

**T E S T I M O N Y**

by

**C U R T I S   G A N S**

**D I R E C T O R**

of

**A M E R I C A N   U N I V E R S I T Y ' S**

**C E N T E R   F O R   T H E   S T U D Y   O F   T H E   A M E R I C A N   E L E C T O R A T E**

before

**T H E   S E N A T E   R U L E S   C O M M I T T E E**

**M A R C H   1 1 ,   2 0 0 9**

**O n**

**V o t e r   R e g i s t r a t i o n :   A s s e s s i n g   C u r r e n t   P r o b l e m s**

My name is Curtis Gans. For the past 33 years I have directed, first a non-partisan independent committee and for the past three and a half years a center at American University both devoted to providing data, analysis, public education and, where bi-partisanly possible, public policy approaches to dealing with citizen political engagement and disengagement. The data I have published has been the staple for coverage and analysis of registration and voting for three decades. I have testified frequently before both houses of Congress. I gave research assistance to the Carter/Baker Commission on electoral reform. And in the late 1980s, I created a commission headed by the chairs of the two major parties which provided sufficient consensual agreement on registration confirmation issues to make possible the initial passage of the National Voter Registration Act in the House by a two-thirds majority vote.

I am honored and grateful that the chair and ranking minority member have invited me to testify at this hearing and hope that my testimony will be helpful as you move from deliberation to public policy. I want to make one thing clear at the outset. While I will be highly critical of aspects of our electoral system under consideration today, my comments are in no way to be considered a reflection on the many dedicated men and women who oversee, administer and, in other ways, carry out our elections, the overwhelming majority of whom want to do the very best to ensure both high levels of participation and honorable elections.

The goal of any democratic electoral system is to make possible the maximum voting participation of the citizenry while protecting the integrity of the political process B engendering public faith in both the system and its outcomes.

How far the United States is from those ideals can be seen in three sets of figures.

The first are the numbers 74 and 50. If one corrects for all the anomalies in official registration figures, an educated estimate of the percentage of eligible citizens who are registered is 74 percent. This, in turn, means that more than 50 million American citizens are not registered and cannot vote.

The second set of numbers are 115, 104.2, 103.6 and 100.3. These are the percentage of eligible citizens who are listed on the official registration rolls of the District of Columbia, Alaska, Illinois and South Dakota. Official registration numbers exceed 95 percent in ten other states (Colorado, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, New York, North Carolina and Ohio). If anyone believes these official numbers are accurate, I have a bridge to sell you which crosses the East River in the chairman's home state. There are as many as 20 million names on the registration lists of the several states and the District of Columbia that do not belong on these lists B because they have died or moved or, in a indeterminate number of cases, are not eligible citizens.

The third set of figures are 139 and 172 B the United States rank at the last accounting as 139<sup>th</sup> in the rate of participation among the 172 democracies in the world.

None of these sets of figures can inspire public confidence that our system of registration and voting is anywhere close to the best it can and should be.

Nor can we take comfort in what we have seen in recent elections, including but not limited to:

- Individuals working for non-partisan but Democratic-oriented registration groups who in an excess of partisan zeal place fraudulent names on the registration rolls.
- Individuals working for non-partisan but Republican-oriented registration organizations who in an excess of partisan zeal discard collected registrations if the registrants listed themselves as Democrats.
- Some residents of northern states with homes in Florida registering and voting in both places.
- Registration list purging conducted by non-governmental agencies focused largely only on certain segments of the population.
- Legitimate and long-time voters finding their names removed from registration lists by inaccurate purging.

- Michael Mouse and Richard Tracy appearing on registration lists along with a number of real individuals who are not legally qualified to vote.
- Arbitrary decision-making in very close elections, as in Florida in 2000 and presently in Minnesota, because of uncertainty as to who was entitled to cast ballots and whose ballots should be counted.
- Seven-figure election-day expenditures for monitors, poll watchers and lawyers all primed to swing into aggressive action at the slightest sign that anything might advantage one side or the other.
- Biennial claims of fraud by Republicans, intimidation and suppression by Democrats, all with their grains of truth, all eroding trust in the electoral system.

