expanding\\_democracy\\_voter\\_registration\\_around\\_the\\_world/](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/expanding_democracy_voter_registration_around_the_world/).
- <sup>160</sup> 42 U.S.C. §§ 1973gg to 1973gg-10.
- <sup>161</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-4(b).
- <sup>162</sup> League of Women Voters v. Cobb, 447 F. Supp. 2d. 1314 (D. Fla. 2006).
- <sup>163</sup> In 2004, while 7.8% of non-Hispanic whites registered with private drives, 12.7% of blacks and 12.9% of Hispanics did the same. *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2004 – Detailed Tables*, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/socdemo/voting/publications/p20/2004/tables.html> (download Table 14) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011). In 2008, African Americans and Hispanics nationally remained almost twice as likely to register through a voter registration drive as whites. While 5.4% of non-Hispanic whites registered at private drives, 11.1% of African-Americans and 9.6% of Hispanics did the same. *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2008 – Detailed Tables*, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/socdemo/voting/publications/p20/2008/tables.html> (download Table 14) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
- <sup>164</sup> During the 2008-2010 voter registration cycle, 14.4 million applications nationwide were from new registrants who were not previously registered in a local jurisdiction or had not previously registered in any jurisdiction. This is a 16.8% drop from the last voter registration cycle that coincided with a national midterm election: during the 2004-2006 period, there were 17.3 million new registrants. U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMM'N, THE IMPACT OF THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993 ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE 2009-2010: A REPORT TO THE 112TH CONGRESS 1 (2011), available at <http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/2010%20NVRA%20FINAL%20REPORT.pdf>.
- <sup>165</sup> See, e.g., Reince Priebus, *Anti Voter Fraud Reforms are Practical, not Partisan*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., June 6, 2011, <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2011/06/06/anti-voter-fraud-reforms-are-practical-not-partisan>.
- <sup>166</sup> Brad Friedman, *John McCain: "One of the Greatest Frauds in Voter History"*, HUFFINGTON POST, Oct. 16, 2008, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/brad-friedman/john-mccain-one-of-the-gr\\_b\\_135460.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/brad-friedman/john-mccain-one-of-the-gr_b_135460.html).
- <sup>167</sup> See *infra* notes 182-183 and accompanying text.
- <sup>168</sup> Ryan J. Reilly, *Columnist: Registering Poor to Vote "Like Handing Out Burglary Tools to Criminals"*, TPM MUCKRAKER, Sept. 2, 2011, [http://tpmmuckraker.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/09/columnist\\_registering\\_poor\\_to\\_vote\\_like\\_handing\\_out\\_burglary\\_tools\\_to\\_criminals.php](http://tpmmuckraker.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/09/columnist_registering_poor_to_vote_like_handing_out_burglary_tools_to_criminals.php).
- <sup>169</sup> The one exception is California's bill.
- <sup>170</sup> *CS/CS/HB 1355: Elections*, FLA. SENATE, <http://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2011/1355> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
- <sup>171</sup> *History: HB 1570*, TEX. LEG. ONLINE, <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=HB1570> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011); *History: HB 2194*, TEX. LEG. ONLINE, <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=HB2194> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
- <sup>172</sup> H.B. 1570, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2011), available at <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/82R/billtext/pdf/HB01570F.pdf#navpanes=0>.

- <sup>173</sup>. H.B. 2194, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2011), *available at* <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/82R/billtext/pdf/HB02194F.pdf#navpanes=0>.
- <sup>174</sup>. Florida H.B. 1355 passed on a party line vote of 25-13 in the Senate and 77-38 in the House. *CS/CS/HB 1355: Elections – House Floor Vote*, FLA. HOUSE OF REPS. (May 15, 2011), <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Bills/floorvote.aspx?VoteId=12484&BillId=46543&SessionIndex=-1&SessionId=66&BillText=&BillNumber=1355&BillSponsorIndex=0&BillListIndex=0&BillStatuteText=&BillTypeIndex=0&BillReferredIndex=0&HouseChamber=H&BillSearchIndex=-1>; *CS/CS/HB 1355: Elections – Senate Floor Vote*, FLA. HOUSE OF REPS. (May 5, 2011), <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Bills/floorvote.aspx?VoteId=12464&BillId=46543&SessionIndex=-1&SessionId=66&BillText=&BillNumber=1355&BillSponsorIndex=0&BillListIndex=0&BillStatuteText=&BillTypeIndex=0&BillReferredIndex=0&HouseChamber=H&BillSearchIndex=-1>.
- <sup>175</sup>. H.B. 1570, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tx. 2011); H. Journal, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess., at 1583 (Tx. 2011), *available at* <http://www.journals.house.state.tx.us/hjrn/82r/pdf/82RDAY51FINAL.PDF#page=5>; S. Journal, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess., at 2381 (Tx. 2011), *available at* <http://www.journals.senate.state.tx.us/sjrn/82r/pdf/82RSJ05-17-F.PDF#page=5>.
- <sup>176</sup>. H.B. 2194, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tx. 2011); S. Journal, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess., at 3537 (Tx. 2011), *available at* <http://www.journals.senate.state.tx.us/sjrn/82r/pdf/82RSJ05-25-F1.PDF#page=9>.
- <sup>177</sup>. H.B. 2194, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tx. 2011); H. Journal, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess., at 3550 (Tx. 2011), *available at* <http://www.journals.house.state.tx.us/hjrn/82r/pdf/82RDAY74FINAL.PDF#page=12>.
- <sup>178</sup>. *See Court Cases: League of Women Voters of Florida v. Cobb*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (Aug. 8 2008), *available at* [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/league\\_of\\_women\\_voters\\_of\\_florida\\_v\\_cobb/](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/league_of_women_voters_of_florida_v_cobb/).
- <sup>179</sup>. *Id.*
- <sup>180</sup>. *League of Women Voters v. Cobb*, 447 F. Supp. 2d 1314 (D. Fla. 2006).
- <sup>181</sup>. *Court Cases*, *supra* note 178.
- <sup>182</sup>. Jerome R. Stockfish, *Lawmakers Cut Time to File Hurricane-Related Claims*, TAMPA TRIB., May 6, 2011, <http://www2.tbo.com/news/politics/2011/may/05/lawmakers-cut-time-to-file-hurricane-related-claim-ar-205183/>; *Bill cutting early voting hours heads to governor*, TAMPA BAY ONLINE, May 5, 2011, *available at* <http://www2.tbo.com/news/politics/2011/may/05/bill-cutting-early-voting-hours-heads-to-governor-ar-205181/>.
- <sup>183</sup>. Catherine Whittenburg & Lindsay Peterson, *Bill Would Cut Early Voting Period in Florida to 7 Days*, TAMPA TRIB., Apr. 28, 2011, <http://www2.tbo.com/news/breaking-news/2011/apr/28/bill-would-cut-early-voting-period-in-florida-to-7-ar-203024/>.
- <sup>184</sup>. LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COLLIER COUNTY, *available at* <http://www.lwvcolliercounty.org/> (last visited September 3, 2011).
- <sup>185</sup>. *Id.*
- <sup>186</sup>. Letter from Lee Rowland, Democracy Counsel, Brennan Center for Justice & Mark A. Posner, Senior Counsel, Lawyers' Comm. for Civil Rights Under the Law, to Chris Herren, Chief, Voting Section, U.S. Dep't. of Justice (July 15, 2011), *available at* [http://brennan.3cdn.net/4713a8395c96f48085\\_p7m6iv6sh.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/4713a8395c96f48085_p7m6iv6sh.pdf).
- <sup>187</sup>. CITIZENS WITHOUT PROOF, *supra* note 4.
- <sup>188</sup>. Letter from Wendy Weiser, Brennan Center for Justice, et al., to T. Christian Herren, Chief, Voting Section, U.S. Dep't of Justice (Sept. 14, 2011), *available at* [http://brennan.3cdn.net/772eab3b160f2da9f7\\_n4m6ivkrc.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/772eab3b160f2da9f7_n4m6ivkrc.pdf).
- <sup>189</sup>. *See* "Focus: Early Voting on Sunday and the Black Vote," *infra* at 33.
- <sup>190</sup>. Rowland & Posner, *supra* note 186.
- <sup>191</sup>. WENDY WEISER ET AL., BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, MODERNIZING VOTER REGISTRATION: MOMENTUM IN THE STATES 7-9 (2010), *available at* <http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/Democracy/VRM%20State%20Trends%20Final.pdf;nocdn=1>.

