



COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
CHAIRPERSON ZOE LOFGREN (D-CALIF.)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

REPORT ON

Voting Rights and Election Administration in the United States of America

PREPARED BY CHAIRPERSON MARCIA L. FUDGE (D-OHIO)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction.....	1
The Subcommittee on Elections	2
Findings.....	4
Conclusion	10

CHAPTER ONE

Voting Rights in America Before Shelby County v. Holder (2013)

America’s Founding.....	11
Post-Civil War Reconstruction and the Rise of the Jim Crow Era	14
The Civil Rights Era and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.....	17
Reauthorizations of and Amendments to the Voting Rights Act.....	23
The Constitutionality and Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act and its Provisions..	27
Shelby County and the Undermining of the Voting Rights Act.....	29

CHAPTER TWO

The State of Voting Rights and Election Administration post-Shelby County

The Current Landscape.....	31
Voter Suppression Efforts Across America.....	39
Conclusion	83

CHAPTER THREE

Obstacles Faced by Native American Voters

Background.....	85
Voting Rights Act Protections for Native Americans.....	88
Ongoing Barriers Faced by Native Americans	89
Lack of Access to the Polls and Resources.....	103
Vote Dilution.....	105
Language Access.....	106
Conclusion	108

CHAPTER FOUR

Election Administration Barriers Hindering the Right to Vote

General Election Administration.....	109
Continued Disenfranchisement of American Citizens.....	119
Misinformation and Disinformation	125

Climate Disaster Response	126
Conflicts of Interest: Candidates as Election Administrators	127
Conclusion	129

CONCLUSION

The Purpose of the Subcommittee’s Hearings	130
Findings.....	131
Moving Forward	137
The Role of Congress.....	137

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

“Voting is the right that is ‘preservative of all rights,’ because it empowers people to elect candidates of their choice, who will then govern and legislate to advance other rights.”

— Kristen Clarke, Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

In 1965, following years of suppression, discrimination, protest, and a fight for equality that led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (“Voting Rights Act”).¹ The Voting Rights Act was created to address long entrenched racial discrimination in voting, “an insidious and pervasive evil which had been perpetuated in certain parts of our country through unremitting and ingenious defiance

of the Constitution.”² The Voting Rights Act protected the American people from racial discrimination in voting for nearly 50 years. In 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States (“the Court”) struck down portions of the 2006 Voting Rights Act reauthorization in *Shelby County v. Holder* (“*Shelby County*”), leaving American voters vulnerable to tactics of suppression and discrimination.³ In the aftermath of the Court’s decision, the duty of Congress remains unchanged – the Legislative Branch is entrusted with protecting the right to vote for every eligible American. This is as essential today as it was in 1965.

In North Dakota, Native Americans, this land’s first inhabitants, have been forced to obtain identification cards they would never have otherwise needed, or face being stripped of their right to vote. In advance of the 2018 election, tribes went to great lengths to ensure tribal members could vote, often producing ID cards for free, working overtime, to ensure members who did not otherwise have a home address had what they needed to vote. The resulting turnout for tribal members in the 2018 election was higher due to these efforts. However, crisis is not—nor should it be—a “get out the vote” strategy.

Less than two months after the Court struck down the preclearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act, North Carolina state legislators wasted no time passing an omnibus “monster law.” State Senator Tom Apodaca (then-Chairman of the North Carolina Senate Rules Committee) said the State did not want the “legal headaches” of preclearance if it was not necessary to determine which portions of the proposal would be subject to federal scrutiny, “so, now we can go with the full bill,” he added. He predicted an omnibus voting bill would surface in the

1 Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-110, 79 Stat. 437.

2 *Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 133 S.Ct. 2612, 2618 (2013), citing *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 309.

3 *Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 133 S.Ct. 2612 (2013).

Senate the next week that could go beyond voter ID to include issues such as reducing early voting, eliminating Sunday voting, and barring same-day voter registration.⁴

These are just two examples of the many egregious stories the Subcommittee on Elections heard as it convened hearings across the country examining the state of voting rights and election administration in America.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

At the outset of the 116th Congress, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi and Committee on House Administration Chairperson Zoe Lofgren reconstituted the Committee on House Administration's Subcommittee on Elections, which House Republicans eliminated six years earlier. The Subcommittee is now chaired by Congresswoman Marcia L. Fudge of Ohio. The Subcommittee planned to take Congress to the American people, engage with voters, stakeholders, officials and election administrators, and collect testimony and evidence on the state of voting rights and election administration to ensure every eligible American has equal and fair access to the ballot and the confidence their ballot is counted as cast.

The Subcommittee reviewed the landscape of voting in America post-*Shelby County* to determine whether Americans can freely cast their ballot. The Subcommittee examined arbitrary barriers that have been erected to impede access and block ballots from being counted. The wide-ranging and voluminous testimony received by the Subcommittee form the basis of this report.

Writing for the majority in the 5-4 *Shelby County* decision, Chief Justice John Roberts acknowledged that “voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that.”⁵ However, the Court held that Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act was unconstitutional and the coverage formula could “no longer be used as a basis for subjecting jurisdictions to preclearance.”⁶ Chief Justice Roberts held that “nearly 50 years later things have changed dramatically. . . . The tests and devices that blocked ballot access have been forbidden nationwide for over 40 years.⁷ . . . The [15th] Amendment is not designed to punish for the past; its purpose is to ensure a better future. To serve that purpose, Congress—if it is to divide the States—must identify those jurisdictions to be singled out on a basis that makes sense in light of current conditions.”⁸

To collect the contemporaneous evidence called for by the Chief Justice, the Subcommittee on Elections worked over the first 10 months of the 116th Congress, traveling across the country to meet voters where they live and vote. Hearings were held in Atlanta, Georgia; Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, North Dakota; Halifax County, North Carolina; Cleveland, Ohio; Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Birmingham, Alabama; Phoenix, Arizona; and Washington,

4 *NC Voter Bill Moving Ahead with Supreme Court Ruling*, WRAL.com (June 25, 2013), <https://www.wral.com/nc-senator-voter-id-bill-moving-ahead-with-ruling/12591669/>.

5 *Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 133 S.Ct. 2612, 2619 (2013).

6 *Id.* at p. 2631.

7 *Id.* at p. 2625.

8 *Id.* at p. 2629.

District of Columbia. An inaugural listening session was also held in Brownsville, Texas. The Subcommittee called more than 60 witnesses, gathered several thousand pages of testimony, documents, and transcripts, and hours of oral testimony were delivered before Members of the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee heard testimony describing polling place closures; frequent polling place movements; cutbacks and restrictions on early voting; voter ID requirements that disenfranchise targeted populations; purges of otherwise eligible voters from the registration rolls; the enormous expense of enforcing the Voting Rights Act through Section 2 litigation; the disenfranchisement of millions of formerly incarcerated Americans; and a lack of access to multilingual ballots and assistance, among the many voter suppressive laws implemented by states post-*Shelby County*. The Subcommittee heard a common refrain across the country that poverty and a lack of access to adequate transportation are significant barriers to voting that, when coupled with state-sponsored voter suppression, can lead to a complete deprivation of the franchise.

The Subcommittee's work took place in six states formerly covered, partially or completely, by the Section 4(b) formula and Section 5 preclearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act, and two states that were never covered. The Subcommittee visited states where there had been reports of barriers to voting in the years since *Shelby County* to get a sense of how Congress can help every American exercise his or her right to vote. For example, North Dakota and Ohio were never required to preclear their voting changes with the Department of Justice. As the Subcommittee found, this does not render the state's voters immune to voter suppression and election administration issues.

In North Dakota, Members heard testimony on issues unique to the Native American communities. The North Dakota legislature passed a voter ID law that disproportionately impacted Native Americans, effectively creating a poll tax and forcing voters to get IDs they would not otherwise need. The North Dakota field hearing also included witnesses and testimony regarding issues in South Dakota, which was a partially covered state under the Voting Rights Act.⁹

Ohio was recently a progressive voting state, after correcting issues from the 2004 election that left voters "effectively disenfranchised" in the words of one court.¹⁰ The state implemented 35 days of in-person early voting and effectively created a week of early, same-date voter registration, dubbed "Golden Week." In 2014, Ohio changed course, reducing early voting hours and days, eliminating Golden Week, and reducing early voting locations, all while constantly altering the rules and procedures around voting and implementing an aggressive voter purge system.

The hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Elections, detailed in this report, show the right to vote is not yet shared equally among all Americans. As a nation, we have made significant progress, but it is apparent more remains to be achieved before America truly

⁹ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

¹⁰ See *Ohio State Conference of the NAACP et al. v. Husted et. al.*, 786 F.3d 524, 531 (6th Cir. 2014).

becomes the democracy she strives to be. The right to vote is fundamental to American democracy, yet our country has struggled to provide full, free, and fair access to the ballot box to all her citizens. As we see with each passing election, the struggle is far from over, and matters have too often worsened since *Shelby County*. Since then, voters have gone to the polls without the full protection of the Voting Rights Act for three federal elections, with a fourth rapidly approaching.

FINDINGS

During the field hearings, the Subcommittee heard testimony from lawyers, advocates, elected officials, tribal officials, and voters about the array of tactics used to suppress the votes of targeted communities. Some are more overt than others, but all have the same effect of erecting barriers that impede the free exercise of the right to vote.



Figure 1: Marchers cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge on the march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama on what became known as “Bloody Sunday” in 1965.

Chapter One of this report outlines the state of voting rights and access to the ballot before the Court significantly undermined the Voting Rights Act in *Shelby County*. On March 7, 1965, Americans were forced to confront the vicious and persistent reality of racially-motivated voter discrimination. On Bloody Sunday, marchers on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama were attacked with clubs, whips, and tear gas by state troopers and local lawmen on their 54-mile journey to Montgomery to call attention to the Black struggle for full and equal voting rights. Shortly after Selma, President Lyndon B. Johnson called on Congress to act.

On August 6, 1965, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law, 95 years after the 15th Amendment first granted Black men the right to vote and 45 years after the 19th Amendment granted women the right to vote. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act applied a nationwide ban on the denial or abridgment of the right to vote based on race or color, and was later amended to include language minorities.¹¹ Section 4(b) became known as the “coverage formula,” setting forth the criteria for determining which states and localities were covered under the

11 L. Paige Whitaker, *Statement for Hearing on “History and Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act of 1965,”* CRS Testimony TE10033, Testimony for Committee on Judiciary, Subcomm. on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Justice (Mar. 12, 2019), *citing* codified as amended at 52 U.S.C. §§ 10301, 10303(f) and Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1975, Pub. L. No. 94-73.

preclearance provisions of Section 5.¹² Sections 4(e) and 4(f)(4), along with portions of Section 2, ensure access for limited-English proficiency voters.¹³ Section 5, the “preclearance” provision, required states with a history of discrimination in voting to submit all voting changes for approval by the federal government or judiciary to determine whether they would be discriminatory prior to implementation.¹⁴

Under Sections 4(b) and 5, Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia were all covered in their entirety. California, Florida, New York, North Carolina, South Dakota, and Michigan each had counties and townships covered under the Voting Rights Act, but were not wholly covered.

Initially scheduled to expire in 1970, Congress voted to amend and expand the Voting Rights Act five times: in 1970, 1975, 1982, 1992, and 2006. The Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 passed the House overwhelmingly, the Senate unanimously, and was signed into law by President George W. Bush, extending the Voting Rights Act until 2032.¹⁵

During the time preclearance was in effect, the Department of Justice reviewed thousands of voting changes, objecting to hundreds that would have a discriminatory effect and limited access to the vote had they been implemented.¹⁶ According to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (“USCCR”) 2018 Minority Voting Report, from 2006-2013, the Department of Justice issued 30 objections to voting changes. Furthermore, the Department of Justice sent 144 letters informing jurisdictions that the information provided in their submission was insufficient and the Attorney General required more information.¹⁷ Testimony heard by the USCCR and the Subcommittee on Elections illustrated how the process forced jurisdictions to rethink their changes and amend proposals that would have been discriminatory.¹⁸

In 2013, Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act was successfully challenged in *Shelby County*. The Court’s decision struck down Section 4(b) as unconstitutional, effectively rendering Section 5’s preclearance requirements obsolete and undermining critical enforcement provisions of the Voting Rights Act. Congress has since failed to enact legislation restoring the necessary protections to ensure every American can access the ballot without discrimination and undue barriers. The struggle for free and fair access to the right to vote continues. The poll taxes and literacy tests of pre-1966 may be gone, but without the full protection of Sections 4(b) and 5 of the Voting Rights Act, the nation has seen the development of a new generation of poll taxes and discriminatory tactics.

12 L. Paige Whitaker, *Statement for Hearing on “History and Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act of 1965,”* CRS Testimony TE10033, Testimony for Committee on Judiciary, Subcomm. on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Justice (Mar. 12, 2019), <https://www.crs.gov/Reports/TE10033?source=search&guid=7714a4e4d65c4dfc871ec1865b13ca5a&index=0#fn9>.

13 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 28-29, https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/Minority_Voting_Access_2018.pdf.

14 *Id.*

15 *Id.* at p. 37.

16 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 28, *citing* DOJ Response to USCCR Interrogatory No. 22.

17 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 28.

18 *Id.* at p. 245.

Chapter Two of this report explores how undermining the Voting Rights Act has made casting a ballot more difficult. The various sections of this chapter cover overt tactics of voter suppression, the more subtle tactics that lead to suppression, and a new generation of voter suppression. This chapter explores the most common voter suppression tactics discussed during the Subcommittee’s field hearings, many of which have become more pervasive post-*Shelby County*, as there is no longer any check on these practices.

While the evidence collected by the Subcommittee shows many legacy voter suppression tactics are still pervasive, a new wave of surreptitious tactics has also emerged. To suppress the vote, states have aggressively purged otherwise eligible voters from the voter registration rolls, made cuts to early voting and same-day registration, moved, closed, or consolidated polling places without adequate notice to voters, required exact name or signature match, engaged in discriminatory gerrymandering, and restricted language access and assistance, among other devices. Some of these tactics could be viewed as issues of election administration, and while that may be accurate, when combined with other insidious measures or when allowed to persist without consideration for their discriminatory impact, these changes undeniably result in voter suppression.

Except for North Dakota, which does not have voter registration, Members of the Subcommittee heard evidence of states purging otherwise eligible voters from the voter rolls. Time and again, purging voters from the registration rolls is billed as “list maintenance” and a necessary measure to combat “voter fraud.” However, there is no credible evidence of voter fraud in American elections. Nevertheless, a 2018 study by the Brennan Center for Justice (“Brennan Center”) found that between 2014 and 2016, states purged more than 16 million voters from the rolls.¹⁹ An updated analysis found that at least 17 million voters were purged nationwide between 2016 and 2018.²⁰

Persistent cutbacks and restrictions to early voting opportunities result in longer lines and wait times on Election Day. These cutbacks also disenfranchise those who cannot make it to the polls. Voters who work hourly jobs cannot take multiple hours



Figure 2: Lines of voters waiting outside the Cuyahoga County Board of Elections, Cleveland, Ohio, to cast their ballot on Election Day in 2016; provided by Inajo Davis Chappell at the Ohio Field Hearing.

19 Jonathan Brater, Kevin Morris, Myrna Perez, and Christopher Deluzio, *Purges: A Growing Threat to the Right to Vote*, Brennan Center for Justice (2018), https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/Purges_Growing_Threat_2018.1.pdf.