The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) has propelled modest improvements. Beyond beginning to establish standards for methods of voting, it did mandate the computerization of voting lists that may, at some future date when they are all in place and interoperable, make it more difficult for duplicate registrations and double voting. And it did provide for provisional ballots for those who feel unjustly left off registration lists, but there is no uniform standard for who gets these ballots, which ballots will be counted or who bears the responsibility for the effort and cost of verifying the claim of enfranchisement entitlement

But what we have been doing is patching up a fundamentally flawed system which cannot in its present form be perfected, which is wasting enormous amounts of money and well-meaning human effort and which will not majorly boost enrollment and turnout nor majorly diminish the inaccuracy of the voting lists.

There is a better way which is currently in practice within our neighbor to the south which has transformed what had been one of the most corrupt electoral systems anywhere into one that is respected and trusted by its citizenry.

If we, like they, had a government-provided (and paid for, including outreach and documentation) mandatory biometric identification card and system, every citizen aged 18 and over would be enfranchised and none of the putative fraud (and intimidation and suppression) associated with the current registration system could occur. Voting would be, in this nation as in most other nations, a one-step act. Citizens would no longer need to qualify themselves through registration. All they need do is vote with confidence that their vote will be counted accurately.

This would also substantially reduce the cost of election administration and the complexity of registration list maintenance and verification. And it would likely but not certainly lead to at least a noticeable increase in turnout

The obstacles to such a system are cost and fears, I believe irrational fears, of undue invasion of privacy.

When I investigated these issues and this system for the Carter/Baker Commission, I ascertained that the up-front cost would be \$14 billion. In the best of all possible worlds, we would invest this amount for the betterment of the electoral system of the nation which prides itself on being the greatest democracy in the world.

In the real world, such a level of expenditure tends only to be justified on the grounds of national defense. On the other hand, I believe it can be justified on national defense grounds. For the sine qua non of national defense and homeland security is to know who is in this country and coming into this country.

If this system were adopted, it could have other beneficial applications. It could be a better way of dealing with the immigration issue--the sorting out of who should be given green cards, be on a citizenship track or sent home--then random arrests and a border fence. It could provide for a fully accurate Census without the cost of physical enumeration. It could substantially reduce or eliminate identity theft. It could help with both accurate criminal prosecution and exoneration of those wrongfully prosecuted or incarcerated. It could be used for medical records, social security, Medicare, drivers' licenses, selective service registration and, perhaps, even for commerce. It could unify the many and varied identification programs in place, contemplated or mandated. It will not, however, serve as a cure for halitosis or the common cold.

With respect to privacy concerns, there are three answers. The first is that we have lost almost all of our privacy already, beginning when we allowed our social security numbers to be used for identification in realms other than social security and now much more broadly through the Internet. The second is that for most uses --other than national defense and law enforcement-- there are technologies that put a person's information on the card rather than a database and readers can be programmed to take only the information needed for a given person (i.e. for voting: name, address, citizenship status and, where relevant, party registration). The only way to prevent privacy abuse with respect to national defense and law enforcement is what we already have inadequately in place B criminal penalties for abuse made more detailed and adequate.

The downside risks of such a system are small. The upside benefits great. And, with respect to the issues before this hearing, it would solve virtually all of them and remove all the remaining barriers to full citizen political participation.

Two final points:

I was asked by the minority staff to address the issue of the nexus between registration law and turnout. The broad answer is that this relationship has grown increasingly tenuous. At one time, it could accurately be said that one of the reasons for the lower turnout of the United States as compared to almost all advanced democracies (Switzerland, which referends all its issues of consequence, excepted) was that we were the only nation other than France that made voting a two-step act. In all the other nations, government has been responsible for creating the list of eligible voters, all the citizen had to do was vote. Our citizens (other than those living in North Dakota) had to qualify through registration and, if addresses changed, through re-registration before one could vote. That was once a major barrier which has become profoundly less so now as we have made it progressively easier to both register and vote.

There are many indicators of the increasing lack of connection between registration and voting. We just held an election which produced the third highest turnout since women were given the vote in 1920. Yet, thirteen states recorded lower turnout, including five of the eight states which have election day registration. When election day registration was instituted in four states in 1976, turnout went up by between one and three percentage points in those states. By 1988, turnout was lower than in 1972 prior to the initiation of election day registration in the three states which continued to have election day registration (Oregon had repealed it). When the NVRA was enacted in 1995, registration went up in the two subsequent elections (1996 and 1998) but turnout went down. In the next two elections (2000 and 2002), registration went down but turnout increased. Prior to the voting surges (which I believe to be temporary) in 2004 and 2008, North Dakota which has no registration and thus no registration barriers had a greater turnout decline over the previous three decades than the average for the rest of the nation. In 2008, my home state of Virginia had a record high turnout. Under the same laws this year, a municipal election in the largest town in my home county saw a turnout of 1300 of 25,000 registered citizens. The 2008 presidential primaries produced the third highest turnout ever. The statewide primaries—for governor and U.S. Senate—which were not held on the same day as the presidential primaries produced the lowest turnout ever. It is incandescently clear that the primary determinant of turnout is no longer procedure but motivation. (It should also be noted that France, even with its system of personal registration, has a substantially higher turnout than we do.)