- <sup>192.</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>193.</sup> Margaret Lillard, *Same-Day Voter Registration OK'd*, STAR NEWS ONLINE (Aug. 22, 2007, 3:30 AM), <http://www.starnewsonline.com/article/20070822/NEWS/708220479/-1/State>.
- <sup>194.</sup> Mary Lu Carnevale, *Ohio Gets Green Light on Same-Day Registration and Voting*, WALL ST. J.: WASH. WIRE (Oct. 1, 2008, 3:28 PM), <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2008/10/01/ohio-gets-green-light-on-same-day-registration-and-voting/>.
- <sup>195.</sup> See BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO VOTING: SAME DAY REGISTRATION (2001), available at [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/eliminating\\_barriers\\_to\\_voting\\_election\\_day\\_registration/](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/resource/eliminating_barriers_to_voting_election_day_registration/); *Election Day Registration*, COMMON CAUSE, <http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG&b=4849117> (last visited July 19, 2011); *Election Day Registration*, DEMOS, <http://archive.demos.org/page18.cfm> (last visited July 19, 2011); *Election Day Voter Registration*, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS ME., <http://www.lwvme.org/EDR.html> (last visited July 19, 2011).
- <sup>196.</sup> EDR states in the 2004 presidential election had on average a 12% higher turnout rate than non-EDR states, and 7% higher turnout in the 2008 presidential election. DEMOS, VOTERS WIN WITH ELECTION DAY REGISTRATION (2009), available at [http://www.demos.org/pubs/voterswin\\_09.pdf](http://www.demos.org/pubs/voterswin_09.pdf).
- <sup>197.</sup> Roger Larocca & John S. Klemanski, *U.S. State Election Reform and Turnout in Presidential Elections*, 11 ST. POLS. & POL'Y Q. 76 (2011), <http://spa.sagepub.com/content/11/1/76.full.pdf>.
- <sup>198.</sup> See *Hearing on S.B. 641 Before the Cal. State Assemb. Comm. on Elections and Redistricting* (July 5, 2011) (statement of Steven Carbó, Senior Program Director, Demos), available at [http://www.demos.org/pubs/Assembly\\_Elections\\_Comm.pdf](http://www.demos.org/pubs/Assembly_Elections_Comm.pdf) (stating that in Iowa, the number of provisional votes dropped from 14,661 in 2004 to 4,725 in 2008 and in North Carolina, there were nearly 40,000 fewer provisional ballots cast in the 2008 presidential race than in the 2006 midterm election).
- <sup>199.</sup> In 2004, 35.5% of provisional ballots cast were not counted. ELECTION DATA SERVICES, INC., 2004 ELECTION DAY SURVEY REPORT (2005), available at <http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/AssetManager/2004%20EAVS%20Chapter%206.pdf>. In 2006, over 20% of provisional ballots cast in the 2006 midterm election were rejected. U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION, CASTING AND COUNTING PROVISIONAL BALLOTS (2007), available at <http://archives.eac.gov/program-areas/research/doc/eds-2006/2006-eds-casting-and-counting-provisional-ballots.pdf>. In 2008, 28.2 percent of provisional ballots were rejected. U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION, 2008 ELECTION ADMINISTRATION AND VOTING SURVEY (2009), available at <http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Documents/2008%20Election%20Administration%20and%20Voting%20Survey%20EAVS%20Report.pdf>.
- <sup>200.</sup> *Montana Lawmakers Vote to End Same-Day Voter Registration*, ASSOCIATED PRESS, Apr. 5, 2011, <http://www.ktvq.com/news/montana-lawmakers-vote-to-end-same-day-voter-registration/>; Nancy Doty, *'Modernization of Elections' Bill Is a Bad Joke*, COLORADO STATESMAN, Apr. 9, 2010, <http://www.coloradostatesman.com/content/991753-%3Fmodernization-elections%3F-bill-a-bad-joke>; Press Release, Me. House Democrats, Republicans Vote to Prevent Election Day Registration (June 6, 2011), available at <http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=HouseDems+News&tid=256954&v=Article>.
- <sup>201.</sup> Rebekah Metzler, *Same-Day Voter Sign-Up Set Back*, KENNEBEC J., June 9, 2011, [http://www.kjonline.com/news/same-day-voter-sign-up-set-back\\_2011-06-08.html](http://www.kjonline.com/news/same-day-voter-sign-up-set-back_2011-06-08.html).
- <sup>202.</sup> *Detailed Bill Information: HB 152*, MONT. LEG., [http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W\\$BSRV.ActionQuery?P\\_BLTP\\_BILL\\_TYP\\_CD=HB&P\\_BILL\\_NO=180&P\\_BILL\\_DFT\\_NO=&P\\_CHPT\\_NO=&Z\\_ACTION=Find&P\\_SBJ\\_DESCR=&P\\_SBJT\\_SBJ\\_CD=&P\\_LST\\_NM1=&P\\_ENTY\\_ID\\_SEQ=](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W$BSRV.ActionQuery?P_BLTP_BILL_TYP_CD=HB&P_BILL_NO=180&P_BILL_DFT_NO=&P_CHPT_NO=&Z_ACTION=Find&P_SBJ_DESCR=&P_SBJT_SBJ_CD=&P_LST_NM1=&P_ENTY_ID_SEQ=) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011); *Unofficial Votes for House Bill 194*, 129TH GEN. ASSEMB. OF THE STATE OF OHIO, [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/votes.cfm?ID=129\\_HB\\_194](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/votes.cfm?ID=129_HB_194) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
- <sup>203.</sup> Marian McCue, *Republicans Move to Abolish Same-Day Voting Registration*, NEW ME. TIMES, June 1, 2011, <http://www.newmainetimes.org/articles/2011/06/01/republicans-move-abolish-same-day-voting-registration/>.
- <sup>204.</sup> Linda McCulloch, *Existing Law Good for Democracy*, MISSOULIAN, Apr. 13, 2011, [http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/columnists/article\\_19504edc-6a92-11e0-8c93-001cc4c03286.html](http://missoulian.com/news/opinion/columnists/article_19504edc-6a92-11e0-8c93-001cc4c03286.html).
- <sup>205.</sup> Rebekah Metzler, *Maine's Same-Day Voter Registration Ban Signed, Challenged*, PORTLAND PRESS HERALD, June 22, 2011, [http://www.pressherald.com/news/same-day-registration-ban-signed-challenged\\_2011-06-22.html](http://www.pressherald.com/news/same-day-registration-ban-signed-challenged_2011-06-22.html).