20 Kevin Morris, *Voter Purge Rates Remain High, Analysis Finds*, Brennan Center for Justice (Aug. 1, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/voter-purge-rates-remain-high-analysis-finds>.

off on a workday to stand in line to vote. Additionally, signature match and exact name match requirements can disenfranchise voters, sometimes without their knowledge. In Florida, reports during the 2018 election demonstrated that voters' ballots were rejected for failing to match signatures without any notification sent to voters, providing no opportunity for the voter to correct the signature or contest the rejection.²¹ In Georgia, thousands of voter registrations were put on hold because the name on the registration form did not exactly match specific government records.²²

Laws requiring voters to show specific forms of ID have, unfortunately, become a common voter suppression tactic. In nearly every state, the Subcommittee heard testimony regarding issues with state-imposed voter ID laws. In Texas, North Dakota, and Alabama, witnesses testified that voter IDs are financially burdensome, disproportionately impact minority voters, and effectively impose a poll tax.²³ In North Carolina, the state's attempt to implement a voter ID law was struck down. Subsequently, voter ID was placed on the ballot as a measure and passed as a state constitutional amendment.²⁴ The state legislature passed implementing legislation and subsequently overrode the Governor's veto. The law is currently being challenged in court but remains in effect for the 2020 election.²⁵

Another obstacle is lack of access to multi-lingual ballots, even when required under the Voting Rights Act, as well as assistance at the polls for those who are not proficient in English. In August 2018, a group of voting rights advocacy organizations sued the Florida Secretary of State and the Supervisors of Elections in 32 Florida counties for violating the Voting Rights Act's requirement to provide bilingual voting materials and assistance for Spanish-speaking U.S. citizens.²⁶

Finally, the Subcommittee heard testimony at every field hearing describing how reactive litigation under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is prohibitively expensive, lengthy, and ineffective at combating voter disenfranchisement. In Texas, Georgia, and North Carolina specifically, the Subcommittee heard testimony describing how the loss of preclearance created an environment in which litigators and stakeholders are forced to expend significant resources to play what was described as a "whack-a-mole" defense against persistent, discriminatory voting changes.²⁷ Moreover, it is now nearly impossible to know all the voting changes made by states and monitor their potential discriminatory effect without the benefit of Section 5 preclearance. In North Carolina, USCCR Vice-Chair Patricia Timmons-Goodson

21 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

22 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

23 *Voting Rights and Election Administration*: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), *see* hearing transcripts for Texas, North Dakota, and Alabama.

24 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), testimony of State Senate Minority Leader Dan Blue.

25 Elizabeth Thompson, *Judges won't block voter ID law for 2020, but lawsuit will continue*, The News & Observer, (July 19, 2019), <https://www.newsobserver.com/news/politics-government/article232078502.html>.

26 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); testimony of Juan Cartagena; *see also* Christiaan Perez and Jenifer Fenton, *Voting rights advocates sue to bring bilingual elections to 32 Florida counties*, LatinoJustice (Aug. 16, 2018), <https://www.latinjustice.org/en/news/voting-rights-advocates-sue-bring-bilingual-elections-32-florida-counties>.

27 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Texas, Georgia, and North Carolina*: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

testified there is no longer a database of the changes made in the most at-risk jurisdictions, making it much more difficult to track, combat, and evaluate the impact of changes made to voting laws.²⁸

Chapter Three focuses on issues that particularly affect Native American voters.

North Dakota is unique for being the only state with no voter registration – a citizen may simply arrive at the polls on Election Day and cast a ballot.

In 2013, North Dakota required voter IDs to contain the voter’s residential address, and expressly excluded Post Office Box numbers as an acceptable form of address. This law, and specifically the residential address requirement, has a disproportionately negative impact on Native American voters.²⁹

While the State of North Dakota claims tribal IDs qualify under its law, most tribal IDs do not include a residential address. This is due, in part, to the fact that the United States Postal Service does not provide residential delivery in these rural Native American communities, forcing most tribal members to rely on a Post Office Box instead. If a tribal ID has an



address, it is typically the Post Office Box, which does not satisfy North Dakota’s restrictive voter ID law. Further, Native Americans as a group are disproportionately homeless and – due to overcrowding in homes, the prevalence of transience, and inconsistent addresses – identifying a consistent, accurate address for an ID remains a challenge.³⁰

The voter ID law effectively created a poll tax on Native American voters. A tribal ID generally comes at a fee to cover the costs of printing and provide income for the Tribe. Alysia LaCounte, General Counsel for the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, testified that the unemployment rate on the Turtle Mountain Reservation hovers near 70 percent: “\$15 for an ID is milk and bread for a week for a poor family.”³¹ Many North Dakota Tribes waived these fees so their members could vote in the 2018 midterm election. This equated to an

28 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), testimony of Patricia Timmons-Goodson.

29 Matthew L. Campbell, Jacqueline De León, *Brakebill, et al. v. Jaeger (ND Voter ID Law)*, <https://www.narf.org/cases/nd-voter-id/>.

30 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), see hearing report.

31 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), testimony of Alysia LaCounte.

unfunded mandate on the Tribes despite their status as sovereign entities with a trust and treaty relationship with the federal government, not the state.³²

In Arizona, tribal leaders and advocates attested to the difficulties tribal members face when voting on reservations. Rural reservation voters often do not have traditional mailing addresses, creating difficulties in registering to vote, receiving and returning mail-in ballots, and accessing consolidated polling locations when unsure of where to vote. Additionally, access to properly translated voting materials for Native-language speaking voters, as well as proper assistance at the polls, poses a challenge for Native voters. Since *Shelby County*, the state of Arizona has closed hundreds of polling locations, moving toward vote-by-mail and voting centers, which has significantly impacted Native American voters given their heavy reliance on Post Office Boxes, long distances to mail services, and the demonstrated cultural significance of in-person voting on Election Day.³³

Chapter Four examines how the administration of elections can be improved to ensure that all eligible voters are able to cast their ballots.

General election administration issues existed prior to the *Shelby County* decision, but they are also barriers to voting, especially when compounded with the suppressive, discriminatory tactics deployed in states across the country. A lack of compliance with the National Voter Registration Act (“NVRA”) inhibits voters’ ability to register to vote. Inconsistent poll worker training and lack of adequate resources can lead to erratic enforcement of voting laws, disenfranchise voters, and lead to the overuse of provisional ballots. Proper poll worker training can make the difference between a voter being denied access to a ballot, casting a provisional ballot, or being turned away completely. Provisional ballots do serve a purpose, giving voters an alternative if prevented from casting a traditional ballot, but they can also disenfranchise voters when misused.

Several states have attempted to force voters to provide proof of citizenship before they are allowed to register to vote. Alabama is one of four states that have attempted to require documentary proof of citizenship when registering to vote, as have Arizona, Kansas, and Georgia. Generally, a sworn statement is considered sufficient to prove citizenship. In Arizona, the state’s insistence on requiring documentary proof of citizenship has led to a two-tiered registration system after the Court said states could not require proof of citizenship on the federal voter registration form. An ongoing federal lawsuit has partially blocked the implementation of the unilateral policy decision made by then-Election Assistance Commission (“EAC”) Executive Director Brian Newby allowing Alabama, Georgia, and Kansas to require applicants using the federal voter registration form to provide documentary proof of citizenship.³⁴

32 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), testimony of Tribal leaders and designees.

33 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

34 Max Feldman and Peter Dunphy, *The State of Voting Rights Litigation (March 2019)*, Brennan Center for Justice (Mar. 25, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/state-voting-rights-litigation-march-2019>, *see also League of Women Voters v. Newby* (D.D.C., No. 1:16-cv-00236; D.C. Cir. No. 16-5196).

Millions of Americans are disenfranchised after states strip them of their right to vote following a felony conviction. The Subcommittee heard testimony at multiple hearings about barriers to re-enfranchisement for formerly incarcerated individuals.³⁵ In various states and D.C., witnesses testified that requiring repayment of fines and fees before re-enfranchisement was a significant burden on low-income and minority Americans. The full impact of efforts to roll back Florida’s restoration of voting rights is not yet known, but a report in the Sun Sentinel found that Florida’s new law could cost formerly incarcerated persons with a felony conviction more than \$1 billion in past fines and fees in just three South Florida counties to regain their right to vote.³⁶ Mandating otherwise eligible Americans pay all fines and fees before regaining their right to vote, a right they never constitutionally lost, is effectively a modern-day poll tax.

The 2016 and 2018 elections opened a new frontier of voter suppression – the dissemination of misinformation and disinformation by both foreign and domestic actors specifically targeting minority voters to sow division and depress turnout. A bipartisan report by the Senate Intelligence Committee found the Russian Internet Research Agency’s social media influence campaign during the 2016 election made an extraordinary effort to target Black Americans, using a variety of tactics to suppress Democratic turnout on an array of social media platforms.³⁷ The use of fake accounts and bots to spread false information continues and remains a concern for upcoming elections.

The increasing frequency and intensity of natural disasters require effective climate disaster responses to ensure voters displaced by these events are not disenfranchised because of missed voter registration deadlines or polling locations moved due to damage. Finally, conflicts of interest arising from candidates serving as both arbiter and candidate has occurred in multiple elections and raises questions of voter confidence in the process.

CONCLUSION

The federal government has a responsibility to protect the right to vote of every eligible American. Congress must take full stock of the evidence before it, acknowledge widespread voter fraud does not exist, recognize the barriers preventing our constituents from voting, and act to remove them. This report details the Subcommittee’s findings to enable Congress to move forward in ensuring the unimpeded right to vote for all Americans.

The right to vote is at the core of what it means to participate in our democracy, and it must be protected.

35 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida and Alabama: Hearings Before the Subcommittee. on Elections, 116th Cong.* (2019).

36 Dan Sweeney, *South Florida felons owe a billion dollars in fines – and that will affect their ability to vote*, South Florida Sun Sentinel (May 31, 2019), <https://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/politics/fl-ne-felony-fines-broward-palm-beach-20190531-5hxf7mveyree5cjhk4xr7b73v4-story.html>.

37 Scott Shane and Sheera Frenkel, *Russian 2016 Influence Operation Targeted African-Americans on Social Media*, N.Y. Times (Dec. 17, 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/17/us/politics/russia-2016-influence-campaign.html>.

CHAPTER ONE

Voting Rights in America Before Shelby County v. Holder (2013)

AMERICA'S FOUNDING

At her founding, America claimed a commitment to equality. Yet in practice, not all men, nor women, were treated equally. In declaring independence from the British Crown in 1776, the founders wrote:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed...”³⁸

For more than two centuries, America has struggled to achieve racial equality. During the writing of the Constitution in 1787, the practice of slavery was widespread in many parts of America and would persist for nearly 80 years. During the first apportionment for the House of Representatives, while indentured servants were counted as whole persons, enslaved people were each counted as three-fifths of a person, and “Indians not taxed” were not counted.³⁹

In 1857, the Court held in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* that, even if enslaved people were freed, the formerly enslaved and their descendants were each legally three-fifths of a person and not to be recognized as citizens.⁴⁰ On January 1, 1863, as the Civil War raged on, President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, declaring “that all persons held as slaves” in the rebelling states, “are, and henceforward shall be free.”⁴¹ However, the Proclamation only

38 U.S. Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776), National Archives, *transcription available at* <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>.

39 U.S. Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 2, National Archives, *transcription available at* <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>.

“Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons.”

40 *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 (1857).

“In the opinion of the court, the legislation and histories of the times, and the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show, that neither the class of persons who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then acknowledged as a part of the people, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument.”

41 President Abraham Lincoln (Jan. 1, 1863), Transcript of the Proclamation, National Archives, *transcript available at* <https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured-documents/emancipation-proclamation/transcript.html>.

“That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.”

freed those enslaved persons held in states that had seceded from the Union, leaving enslaved those living in border states.⁴²

Slavery was abolished nationwide in 1865, with the passage and ratification of the 13th Amendment,⁴³ though other vestiges of slavery persisted. In 1868, the 14th Amendment established that all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens and forbade states from denying any person due process or equal protection under the law.⁴⁴ The 15th Amendment, ratified in 1870, guaranteed all United States citizens the right to vote regardless of “race, color, or previous condition of servitude,”⁴⁵ and gave Congress the power to enforce the amendment through appropriate legislation.⁴⁶ However, the 15th Amendment did not guarantee the right to vote based on gender. Collectively, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments are known as the “Reconstruction Amendments.”

As Black voter registration and participation soared in the post-Civil War Reconstruction Era, efforts to dampen the effects of the Reconstruction Amendments began, resulting in a backlash that would limit access to voting for Black Americans for decades.

Other minority groups also faced restrictions to their citizenship and voting rights. In 1884, the Court held in *Elk v. Wilkins* that the 14th Amendment did not provide citizenship to Native Americans.⁴⁷ Not until 1924, with the passage of the Indian Citizenship Act, did Native Americans gain full citizenship and voting rights without impairing the right to remain a member of their tribe.⁴⁸ As late as 1948, Arizona and New Mexico had state laws expressly barring many Native Americans from voting.⁴⁹ In 1962, Utah became the last state to remove formal barriers and guarantee voting rights for Native American peoples.⁵⁰ As detailed in this report, Native Americans still face discrimination and barriers to freely exercising their right to vote.

The United States government has also systematically denied citizenship to Asian Americans. Not until 1898, with the Court’s decision in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, was it made clear

42 National Archives, Online Exhibits, *The Emancipation Proclamation*, <https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured-documents/emancipation-proclamation>.

43 U.S. Const. amend. XIII, sec. 1.

“Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

44 U.S. Const. amend. XIV, sec. 1.

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

45 U.S. Const. amend. XV, sec. 1.

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

46 *Id.* at sec. 2.

“The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

47 *Elk v. Wilkins*, 112 U.S. 94 (1884).

48 Indian Citizenship Act, Pub. L. No. 68-175, 43 Stat. 253, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to issue certificates of citizenship to Indians.

49 Peter Dunphy, *The State of Native American Voting Rights*, Brennan Center for Justice (Mar. 13, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/state-native-american-voting-rights>.

50 *Id.*

that children of non-White immigrants were entitled to birthright citizenship.⁵¹ In the 1920s, the Court held in two cases that Asian immigrants were not “free White people” and therefore ineligible for naturalized citizenship.⁵² Not until the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943 and the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952 were all Asian Americans granted the right to become citizens and therefore eligible to vote.⁵³

Women also faced restrictions to their citizenship and voting rights. Women did not gain the right to vote until 1920, with the ratification of the 19th Amendment.⁵⁴ However, ratification did not fully extend that right to all women. Native American women did not have citizenship, nor did many Asian women, and Black women still faced post-Reconstruction, Jim Crow Era discrimination at the polls.

To this day, more than 4.4 million residents of the U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia still do not have full voting rights and representation equal to that of their counterparts living in the 50 states.⁵⁵ Residents of the U.S. Virgin Islands (“USVI”), the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (“CNMI”) (collectively “the Territories”), along with the District of Columbia (“D.C.”), can each select one Delegate (or in the case of Puerto Rico, the Resident Commissioner) to send to the House of Representatives. However, that Delegate or Resident Commissioner does not have the same voting privileges in the House of Representatives as other Members of Congress, and their constituents do not have any representation in the Senate. Together, the Territories and D.C. have a combined population nearly equal to that of Delaware, South Dakota, North Dakota, Alaska, Vermont, and Wyoming.⁵⁶ Those states have a combined six Members of Congress and 12 Senators, while in contrast the Territories and D.C. have no voting representation in Congress. In 1961, the 23rd Amendment gave D.C. residents the right to vote for President and Vice President.⁵⁷ Residents of the Territories can still only vote for President and Vice President in the primary election, not in the general election.

51 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States*, 2018 Statutory Report (Sept. 2018) at p. 17, citing *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U.S. 649, 705 (1884).

52 Terry Ao Minnis and Mee Moua, *50 Years of the Voting Rights Act: The Asian American Perspective*, Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC (Aug. 4, 2015), <https://www.advancingjustice-aaajc.org/sites/default/files/2016-09/50-years-of-VRA.pdf>.