That said I would still prefer that government be responsible for registration, that voting be a one-step act and that the fail-safe way of accomplishing both would be a biometric ID.

My last point is about partisanship. It has been axiomatic among Democrats that because of the demographic profile of those who don't vote, greater turnout benefits them. It has been equally axiomatic among a majority of Republicans that the best electoral event that could happen to them is rain on election day—that the lower the turnout the better their chances. There may have been a time when these axioms were valid, but that time has long passed. Both axioms are demonstrably wrong. Three of the highest turnout presidential elections in the last 75 years occurred in 1952, 1968 and 2004 when the GOP won. Two of the lowest turnout elections during the same period were 1948 and 1996 when the Democrats won. There is a similar pattern for mid-term elections. In 1980, 1984 and 2004, there could have been 10 million additional voters and the winners of those elections--Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush-- would have won by even larger margins.

Elections are now decided by political and societal conditions, perceptions of the candidates and their respective records and messages.

When, in 1988, the ad hoc commission that I created, headed by the chairs of the two major parties, reached agreement on a bi-partisanly acceptable method of cleaning the registration lists, that result was handed to the chair and ranking minority member of the House Election Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee, Reps. Al Swift and Bill Thomas. Within a matter of days, what had been seen as a partisan bill sponsored by Rep. Swift became the Foley-Gingrich bill, sponsored by the speaker of the House and its minority whip and it passed by a two-thirds vote. That bill was the framework for NVRA. It achieved its high-level bi-partisan sponsorship not simply because there was a resolution to the registration confirmation issue, but

because Gingrich and Thomas believed and, I think, still believe that the Republican Party would not achieve a durable majority status without appealing to the whole of the electorate.

What I hope is that as this committee and its counterpart in the other house deliberate legislative changes to the current registration and voting system, they do so in the same spirit of bipartisanship which existed in 1988—one in which partisan interests are not sacrificed but cooperation for the common good is emphasized. We are, after all, talking about the electoral underpinnings of the most important democracy in the world.

\*

\*

\*

(I have appended a few illustrative charts and one explanation of the difficulty one finds in dealing with official registration statistics.

**Turnout Trend:** The number and percentage of eligible citizens who voted for President in elections since 1920.

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Citizens Eligible</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Percent of Eligible Voted</b>	<b>Pct. Pt. Dif.</b>	<b>Adj Pct * Voted</b>
2008	208,323,000	131,257,542	63.0	2.4	
2004	201,780,000	122,265,430	60.6	6.4	
2000	194,327,000	105,399,313	54.2	2.8	
1996	187,437,000	96,277,872	51.4	-6.9	
1992	179,048,000	104,428,377	58.3	5.0	
1988	171,855,000	91,594,805	53.3	-2.6	
1984	165,727,000	92,659,600	55.9	1.2	
1980	158,111,000	86,515,221	54.7	-0.3	
1976	148,419,000	81,555,889	55.0	-2.1	
1972	136,228,000	77,718,554	57.1	-3.9	
1968	119,955,000	73,211,875	61.0	-1.0	
1964	113,979,000	70,645,592	62.0	-2.8	64.9
1960	106,188,000	68,838,219	64.8	3.6	67.8
1956	101,295,000	62,026,908	61.2	-2.5	63.9
1952	96,607,000	61,550,918	63.7	10.5	66.8
1948	91,689,000	48,793,826	53.2	-2.2	56.2
1944	86,607,000	47,976,670	55.4	-6.8	58.8
1940	80,248,000	49,900,418	62.2	1.3	66.1
1936	75,013,000	45,654,763	60.9	3.5	63.5
1932	69,295,000	39,758,759	57.4	0.5	61.4
1928	64,715,000	36,805,951	56.9	8.6	61.2
1924	60,334,466	29,095,023	48.2	0.1	51.9
1920	55,441,000	26,762,613	48.3		52.2

\* Prior to 1964, African-Americans in the south were considered eligible voters but were almost universally unable to vote until the Voting Rights Act became law in 1965 because of Jim Crow laws. The percentages in this column are based on subtracting the Census Bureau's estimate of southern African-Americans from the overall citizen-eligible population for the nation and interpolating between Censuses and dividing the vote for President by these interpolated figures. This probably provides a more accurate turnout percentage of those who could actually vote but for the purposes of consistency, all percentage in the text are based on citizen-eligible vote as explained in the notes below without this adjustment.