206. Mary Lu Carnevale, *Ohio Gets Green Light on Same-Day Registration and Voting*, WALL ST. J.: WASH. WIRE (Oct. 1, 2008, 3:28 PM), <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2008/10/01/ohio-gets-green-light-on-same-day-registration-and-voting/>.
207. *Id.*; Martin Gottlieb, *Vote/Register Overlap Bad in '08, Not in '10*, DAYTON DAILY NEWS: OPINION BLOG (Sept. 28, 2010, 5:56 PM), <http://www.daytondailynews.com/blogs/content/shared-gen/blogs/dayton/opinion/entries/2010/09/28/>.
208. S.B. 657, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2011), available at <http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Sessions/2011/Bills/House/PDF/S657v1.pdf>.
209. Press Release, Legislation and Executive Orders Signed by Governor, John R. Kasich, Governor State of Ohio, July 5, 2011, <http://governor.ohio.gov/Portals/0/pdf/news/07.05.11,%20Bills%20and%20EOs%20signed%206.30%20and%207.1.pdf>; *Unofficial Votes for House Bill 194*, 129TH GEN. ASSEMB. OF THE STATE OF OHIO, [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/votes.cfm?ID=129\\_HB\\_194](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/votes.cfm?ID=129_HB_194) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
210. Press Release, Ohio Sec'y of State, Secretary of State Husted Statement on Signing of Elections Reform Legislation (July 1, 2011), <http://www.sos.state.oh.us/SOS/PressReleases/2011/2011-0701.aspx>.
211. Ann Sanner, *Ohio Election Law Foes OK to Resume Repeal Effort*, CTPOST.COM (Aug. 18, 2011), <http://www.ctpost.com/news/article/Ohio-election-law-foes-OK-to-resume-repeal-effort-2119083.php>.
212. *See Election Reforms Pass the Senate*, WTAM, June 24, 2011, <http://www.wtam.com/cc-common/news/sections/newsarticle.html?feed=122520&article=8751888>; *Toledo Rally Aims to Spread Opposition to Election Bills*, TOLEDO BLADE, July 15, 2011, <http://beta.toledoblade.com/local/2011/07/15/Toledo-rally-aims-to-spread-opposition-to-election-bills.html>.
213. *See* Mark Niquette, *U.S. States Tighten Voting Regulation With Republicans in Charge*, BLOOMBERG, Aug 25, 2011, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-25/republicans-make-drive-to-tighten-state-voting-rules-before-2012-elections.html>.
214. Sanner, *supra* note 211.
215. *See* Niquette, *supra* note 213.
216. *Detailed Bill Information: HB 180*, MONT. LEG., [http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W\\$BSRV.ActionQuery?P\\_BLTP\\_BILL\\_TYP\\_CD=HB&P\\_BILL\\_NO=180&P\\_BILL\\_DFT\\_NO=&P\\_CHPT\\_NO=&Z\\_ACTION=Find&P\\_SBJ\\_DESCR=&P\\_SBJT\\_SBJ\\_CD=&P\\_LST\\_NM1=&P\\_ENTY\\_ID\\_SEQ=](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W$BSRV.ActionQuery?P_BLTP_BILL_TYP_CD=HB&P_BILL_NO=180&P_BILL_DFT_NO=&P_CHPT_NO=&Z_ACTION=Find&P_SBJ_DESCR=&P_SBJT_SBJ_CD=&P_LST_NM1=&P_ENTY_ID_SEQ=) (last visited July 19, 2011); *Unofficial Votes for House Bill 194*, 129TH GEN. ASSEMB. OF THE STATE OF OHIO, [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/votes.cfm?ID=129\\_HB\\_194](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/votes.cfm?ID=129_HB_194) (last visited July 19, 2011).
217. Marc Kovac, *Ohio Senate Postpones Vote on Photo ID Bill*, RECORDPUB.COM (June 24, 2011), <http://www.recordpub.com/news/article/5055667>.
218. Rebekah Metzler, *Same-Day Voter Sign-Up Set Back*, KENNEBEC J., June 9, 2011, [http://www.kjonline.com/news/same-day-voter-sign-up-set-back\\_2011-06-08.html](http://www.kjonline.com/news/same-day-voter-sign-up-set-back_2011-06-08.html).
219. Me. House Democrats, *supra* note 200.
220. Charles E. Summers Jr., *Ending Same-Day Registration Protects 'Integrity of Maine's Elections'*, BANGOR DAILY NEWS, June 2, 2011, <http://bangordailynews.com/2011/06/02/opinion/ending-same-day-registration-protects-%E2%80%98integrity-of-maine%E2%80%99s-elections%E2%80%99/>.
221. *Election Day Voter Registration*, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF ME., <http://www.lwvme.org/EDR.html> (last visited July 13, 2011).
222. NORDEN & ALLEN, *supra* note 63, at 37.
223. Charles S. Johnson, *House Votes to Nix Same-Day Registration*, HELENA INDEP. REC., Feb. 4, 2011, [http://helenair.com/news/article\\_222d75d8-3032-11e0-9e18-001cc4c002e0.html#ixzz1RvmtAFSi](http://helenair.com/news/article_222d75d8-3032-11e0-9e18-001cc4c002e0.html#ixzz1RvmtAFSi).
224. Me. House Democrats, *supra* note 200.
225. Daniel Person, *Lawmakers Give Final OK to Nixing Same-Day Registration*, BOZEMAN DAILY CHRON., Apr. 5, 2011, [http://www.bozemandailychronicle.com/news/article\\_6024bcc0-5f12-11e0-bfed-001cc4c002e0.html](http://www.bozemandailychronicle.com/news/article_6024bcc0-5f12-11e0-bfed-001cc4c002e0.html).