“Early in America’s founding, naturalization was limited to only “free White persons.” Two key Court cases from the 1920s – *Ozawa v. U.S.* and *U.S. v. Thind* – held that Asian immigrants were not free White people and therefore, ineligible for naturalized citizenship. Federal policy barred immigrants of Asian descent from becoming U.S. citizens through legislation such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 (prohibiting immigration of Chinese laborers) and the Immigration Act of 1924 (banning immigration from almost all countries in the Asia Pacific region). It was not until 1943 with the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, that persons of Chinese origin were granted the ability to naturalize. Most other Asians were granted the ability to naturalize by 1952 through the McCarran-Walter Act (Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952) and subsequent amendments in 1965.”

53 *Id.*

54 U.S. Const. amend. XIX, sec. 1.

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”

55 Aaron Steckelberg and Chiqui Esteban, *More than 4 million Americans don’t have anyone to vote for them in Congress*, The Washington Post (Sept. 28, 2017), https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2017/national/fair-representation/?utm_term=.40b8e64885f8.

56 *Id.*

57 U.S. Const. amend. XXIII.

“The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct: A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to

POST-CIVIL WAR RECONSTRUCTION AND THE RISE OF THE JIM CROW ERA

Following the Civil War, America entered what became known as the “Reconstruction Era.” From 1865 to 1877, the country attempted to address the inequities of slavery and its legacy while reuniting with the 11 states that had seceded from the Union.⁵⁸ Passage of the Reconstruction Amendments paved the way for the first Black Members of Congress to take their seats in 1870.

Hiram Rhodes Revels was elected to fill a vacant Senate seat from Mississippi by the state Senate and Joseph H. Rainey was elected to fill a vacant seat in the House of Representatives in the South Carolina delegation.⁵⁹ Black officials were elected at all levels of government and began to be appointed to federal positions, including as ambassadors, Census officials, customs appointments, U.S. Marshals and Treasury agents, and more.⁶⁰ In many former Confederate states, Black officeholders were elected in large numbers during the Reconstruction period, including: Alabama (167), Georgia (108), Louisiana (210), Mississippi (226), North Carolina (180), and South Carolina (316).⁶¹

The Reconstruction Amendments led to Black voter registration rates that surpassed White registration rates in Louisiana, South Carolina, and Mississippi.⁶² In Alabama and Georgia, Black citizens were nearly 40 percent of all registered voters.⁶³ In the 1868 presidential election, more than 700,000 Black citizens voted for the first time.⁶⁴ As more Black Americans gained access to the franchise, a more representative government began to take shape.

This exercise of power and voting freedom did not go unchallenged. In 1866, President Andrew Johnson wrote, “This is a country for White men, and by God, as long as I am President, it shall be a government for White men.”⁶⁵ The Ku Klux Klan (“KKK”), a White supremacist terrorist organization, was founded in Tennessee in 1866 and soon embarked on a “reign of terror” across the South, including lynchings, bombings, and assassinations of

which the District would be entitled if it were a state, but in no event more than the least populous state; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the states, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a state; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.”

58 Eric Foner, *Reconstruction*, Encyclopedia Britannica (last updated: Aug. 21, 2019), <https://www.britannica.com/event/Reconstruction-United-States-history>.

59 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 5, citing Jennifer E. Manning and Colleen J. Shogan, *African American Members of the United States Congress: 1870-2012*, CRS Report RL30378 at p. 4.

60 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 5, citing Eric Foner, *Freedom’s Lawmakers: A Directory of Black Officeholders during Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996) at p. xv.

“In many of the former Confederate states, hundreds of black officeholders were elected in the Reconstruction period, including Alabama (167), Georgia (108), Louisiana (210), Mississippi (226), North Carolina (180), and South Carolina (316).”

61 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 5.

62 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 16, citing Anderson Bellegarde François, *To Make Freedom Happen: Shelby County v. Holder, the Supreme Court, and the Creation Myth of American Voting Rights*, 34 N. ILL. U. L. REV. 529, 543 (2014).

63 *Id.*

64 *Id.*

65 The Nat’l Constitution Center, *Andrew Johnson: The most-criticized president ever?* (July 31, 2019), <https://constitutioncenter.org/blog/marking-the-passing-of-maybe-the-most-criticized-president-ever>.

political leaders.⁶⁶ The KKK was not the only White supremacist organization formed at the time, and horrific violence against Black Americans spread at a shocking rate.⁶⁷

White supremacist organizations are far from a relic of the past. The Southern Poverty Law Center (“SPLC”) tracks more than 1,600 extremist groups operating across the country. According to their “Hate Map,” there were 1,020 hate groups operating in the United States in 2018.⁶⁸ This list includes many of the hate groups, individuals, and symbols present at the deadly Charlottesville, Virginia White supremacist rally in August 2017.⁶⁹

Reconstruction came to an end in 1877. Following the disputed presidential election of 1876 and the Compromise of 1877, the government removed the remaining federal troops from the South.⁷⁰ Once federal oversight was removed, southern legislatures began passing laws that institutionalized racial segregation and racial discrimination that suppressed the voting rights of minorities, solidifying White dominance in the political structure, and giving rise to what would become known as the Jim Crow Era.

States, predominantly southern,⁷¹ organized state constitutional conventions with the express intent of enacting policies that would prevent Black Americans from voting. Operating without federal involvement, Mississippi led the way with a new state constitution enacted in 1890.⁷² Although the 15th Amendment did not allow for direct disenfranchisement, Mississippi enacted a discriminatory poll tax that disproportionately burdened Black Americans, as well as a literacy test requiring those seeking to register to vote to read a portion of the state constitution and explain it, subject to the discretion of the county clerk, who was nearly, if not always, White.⁷³ The barriers were not limited to poll taxes and literacy tests. South Carolina followed with a constitutional convention in 1895 that adopted a two-year residence requirement, a poll tax, a literacy test, or ownership of property worth \$300, and

66 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 6, citing Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988) at p. 342.

67 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 7.

“In one Louisiana parish, a mob destroyed the Republican newspaper and drove the editor out of town before turning on the local Black population and killing 200. A local sheriff in Camilla, Georgia, led an armed group of 400 Whites to attack a Black election parade and then track down and kill many who had fled to the countryside. In Louisiana alone in the presidential election year of 1868, an estimated 1,081 persons, most of them Black, were killed by state Democrats. The number of Blacks killed in southern cities was likewise shocking: 46 in Memphis and 34 in New Orleans in 1866, 25-30 in Meridian, Mississippi, and 34 in Vicksburg in 1875, and 105 in Colfax, Louisiana on Easter Sunday, 1873.”

68 Southern Poverty Law Center, *Hate & Extremism*, <https://www.splcenter.org/issues/hate-and-extremism> and Hate Map, <https://www.splcenter.org/hate-map>.

69 Southern Poverty Law Center, *The People, Groups, and Symbols at Charlottesville* (Aug. 17, 2017), <https://www.splcenter.org/news/2017/08/15/people-groups-and-symbols-charlottesville>, see also *Remarks by President Trump on Infrastructure, The White House* (Aug. 15, 2017), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-infrastructure/>. Saying there “were very fine people, on both sides” present that day in Charlottesville.

70 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 16.

71 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 8-9 (see Table 2 in source report).

72 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 8.

73 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 17.

the disqualification of convicts.⁷⁴ In the former Confederacy, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia enacted similar barriers.⁷⁵

The state-adopted literacy tests disproportionately disenfranchised Black Americans. For example, at the time these tests were being implemented, over 70 percent of Black citizens were illiterate, compared to less than 20 percent of White citizens.⁷⁶ However, states exempted prior (White) registrants and veterans of the Civil War and other wars from literacy test requirements. Black voters also faced significant violence and overt intimidation when attempting to register and vote.⁷⁷

The effects were significant. For example, in Alabama, only 3,000 of the 181,471 voting-age Black males were registered in 1900. In Louisiana, there were 130,344 Black citizens registered to vote in 1896 – that number dropped to 5,320 by 1900.⁷⁸

Black Americans were not the only targets of Jim Crow Era voter suppression during this period. Native Americans and Asian Americans were also denied equal voting rights. Additionally, in New York, newly arriving citizens from Puerto Rico had their voting rights hindered by complex English-literacy tests.⁷⁹

Some progress was made through litigation.⁸⁰ In 1944, the Court invalidated the Texas “White primary” in *Smith v. Allwright*.⁸¹ White primaries were primary elections in the South where only White voters could vote. Because of the power of the primary process, White primaries essentially prevented Black voters from having any significant effect on elections despite their ability to vote in the general election.⁸²

74 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 8.

75 *Id.* at p. 8-9.

76 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 18, citing Warren M. Christopher, *The Constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act of 1965*, 18 STAN. L. REV. 1, 1 (1965).

77 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 9.

“Between 1884 and 1900, 2,500 lynchings were reported nationwide and most victims were black. While the barbarism occurred in both North and South, the largest numbers of lynchings occurred in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Louisiana.”

78 *Id.*

79 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 18, citing Juan Cartagena, *Latinos and Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act: Beyond Black and White*, 18 Nat’l Black L.J. 201, 206 (2005); see also Voting Rights: Hearings on H.R. Doc. No. 6400 Before Subcomm. No. 5 of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 508-17 (1965) (statement of U.S. Rep. Herman Badillo, Judge Vidal Santaella, and community activist Gilberto Gerena-Valentin); see also *United States v. Cty. Bd. of Elections of Monroe Cty.*, 248 F. Supp. 316, 317 (W.D.N.Y. 1965) (invalidating New York State’s English-language literacy test, holding Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act prohibiting the condition of Puerto Rican’s voting rights on speaking English to be constitutional, and noting that though the Voting Rights Act was “[b]orn out of the civil rights problems currently plaguing the [S]outh ... this Act ... was not designed to remedy deprivations of the franchise in only one section of the country. Rather, it was devised to eliminate second-class citizenship wherever present.”).

80 For more case law see also *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301 (1966), citing

“The course of subsequent Fifteenth Amendment litigation in this Court demonstrates the variety and persistence of these and similar institutions designed to deprive Negroes of the right to vote. Grandfather clauses were invalidated in *Guinn v. United States*, 238 U. S. 347, and *Myers v. Anderson*, 238 U. S. 368. Procedural hurdles were struck down in *Lane v. Wilson*, 307 U. S. 268. The White primary was outlawed in *Smith v. Allwright*, 321 U. S. 649, and *Terry v. Adams*, 345 U. S. 461. Improper challenges were nullified in *United States v. Thomas*, 362 U. S. 58. Racial gerrymandering was forbidden by *Gomillion v. Lightfoot*, 364 U. S. 339. Finally, discriminatory application of voting tests was condemned in *Schnell v. Davis*, 336 U. S. 933; *Alabama v. United States*, 371 U. S. 37; and *Louisiana v. United States*, 380 U. S. 145.”

81 *Smith v. Allwright*, 321 U.S. 649 (1944).

82 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 19, citing 321 U.S. 649, 664 (1944); see also O. Douglas Weeks, *The White Primary: 1944-1948*, 42 AM. POL. SCI. REV. 500-10, n.3 (1948) (noting that white primaries were primary elections in the South where only White voters were allowed to vote.

Some states, including Texas, actively defied federal court orders. The Court had repeatedly held that Texas' all-White primary violated the 14th Amendment. The Court first ruled the primary violated the Constitution in 1927 and then again in 1932. The Court was confronted by Texas' actions again in 1953 after the state tried to circumvent the 15th Amendment with another variant of the all-White primary.⁸³

The courts proved insufficient in combating discrimination and enforcing the right to vote.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ERA AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The voting barriers erected in the late-19th and early 20th centuries demonstrated that protections were needed to ensure full access to the right to vote for all Americans. As discriminatory laws were struck down through litigation, new discriminatory laws were implemented to take their place. Federal action proved to be the only remedy.

The Civil Rights Movement began in the 1950s. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 sought to protect voting rights, giving the Attorney General authority to sue local election officials in jurisdictions with a pattern of discriminating against voters and secure preventative relief.⁸⁴ This removed the burden from private individuals to sue at their own expense and outlawed intimidation, threats, or coercion that interfered with the right to vote.⁸⁵

This law proved insufficient. Reports from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, established under the 1957 Civil Rights Act, documented the persistent discrimination faced by Black voters.⁸⁶ The Commission held a hearing in Jackson, Mississippi, where it found Black voter registration was declining and outlined the barriers, such as poll taxes and registration tests, experienced by Black voters.⁸⁷

Since the Democratic Party dominated Southern elections, positions were often determined during the party's primary elections since there was little chance of a Democrat losing in a general election. Therefore, White primaries essentially prevented Black voters from having any significant effect on elections in the South despite their ability to vote in general elections.)

83 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States*, 2018 Statutory Report (Sept. 2018) at p. 19, *see also* *Nixon v. Herndon*, 273 U.S. 536 (1927); *Nixon v. Condon*, 286 U.S. 73 (1932); and *Terry v. Adams*, 345 U.S. 461 (1953).

84 The Civil Rights Act of 1957, Pub. L. No. 85-315, 71 Stat. 634, pt. IV, § 131(c).

“Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of any right or privilege secured by subsection (a) or (b), the Attorney General may institute for the United States or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proper proceeding for preventative relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order. In any proceeding hereunder the United States shall be liable for the costs the same as a private person.”

85 The Civil Rights Act of 1957, Pub. L. No. 85-315, 71 Stat. 634, pt. IV, § 131(b).

“No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any other person for the purpose of interfering with the right of such other person to vote or to vote as he may choose, or of causing such other person to vote for, or not to vote for, any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, Delegates or Commissioners from the Territories or possession, at any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any such candidate.”

86 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States*, 2018 Statutory Report (Sept. 2018), *citing* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report Book 1: Voting, (1961) XVI.

87 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States*, 2018 Statutory Report (Sept. 2018) at p. 21, *citing* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Mississippi (1965).

Subsequent Civil Rights Acts in 1960 and 1964, while milestones at the time, also proved inadequate in protecting against discrimination in voting.⁸⁸ At the time, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach said the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, when it came to ensuring the right to vote, “had only minimal effect. They [were] too slow.”⁸⁹

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was the culmination of a long, non-violent movement for equal voting rights led by civil rights organizations such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), launched by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and other civil rights activists, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). This peaceful movement was often met with violence. Civil rights workers involved in voter registration campaigns were beaten and jailed, and churches, homes, and other buildings were bombed.⁹⁰ In 1964, three activists working on SNCC’s voter registration campaigns were murdered in Neshoba County, Mississippi.

On March 7, 1965, in Selma, Alabama, when civil rights advocates peacefully marched across Edmund Pettis Bridge to condemn such violence and bring attention to the struggle for equal voting rights, state troopers and local law enforcement viciously attacked them with clubs, whips, and tear gas. That day would become known as “Bloody Sunday.” Two days later, Dr. King led a second peaceful march from Selma to Montgomery,⁹¹ at which he critically noted in a speech that, “the Civil Rights Act of 1964 gave Negroes some part of their rightful dignity, but without the vote, it was dignity without strength.”⁹²

On March 15, 1965, shortly after Bloody Sunday, President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke before a Joint Session of Congress, in a nationally televised address calling on Congress to act. He said:

“There is no cause for pride in what has happened in Selma. There is no cause for self-satisfaction in the long denial of equal rights of millions of Americans. But there is cause for hope and for faith in our democracy in what is happening tonight. . . . Our mission is at once the oldest and the most basic of this country—to right wrong, to do justice, to serve man. . . . Our fathers believed that if this noble view of the rights of

88 See *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 313 (1966).

“In recent years, Congress has repeatedly tried to cope with the problem by facilitating case-by-case litigation against voting discrimination. The Civil Rights Act of 1957^[16] authorized the Attorney General to seek injunctions against public and private interference with the right to vote on racial grounds. Perfecting amendments in the Civil Rights Act of 1960^[17] permitted the joinder of States as parties defendant, gave the Attorney General access to local voting records, and authorized courts to register voters in areas of systematic discrimination. Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1964^[18] expedited the hearing of voting cases before three-judge courts and outlawed some of the tactics used to disqualify Negroes from voting in federal elections.