## 3. Convenience Voting and Turnout

State	2008			2004			2008 - 2004		Early Voting	No Excuse Absentee	EDR
	2008 VAP	2008 Turnout	2008 % VAP Voted	2004 VAP	2004 Turnout	2004 % VAP Voted	Pt Diff	% Diff			
DC	371,000	265,853	71.66	388,000	227,586	58.66	13.00	22.17			
NC	6,423,000	4,310,789	67.11	6,161,000	3,501,007	56.83	10.29	18.11	X	X	
SC	3,224,000	1,920,969	59.58	3,102,000	1,617,730	52.15	7.43	14.25			
GA	6,302,000	3,924,440	62.27	6,028,000	3,298,790	54.72	7.55	13.79		X	
VA	5,560,000	3,723,260	66.97	5,339,000	3,198,360	59.91	7.06	11.78			
MS	2,151,000	1,289,865	59.97	2,107,000	1,139,826	54.10	5.87	10.85			
AL	3,394,000	2,099,819	61.87	3,343,000	1,883,415	56.34	5.53	9.81			
IN	4,586,000	2,751,054	59.99	4,509,000	2,468,002	54.74	5.25	9.60			
CO	3,219,000	2,401,349	74.60	3,118,000	2,129,630	68.30	6.30	9.22	X	X	
NV	1,642,000	967,848	58.94	1,500,000	829,587	55.31	3.64	6.58	X	X	
MD	4,064,000	2,630,947	64.74	3,906,000	2,384,214	61.04	3.70	6.06		X	
NM	1,346,000	830,158	61.68	1,296,000	756,204	58.35	3.33	5.70	X	X	
DE	630,000	412,398	65.46	603,000	375,190	62.22	3.24	5.21			
AZ	4,117,000	2,293,475	55.71	3,800,000	2,012,585	52.96	2.74	5.18	X	X	
NJ	5,904,000	3,868,237	65.52	5,787,000	3,611,691	62.41	3.11	4.98		X	
RI	790,000	469,767	59.46	771,000	437,134	56.70	2.77	4.88			
MT	731,000	490,109	67.05	703,000	450,434	64.07	2.97	4.64		X	
MO	4,328,000	2,925,205	67.59	4,227,000	2,731,364	64.62	2.97	4.60			
MA	4,625,000	3,080,985	66.62	4,556,000	2,905,360	63.77	2.85	4.46		X	
CA	22,319,000	13,561,900	60.76	21,306,000	12,419,857	58.29	2.47	4.24		X	
TX	14,886,000	8,077,795	54.26	14,189,000	7,410,749	52.23	2.04	3.90	X		
IL	8,540,000	5,523,051	64.67	8,466,000	5,275,415	62.31	2.36	3.79			
TN	4,512,000	2,599,749	57.62	4,378,000	2,437,319	55.67	1.95	3.50	X		
FL	12,923,000	8,390,744	64.93	12,124,000	7,609,810	62.77	2.16	3.44	X	X	
ID	1,024,000	655,032	63.97	967,000	598,376	61.88	2.09	3.37		X	X
PA	9,450,000	5,995,107	63.44	9,318,000	5,765,764	61.88	1.56	2.53			
KS	1,968,000	1,235,872	62.80	1,939,000	1,187,756	61.26	1.54	2.52		X	
CT	2,518,000	1,649,399	65.50	2,466,000	1,578,769	64.02	1.48	2.32			
NE	1,243,000	801,281	64.46	1,233,000	778,186	63.11	1.35	2.14		X	
WA	4,489,000	3,036,878	67.65	4,313,000	2,859,084	66.29	1.36	2.05		X	
NY	12,653,000	7,594,813	60.02	12,563,000	7,391,036	58.83	1.19	2.03			
HI	918,000	453,158	49.36	885,000	429,013	48.48	0.89	1.83		X	
WY	388,000	254,658	65.63	376,000	243,428	64.74	0.89	1.38		X	X
MI	7,490,000	5,001,766	66.78	7,323,000	4,839,252	66.08	0.70	1.05			
IA	2,201,000	1,537,123	69.84	2,175,000	1,506,908	69.28	0.55	0.80	X	X	X
AR	2,065,000	1,086,617	52.62	2,015,000	1,054,945	52.35	0.27	0.51			
ND	485,000	316,621	65.28	481,000	312,833	65.04	0.24	0.38	X	X	
VT	495,000	325,046	65.67	477,000	312,309	65.47	0.19	0.29		X	
OH	8,562,000	5,698,260	66.55	8,458,000	5,627,903	66.54	0.01	0.02		X	
NH	1,016,000	710,970	69.98	968,000	677,662	70.01	-0.03	-0.04			X
KY	3,147,000	1,826,508	58.04	3,085,000	1,795,860	58.21	-0.17	-0.30			
AK	476,000	326,197	68.53	453,000	312,598	69.01	-0.48	-0.69	X	X	X
MN	3,824,000	2,910,369	76.11	3,685,000	2,828,370	76.75	-0.65	-0.84			X
LA	3,338,000	1,960,761	58.74	3,278,000	1,943,106	59.28	-0.54	-0.91			
OK	2,561,000	1,462,661	57.11	2,528,000	1,463,758	57.90	-0.79	-1.36		X	
UT	1,578,000	952,370	60.35	1,511,000	927,844	61.41	-1.05	-1.71		X	
WI	4,183,000	2,983,417	71.32	4,061,000	2,998,007	73.82	-2.50	-3.39		X	X
SD	573,000	381,975	66.66	562,000	388,215	69.08	-2.42	-3.50		X	
OR	2,615,000	1,827,864	69.90	2,528,000	1,836,782	72.66	-2.76	-3.80	X		
ME	1,048,000	731,163	69.77	1,010,000	740,748	73.34	-3.57	-4.87		X	X
WV	1,428,000	713,362	49.96	1,415,000	755,659	53.40	-3.45	-6.46	X		