- <sup>226</sup> Susan M. Cover, *Wording of People's Veto Is Set*, PORTLAND PRESS HERALD, July 7, 2009, [http://www.pressherald.com/news/wording-of-peoples-veto-is-set\\_2011-07-07.html](http://www.pressherald.com/news/wording-of-peoples-veto-is-set_2011-07-07.html).
- <sup>227</sup> Eric Russel, *People's Veto of Same Day Registration Ban Will Be Question 1 in November*, September 12, 2011, <http://bangordailynews.com/2011/09/08/politics/people%E2%80%99s-veto-of-same-day-voter-registration-ban-will-be-question-1-in-november/?ref=latest>.
- <sup>228</sup> R. MICHAEL ALVAREZ ET AL., 2008 SURVEY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF AMERICAN ELECTIONS (2009), available at <http://www.vote.caltech.edu/drupal/files/report/Final%20report20090218.pdf>.
- <sup>229</sup> See *Frequently Asked Questions*, EARLY VOTING INFORMATION CENTER, <http://earlyvoting.net/faq> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011); Editorial, *They Want to Make Voting Harder?*, N.Y. TIMES, June 6, 2011, at A20, available at [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/06/opinion/06mon1.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/06/opinion/06mon1.html?_r=1).
- <sup>230</sup> JAN E. LEIGHLEY & JONATHAN NAGLER, PEW CENTER ON THE STATES, THE EFFECTS OF NON-PRECINCT VOTING REFORMS ON TURNOUT, 1972-2008 (2009), [http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewcenteronthestatesorg/Initiatives/MVW/Leighley\\_Nagler.pdf?n=8970](http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewcenteronthestatesorg/Initiatives/MVW/Leighley_Nagler.pdf?n=8970); PAUL GRONKE, ET AL., EARLY VOTING INFORMATION CENTER AT REED COLLEGE, EARLY VOTING AND TURNOUT (2007), available at <http://thecommoninterest.org/docs/Gronke2007.pdf>.
- <sup>231</sup> Tony Barboza, *In O.C., It's a Lot Easier to Vote*, L.A. TIMES, Nov. 2, 2008, <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/nov/02/local/me-ocregistrar2>.
- <sup>232</sup> Benjamin Highton, *Long Lines, Voting Machine Availability, and Turnout: The Case of Franklin County, Ohio in the 2004 Presidential Election*, 39 PS: POL. SCI. & POLS. 65 (2006), available at <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/PSJan2006Highton.pdf>. (estimating that long lines in Franklin County Ohio in 2004 prevented 22,000 citizens from voting).
- <sup>233</sup> A 2005 survey of likely voters showed that 69% of Democrats, 66.4% of Independents and 53.4% of Republicans favored the ballot issue allowing for early voting in Ohio. RAY C. BLISS, THE 2005 OHIO BALLOT INITIATIVES: PUBLIC OPINION ON ISSUES 1-5 (2005), available at <http://www.uakron.edu/bliss/research/archives/2005/finalballotissuereport.pdf>. See also Carol Anne Clark Kelly, *Early Voting: Getting the Jump on Election Day*, NAT'L PUB. RADIO (Nov. 4, 2006), <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6431903>; Jo Becker, *Voters May Have Their Say Before Election Day*, WASH. POST, Aug. 26, 2004, at A01, available at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A33796-2004Aug25.html>.
- <sup>234</sup> See, e.g., Winston Jones, *New Law Shortens Early Voting Period*, TIMES GEORGIAN June 14, 2011, [http://www.timesgeorgian.com/view/full\\_story/14217170/article-New-law-shortens-early-voting-period?instance=west\\_ga\\_news](http://www.timesgeorgian.com/view/full_story/14217170/article-New-law-shortens-early-voting-period?instance=west_ga_news); Kurt Browning, Letter to the Editor, *Pro: New Early Voting Rules Combat Fraud and Protect Voter Access*, FLA. TIMES UNION, May 31, 2011, <http://jacksonville.com/opinion/letters-readers/2011-05-31/story/pro-new-early-voting-rules-combat-fraud-and-protect-voter>.
- <sup>235</sup> Jim Morrill, *House Votes to Shorten Early Voting*, CHARLOTTE OBSERVER, May 19, 2011, <http://www.newsobserver.com/2011/05/19/1208104/house-votes-to-shorten-early-voting.html>; Editorial, *Only the Foolish Limit Early Voting*, NEWS & RECORD, May 18, 2011, [http://www.news-record.com/content/2011/05/17/article/editorial\\_only\\_the\\_foolish\\_limit\\_early\\_voting](http://www.news-record.com/content/2011/05/17/article/editorial_only_the_foolish_limit_early_voting).
- <sup>236</sup> See, e.g., Editorial, *They Want to Make Voting Harder?*, N.Y. TIMES, June 6, 2011, at A20, available at [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/06/opinion/06mon1.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/06/opinion/06mon1.html?_r=1); Joy-Ann Reid, *In Florida, GOP Squeezes Obama-Friendly Voters*, MIAMI HERALD, May 1, 2011, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2011/05/01/2194520/in-florida-gop-squeezes-obama.html>.
- <sup>237</sup> H.B. 1355, 2011 Leg. Sess. (Fla. 2011), available at [http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Documents/loaddoc.aspx?FileName=\\_h1355er.docx&DocumentType=Bill&BillNumber=1355&Session=2011](http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Documents/loaddoc.aspx?FileName=_h1355er.docx&DocumentType=Bill&BillNumber=1355&Session=2011); H.B. 92, 2011 Gen. Assemb. (Ga. 2011), available at <http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/20112012/116254.pdf>; H.B. 850, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2011), available at <http://mlis.state.md.us/2011rs/bills/hb/hb0850f.pdf>; A.B. 311, 76th Leg. (Nev. 2011), available at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/76th2011/Bills/AB/AB311.pdf>; H.B. 352, 50th Leg., 1st Sess. (N.M. 2011), available at <http://www.nmlegis.gov/Sessions/11%20Regular/bills/house/HB0352.pdf>; S.B. 657, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2011) available at <http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Sessions/2011/Bills/Senate/PDF/S657v1.pdf>; H.B. 194, 129th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ohio 2011), available at [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129\\_HB\\_194\\_PS\\_N.html](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_HB_194_PS_N.html); S.B. 772, 107th Gen. Assemb., 2011 Reg. Sess. (Tenn. 2011), available at <http://www.capitol.tn.gov/Bills/107/Bill/SB0772.pdf>; S.B. 581, 80th Leg., 1st Sess. (W. Va. 2011), available at [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill\\_Text\\_HTML/2011\\_SESSIONS/RS/pdf\\_bills/sb581%20ENR.pdf](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2011_SESSIONS/RS/pdf_bills/sb581%20ENR.pdf).