Despite the earnest efforts of the Justice Department and of many federal judges, these new laws have done little to cure the problem of voting discrimination. According to estimates by the Attorney General during hearings on the Act, registration of voting-age Negroes in Alabama rose only from 14.2% to 19.4% between 1958 and 1964; in Louisiana it barely inched ahead from 31.7% to 31.8% between 1956 and 1965; and in Mississippi it increased only from 4.4% to 6.4% between 1954 and 1964. In each instance, registration of voting-age Whites ran roughly 50 percentage points or more ahead of Negro registration.”

89 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 11, citing David J. Garrow, *Protest at Selma: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Voting Rights Act of 1965* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978).

90 *Id.* at p. 11.

91 *Id.*

92 Martin Luther King, Jr., *Address at the Conclusion of the Selma to Montgomery March*, March 25, 1965, The Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute, <https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/king-papers/documents/address-conclusion-selma-montgomery-march>.

man was to flourish it must be rooted in democracy. The most basic right of all was the right to choose your own leaders. The history of this country in large measure is the history of expansion of that right to all of our people. Many of the issues of civil rights are very complex and most difficult. But about this there can and should be no argument: every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. ... Experience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic and ingenious discrimination. No law that we now have on the books ... can ensure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it. In such a case, our duty must be clear to all of us. The Constitution says that no person shall be kept from voting because of his race or his color.”⁹³

In passing the Voting Rights Act, Congress observed, “there is little basis for supposing that without action, the States and subdivisions affected will themselves remedy the present situation in view of the history of the adoption and administration of the several tests and devices reached by this bill.”⁹⁴ Congress was presented with a record revealing more than 95 years of pervasive racial discrimination in certain areas of the country.⁹⁵ Before enacting the Voting Rights Act, the House and Senate Judiciary Committees each held nine days of hearings and received testimony from a total of 67 witnesses.⁹⁶

Congress found the Department of Justice’s attempt to protect the right to vote through case-by-case enforcement to be inadequate, as states determined to discriminate still found ways to defy court orders and enact new laws. The Voting Rights Act called for a new approach – direct federal intervention and prescription to ensure constitutional rights were protected. Key provisions of the bill required certain states to submit to the federal government for oversight and approval — or “preclearance” — of any and all voting changes prior to implementation. In subsequently upholding the constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act, the Court recognized Congress’s broad authority to correct the history of discrimination in voting, reiterating that while states have broad powers to determine conditions under which the right to vote is exercised, states are not insulated from federal involvement when “State power is used as an instrument for circumventing a Federally protected right.”⁹⁷

Nearly five months after President Johnson’s address, on August 6, 1965, he signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 into law, 95 years after the 15th Amendment first granted Black men the right to vote and 45 years after the 19th Amendment granted women the franchise. The bill passed the House on August 3 (328-74) and the Senate on August 4 (79-18). In the words of President Johnson, the Voting Rights Act was designed to “help rid the Nation of racial discrimination in every aspect of the electoral process and thereby insure the right of all to vote.”⁹⁸

93 President Lyndon Johnson, *President Johnson’s Special Message to Congress: The American Promise*, (Mar. 15, 1965), <http://www.lbjlibrary.org/lyndon-baines-johnson/speeches-films/president-johnsons-special-message-to-the-congress-the-american-promise>.

94 H. Rept. 109-478 accompanying H.R. 9 Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (109th Congress).

95 *Id.*

96 *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 308-9 (1966).

97 *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 325 (1966).

98 Communication From the President of the United States Transmitting a Draft of Proposed Legislation Entitled, “A Bill to Enforce the 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States,” H.R. Doc. 89-120 at p. 1 (1965)

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a necessary response to the years of discrimination and voter suppression experienced by Black Americans and other minority voters in the decades following Reconstruction. The Voting Rights Act and its subsequent reauthorizations took several key steps to protect voting rights. First, it prohibited discrimination in voting on the basis of race, creating a standard under which the Attorney General and private citizens could sue states and localities. Second, it created a formula for determining which states would become subject to federal government review of their voting law changes. Third, it required these states to get approval from the federal government or a court before making any changes to voting laws. Fourth, the Voting Rights Act authorized federal election observers and examiners to monitor what was happening in states. Finally, subsequent versions of the Voting Rights Act expanded these protections to include language minorities, prohibiting discrimination in voting on the basis of a person’s ability to read and understand the English language.

The original Voting Rights Act placed a nationwide prohibition on states, or any political subdivision, from implementing voting qualifications or prerequisites, standards, practices, or procedures to “deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on the basis of race or color.”⁹⁹ Section 2 allows both the Attorney General and private citizens to sue to enforce the law’s protections. The Section 2 standard was expanded during subsequent reauthorizations and does not expire. While Section 2 is still in place and can be used to combat any discriminatory voting standard, practice, or procedure,¹⁰⁰ it is costly, time-consuming, and inadequate without the full complement of an enforceable Section 5.

Section 3 authorized the appointment of federal election examiners to observe voter registration and elections and register voters. Section 3 also contained what became known as the “bail in” provision — if a court finds violations of the 15th Amendment justifying relief, the court could retain jurisdiction over changes in voting laws.¹⁰¹

Section 4 created what has become known as the “coverage formula.” This set forth the criteria by which jurisdictions with a history of voter discrimination were identified and covered under the preclearance requirements of Section 5.¹⁰² states and localities were covered under the Voting Rights Act if they used any “test or device” as a condition of voter registration on

99 Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. Law No. 89-110, Sec. 2.

“No voting qualifications or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.”

100 U.S. Department of Justice, *Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act* (updated Sept. 14, 2018), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/section-2-voting-rights-act>.

101 Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. Law No. 89-110, at Sec. 3(c) – Section 3(c) is still in effect and was expanded to include Fourteenth Amendment violations in a later reauthorization.

102 *Id.* at Sec. 4(b).

“(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a state which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to when (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964. A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this section or under section 6 or section 13 shall not be reviewable in any court and shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.”

November 1, 1964, and either less than 50 percent of voting age persons living there were registered to vote or less than 50 percent voted in the presidential elections that year.¹⁰³

This provision was justified by the evidence Congress collected, outlining the rampant discrimination and violation of the 14th and 15th Amendments.¹⁰⁴ At the time of enactment, the jurisdictions covered were Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, 39 counties in North Carolina, and specific counties in Arizona and Hawaii.¹⁰⁵ As Congress amended the Voting Rights Act and added new criteria, the coverage formula encompassed additional states and localities. Furthermore, Section 4 contained a “bail out” provision under which states and localities could seek termination of Voting Rights Act coverage from a three-judge panel in the D.C. District Court.¹⁰⁶

Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act also prohibited states from discriminating against non-English speakers educated in American schools. States could no longer condition the right to vote on a person’s ability to read, write, understand, or interpret something in the English language if they were educated in American-flag schools.¹⁰⁷ Section 4(e)(2) specifically protected the right to vote for people who successfully completed the sixth grade and were educated in schools in any state or territory, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in a language other than English.¹⁰⁸ Between 1950 and 1963, an average of 50,000 people migrated from Puerto Rico to New York City per year.¹⁰⁹

Section 5 is the enforcement mechanism for Section 4. Known as “preclearance,” Section 5 requires any state or locality encapsulated by Section 4’s coverage formula to clear any voting changes with the federal government or the U.S. District Court for the District of

103 *Id.*

104 *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 315 (1966).

“The Voting Rights Act of 1965 reflects Congress’ firm intention to rid the country of racial discrimination in voting. . . . After enduring nearly a century of widespread resistance to the Fifteenth Amendment, Congress has marshalled an array of potent weapons against the evil, with authority in the Attorney General to employ them effectively.”

105 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015).

106 U.S. Department of Justice, *Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act* (updated Dec. 21, 2017), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/section-4-voting-rights-act#bailout>.

Localities within the following States were allowed to bail out from Voting Rights Act coverage by the courts: North Carolina, New Mexico, Maine, Oklahoma, Wyoming, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Virginia, Texas, Georgia, California, Alabama, and New Hampshire.

See also Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-110 at Sec. 4(a).

107 Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-110 at Sec. 4(e)(1).

“(e) (1) Congress hereby declares that to secure the rights under the fourteenth amendment of persons educated in American-flag schools in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, it is necessary to prohibit the States from conditioning the right to vote of such persons on ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language.”

108 *Id.* at Sec. 4(e)(2).

“(2) No person who demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, except that in States in which State law provides that a different level of education is presumptive of literacy, he shall demonstrate that he has successfully completed an equivalent level of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.”

109 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 18.

Columbia *before* implementation. This effectively froze in place existing voting procedures and created a structure through which all voting changes would need to be analyzed for potential discriminatory effect before they were allowed to proceed.¹¹⁰ In contrast to Section 2, preclearance is prospective, preventing discrimination before it happens. Preclearance negated the state’s ability to circumvent court rulings by allowing the Attorney General or the D.C. Court to block discriminatory laws before voters were disenfranchised, and created an administrative procedure to evaluate proposed voting changes for potential discriminatory effect. It also prevented the state practice of enacting another discriminatory law once the original was struck down by the courts.

Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the Voting Rights Act addressed the appointment of federal election examiners for voter registration and the deployment of federal election observers. Section 6 allowed the Attorney General to request election examiners be deployed to jurisdictions.¹¹¹ Section 7 outlines how these examiners shall register voters.¹¹² Section 8 allows for federal monitors to observe inside polling places and ensure Voting Rights Act compliance on Election Day.¹¹³

The Voting Rights Act also suspended the use of literacy tests.¹¹⁴ Further, the law included a congressional finding that poll taxes are a barrier to voting for people of limited means and impose “unreasonable financial hardship upon such a person as a precondition to their exercise of the franchise,” bear no reasonable relationship to a legitimate state interest, are used for discriminatory purposes,¹¹⁵ and are prohibited.¹¹⁶ While the Voting Rights Act did not explicitly outlaw poll taxes, it did direct the Attorney General to challenge the issue in court. The Court held poll taxes unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment in 1966.¹¹⁷

110 Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-110, at Sec. 5.

“Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the prohibitions set forth in section 4(a) are in effect shall enact or seek to administer any voting qualifications or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964, such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, and unless and until the court enters such judgment no person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to comply with such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure: Provided, That such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure may be enforced without such proceeding if the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has Page 4 of 26 been submitted by the chief legal officer or the appropriated official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within sixty days after such submission, except that neither the Attorney General’s failure to object nor a declaratory judgment entered under this section shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure. Any action under this section shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.”

111 *Id.* at Sec. 6.

112 *Id.* at Sec. 7.

113 *Id.* at Sec. 8.

114 *Id.* at Sec. 4.

115 *Id.* at Sec. 10.

116 *Id.* at Sec. 11.

117 *Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663 (1966).

Held: A State’s conditioning of the right to vote on the payment of a fee or tax violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The effects of the Voting Rights Act were immediate and significant. Nearly 1 million Black voters were registered within four years of the Act's passage.¹¹⁸ More than 50 percent of the Black voting age population in each of the southern states were registered.¹¹⁹ Additionally, the number of Black officials elected in the South more than doubled following the 1966 elections.¹²⁰

REAUTHORIZATIONS OF AND AMENDMENTS TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Originally set to expire five years after enactment, the Voting Rights Act was amended and extended by Congress on a bipartisan basis several times. Congress continued to support the underlying policy of the Voting Rights Act while voting to amend, expand, and extend the law five times: in 1970, 1975, 1982, 1992, and 2006.

The Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 passed on a bipartisan basis¹²¹ in both the House (272-132) and Senate (64-12) and was signed into law by President Richard Nixon on June 22, 1970.¹²² In extending the provisions, Congress reviewed the progress of the previous five years and extended the Voting Rights Act for another five years, and extended the prohibition on literacy and similar tests as a prerequisite to voting or voter registration for 10 years.¹²³ Congress determined that there had been a lack of enforcement by the Department of Justice over the previous years.¹²⁴ The preclearance formula updated the turnout disparities formula, thus updating Section 5's preclearance requirements.¹²⁵ The new formula resulted in the inclusion of parts of Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, New York, and Oregon under Section 5 preclearance.¹²⁶

118 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 12, citing Guide to U.S. Elections, 6th ed., vol. 1 (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2010) at p. 33.

119 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 12, citing United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Political Participation: A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Publishing Office, 1968) at p. 13.

120 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 12, citing David J. Garrow, *Protest at Selma* at p. 190.

121 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 18, see H.R. 4249 – passed the Senate on March 13, 1970 (64-12); House passed the Senate amendments on June 17, 1970 (272-132); signed into law June 22, 1970.

122 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 32.

123 *Id.*

124 H. Rept. 109-478 accompanying H.R. 9 Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (109th Congress), citing H.R. Rep. No. 91-397, at 4 (1970).

125 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 32-33; see also Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, Pub. L. No. 91-285, available at: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-84/pdf/STATUTE-84-Pg314-2.pdf>.

“Sec. 4. Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 438; 42 U.S.C. 1973b) is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following new sentence: “On and after August 6, 1970, in addition to any State or political subdivision of a State determined to be subject to subsection (a) pursuant to the previous sentence, the provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or any political subdivision of a State which (i) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1968, any test or device, and with respect to which (ii) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1968, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1968.”

126 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 19.

The 1970 updates also abolished durational residency requirements in the presidential elections and directed the states to provide voter registration for eligible voters who apply at least 30 days before an election, as well as allow voters who move within 30 days of an election to vote in their previous precinct or by absentee ballot.¹²⁷ Section 301 of the Amendments lowered the voting age to 18 for voting in federal elections.¹²⁸ In 1971, the 26th Amendment lowered the voting age from 21 to 18 for all elections.¹²⁹

The Voting Rights Act Extension of 1975 again passed on a bipartisan basis¹³⁰ in both the House (341-70) and the Senate (77-12), and was signed into law by President Gerald Ford. The legislation extended the Voting Rights Act for another seven years and expanded the definition of permanently prohibited “tests and devices” to address language minorities.¹³¹ This expanded Sections 5 and 8 to cover jurisdictions where five percent of the voting-age citizens were from a single language minority, election materials were printed only in English, and less than 50 percent of the voting age citizens were registered to vote or voted in the 1972 presidential election.¹³² Congress found that “while minority political progress [that] had been made under the Voting Rights Act is undeniable . . . the nature of that progress has been limited.”¹³³

The bill also included a requirement for bilingual elections if the illiteracy rate in English was greater than the national illiteracy rate, and a formula for determining when those materials must be provided. Section 203 of the amendments required voting materials be available in the language of the “applicable minority” within the jurisdiction, including Latinos, Asian and Pacific Islanders, Native Alaskans, and Native Americans.¹³⁴ The 1975 extension also made permanent the ban on literary tests nationally, directed the Attorney General to enforce the 26th Amendment, and established a federal penalty for voting more than once in a federal election.¹³⁵

The Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1982 again passed with largely bipartisan votes¹³⁶ in both chambers (389-24 in the House; 85-8 in the Senate) and was signed into law by President

127 Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, Pub. L. No. 91-285, Sec. 202 Residence Requirements for Voting.

128 Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, Pub. L. No. 91-285, Sec. 301(a); *Oregon v. Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112 (1970) held that Congress had the power to lower the voting age to 18-year-old citizens in national elections, such as congressional, senatorial, vice-presidential, and presidential elections, but cannot set the voting age in state and local elections.

129 U.S. Const. amend. XXVI, Sec. 1.

“The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.”

130 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 19, see H.R. 6219 passed the House on June 4, 1975 (341-70); passed the Senate on June 24, 1975 (77-12); and the House agreed to the Senate amendments on July 28, 1975 (346-56); signed into law August 6, 1975.