**Overall Registration:** The chart below represents CSAE’s best estimate of the number and percentage of eligible citizens who were registered this year and in past years. (See note 3.)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Estimated Number and Percent Registered</b>	
2008	154,576,000	74.2
2004	143,000,000	71.0
2000	133,780,000	68.0
1996	132,000,000	70.0
1992	123,649,000	68.4
1988	116,820,000	67.0
1984	114,750,000	68.8
1980	103,500,000	65.9
1976	95,850,000	66.0
1972	92,700,000	68.7
1968	81,000,000	70.3
1964	78,300,000	72.1
1960	74,250,000	70.9

## Total Registration as a Percentage of VAP - Citizen 2008 vs 2004 - 2000

## Registration Races

State	2008 VAP	2008 Turnc	2008 % VA	2004 VAP	2004 Turnc	2004 % VAI	+/-08-04 Pr	2000 VAP	2000 Turnc	2000 % VA	+/-08-00 Pc
AL	3394000	3010638	88.7	3343000	2843111	85.05	3.65	3284000	2889772	88	0.7
AK	476000	495731	104.15	453000	469042	103.54	0.61	425000	581347	136.79	-32.64
AZ	4117000	3441141	83.58	3800000	2896748	76.23	7.35	3437000	2654700	77.24	6.34
AR	2065000	1684290	81.56	2015000	1685527	83.65	-2.09	1959000	1555809	79.42	2.14
CA	22319000	17304091	77.53	21306000	16557273	77.71	-0.18	20154000	15707307	77.94	-0.41
CO	3219000	3203583	99.52	3118000	3065227	98.31	1.21	3007000	2858239	95.05	4.47
CT	2518000	2097635	83.31	2466000	2102941	85.28	-1.97	2408000	2031626	84.37	-1.06
DE	630000	602726	95.67	603000	553917	91.86	3.81	571000	503672	88.21	7.46
DC	371000	426761	115.03	388000	383919	98.95	16.08	408000	431816	105.84	9.19
FL	12923000	11247634	87.04	12124000	10301290	84.97	2.07	11205000	8752717	78.11	8.93
GA	6302000	5755750	91.33	6028000	4248802	70.48	20.85	5718000	4648205	81.29	10.04
HI	918000	691356	75.31	885000	647238	73.13	2.18	847000	637349	75.25	0.06
ID	1024000	861869	84.17	967000	684936	70.83	13.34	900000	728085	80.9	3.27
IL	8540000	8849117	103.62	8466000	7499488	88.58	15.04	8393000	8940544	106.52	-2.9
IN	4586000	4514804	98.45	4509000	4286858	95.07	3.38	4421000	4000809	90.5	7.95
IA	2201000	2169682	98.58	2175000	2106658	96.86	1.72	2147000	1969199	91.72	6.86
KS	1968000	1749756	88.91	1939000	1687896	87.05	1.86	1906000	1623623	85.18	3.73
KY	3147000	2906809	92.37	3085000	2794286	90.58	1.79	3013000	2722557	90.36	2.01
LA	3338000	2945619	88.25	3278000	2889981	88.16	0.09	3207000	2782929	86.78	1.47