- <sup>238</sup>. H.B. 138, 2011 Gen. Assemb. (Ga. 2011), *available at* <http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/20112012/108934.pdf>; S.B. 1596, 214th Leg. (N.J. 2011), *available at* [http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2010/Bills/S2000/1596\\_I1.pdf](http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2010/Bills/S2000/1596_I1.pdf); H.B. 194, 129th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ohio 2011), *available at* [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129\\_HB\\_194\\_PS\\_N.html](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_HB_194_PS_N.html); A.B. 7, 2011 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Wis. 2011), *available at* <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/2011/data/acts/11Act23.pdf>.
- <sup>239</sup>. H.B. 185, 82d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2011), *available at* <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/82R/billtext/pdf/HB00185H.pdf#navpanes=0>.
- <sup>240</sup>. Patrick Marley, *Bill Affects More than Voter ID, Absentee Ballots Limited, Primary Date Moved in New GOP Version*, MILWAUKEE J.-SENTINEL, Apr. 27, 2011, <http://www.jsonline.com/news/statepolitics/120748279.html>.
- <sup>241</sup>. In-person early voting previously began thirty-five days before an election, and now begins seventeen days beforehand. However, H.B. 194 eliminated voting on Sundays and only allows voting for half of each Saturday, resulting in only eleven early voting days prior to an election. H.B. 194, 129th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. § 3509.01(B) (Ohio 2011), *available at* [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129\\_HB\\_194\\_PS\\_N.html](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_HB_194_PS_N.html).
- <sup>242</sup>. H.B. 194, 129th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ohio 2011), *available at* [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129\\_HB\\_194\\_PS\\_N.html](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_HB_194_PS_N.html).
- <sup>243</sup>. H.B. 194, 129th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. §§ 3509.03, 3509.031 (Ohio 2011), *available at* [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129\\_HB\\_194\\_PS\\_N.html](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_HB_194_PS_N.html).
- <sup>244</sup>. LAWRENCE NORDEN & JESSIE ALLEN, *supra* note 63, at 59.
- <sup>245</sup>. *County, State Officials Reach Resolution in Ohio Battle over Absentee Ballot Applications*, THE REPUBLIC, Sept. 2, 2011, <http://www.therepublic.com/view/story/5279a17cd5224ba6a05d3fe4761aca1f/OH--Ohio-Elections-2012/>.
- <sup>246</sup>. *Id.*
- <sup>247</sup>. 2011 Fla. Laws 40, *available at* [http://laws.flrules.org/files/Ch\\_2011-040.pdf](http://laws.flrules.org/files/Ch_2011-040.pdf); *see also* Justin Levitt, *A Devil in the Details of Florida's Early Voting Law*, ELECTION LAW BLOG (May 23, 2011), <http://electionlawblog.org/?p=18296>.
- <sup>248</sup>. H.B. 92, 2011 Gen. Assemb. (Ga. 2011), *available at* <http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/20112012/116254.pdf>.
- <sup>249</sup>. S.B. 923, 107th Gen. Assemb., 2011 Reg. Sess. (Tenn. 2011), *available at* <http://www.capitol.tn.gov/Bills/107/Bill/SB0923.pdf>.
- <sup>250</sup>. S.B. 581, 80th Leg., 1st Sess. (W. Va. 2011), *available at* [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill\\_Text\\_HTML/2011\\_SESSIONS/RS/pdf\\_bills/sb581%20ENR.pdf](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2011_SESSIONS/RS/pdf_bills/sb581%20ENR.pdf).
- <sup>251</sup>. H.B. 138, 2011 Gen. Assemb. (Ga. 2011), *available at* <http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/20112012/108934.pdf>.
- <sup>252</sup>. S.B. 1596, 214th Leg. (N.J. 2011), *available at* [http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2010/Bills/S2000/1596\\_I1.pdf](http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2010/Bills/S2000/1596_I1.pdf).
- <sup>253</sup>. S.B. 657, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2011), *available at* <http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Sessions/2011/Bills/House/PDF/S657v1.pdf>.
- <sup>254</sup>. S.B. 47, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2011), *available at* <http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Sessions/2011/Bills/Senate/PDF/S47v4.pdf>.
- <sup>255</sup>. In Florida, H.B. 1355 passed the House 77 yeas to 38 nays and the Senate 25 yeas to 13 nays. *CS/CS/HB 1355: Elections*, FLA. HOUSE OF REPS., <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Bills/billsdetail.aspx?BillId=46543&SessionIndex=-1&SessionId=66&BillText=&BillNumber=1355&BillSponsorIndex=0&BillListIndex=0&BillStatuteText=&BillTypeIndex=0&BillReferredIndex=0&HouseChamber=H&BillSearchIndex=0> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011). In Georgia, H.B. 92 passed the House 148 yeas to 20 nays and the Senate 34 yeas to 20 nays. *H.B. 92 Status History*, GA. GEN. ASSEMB., <http://www.legis.ga.gov/legislation/en-US/display.aspx?BillType=HB&Legislation=92> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011). In Ohio H.B. 194 passed the House 59 yeas to 40 nays and the Senate 23 yeas to 10 nays. *Status Report of Legislation: HB 194*, 129th GEN. ASSEMB. OF THE STATE OF OHIO, <http://lsc.state.oh.us/coderev/hou129.nsf/House+Bill+Number/0194?OpenDocument> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011). In Tennessee, S.B. 772 passed the House 75 yeas to 11 nays and the Senate 23 yeas to 3 nays and S.B. 993 passed the House 72 yeas to 9 nays and the Senate 21 yeas to 12 nays. *Bill Information for SB 0772*, TENN. GEN. ASSEMB., <http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=SB0772> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).