131 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 33.

132 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 19-20.

133 H. Rept. 109-478 accompanying H.R. 9 Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (109th Congress), citing H.R. Rep. No. 94-196, at 7 (1975).

134 Voting Rights Act Extension of 1975, Pub. L. No. 94-73, Sec. 203, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-89/pdf/STATUTE-89-Pg400.pdf#page=3>.

135 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 19-20.

136 *Id.* at p. 20-21, see H.R. 3112 – passed the House on October 15, 1981 (389-24); passed the Senate with amendments on June 18, 1982 (85-8) following a filibuster; the House approved the Senate amendments by unanimous consent on October 5, 1982; signed into law June 29, 1982.

Ronald Reagan. The law extended preclearance for another 25 years, leaving in place the same coverage formula.¹³⁷ Congress found that, “despite the gains in increased minority registration and voting and in the number of minority elected officials ... continued manipulation of registration procedures and the electoral process, which effectively exclude minority participation from all stages of the political process” was occurring.¹³⁸ Congress reemphasized its intent that, “protection of the franchise extend beyond mere prohibition of official actions designed to keep voters away from the polls ... [and] include prohibition of State actions which so manipulate the elections process as to render the vote meaningless.”¹³⁹

The requirement for bilingual elections was also extended for 10 years.¹⁴⁰ Jurisdictions could now also petition to be “bailed out” separately from states.¹⁴¹ A significant change was also made to Section 2 – plaintiffs could now challenge laws and election practices without needing to prove discriminatory intent, adjusting the burden of proof requirement to necessitate a “results” or “effects” test, lowering the evidentiary burden on the plaintiffs.¹⁴²

This change addressed the Court’s ruling in *City of Mobile v. Bolden*, which held that Section 2 required proof of a discriminatory intent to challenge a law.¹⁴³ This adjustment also reflected the changing landscape of discrimination in voting laws. Poll taxes and literacy tests were no longer as prevalent as they were pre-Voting Rights Act, but a new generation of discriminatory practices had begun to emerge. This “second generation” of suppression tactics included discriminatory redistricting, annexations, and at-large elections meant to dilute the minority vote.¹⁴⁴ Eliminating the intent requirement made it possible to challenge and prosecute these types of practices that were discriminatory in their application and effect, regardless of their intent.

The Voting Rights Language Assistance Act of 1992, again bipartisan (237-125 in the House; 75-20 in the Senate),¹⁴⁵ was signed into law by President George H. W. Bush. The law extended the bilingual voting assistance requirement until 2007 (another 15 years) and expanded the scope of bilingual voting assistance coverage to include jurisdictions with 10,000 members of a language minority whose members have limited English proficiency (“LEP”).¹⁴⁶ This change ensured the protections covered jurisdictions where LEP voters did not make up five percent of the eligible voters, reaching Latino and Asian American voters in

137 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 33.

138 H. Rept. 109-478 accompanying H.R. 9 Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (109th Congress).

139 *Id.*, citing H.R. Rep. No. 97-227, at 14 (1982).

140 Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1982, Pub. L. No. 97-205, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-96/pdf/STATUTE-96-Pg131.pdf#page=1>.

141 *Id.*

142 *Id.*

143 *Id.* at p. 35, see also *City of Mobile v. Bolden*, 446 U.S. 55, 75 (1980).

144 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 34-35.

145 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 21, see H.R. 4312 – passed the House on June 24, 1992 (237-125); passed the Senate on August 7, 1992 (75-20); signed into law August 26, 1992.

146 Voting Rights Language Assistance Act of 1992, Pub. L. No. 102-334, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/102nd-congress/house-bill/4312>, see also Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 21.

larger cities.¹⁴⁷ The law also included more expansive coverage formulas for language access for Native American voters living on reservations.¹⁴⁸

The last reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act took place in 2006. President George W. Bush signed H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 into law following a largely bipartisan vote in the House (390-33) and unanimous passage in the Senate on July 13, 2006.¹⁴⁹ Upon signing the reauthorization, President Bush said, “In four decades since the Voting Rights Act was first passed, we’ve made progress toward equality, yet the work for a more perfect union is never ending. We’ll continue to build on the legal equality won by the civil rights movement to help ensure that every person enjoys the opportunity that this great land of liberty offers.”¹⁵⁰

The 2006 reauthorization extended the bulk of the Voting Rights Act for another 25 years, though it did eliminate the ability of federal election examiners to register voters under Section 5.¹⁵¹ Prior to introducing H.R. 9, the House Committee on Judiciary held 10 oversight hearings before the Subcommittee on the Constitution examining the effectiveness of the temporary provision of the Voting Rights Act over the last 25 years.¹⁵² The Subcommittee heard testimony from 39 witnesses and assembled over 12,000 pages of testimony, documentary evidence and appendices.¹⁵³ Additionally, the Subcommittee held two legislative hearings and heard from seven additional witnesses.¹⁵⁴ When combined with the work of the Senate, the two Judiciary Committees held 21 hearings, heard from numerous witnesses, received reports and documents illustrating continued discrimination, and, in all, compiled a legislative record totaling more than 15,000 pages.¹⁵⁵

In the absence of a full Voting Rights Act, during the first year of the 116th Congress, the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration held eight hearings and one listening session in eight states and the House of Representatives, heard testimony from more than 60 witnesses, and collected more than 3,000 pages of testimony and documents.

147 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 36-37.

148 *Id.* at p. 37.

149 Kevin J. Coleman, *The Voting Rights Act of 1965: Background and Overview*, CRS Report R43626 (updated July 20, 2015) at p. 22, *see* H.R. 9 – passed the House on July 13, 2006 (390-33); passed the Senate on July 20, 2006 (unanimous); signed into law July 27, 2006.

150 *President Bush Signs Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006*, The White House, Office of the Press Secretary (July 27, 2006), <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2006/07/20060727.html>.

151 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 36-37.

152 H. Rept. 109-478 accompanying H.R. 9 Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (109th Congress).

153 *Id.*

154 *Id.*

155 H. R. Rep. 109-478, at 5, 11-12; S. Rep. 109-295, at 2-4, 15.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT AND ITS PROVISIONS

The Court upheld the constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act in 1966, in *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*.¹⁵⁶ Seeking to block its enforcement, the State of South Carolina alleged that provisions of the Voting Rights Act violated the Constitution and infringed on states' rights.

Congress exercised its power to create the law through Section 2 of the 15th Amendment, which gave power to the Congress to create laws necessary to uphold the constitutional prohibition against racial discrimination in voting.¹⁵⁷ The Court held that,

“After enduring nearly a century of widespread resistance to the Fifteenth Amendment, Congress has marshalled an array of potent weapons against the evil, with authority in the Attorney General to employ them effectively. . . . We here hold that the portions of the Voting Rights Act properly before us are a valid means for carrying out the commands of the Fifteenth Amendment. Hopefully, millions of non-White Americans will now be able to participate for the first time on an equal basis in the government under which they live. We may finally look forward to the day when truly ‘[t]he right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.’”¹⁵⁸

Also, in 1966, the Court held in *Katzenbach v. Morgan* that Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act was a proper exercise of Congress's powers under Section 5 of the 14th Amendment, rendering New York's English literacy requirements unenforceable to the extent they conflicted with the Voting Rights Act.¹⁵⁹

Prior to 2013, any voting change in a jurisdiction covered under Section 4 was subject to review. Many of these changes include current issues discussed in this report, including: redistricting, closing or moving polling locations, new procedures for purging voters from the rolls, English-language literacy tests, voter ID laws, cutting early voting or same-day registration, and any other changes to voting procedures. The goal of the Voting Rights Act and its enforcement mechanisms was to block the implementation of racially discriminatory voting practices and prevent these practices from disenfranchising voters.

From 1982 to 2006, there were more than 700 objections to voting changes under the Voting Rights Act's Section 5 preclearance provisions because the Department of Justice or the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia considered them to be racially discriminatory.¹⁶⁰ More than 800 proposed changes were also withdrawn or amended after the Department of Justice requested additional information.¹⁶¹ During the 2006 reauthorization, “Congress found there were more Department of Justice objections [blocking proposed voting changes under

¹⁵⁶ *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301 (1966).

¹⁵⁷ *Id.*

¹⁵⁸ *Id.* at p. 328.

¹⁵⁹ *Katzenbach v. Morgan*, 384 U.S. 641 (1966).

¹⁶⁰ H.R. Rep. No. 109-478, at 21 (2006); H.R. Rep. No. 109-478, at 40-41 (2006).

¹⁶¹ H.R. Rep. No. 109-478, at 645 (2006).

Section 5 due to determinations that they would be discriminatory] between 1982 and 2004 (626) than there were between 1965 and the 1982 reauthorization (490).”¹⁶²

During the 2006 Voting Rights Act reauthorization, the Department of Justice reported receiving between 4,000 and 6,000 submissions annually from jurisdictions covered by the Voting Rights Act.¹⁶³ The Judiciary Committee found that, “The changes sought by covered jurisdictions were calculated decisions to keep minority voters from fully participating in the political process. This increased activity shows that attempts to discriminate persist and evolve, such that Section 5 is still needed to protect minority voters in the future.”¹⁶⁴ During the 2006 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, Congress received testimony from the National Commission on the Voting Rights Act that the number of elected officials serving in the original six states covered by the temporary provisions of the Voting Rights Act (Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, and Alabama) increased by approximately 1,000 percent since 1965.¹⁶⁵

Section 2, in concert with Sections 4 and 5, also proved a powerful tool to protect the right to vote and enforce the Voting Rights Act. At its enactment, Section 5 left in place long-standing, racially discriminatory practices that were not already struck down because they were not enacted *after* 1965. Preclearance was prospective and did not preclear existing voting laws.¹⁶⁶ For example, when Black voters wanted to challenge Mississippi’s historic dual voter registration system that had been enacted a century before, they had to do so under Section 2.¹⁶⁷ After the success of this case, when Mississippi tried to resurrect the dual system, it was successfully challenged under Section 5.¹⁶⁸ Section 2 is also critical to protecting the voting rights of Americans living in states not covered under Section 5 preclearance. Section 2 is still in effect nationwide, the implications of which will be discussed in greater detail later in this report.

Over the lifetime of the Voting Rights Act, states and localities have been “bailed in” under the coverage formula, as well as successfully petitioned to “bail out.” As of 2013, Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia were covered in their entirety.¹⁶⁹ California, Florida, New York, North Carolina, South Dakota, and Michigan each contained covered counties or townships, but the state as a whole was

162 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 45, citing *Shelby Cty.*, 570 U.S. at 571 (Ginsburg, J., dissenting) (“On that score, the record before Congress was huge.

In fact, Congress found there were more DOJ objections between 1982 and 2004 (626) than there were between 1965 and the 1982 reauthorization (490).”); Voting Rights Act: Evidence of Continued Need: Hearing Before the H. Subcomm. on the Constitution of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary, 109th Cong. 172 (2006).

163 H. Rept. 109-478 accompanying H.R. 9 Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006 (109th Congress).

164 *Id.*

165 *Id.*

166 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 30.

167 *Id.*, citing *Mississippi State Chapter of Operation PUSH v. Allain*, 674 F. Supp. 1245, 1247 (N.D. Miss. 1987).

168 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 31.

169 U.S. Department of Justice, *Jurisdictions Previously Covered by Section 5* (updated Aug. 6, 2015), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/jurisdictions-previously-covered-section-5>.

not.¹⁷⁰ From 1967 until 2013, sixteen jurisdictions in North Carolina, New Mexico, Maine, Oklahoma, Wyoming, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Virginia, Texas, Georgia, California, Alabama, and New Hampshire successfully availed themselves of the Section 4 bailout mechanism and were no longer individually subject to Section 5.¹⁷¹

This section is not designed to be an exhaustive examination of the various provisions of the Voting Rights Act or the relevant case law.

SHELBY COUNTY AND THE UNDERMINING OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Following the 2006 reauthorization, the Voting Rights Act was again challenged in *Northwest Austin Utility District Number One v. Holder*.¹⁷² Though the Court specifically did not rule on the constitutionality of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, the majority raised significant concerns.¹⁷³ These concerns served as a predicate to the Court's actions in 2013.¹⁷⁴

On June 25, 2013, the Court struck down Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act, finding the coverage formula unconstitutional in the 5-4 decision in *Shelby County*.¹⁷⁵ The Court specifically did not rule on the constitutionality of Section 5 preclearance, only the formula determining which jurisdictions were subject to coverage. The decision effectively returned the United States to a reactive state of voting rights protection, eliminating the proactive protections that had worked for decades to ensure equal access to the ballot.

The *Shelby County* decision changed the landscape of voting rights and efforts to prevent discriminatory voting laws. Striking down Section 4(b) effectively rendered Section 5 inoperable. The Department of Justice no longer has the authority to review proposed voting changes before they go into effect, leaving it to voters and litigators to identify when discrimination has occurred and to undertake the lengthy and costly process of challenging

170 *Id.*

171 U.S. Department of Justice, *Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act* (updated Dec. 21, 2017), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/section-4-voting-rights-act#bailout>.

172 *Northwest Austin Utility District Number One v. Holder*, 557 U.S. 193, 129 S.Ct. 2504 (2009).

173 *Id.* at p. 2506.

“The historic accomplishments of the Voting Rights Act are undeniable, but the Act now raises serious constitutional concerns. The preclearance requirement represents an intrusion into areas of state and local responsibility that is otherwise unfamiliar to our federal system. Some of the conditions that the Court relied upon in upholding this statutory scheme in *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 86 S.Ct. 803, 15 L.Ed.2d 769, and *City of Rome v. United States*, 446 U.S. 156, 100 S.Ct. 1548, 64 L.Ed.2d 119, have unquestionably improved. Those improvements are no doubt due in significant part to the Voting Rights Act itself, and stand as a monument to its success, but the Act imposes current burdens and must be justified by current needs. The Act also differentiates between the States in ways that may no longer be justified.”

174 *Id.* at p. 2511.

“Some of the conditions that we relied upon in upholding this statutory scheme in *Katzenbach* and *City of Rome* have unquestionably improved. Things have changed in the South. Voter turnout and registration rates now approach parity. Blatantly discriminatory evasions of federal decrees are rare. And minority candidates hold office at unprecedented levels. ... These improvements are no doubt due in significant part to the Voting Rights Act itself, and stand as a monument to its success. Past success alone, however, is not adequate justification to retain the preclearance requirements.”

175 *Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 133 S.Ct. 2612 (2013); Chief Justice Roberts writing for the majority, Justice Ginsberg writing for the dissent.

these laws in court. States and localities are no longer required to collect and evaluate racial impact data when making changes to voting laws.

Chief Justice Roberts, writing for the majority, acknowledged that “voting discrimination still exists, no one doubts that.”¹⁷⁶ While acknowledging that the progress made was “largely because of the Voting Rights Act,” the question, Roberts said, was “whether the Act’s extraordinary measures, including its disparate treatment of the States, continue to satisfy constitutional requirements.”¹⁷⁷ “The [15th] Amendment is not designed to punish for the past; its purpose is to ensure a better future.”¹⁷⁸

In declaring Section 4(b) unconstitutional, the Roberts Court held that the coverage formula in the 2006 reauthorization “could no longer be used as a basis for subjecting jurisdictions to preclearance,”¹⁷⁹ finding that 40 years had passed since the enactment of the original Voting Rights Act and the 2006 law ignored these developments in the coverage formula “keeping the focus on decades-old data relevant to decades-old problems, rather than on current data reflecting current needs.”¹⁸⁰ *Shelby County* did not rule on Section 5 itself, nor did it affect the permanent, nationwide ban on racial discrimination in Section 2. Additionally, Chief Justice Roberts said, “Congress may draft another formula based on current conditions,” leaving open the possibility that the Court could find an updated formula to be constitutional.¹⁸¹

Section 5 prohibited retrogression — going backwards by restricting access to the polls for minority voters.¹⁸² The Court’s decision in *Shelby County* has left voters across America vulnerable to the discrimination and disenfranchisement the Voting Rights Act sought to eradicate.¹⁸³ The American people have now gone to the polls in three federal elections without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. The next chapters of this report illustrate how, without the full protection of the Voting Rights Act and support of the Department of Justice,¹⁸⁴ states have retrogressed, limiting access to the polls and suppressing the vote of Americans of color.