ME	1048000	1027585	98.05	1010000	1023956	101.38	-3.33	965000	1064368	110.3	-12.25
MD	4064000	3430364	84.41	3906000	3105370	79.5	4.91	3723000	2980950	80.07	4.34
MA	4625000	4220488	91.25	4556000	4098634	89.96	1.29	4479000	4000218	89.31	1.94
MI	7490000	7470764	99.74	7323000	7164047	97.83	1.91	7131000	6861342	96.22	3.52
MN	3824000	3203835	83.78	3685000	2975125	80.74	3.04	3525000	2801077	79.46	4.32
MO	4328000	4205774	97.18	4227000	4206423	99.51	-2.33	4110000	3676664	89.46	7.72
MT	731000	672961	92.06	703000	638474	90.82	1.24	671000	698260	104.06	-12
NE	1243000	1157034	93.08	1233000	1160199	94.1	-1.02	1221000	1085272	88.88	4.2
NV	1642000	1446027	88.06	1500000	1071101	71.41	16.65	1339000	878970	65.64	22.42
NH	1016000	954913	93.99	968000	855861	88.42	5.57	910000	856519	94.12	-0.13
NJ	5904000	5378792	91.1	5787000	5005969	86.5	4.6	5659000	4710768	83.24	7.86
NM	1346000	1192969	88.63	1296000	1051536	81.14	7.49	1238000	928931	75.03	13.6
NY	12653000	12031312	95.09	12563000	11837068	94.22	0.87	12474000	11262816	90.29	4.8
NC	6423000	6287992	97.9	6161000	5502937	89.32	8.58	5862000	5186094	88.47	9.43
OH	8562000	8302900	96.97	8458000	7979630	94.34	2.63	8337000	7537822	90.41	6.56
OK	2561000	2184084	85.28	2528000	2143978	84.81	0.47	2491000	2233602	89.67	-4.39
OR	2615000	2166866	82.86	2528000	2141243	84.7	-1.84	2428000	2136719	88	-5.14
PA	9450000	8758031	92.68	9318000	8315974	89.25	3.43	9166000	7781997	84.9	7.78
RI	790000	680651	86.16	771000	687488	89.17	-3.01	749000	661295	88.29	-2.13
SC	3224000	2553923	79.22	3102000	2256745	72.75	6.47	2960000	2349863	79.39	-0.17
SD	573000	574632	100.28	562000	552441	98.3	1.98	547000	520881	95.23	5.05
TN	4512000	3977586	88.16	4378000	3730058	85.2	2.96	4224000	3400487	80.5	7.66
TX	14886000	13575062	91.19	14189000	13098329	92.31	-1.12	13404000	12365235	92.25	-1.06
UT	1578000	1432525	90.78	1511000	1278251	84.6	6.18	1435000	1303603	90.84	-0.06
VT	495000	454466	91.81	477000	444077	93.1	-1.29	456000	427354	93.72	-1.91
VA	5560000	5034660	90.55	5339000	4517980	84.62	5.93	5086000	4071471	80.05	10.5
WA	4489000	3629898	80.86	4313000	3514078	81.48	-0.62	4114000	3335714	81.08	-0.22
WV	1428000	1212117	84.88	1415000	1168694	82.59	2.29	1400000	1067822	76.27	8.61
WY	388000	244818	63.1	376000	232396	61.81	1.29	362000	220012	60.78	2.32
Overall:	2.02E+08	1.81E+08	90.03	1.95E+08	1.69E+08	86.85	3.19	1.88E+08	1.62E+08	86.45	3.58