- <sup>256</sup>. In West Virginia S.B. 581 was co-sponsored by Democratic Majority Leader John Unger II and Republican Minority Whip Karen L. Facemyer. The bill passed the House 89 yeas to 9 nays and the Senate with 33 yeas and zero nays. *Bill Status: House Bill 581*, W. VA. LEG., [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/bill\\_status/bills\\_history.cfm?year=2011&sessiontype=RS&btype=bill](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/bill_status/bills_history.cfm?year=2011&sessiontype=RS&btype=bill) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
- <sup>257</sup>. JAN E. LEIGHLEY & JONATHAN NAGLER, PEW CENTER ON THE STATES, *THE EFFECTS OF NON-PRECINCT VOTING REFORMS ON TURNOUT, 1972-2008*, 22 at table 1 (2009), [http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewcenteronthestatesorg/Initiatives/MVW/Leighley\\_Nagler.pdf?n=8970](http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewcenteronthestatesorg/Initiatives/MVW/Leighley_Nagler.pdf?n=8970); *Absentee and Early Voting*, NAT'L CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES, <http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=16604>, (last updated Oct. 12, 2010).
- <sup>258</sup>. Winston Jones, *Lawmakers Split on Shortening Early Voting*, TIMES GEORGIAN, Feb. 5, 2011, [http://times-georgian.com/view/full\\_story/11273799/article-Lawmakers-split-on-shortening-early-voting?instance=west\\_ga\\_news](http://times-georgian.com/view/full_story/11273799/article-Lawmakers-split-on-shortening-early-voting?instance=west_ga_news).
- <sup>259</sup>. Editorial, *Cutting Early Voting Is About Money, Not Race*, HERALD SUN, May 20, 2011, [http://www.heraldsun.net/view/full\\_story/13353708/article-Cutting-early-voting-is-about-money--not-race?instance=most\\_commented](http://www.heraldsun.net/view/full_story/13353708/article-Cutting-early-voting-is-about-money--not-race?instance=most_commented).
- <sup>260</sup>. Jones, *supra* note 258.
- <sup>261</sup>. Jim Morrill, *GOP Proposal Would Cut a Week from Early Voting*, CHARLOTTE OBSERVER, Apr. 27, 2011, <http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2011/04/27/2251564/gop-proposal-would-cut-a-week.html#ixzz1RXidbvMJ>.
- <sup>262</sup>. Editorial, *They Want to Make Voting Harder?*, N.Y. TIMES, June 6, 2011, at A20, *available at* [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/06/opinion/06mon1.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/06/opinion/06mon1.html?_r=1).
- <sup>263</sup>. *See, e.g.*, Editorial, *Voting Law's Sunday Punch*, June 15, 2011, HERALD TRIB., <http://www.heraldtribune.com/article/20110615/OPINION/110619722>; Scott Maxwell, *The Real Frauds Are Backers of Bad Election Bill*, ORLANDO SENTINEL, May 10, 2011, [http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-05-10/news/os-scott-maxwell-early-voting-051111-20110510\\_1\\_early-voting-absentee-voting-convenient-voting](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-05-10/news/os-scott-maxwell-early-voting-051111-20110510_1_early-voting-absentee-voting-convenient-voting).
- <sup>264</sup>. H.B. 194, 129th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ohio 2011), *available at* [http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129\\_HB\\_194\\_PS\\_N.html](http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_HB_194_PS_N.html).
- <sup>265</sup>. H.B. 1355, 2011 Leg. Sess. (Fla. 2011), *available at* [http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Documents/loaddoc.aspx?FileName=\\_h1355er.docx&DocumentType=Bill&BillNumber=1355&Session=2011](http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Documents/loaddoc.aspx?FileName=_h1355er.docx&DocumentType=Bill&BillNumber=1355&Session=2011).
- <sup>266</sup>. S.B. 657, 2011 Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (N.C. 2011), *available at* <http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/Sessions/2011/Bills/House/PDF/S657v1.pdf>.
- <sup>267</sup>. Laura Leslie, *Why Ban Sunday Voting?*, WRAL.COM, June 16, 2011, <http://www.wral.com/news/state/nccapitol/blog-post/9737378/>.
- <sup>268</sup>. Joy-Ann Reid, *In Florida, GOP Squeezes Obama-Friendly Voters*, MIAMI HERALD, May 1, 2011, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2011/05/01/2194520/in-florida-gop-squeezes-obama.html>; Dan Tokaji, *Blocking the Vote in Ohio*, INNOVATION OHIO (June 22, 2011), <http://innovationohio.org/blog/guest-post-blocking-the-vote-in-ohio>; Justin Levitt, *A Devil in the Details of Florida's Early Voting Law*, ELECTION LAW BLOG (May 23, 2011), <http://electionlawblog.org/?p=18296>.
- <sup>269</sup>. Laura Leslie, *supra* note 267.
- <sup>270</sup>. Frank Cerabino, *Early Voting Change Might Reduce Black Participation*, PALM BEACH POST, July 6, 2011, <http://www.palmbeachpost.com/news/cerabino-early-voting-change-might-reduce-black-participation-1587638.html>.
- <sup>271</sup>. *Id.*
- <sup>272</sup>. Editorial, *Toledo Rally Aims to Spread Opposition to Election Bills*, TOLEDO BLADE, July 15, 2011, <http://beta.toledoblade.com/local/2011/07/15/Toledo-rally-aims-to-spread-opposition-to-election-bills.html>.
- <sup>273</sup>. Letter from Lee Rowland & Mark A. Posner to Chris Herren, Chief, Voting Section, U.S. Dept. of Justice (July 15, 2011), *available at* [http://brennan.3cdn.net/4713a8395c96f48085\\_p7m6iv6sh.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/4713a8395c96f48085_p7m6iv6sh.pdf).