176 *Id.* at p. 2619.

177 *Id.*, citing *Northwest Austin*, “the Act imposes current burdens and must be justified by current needs.”

178 *Id.* at p. 2629.

179 *Id.* at p. 2631.

180 *Id.* at p. 2628-29.

181 *Id.* at p. 2631.

“Our decision in no way affects the permanent, nationwide ban on racial discrimination in voting found in § 2. We issue no holding on § 5 itself, only on the coverage formula. Congress may draft another formula based on current conditions. Such a formula is an initial prerequisite to a determination that exceptional conditions still exist justifying such an “extraordinary departure from the traditional course of relations between the States and the Federal Government.” *Presley*, 502 U.S., at 500-501, 112 S.Ct. 820. Our country has changed, and while any racial discrimination in voting is too much, Congress must ensure that the legislation it passes to remedy that problem speaks to current conditions.”

182 *Beer v. United States*, 425 U.S. 130, 141 (1976).

“By prohibiting the enforcement of a voting-procedure change until it has been demonstrated to the United States Department of Justice or to a three-judge federal court that the change does not have a discriminatory effect, Congress desired to prevent States from ‘undo[ing] or defeat[ing] the rights recently won’ by Negroes. . . . Section 5 was intended “to ensure that [the gains thus far achieved in minority political participation] shall not be destroyed through new [discriminatory] procedures and techniques. . . .”

In other words, the purpose of § 5 has always been to ensure that no voting-procedure changes would be made that would lead to a retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise.”

183 For a summary of the impact of the *Shelby County* decision, see U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 59.

184 U.S. Department of Justice, *Fact Sheet on Justice Department’s Enforcement Efforts Following Shelby County Decision*, <https://www.justice.gov/crt/file/876246/download>.

CHAPTER TWO

The State of Voting Rights and Election Administration post-Shelby County

THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE

“As a people, the most important right that we have is the right to vote. ... Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined.”

— Irving Joyner, NCCU School of Law

The Court’s decision in *Shelby County* fundamentally undermined the manner in which voting rights are protected and enforced across America, including pursuant to the 14th and 15th Amendments. Before *Shelby County*, all voting changes in covered jurisdictions had to be cleared through the Department of Justice or the Federal Court in the District of Columbia.¹⁸⁵

Now, without the Section 4(b) coverage formula, no jurisdiction falls under Section 5 preclearance, rendering this critical portion of the Voting Rights Act effectively unenforceable. Previously covered states are now free to enact discriminatory and suppressive laws that may have otherwise been denied under a preclearance review. This leaves the voting rights of millions of Americans vulnerable to suppression and disenfranchisement.

Shelby County opened the door for a new generation of voter suppression. Its effects were sudden.

Hours after *Shelby County*, Texas revived a previously blocked voter ID law. Within days, Alabama announced it would move to enforce a photo ID law it had previously refused to submit to the Department of Justice for preclearance. Within months, New York broke from past practices and declined to hold special elections to fill 12 legislative vacancies, denying 800,000 voters of color representation.¹⁸⁶

In North Carolina, State Senator Tom Apodaca announced the state’s General Assembly leadership no longer had to worry about the “legal headache” of preclearance, and the state

¹⁸⁵ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 45-46, citing 52 U.S.C. § 10304(a), see also 28 C.F.R. § 51.10; *Allen v. State Bd. of Elections*, 393 U.S. 544, 548-89 (1969).

“First, under Section 5, any voting law, practice, or procedure was subject to preclearance review prior to *Shelby County*...”

¹⁸⁶ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong.* (2019); written testimony of Deuel Ross at p. 4.

moved ahead with a law to remake the state’s elections system.¹⁸⁷ Less than two months after *Shelby County*, the North Carolina General Assembly passed, and the Governor signed into law, what became known as the “monster law,”¹⁸⁸ a sweeping voter suppression bill requiring strict forms of voter ID, cuts to early voting, and eliminating key election administration practices, including:

- One of two “Souls to the Polls” Sundays (these are early voting events, traditionally held the Sunday before Election Day and heavily utilized by Black faith communities to get voters to the polls);
- Same-day voter registration;
- Out-of-precinct voting which allowed voters to cast provisional ballots if they appeared at the wrong precinct but in the correct county; and
- Preregistration of 16- and 17-year old voters.¹⁸⁹

Litigation against the law, captioned *NC NAACP v. McCrory*, demonstrated there was no legitimate reason for North Carolina’s law. It was enacted specifically to target minority voters.¹⁹⁰ The court characterized H.B. 589 as “the most restrictive voting law North Carolina has seen since the era of Jim Crow”¹⁹¹

Before *Shelby County*, the Department of Justice issued over 50 objection letters under Section 5 from 1980 to 2013 regarding proposed voting changes in North Carolina, including several after 2000.¹⁹² During the same period, plaintiffs brought 55 successful Section 2 cases in North Carolina.¹⁹³ Post-*Shelby County*, the monster law attempted to usher in a suite of suppressive laws that could have almost certainly not passed preclearance scrutiny, crafted in such a

187 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Tomas Lopez at p. 2, *see also* Laura Leslie, *NC voter ID bill moving ahead with Supreme Court ruling*, WRAL (June 25, 2013), <http://www.wral.com/nc-senator-voter-id-bill-moving-ahead-with-ruling/12591669/>.

188 Sari Horwitz, *How North Carolina Became the Epicenter of the Voting Rights Battle*, The Washington Post (April 27, 2016), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/how-north-carolina-became-the-epicenter-of-the-voting-rights-battle/2016/04/26/af05c5a8-0bcb-11e6-8ab8-9ad050f76d7d_story.html.

189 *North Carolina State Conference of the NAACP v. McCrory*, 831 F.3d 204, 216-218 (4th Cir. 2016), *cert. denied*, 137 S. Ct. 1399 (2017).

190 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Caitlin Swain at p. 5-6, *citing NC NAACP v. McCrory*, 831 F.3d 204 (4th Cir. 2016).

“Finding in favor of plaintiffs, the court concluded that ‘[t]he new provisions target African Americans with almost surgical precision’ and ‘impose cures for problems that did not exist.’ ‘Upon receipt of [racially disaggregated data on voting patterns and usage],’ the Fourth Circuit found that ‘the General Assembly enacted legislation that restricted voting and registration in five different ways, all of which disproportionately affected African Americans.’

‘[W]ith race data in hand,’ the General Assembly had crafted a photo ID requirements that excluded the specific types of photo IDs that it knew Black voters disproportionately lacked, and enacted other provisions after learning that Black voters used early voting at a much higher rate than Whites, Black voters specifically used the first week of early voting more heavily than Whites, Black voters voted out-of-precinct at higher rates than whites and thus benefited more from the partial counting of those ballots, and Black youth used preregistration at higher rates than Whites. ... This case ‘comes as close to [including] a smoking gun as we are likely to see in modern times,’ the court explained, ‘[when] the State’s very justification for a challenged statute hinges explicitly on race—specifically its concern that African Americans, who had overwhelmingly voted for Democrats, had too much access to the franchise.’”

191 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Caitlin Swain at p. 2, *citing NC NAACP v. McCrory*, 831 F.3d 204, 227 (4th Cir. 2016).

192 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 70-71.

193 *Id.*

“Prior to Shelby, covered jurisdictions had to provide notice to the federal government – which meant notice to the public – before they could implement changes in their voting practices or procedures. Such notice is of paramount importance, because the ways that the voting rights of minority citizens are jeopardized are often subtle. They range from the consolidation of polling places so as to make it less convenient for minority voters to vote, to the curtailing of early voting hours that makes it more difficult for low-income people of color to vote, to the disproportionate purging of minority voters from voting lists under the pretext of “list maintenance.”

— Kristen Clarke, Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

discriminatory manner a three-judge panel found they “target[ed] African Americans with almost surgical precision” and “impose[d] cures for problems that did not exist.”¹⁹⁴

By 2016, 14 states had enacted new voting restrictions for the first time, including previously covered states such as Alabama, Arizona, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia.¹⁹⁵ In 2017, two additional states, Arkansas and North Dakota, enacted voter ID laws.¹⁹⁶ In 2018, Arkansas, Indiana, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Wisconsin enacted new restrictions on voting, ranging from restrictions on who can collect absentee ballots, to cuts to early voting, restrictions on college students, and enshrining voter ID requirements in a state constitution.¹⁹⁷

In 2018, more than 60 percent of Florida’s voters passed a ballot initiative automatically restoring the voting rights of more than 1 million formerly incarcerated individuals with past felony convictions. Amendment 4 would apply once an individual had completed his or her sentence, including parole and probation, except for murder or felony sex offenses. In 2019, the Florida legislature passed, and the Governor signed a new law effectively overruling the will of more than 60 percent of the state’s voters, requiring all formerly incarcerated individuals to pay fines and fees before they can be re-enfranchised.¹⁹⁸

194 *North Carolina State Conference of the NAACP v. McCrory*, 831 F.3d 204, 216-218 (4th Cir. 2016), *cert. denied*, 137 S. Ct. 1399.

195 *New Voting Restrictions in America*, Brennan Center for Justice (last updated July 3, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/new-voting-restrictions-america>.

In 2016, the 14 states with new voting restrictions in place for the presidential election were: Alabama, Arizona, Indiana, Kansas, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

196 *Id.*

197 *Id.*

198 Amendment 4 passed overwhelmingly, yet the Florida State Legislature passed S.B. 7066 and Governor DeSantis signed it into law in 2019. The law is currently being challenged in court, *see also Voting Laws Roundup 2019*, Brennan Center for Justice (July 10, 2019),

Also in 2019, Arizona enacted laws extending voter ID requirements to early voting and emergency early and absentee voting.¹⁹⁹

Without the full protection of the Voting Rights Act, voters and litigators are left to rely primarily on lawsuits to protect the franchise. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act provides a private right of action to sue in cases of voting rights violations. However, as discussed in this report, Section 2 litigation has been time consuming and costly, and is only available to block existing or newly instituted discriminatory policies or procedures. Since *Shelby County*, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law ("Lawyers' Committee") alone has been involved in 41 cases related to discriminatory practices in voting or adverse effects on the voting rights of minority voters.²⁰⁰ Twenty-four of these actions have been filed since January 20, 2017.²⁰¹ By contrast, the Department of Justice has filed no cases in that time.²⁰²

In the same timeframe, the American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU") has opened more than 60 new voting rights matters, including cases filed, amicus briefs, and investigations.²⁰³ The organization currently has more than 30 active matters.²⁰⁴ Between the 2012 and 2016 presidential elections, the ACLU and its affiliates won 15 voting rights victories protecting more than 5.6 million voters in 12 states, collectively home to 161 members of the House and 185 Electoral College votes.²⁰⁵ Between the *Shelby County* decision and the September 2018 issuance of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' report entitled "An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States" at least 23 states had enacted newly restrictive statewide voter laws.²⁰⁶

Reliance on Section 2 also shifts the burden to the citizen, rather than the state or local government seeking to enact a change to its voting laws, to prove disenfranchisement. Suppressive laws can potentially disenfranchise voters for years before they are identified,

<https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/voting-laws-roundup-2019>.

199 *Voting Laws Roundup 2019*, Brennan Center for Justice (July 10, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/voting-laws-roundup-2019>, see also S.B. 1072 and S.B. 1090.

200 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 4.

201 *Id.*

"... Since *Shelby County*, the Lawyers' Committee has been involved in 41 cases relating to discriminatory practices in voting or adverse effects on the voting rights of minority voters... Twenty-four of these actions were filed since January 20, 2017—which is twenty-four more cases than instituted by the current administration's Department of Justice. Not including the four cases where we sued the federal government, in twenty-nine of the thirty-seven (78.3%) cases we have been opposed by state or local jurisdictions that were covered by Section 5, even though far less than half of the country was covered by Section 5. Importantly, we have achieved substantial success—measured by final judgment, advantageous settlement, or effective injunctive relief in three-quarters of these cases."

202 *Id.*

203 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Dale Ho at p. 2.

204 *Id.*

205 *Id.* at p. 2-3.

206 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Catherine Lhamon at p. 36.

"Drawing from Commission research and investigations and memoranda from 13 of the Commission's State advisory committees who analyzed voting discrimination in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, New Hampshire, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Texas, this report documents current conditions evidencing ongoing discrimination in voting. On every measure the Commission evaluated, the information the Commission received underscores that discrimination in voting persists."

challenged, and litigated to a conclusion. In addition, the Department of Justice has also interpreted *Shelby County* to mean it can now only send election observers if ordered by a court,²⁰⁷ removing a critical tool for gathering evidence of voting discrimination and firsthand knowledge.

The 2014 midterm was the first election since the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965 that Americans went to register and cast their votes without the full might of the federal government protecting their right to do so.

In 2018, more than 50 percent of eligible Americans cast a ballot in the midterm elections.²⁰⁸ The U.S. Census Bureau reported voter turnout was up among all voting age and major racial and ethnic groups.²⁰⁹ 2018 saw the highest midterm turnout in four decades.²¹⁰ The increased turnout resulted in reports of long lines stretching for multiple hours; voting machines that did not work or were not plugged in; and polling locations that did not open on time or were moved. There is no way to know how many voters were disenfranchised because they had to leave the line or were turned away inside the polling place. It is also unknown how many voters were forced to cast a provisional ballot because of haphazard enforcement of voting regulations, or a lack of proper poll worker training, or their name was improperly removed from the voter rolls.

The Committee on House Administration Subcommittee on Elections held hearings in communities across the country, collecting contemporaneous data that clearly illustrates the ongoing attempts to suppress the votes of minority communities. The hearings provided clear evidence that discrimination and suppression are alive and well – the overt poll taxes and literacy tests as experienced during the Jim Crow Era may be resigned to the past, but discrimination in voting is not. Across the country, the Subcommittee on Elections heard testimony and gathered evidence of ongoing voter suppression. Six years after the Court’s decision in *Shelby County*, Americans, including policymakers, have a more in-depth understanding of the measures taken by states to restrict and subvert the right to vote. Lawsuits over discriminatory voting changes lay bare the persistent opposition that some states and localities have toward equal access to the ballot. Furthermore, the evidence is clear that Sections 4(b) and 5 of the Voting Rights Act remain just as critical to protecting the right to vote and enforcing the 14th and 15th Amendments as they were in 1965.

Voters now face pervasive subtle and overt suppression tactics, many (if not all) of which would have been vetted through a transparent and thorough process under Section 5. Under current law, these changes can be enacted under the cover of darkness, with little to no public notice and no evaluation of the potential impact on voters. This chapter explores these tactics, highlighting testimony received at Subcommittee hearings, as well as how voter suppression

207 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 9-10, https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/Minority_Voting_Access_2018.pdf, see also U.S. Dep’t of Justice, Fact Sheet on Justice Department’s Enforcement Efforts Following *Shelby County* Decision, <https://www.justice.gov/crt/file/876246/download>.

208 Jordan Misra, *Voter Turnout Rates Among All Voting Age and Major Racial and Ethnic Groups Were Higher Than in 2014*, U.S. Census Bureau, Behind the 2018 U.S. Midterm Election Turnout (April 23, 2019), <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2019/04/behind-2018-united-states-midterm-election-turnout.html>.