**Adjusted Registration:**

**ADJUSTED REGISTRATION**  
 (Gross Registration Minus Inactive Lists Comparison 2008 -- 2004)

State	2008 Nov Citizen VAP	2008 Gross Reg.	2008 Gross Reg. % VAP	2004 Gross Reg. % VAP	% Pt Diff Gross Reg. 2008-2004	2008 Inactive Registration	2008 Adjusted Registration	2008 Adjusted % VAP	2004 Adjusted % VAP	% Pt Diff Adj Registration 2008-2004
AL	3,394,000	3,010,638	88.70%	85.38%	3.33	169,443	2,841,195	83.71%	78.30%	5.42
AZ	4,117,000	3,441,141	83.58%	76.21%	7.37	453,690	2,987,451	72.56%	69.53%	3.03
AR	2,065,000	1,684,240	81.56%	84.36%	-2.8	319,499	1,364,741	66.09%	74.23%	-8.14
CO	3,219,000	3,203,583	99.52%	99.49%	0.04	621,394	2,582,189	80.22%	77.14%	3.07
GA	6,302,000	5,755,750	91.33%	85.14%	6.2	570,838	5,184,912	82.27%	73.47%	8.8
IL	8,540,000	8,825,639	103.34%	103.76%	-0.42	1,125,384	7,700,255	90.17%	85.00%	5.17
NY	12,653,000	12,031,312	95.09%	94.22%	0.86	1,214,812	10,816,500	85.49%	84.66%	0.83
SD	573,000	574,632	100.28%	98.30%	1.99	45,170	527,830	92.12%	89.37%	2.75
TN	4,512,000	3,977,586	88.16%	85.62%	2.54	395,845	3,581,741	79.38%	76.57%	2.81
TX	14,886,000	13,575,062	91.19%	92.31%	-1.12	1,898,044	11,677,018	78.44%	77.53%	0.91
UT*	1,578,000	1,584,669	100.42%	100.78%	-0.36	266,575	1,318,094	83.53%	84.64%	-1.11
VA	5,560,000	5,034,660	90.55%	84.58%	5.97	121,689	4,912,971	88.36%	78.28%	10.08
WA	4,489,000	3,629,898	80.86%	78.15%	2.71	401,651	3,228,247	71.91%	67.72%	4.19
Total	58,445,000	54,653,614	93.51%	92.48%	1.03	6,911,251	47,740,731	81.68%	79.35%	2.33

**Registration:** The registration figures for the individual states in the back of this report are final, official, certified by the chief election officer of each state and totally unreliable. At least four states have reported registration levels in excess of their eligible population. Several more are close. (Note there are no figures for North Dakota which has no registration and Mississippi and Wisconsin whose statewide figures always come late and the figures for Iowa and Maine, both election day registration states, are almost final and unofficial).

In any given election the official registration figures provided by the states are inaccurate because they contain the names of people who have either died or moved but have not been removed from the registration rolls. The degree of inaccuracy in any given state would pend both on when they conducted a list cleaning and how thorough such a list cleaning was. A state which conducted a thorough list cleaning close to an election would likely have fewer names that were not eligible. Prior to the enactment of the National Voter Registration Act (the so-called motor-voter law), it was at least possible to make a national estimate of registration which would be, on the average, ten percent lower than the official figures provided by the states.

But the NVRA mandated that states must keep even those who have moved or died on their registration rolls for at least two federal elections, even if the people whose names have remained on the rolls have been determined to have moved or died. And, this, in turn, accounts for the substantially higher official figures than prior to the NVRA's implementation.

While states cannot remove names, they can transfer those for whom they have evidence have died or moved to an inactive list, which they are required by the NVRA to report each biennium by March of the year following a national election. A truer picture can be gleaned from the chart above which compares registration rates based on official figures and rates based on official figures minus those kept on inactive lists. The charts on registration and partisan registration in the summary charts below represent the Committee's best estimate of what actual registration is likely to be, based on the states which have provided final and official registration figures at the time of this report. (Three additional considerations when looking at these statistics: 1. Only 28 states and the District of Columbia have partisan registration and the partisan registration percentages estimated below are based on the raw registration figures. There are no similar corrective inactive lists for partisan registrants and it is likely that were there, the estimates for partisan registration percentages below would be smaller in each category. 2. The percentages of Democratic, Republican and Other registrations do not add up to 100 percent. The balance is unregistered. 3. The partisan percentages are taken from raw official data and thus do not yield the same totals as do the overall percentages).