- <sup>274.</sup> Laura Leslie, *Why Ban Sunday Voting?*, WRAL.COM (June 16, 2011), <http://www.wral.com/news/state/nccapitol/blog-post/9737378/>.
- <sup>275.</sup> JEFF MANZA & CHRISTOPHER UGGEN, *LOCKED OUT: FELON DISENFRANCHISEMENT AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY* 76 (2006).
- <sup>276.</sup> SENTENCING PROJECT, *FELONY DISENFRANCHISEMENT LAWS IN THE UNITED STATES* 1 (Mar. 2011), *available at* [http://sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/fd\\_bs\\_fdlawsinusMar11.pdf](http://sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/fd_bs_fdlawsinusMar11.pdf).
- <sup>277.</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>278.</sup> Christopher Uggen, et al., *Criminal Disenfranchisement*, 1 ANN. REV. L. & SOC. SCI. 307, 319 (2005) (“With the exception of Belgium, the United States stands alone in disenfranchising large numbers of nonincarcerated persons for lengthy or indefinite periods.”).
- <sup>279.</sup> *See, e.g.*, KY. CONST. OF 1792 art. VIII, § 2, *available at* [http://felonvoting.procon.org/sourcefiles/1792\\_KY\\_Constitution.pdf](http://felonvoting.procon.org/sourcefiles/1792_KY_Constitution.pdf).
- <sup>280.</sup> ERIKA WOOD, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, *RESTORING THE RIGHT TO VOTE* 6 (2009), *available at* [http://brennan.3cdn.net/5c8532e8134b233182\\_z5m6ibv1n.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/5c8532e8134b233182_z5m6ibv1n.pdf).
- <sup>281.</sup> *State Based Advocacy*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, [http://www.brennancenter.org/content/pages/state\\_based\\_advocacy](http://www.brennancenter.org/content/pages/state_based_advocacy) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
- <sup>282.</sup> Erika Wood, *Turning Back the Clock in Florida*, HUFFINGTON POST (Mar. 10, 2011, 4:26 PM), [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/erika-wood/turning-back-the-clock-in\\_b\\_834239.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/erika-wood/turning-back-the-clock-in_b_834239.html).
- <sup>283.</sup> Kate Zernike, *Iowa Governor Will Give Felons the Right to Vote*, N.Y. TIMES, June 18, 2005, *available at* <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/06/18/national/18iowa.html>.
- <sup>284.</sup> *See* Gary Fineout, *Study: Fewer Ex-Felons Back in Prison After Rights Restored*, HERALD TRIBUNE, July 21, 2011, <http://htpolitics.com/2011/07/21/study-fewer-ex-felons-back-in-prison-after-rights-restored/>.
- <sup>285.</sup> *Bill Status for SB 243*, ALA. LEG. INFO. SYS. ONLINE, <http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/ACASLoginMac.asp?SESSION=1058> (follow “bills” hyperlink; then follow “status” hyperlink; then search “SB243”) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011); *House Bill 385: History by Legislative and Calendar Date*, MD. GEN. ASSEMB., <http://senate.state.md.us/2011rs/billfile/HB0385.htm> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011); H. 3168, 119th Gen. Assemb., Reg. Sess. (S.C. 2011), *available at* [http://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess119\\_2011-2012/bills/3168.htm](http://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess119_2011-2012/bills/3168.htm); *Bill Information*, S.C. BILL INFO, [http://www.scstatehouse.gov/php/web\\_bh10.php](http://www.scstatehouse.gov/php/web_bh10.php) (search “3168”) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011); *Bill Information*, WASH. ST. LEG., <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?bill=1030#documents> (last visited Aug. 2, 2011); H.B. 2089, 80th Leg., 1st Sess. (W. Va. 2011), *available at* [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/bill\\_status/bills\\_text.cfm?billdoc=hb2089%20intr.htm&yr=2011&sesstype=RS&ci=208](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/bill_status/bills_text.cfm?billdoc=hb2089%20intr.htm&yr=2011&sesstype=RS&ci=208); *Bill Status*, W. VA. LEG., [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/bill\\_status/bills\\_history.cfm?year=2011&sessiontype=RS](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/bill_status/bills_history.cfm?year=2011&sessiontype=RS) (search “Bill Quick Search” for “2089”) (last visited Aug. 2, 2011).
- <sup>286.</sup> FLA. PAROLE COMM’N, *RULES OF EXECUTIVE CLEMENCY* (Mar. 9, 2011), *available at* [https://fpc.state.fl.us/PDFs/clemency\\_rules.pdf](https://fpc.state.fl.us/PDFs/clemency_rules.pdf).
- <sup>287.</sup> Erika Wood, *Restoring the Right to Vote Gains Momentum*, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE (Apr. 9, 2007), [http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/restoring\\_the\\_right\\_to\\_vote\\_gains\\_momentum/](http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/archives/restoring_the_right_to_vote_gains_momentum/).
- <sup>288.</sup> BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, *CRIMINAL DISENFRANCHISEMENT LAWS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES* (2011), [http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/Democracy/USA\\_RTVMAP\\_2011.pdf](http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/Democracy/USA_RTVMAP_2011.pdf).
- <sup>289.</sup> Iowa Exec. Order No. 42 (July 4, 2005), *available at* [http://brennan.3cdn.net/563fe831695be5a1fa\\_nwm6bvbiik.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/563fe831695be5a1fa_nwm6bvbiik.pdf).
- <sup>290.</sup> Letter from Thomas M. Susman, Am. Bar Ass’n Gov’t Affairs Office, to Governor-Elect Terry Branstad, State of Iowa (Jan. 13, 2011), *available at* <http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/Democracy/ABALettertoBranstadonExecutiveOrder42.pdf>.