209 *Id.*

210 *Id.*

techniques have evolved. This chapter also examines the role of Section 2 litigation (one of the key remaining tools in the Voting Rights Act arsenal). It examines the critical role it still plays in helping protect the right to vote, but also examines the limitations in relying on Section 2 to address the disenfranchisement that a full Voting Rights Act would have prevented.

In Brownsville, Texas, Mimi Marziani of the Texas Civil Rights Project testified that, “long lines and late openings are, unfortunately, such a common feature of Texas elections that they are deemed ‘typical’ by election officials.”²¹¹ Ms. Marziani further testified that, in Harris County, home to the city of Houston, numerous polling places opened more than an hour late

“[A]t the Pittman Park voting station, we received calls lines that were reportedly 300 people deep with a wait time of 3.5 hours. Long lines and broken or inoperable voting machines also led to people getting turned away or given provisional ballots. Ultimately, I was involved in advocacy and litigation to extend the hours of several polling locations in Fulton County, Georgia, that particularly impacted Atlanta University Center students at Morehouse, Spelman, and Clark Atlanta University at the Booker T. Washington High School polling place locations.”

— Gilda Daniels, Advancement Project

on Election Day.²¹² The county had to be sued to keep the polls open longer to compensate.

In Georgia, Gilda Daniels of the Advancement Project testified that at the Pittman Park voting sites they received calls that lines were “reportedly 300 people deep with a wait time of 3.5 hours.”²¹³ Ultimately, Ms. Daniels testified she was involved in advocacy and litigation to extend hours of several polling locations in Fulton County, Georgia.²¹⁴ The League of Women Voters of Georgia submitted testimony that voters in Gwinnett County and Atlanta precincts waited at least four hours to cast their vote.²¹⁵ Voters in Georgia experienced issues with the voting rolls, receiving and returning absentee ballots, and being forced to cast provisional ballots.

Witnesses testified that elections officials refused to provide provisional ballots, citing a paper shortage.²¹⁶

211 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Texas*: Listening Session Before the Comm. on House Administration, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Mimi Marziani.

212 *Id.*

213 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Gilda Daniels at p. 5.

214 *Id.*

215 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); written testimony submitted for the record by Tracy Adkison, League of Women Voters of Georgia.

216 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); written testimony of Stacey Abrams at p. 2.

“In counties, polling locations ran out of provisional and back-up paper ballots. Frustrated voters received inaccurate information regarding their rights; and thousands of voters were forced to vote using provisional ballots due to long lines. An untold number simply gave up, unable to bear the financial cost of waiting in line because Georgia does not guarantee paid time off to vote.”

“Voters, many of whom were first time voters, experienced numerous issues with being located on the voting rolls, receiving and returning absentee ballots, and were given a disturbing number of provisional ballots rather than being allowed to vote unhindered. In some areas, elections officials refused to provide provisional ballots, citing a shortage of paper.”

— Stacey Abrams, Fair Fight

dilutes minority voting power, cutbacks or elimination of early voting, forcing more people to miss work in order to cast their vote, creating longer lines at polling locations on Election Day, and impeding voters that rely on others for transportation, frequently changing rules and regulations that confuse poll workers and voters, and denying access to language assistance.

“... when you deny things like early voting ... you are undermining people who every day of their lives have to fight just to exist and may not be able to be off on Election Day.”

— Rev. Dr. William Barber II

Subcommittee’s hearings demonstrate, these voting changes jeopardize millions of Americans’ right to vote and have a disparate impact on the ability of minority voters to cast a ballot.

Much of the testimony and evidence the Subcommittee received demonstrates that states use a combination of these tactics. In Ohio, for example, the state has cut back early voting, eliminated what was once referred to as “Golden Week” (when voters could register and vote

States and localities should be prepared for elections, no matter how high the turnout, and federal and state laws and regulations should support a robust democracy – not make it difficult for eligible voters to exercise the franchise.

After the Court struck down Section 4(b) and rendered Section 5 effectively inoperable, many states and counties, which were once required to clear any proposed voting changes through the Department of Justice or federal court before they could go into effect, have moved to restrict access to the ballot. Some states made overt moves to restrict access to the franchise implementing barriers such as: discriminatory gerrymandering that

Other changes may seem innocuous on their face, such as consolidating or moving polling locations, coloring voter purges as “list maintenance,” or requiring specific forms of voter identification to be presented when voting. However, without Section 5 preclearance, none of these changes were evaluated for their potential discriminatory effect before implementation. As the testimony and evidence collected during the

on the same day), consolidated early voting sites, and purged thousands of voters from the registration rolls, among other things.²¹⁷

In Florida, a lack of language access and language assistance remains a critical barrier to voting.²¹⁸ In Alabama, the home of *Shelby County* and the infamous Bloody Sunday, the state is still attempting to suppress the vote of minority communities through implementation of strict voter ID requirements, attempts to require proof of citizenship for voter registration, and polling place closures.²¹⁹

When compounded with poverty, a lack of adequate transportation, and/or other socioeconomic constraints, these tactics result in the disenfranchisement of thousands of otherwise eligible voters. This refrain was heard time and again, across all field hearings.

Some argued over the course of the field hearings that “voter turnout is up,” so there must not be a problem. As this report demonstrates, that sentiment is inaccurate. Overcoming barriers to exercise the right to vote does not excuse the barriers’ existence. The will and stamina that voters take to overcome suppressive laws is not an excuse to keep the unjust barriers in place. Congress and the American people made that clear nearly 55 years ago with the passage of the Voting Rights Act and its five subsequent reauthorizations.

“We ought to be celebrating increased turnout wherever it exists. And we also ought to be recognizing that, across the board, in this country, we have very, very low turnout for voters. And that is, in itself, a concern.”

— Catherine Lhamon, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Others posit that purging voter rolls, requiring voter ID, and banning people from putting a neighbor’s ballot in the mail is necessary to prevent voter fraud. Voter fraud has long been a red herring in the attempt to suppress the right to vote. The Subcommittee received testimony and evidence of how purge processes often inaccurately sweep up people who are, in fact, eligible to vote and disproportionately affect minority voters and naturalized citizens. There have been very few, if any, cases of in-person voter fraud, which is the only

type of fraud voter ID would purportedly prevent.

The Subcommittee received no testimony in Arizona, a state that has seen a large shift toward mail-in ballots, warranting its suppressive ban on “ballot harvesting” that recently became law. In North Carolina’s Ninth Congressional District, the recent issues with ballot collection were the result of election fraud, not voter fraud. Despite repeated unsubstantiated claims, there were no accounts of voter fraud in California’s vote-by-mail and ballot collection system in the 2018 election.

217 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

218 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

219 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

In Ohio, Inajo Davis Chappell, a member of the Cuyahoga County Board of Elections for the last 12 years, testified in her personal capacity that she believes the “constant clamoring about rampant voter fraud is [also] discouraging voter participation.”²²⁰ Ms. Chappell went on to say, “my experience in administering elections in Cuyahoga County over the last twelve years permits me to say with confidence that claims of voter fraud in the elections process are wholly without merit. Indeed, the voter fraud narrative is a patently false narrative.”²²¹

As U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Chair Catherine Lhamon testified, “[N]ot only was there no evidence given to the Commission about widespread voter fraud, the data and the research that is bipartisan reflect that voter fraud is vanishingly rare in this country. . . . [A]nd so, it is duplicative and also harmful to initiate strict voter ID, among other kinds of requirements, in the name of combating voter fraud.”²²² The very real issue at hand is the lack of access to the ballot and the increase in discriminatory, suppressive voting laws faced by voters. As a guardian of democracy, this is where Congress’s focus must lie.

VOTER SUPPRESSION EFFORTS ACROSS AMERICA

The post-*Shelby County* voting rights landscape has seen the rise of a new generation of voter suppression tactics. Some may appear sensible on their face, but in their intent and practical impact, they discriminate, frustrate, and ultimately suppress the votes of targeted communities. Some of these laws amount to a modern-day poll tax, such as requiring voter ID that is difficult and prohibitively expensive to obtain or requiring formerly incarcerated individuals to pay all fines and fees before their right to vote is restored.

The denial of, or lack of availability of, multi-language access or assistance at the polls disenfranchises voters whose right to those services is still protected under the Voting Rights Act. Discriminatory and over-aggressive methods of purging voter rolls disenfranchise

220 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); written testimony of Inajo Davis Chappell at p. 3.

221 *Id.*

222 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Catherine Lhamon answering Congressman Pete Aguilar at p. 51-52.

“**Mr. Aguilar:** But this is becoming hyper-political. And some of my colleagues across the aisle are conflating voter fraud with legitimate exercising of our electoral process. And they have blamed losses, congressional losses, on this, basically telling folks that thousands of ballots just kind of show up, the inference being that individuals are just grabbing other people’s ballots. I mean, you know, it is just becoming hyper-political.

So, can you talk a little bit about ballot harvesting? And is there evidence? Was there any testimony given to you and your Commission supporting claims of widespread voter fraud that a lot of my colleagues have used, obviously, to pass increased voter suppression laws?

Ms. Lhamon: Not only was there no evidence given to the Commission about widespread voter fraud, the data and the research that is bipartisan reflect that voter fraud is vanishingly rare in this country.

So, the concerns about that type of vote misuse both have existing criminal penalties in the Voting Rights Act for voting twice and State and Federal penalties for the kinds of voter fraud that already exist. And so it is duplicative and also harmful to initiate strict voter ID, among other kinds of requirements, in the name of combating voter fraud.

But, also, the existence of voter fraud, as I mentioned, essentially does not exist. And the testimony, both that we at the Commission received and also that our State advisory committees received across the many States that investigated this question, just don’t find the existence of voter fraud at all.”

otherwise eligible voters, often without their knowledge until they arrive at the polls and are turned away or forced to cast a provisional ballot that may not be counted.

Some states require an exact signature match for a ballot to be accepted, a challenge for elderly and disabled voters. This is often enforced by a lay-person with no training in handwriting analysis. Thousands of Georgia voters had their registrations put on hold because the name on the registration form did not “exact match” the name on file with certain government records. Hundreds of polling locations have closed since *Shelby County* was decided, early voting hours have been cut, and same-day registration has been eliminated in some instances. Discriminatory gerrymandering has once again diluted the vote and voice of minority populations.

This chapter will explore the most common voter suppression tactics discussed during the Subcommittee’s field hearings, which have become more pervasive post-*Shelby County*, as there is no longer any check on these practices (other than costly litigation and ballot measures):

- Purging voter registration rolls
- Cutbacks to early voting
- Polling place closures and movements
- Voter Identification (voter ID) requirements
- Use of exact match and signature match
- Lack of language access and assistance
- Discriminatory gerrymandering

Purging Voter Registration Rolls

Voter purges refer to the process by which election officials attempt to remove the names of allegedly ineligible voters from the voter registration lists.²²³ Voter purges have taken various forms in recent years, and when done improperly, disenfranchise otherwise eligible voters and increase the risk that minority voters will be disproportionately impacted. Often this happens too soon before an election for a voter to correct the error.

Florida has attempted to purge voters based on alleged ineligibility; Georgia came under increased scrutiny for placing voter registrations on hold and purging voters based on minor errors under the “exact match” procedures; North Carolina purges voters based on challenges by private parties; Florida and Pennsylvania purge voters based on felony convictions; and Georgia, and Ohio purge voters based on inactivity, to name a few.²²⁴ While states must

²²³ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michael Waldman at p. 3.

²²⁴ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 145-157.

maintain accurate voter rolls, practices of purging voters from rolls have raised serious concerns in recent years. Some states enacted unnecessary restrictions on voter registration and requirements to remain on the rolls, while others have purged otherwise eligible voters based on exaggerated assertions of non-citizens registering to vote and on the use of faulty databases.

The Brennan Center for Justice found that between 2014 and 2016, states removed almost 16 million voters from the registration rolls.²²⁵ This purge rate resulted in almost 4 million more names being purged from the rolls between 2014 and 2016 than between 2006 and 2008.²²⁶ The purge rate outpaced growth in voter registration (18 percent) or population (6 percent).²²⁷ The Brennan Center calculated that 2 million fewer voters would have been purged between 2012 and 2016 if jurisdictions previously covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act had purged their voter rolls at the same rate as other non-covered jurisdictions.²²⁸

Follow-on research by the Brennan Center found that at least 17 million voters were purged nationwide between 2016 and 2018.²²⁹ According to testimony from Michael Waldman, President of the Brennan Center, the median purge rate was 40 percent higher in jurisdictions previously covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act than elsewhere.²³⁰ Had the purge rate in previously covered jurisdictions been consistent with the rest of the country, as many as 1.1 million fewer people would have been purged from the rolls.²³¹

Federal law governing purges allows a voter's name to be removed from the voter rolls on the following grounds: (1) disenfranchising criminal conviction; (2) mental incapacity; (3) death; and (4) change in residence.²³² Additionally, individuals who were never eligible may be removed. Voters may be removed at their own request (even if they remain eligible).²³³

225 Jonathan Brater, Kevin Morris, Myrna Perez, and Christopher Deluzio, *Purges: A Growing Threat to the Right to Vote*, Brennan Center for Justice (2018), https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/Purges_Growing_Threat_2018.1.pdf.
226 *Id.*

“Almost 4 million more names were purged from the rolls between 2014 and 2016 than between 2006 and 2008. This growth in the number of removed voters represented an increase of 33 percent — far outstripping growth in both total registered voters (18 percent) and total population (6 percent).”

227 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michael Waldman at p. 3.

228 *Id.*

229 Kevin Morris, *Voter Purge Rates Remain High, Analysis Finds*, Brennan Center for Justice (updated: Aug. 21, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/voter-purge-rates-remain-high-analysis-finds>.

230 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michael Waldman at p. 3.

231 *Id.*, citing Kevin Morris, *Voter Purge Rates Remain High, Analysis Finds*, Brennan Center for Justice (Aug. 1, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/voter-purge-rates-remain-high-analysis-finds>.

232 National Voter Registration Act of 1993, H.R. 2, 103rd Cong. (1993), 52 U.S.C. §20507.

“The law discusses five categories of removal from voter rolls: (1) request of the registrant; (2) disenfranchising criminal conviction; (3) mental incapacity; (4) death; and (5) change in residence. The NVRA sets forth a series of specific requirements that apply to purges of registrants believed to have changed residence. The law also contains a series of additional proscriptions on state practices. For example, it provides that list maintenance must be uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in accordance with the Voting Rights Act. It also prohibits systematic voter purges (those programs that remove groups of voters at once) within 90 days of a federal election. The Act also has provisions that apply on Election Day if a voter has changed address. Voters who have moved within a jurisdiction are permitted to vote at either their new or old polling place (states get to choose), while purged voters — mistakenly believed to have moved — who show up on Election Day have the right to correct the error and cast a ballot that will count.”

233 *Id.*, see also Ohio State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *Voting Rights in Ohio* (May 2018) at p. 9, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/06-27-OH-Voting-Rights.pdf>.

Notably, the statute does not allow states to purge voters solely based on inactivity. The Department of Justice supported plaintiffs who successfully challenged state purge practices until the change in presidential administrations following the 2016 election. The new administration reversed course on a brief filed by the Obama administration in support of plaintiffs challenging Ohio's purge practice, and instead filed a brief in support of Ohio.²³⁴

In 2018, the Ohio Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Advisory Memorandum stated that Ohio is currently one of the most aggressive states in purging voter registrations.²³⁵ The Court's decision in *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute*, which upheld Ohio's practice,²³⁶ paved the way for states to conduct more aggressive voter purges. Under Ohio law, voters were being removed from the voter rolls based on failure to vote. Voters who miss a single federal election are flagged to receive a postage prepaid notice to confirm the voter still lives at the same address. If the voter fails to respond to that notice and does not vote within the next four years (two federal elections), the state removes them from the voter rolls, citing change of residence, with no further notice. If a person attempts to vote after her registration has been canceled, she is given a provisional ballot. The provisional ballot is not counted for the current election cycle, but the envelope containing the provisional ballot, if filled out correctly, can double as a voter registration form, re-registering the voter for the next election cycle.²³⁷ As of publication of the Ohio State Advisory Memorandum, Ohio had purged more than 2 million people since 2011 for failure to vote in two consecutive elections.²³⁸

On June 11, 2018, the Court ruled that Ohio's purge law was permissible.²³⁹ The Court's decision was based on its interpretation of the National Voter Registration Act and did not address any possible claims regarding a Section 2 discrimination claim.²⁴⁰ The *Husted* decision effectively punishes voters for failing to vote, contrary to how the law was written and the system is intended to function. In practice, if a voter skips voting in the midterms and one presidential election, they are placed into the process for purging.