- <sup>291</sup>. Thomas Beaumont, *Secretary of State Urges Branstad to Rescind Rule on Iowa Felons' Voting Rights*, DES MOINES REG., Jan. 13, 2011, at B2; Paul Flemming, *Felons Must Wait Years for Rights*, FLA. TODAY, Mar. 10, 2011, at B6.
- <sup>292</sup>. Editorial, *A Step Back for Ex-Felons*, PENSACOLA NEWS J., Mar. 21, 2011.
- <sup>293</sup>. Zoheb Hassanali, *Ex-felons May Have a Tougher Time Voting in Iowa*, KTVO (Jan. 13, 2011, 2:02 PM), <http://www.heartlandconnection.com/news/story.aspx?id=566995>.
- <sup>294</sup>. Matthew Hendley, *Rick Scott and Cabinet's Decision for Ex-Con Voting Hurdles Seems Bogus, Study Implies*, BROWARD-PALM BEACH NEW TIMES, July 22, 2011 [http://blogs.browardpalmbeach.com/pulp/2011/07/rick\\_scott\\_cabinet\\_ex\\_felon\\_voting\\_rights\\_florida\\_parole\\_commission\\_study.php](http://blogs.browardpalmbeach.com/pulp/2011/07/rick_scott_cabinet_ex_felon_voting_rights_florida_parole_commission_study.php).

## NEW & FORTHCOMING BRENNAN CENTER PUBLICATIONS

*The Cost of Voter I.D. Laws: What the Courts Say*  
Vishal Agraharkar, Wendy Weiser, and Adam Skaggs

*Reducing Overclassification Through Accountability*  
Elizabeth Goitein and David M. Shapiro

*A Media Guide to Redistricting*  
Erika Wood and Myrna Pérez

*Rethinking Radicalization*  
Faiza Patel

*Promoting Fair & Impartial Courts Through Recusal Reform*  
Adam Skaggs and Andrew Silver

*Meaningful Ethics Reform for the “New” Albany*  
Lawrence Norden, Kelly Williams, and John Travis

*Money, Politics, and the Constitution: Beyond Citizens United*  
Edited by Monica Youn

*Domestic Intelligence: New Powers, New Risks*  
Emily Berman

*A Report Card on New York’s Civic Literacy*  
Eric Lane and Meg Barnette

*Transparent Elections after Citizens United*  
Ciara Torres-Spelliscy

*Criminal Justice Debt: A Barrier to Reentry*  
Alicia Bannon, Mitali Nagrecha, and Rebekah Diller

For more information, please visit [www.brennancenter.org](http://www.brennancenter.org)

BRENNAN  
CENTER  
FOR JUSTICE

*at New York University School of Law*

161 Avenue of the Americas  
12th Floor  
New York, NY 10013  
[www.brennancenter.org](http://www.brennancenter.org)