A 2016 Reuters analysis of Ohio's voter purge found that "in predominantly African American neighborhoods around Cincinnati, 10 percent of registered voters had been removed due to inactivity since 2012, compared to just four percent in the suburban Indian Hill. The study

234 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 155, *citing*

"After the 2016 presidential election, the DOJ changed its position in this case through a brief filed in Aug. 2017, signed by no career staff. Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioner-Defendant, *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.*, https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/briefs/2017/08/07/16-980_husted_v_randolph_institute_ac_merits.pdf. In the meantime, 17 former DOJ leaders including former Attorney General Eric Holder and career voting rights attorneys filed an amicus before the Supreme Court, arguing that the NVRA protects the right to vote and the right not to vote, and clearly prohibits removals for inactivity, noting that "from 1994 until the Solicitor General's brief in this case, the DOJ had repeatedly interpreted the NVRA to prohibit a state from using a registrant's failure to vote as the basis for initiating the Section 8(d) voter-purge process." Brief for Eric Holder et al. as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents, *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.* at 31."

235 Ohio State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *Voting Rights in Ohio* (May 2018) at p. 9, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/06-27-OH-Voting-Rights.pdf>.

236 *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.*, 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018).

237 *Id.*

238 *Id.*

239 *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute*, 138 S.Ct. 1833 (2018).

240 *Id.*

further found that more than 144,000 people were removed from the rolls in Ohio’s three largest counties, which includes the cities of Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Columbus – hitting hardest neighborhoods that are low-income and have a high proportion of Black voters.”²⁴¹ Ohio’s Secretary of State Frank LaRose recently revealed errors in the state’s purge list as groups found tens of thousands of people were wrongfully on the list.²⁴²

The purported rationale behind these purges often exaggerates the alleged problem of non-citizens voting, while the practical result is the removal of otherwise eligible citizens from the voting rolls. Sometimes, this concern is perpetuated by public officials who may have ulterior political motives. The words of election officials have a significant impact on the public’s trust in the voting process. In Texas, the Secretary of State made wildly inaccurate claims about non-citizens registering to vote.

On January 25, 2019, Texas Secretary of State David Whitley issued an advisory to county voter registrars about non-citizens and voter registration.²⁴³ In an accompanying press release, Secretary Whitley claimed that “approximately 95,000 individuals identified by [the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS)] as non-U.S. citizens have a matching voter registration record in Texas” and “58,000 of whom have voted in one or more Texas elections.”²⁴⁴

This claim was demonstrably false. Within a week, the facts bore out that many of these voters were in fact naturalized citizens who had already confirmed their citizenship.²⁴⁵ As Kristen Clarke of the Lawyers’ Committee testified, “the list was based on DMV data that the state knew was flawed and would necessarily sweep in thousands of citizens who completed the naturalization process after lawfully applying for a Texas drivers’ license.”²⁴⁶ According to testimony from Dale Ho of the ACLU, in Harris County, Texas alone, about 60 percent of the 30,000 voters flagged had already confirmed their citizenship.²⁴⁷ Advocates sued, challenging the purge process; the case settled immediately and Texas abandoned the process.²⁴⁸ The court

241 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 12-13, citing Andy Sullivan & Grant Smith, *Use It or Lose It: Occasional Ohio Voters May Be Shut Out in November*, Reuters (Jun. 2, 2016), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-votingrights-ohioinsight/use-it-or-lose-it-occasional-ohio-voters-may-be-shut-out-in-november-idUSKCN0YO19D>.

242 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 13, see also Andrew J. Tobias, *Ohio Secretary of State Frank LaRose says Ohio’s system of maintaining voter registrations rife with problems*, Cleveland.com (updated Sept. 25, 2019), <https://www.cleveland.com/open/2019/09/ohio-secretary-of-state-frank-larose-says-ohios-system-of-maintaining-voter-registrations-rife-with-problems.html>, and *Ohio Was Set to Purge 235,000 Voters. It Was Wrong About 20%*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 14, 2019), <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/14/us/politics/ohio-voter-purge.html>.

243 Election Advisory No. 2019-02, *Use of Non-U.S. Citizen Data obtained by the Department of Public Safety*, (Jan. 25, 2019), <https://www.sos.texas.gov/elections/laws/advisory2019-02.shtml>.

244 Press Release, *Secretary Whitley Issues Advisory on Voter Registration List Maintenance Activity*, Texas Secretary of State (Jan. 25, 2019), <https://www.sos.texas.gov/about/newsreleases/2019/012519.shtml>.

245 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Dale Ho at p. 17.

246 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 8.

247 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Dale Ho at p. 17.

248 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 8, citing *Texas League of United Latino American Citizens v. Whitley*, No. 5:19-cv-00074 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 27, 2019).

found that Texas “created a mess” which “exemplified the power of the government to strike fear and intimidate the least powerful among us.”²⁴⁹

Purges have also been implemented in Georgia, where then-Secretary of State Brian Kemp’s office purged approximately 1.5 million registered voters between 2012 and 2016. Between 2016 and 2018, Georgia purged more than 10 percent of its voters.²⁵⁰ Secretary of State Kemp then ran for Governor of Georgia in 2018, winning by 54,723 votes, a 1.4 percentage point margin.²⁵¹ In October 2019, Georgia officials announced they would be removing approximately 300,000 names from the voter rolls, almost four percent of those registered to vote.²⁵²

Between 2000 and 2012, the state of Florida was repeatedly charged with allegations it engaged in systematic purges impacting voters of color.²⁵³ In 2012, Florida attempted to remove voters who were allegedly non-citizens from its voter rolls by comparing rolls to driver’s license data, an unreliable method as Florida’s driver’s license databases do not reflect citizenship.²⁵⁴ Utilizing this method, the state identified over 180,000 “questionable” voters before eventually cutting it down to 2,600.²⁵⁵ In addition, the purge had suspicious timing as it took place within 90 days of the 2012 election.²⁵⁶ According to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

“The vast majority of voters on Florida’s 2012 purge list were people of color.²⁵⁷ The data in a federal complaint alleging Section 2 violations (based on Florida voter registration data) showed that 87 percent were voters of color: 61 percent were Hispanic (whereas 14 percent of all registered voters in Florida were Hispanic); 16 percent were Black (whereas 14

249 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript Dale Ho at p. 17.

“There is a similar story in Texas. In January, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton tweeted, in capital letters, “voter fraud alert,” claiming that almost 100,000 registrants in Texas were noncitizens. But that was false. Within a week, it came out that many of these voters were naturalized citizens who had already confirmed their citizenship. In Harris County alone, this translated to about 60 percent of 30,000 voters flagged there. And as to the remaining 12,000, an audit of 150 names chosen at random yielded no noncitizens.

Civil rights organizations, including MALDEF, the ACLU, and the Texas Civil Rights Project, sued to stop Texas from purging these voters. The court found that Texas, quote, created a mess, which, quote, exemplified the power of the government to strike fear and intimidate the least powerful among us. The case was settled with Texas taxpayers on the hook for \$450,000 in costs and attorneys’ fees. Texas Secretary of State David Whitley departed from office in disgrace.”

250 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Gilda Daniels at p. 5.

“Between 2016 – 2018, Georgia purged more than 10 percent of its voters, nearly 670,000 registrations were cancelled in 2017 alone.”

251 Mark Niesse, *Georgia certifies election results after nearly two weeks of drama*, AJC (Nov. 17, 2018), <https://www.ajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/georgia-certifies-election-results-after-nearly-two-weeks-drama/VOUIvFPmmzxad39XQFuoPP/>.

252 Nicholas Casey, *Georgia Plans to Purge 300,000 Names From Its Voter Rolls*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 30, 2019), <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/30/us/politics/georgia-voter-purge.html>.

253 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 145.

254 *Id.*

255 *Id.* at p. 147.

256 Patrik Jonsson, *Court rules Florida voter purge illegal, but will it stop GOP voting tweaks?*, The Christian Science Monitor (Apr. 2, 2014), <https://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Justice/2014/0402/Court-rules-Florida-voter-purge-illegal-but-will-it-stop-GOP-voting-tweaks>.

257 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p. 3.

percent of all registered voters were Black); 16 percent were White (whereas 70 percent of registered voters were White); and 5 percent were Asian American (whereas only 2 percent of registered voters were Asian).²⁵⁸

In ensuing litigation, Florida was blocked from continuing this practice. In 2014, then-Governor, now Senator, Rick Scott again attempted to purge alleged non-citizens from the voter rolls using the Department of Homeland Security's Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements ("SAVE") database. Use of the SAVE database is also highly problematic as it is not updated to include all naturalized citizens.²⁵⁹ This faulty method of purging voter rolls has a disproportionate impact on people of color.

Judith Browne Dianis, Executive Director of the Advancement Project, testified in Florida that the Advancement Project's research found 87 percent of Florida's purge list comprised people of color, and more than 50 percent of the list was Latino.²⁶⁰ Florida has again moved aggressively to purge voters: an estimated seven percent of voters have been purged in the last two years.²⁶¹

In Alabama, since taking office in 2015, Secretary of State John Merrill has purged 780,000 voters from the state's rolls.²⁶² In 2017, more than 340,000 additional voters were listed as inactive, a precursor to being removed from the rolls if the voter does not vote in the next four years.²⁶³ Nancy Abudu, Deputy Legal Director, Voting Rights at the Southern Poverty Law Center testified that, although Alabama law allows voters placed on the inactive list to update their voter registration and cast a regular ballot even on the day of the election, Southern Poverty Law Center employees on the ground as part of the Alabama Voting Rights Project, "spoke to dozens of voters who were forced to cast provisional ballots because of their 'inactive' status."²⁶⁴

New York has also had issues with improperly removing otherwise eligible voters from the rolls. In November 2016, the Lawyers' Committee and Common Cause filed suit alleging the New York City Board of Elections (NYCBOE) had purged voters from the rolls in violation of the National Voter Registration Act.²⁶⁵ Earlier in 2016, NYCBOE had confirmed that more than 126,000 Brooklyn voters were removed from the rolls between the summer of 2015 and the April 2016 presidential primary election.²⁶⁶ After the State of New York and the Department of Justice entered the case, the NYCBOE agreed to place persons who were removed from the rolls or were on inactive status back on the rolls if they met certain

258 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 147-148.

259 *Id.* at p. 148.

260 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Judith Browne Dianis at p. 68.

261 *Id.*

262 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Nancy Abudu at p. 4.

263 *Id.*, also citing Maggie Astor, *Seven Ways Alabama Has Made It Harder to Vote*, N.Y. Times (2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/23/us/politics/voting-rights-alabama.html>.

264 *Id.* at p. 4-5.

265 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 7.

266 *Id.*

requirements. Subsequently, a Consent Decree was negotiated whereby the NYCBOE agreed to comply with the NVRA before purging anyone from the rolls and subject itself to four years of monitoring and auditing.²⁶⁷

In 2016, Arkansas purged thousands of voters due to supposed felony convictions, but the lists used to conduct the purge were highly inaccurate and included many voters who had never committed a felony or whose voting rights had been restored.²⁶⁸

Improper purges are exacerbated by the use of inaccurate databases. The SAVE database is at times used to verify immigration status when an individual interacts with a state, however SAVE does not include a comprehensive and definitive listing of U.S. citizens and states have been cautioned against using it to check voter eligibility.²⁶⁹ Additionally, driver's license databases have proven inaccurate for verifying voter registration lists.²⁷⁰

States have also attempted to address voters rolls through coordinated information sharing. Two systems developed to facilitate this are the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck Program ("Crosscheck") and the Electronic Registration Information Center ("ERIC"). Crosscheck was created by the State of Kansas and has been found to have high error rates.²⁷¹ The system includes data from registered voters in participating states and compares their first names, last names, and date of birth to generate lists of voters who may be registered to vote in more than one state.²⁷² The system has proved highly problematic. A 2017 study found that, if applied nationwide, Crosscheck would "impede 300 legal votes for every double vote prevented."²⁷³ Several states have left the program in recent years or stopped using it.²⁷⁴ Since Kris Kobach lost his election for governor of Kansas in 2018, the future of the Crosscheck system has become uncertain and data has not been loaded into Crosscheck since 2017 due to security concerns.²⁷⁵

267 *Id.*, citing *Common Cause/New York v. Board of Elections in City of New York*, No. 1:16-cv-06122 (E.D.N.Y. 2017).

"On November 3, 2016, the Lawyers' Committee and another civil rights organization filed suit alleging that the New York City Board of Elections (NYCBOE) had purged voters from the rolls in violation of the NVRA. Earlier in the year, the NYCBOE had confirmed that more than 126,000 Brooklyn voters were removed from the rolls between the summer of 2015 and the April 2016 primary election. After entry of the State of New York and the U.S. Department of Justice in the case, the NYCBOE agreed to place persons who were on inactive status or removed from the rolls back on the rolls if they lived at the address listed in their voter registration file and/or if they had voted in at least one election in New York City since November 1, 2012 and still lived in the city. Subsequently, the parties negotiated a Consent Decree, under which the NYCBOE agreed to comply with the NVRA before removing anyone from the rolls, and to subject itself to a four-year auditing and monitoring regimen."

268 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michael Waldman at p. 4.

269 *Id.*, written testimony of Dale Ho at p. 8-9.

270 *Id.* at p. 12.

271 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 109.

272 *Id.* at p. 109-110.

273 Jonathan Brater, Kevin Morris, Myrna Pérez, and Christopher Deluzio, *Purges: A Growing Threat to the Right to Vote*, Brennan Center for Justice (2018) at p. 7-8, https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Purges_Growing_Threat.pdf, citing Sharad Goel et al., *One Person, One Vote: Estimating the Prevalence of Double Voting in U.S. Presidential Elections* (working paper, Stanford University et al., 2017), 3, 26, <https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/morse/files/lplv.pdf>.

274 *Id.* at p. 7-8.

275 Sherman Smith, *ACLU Calls on Kansas to end 'misery' of Crosscheck voter registration system*, The Topeka Capital-Journal (Mar. 28, 2019), <https://www.cjonline.com/news/20190328/aclu-calls-on-kansas-to-end-misery-of-crosscheck-voter-registration-system>.

The ERIC system uses far more data points than Crosscheck to attempt to identify when voters move, including voter registration data, DMV licensing information, Social Security Administration data, and National Change of Address information.²⁷⁶ As of July 2019, 28 states and the District of Columbia participate in ERIC.²⁷⁷

This problem could be ameliorated by implementing same-day registration. Dale Ho testified that states that have Election Day registration “tend to have turnout that is about 5 to 10 percentage points higher than the states that don’t.”²⁷⁸ Allowing voters to same-day register could ensure that voters who are erroneously purged from the rolls are not forced to cast a provisional ballot that may never be counted or do not vote at all.

Cutbacks to Early Voting

In the 2016 election cycle, 23,024,146 Americans used in-person early voting.²⁷⁹ Since 2010, several states have reduced the hours and/or days of early, in-person voting available to voters.²⁸⁰ The USCCR Minority Voting Report found cuts to early voting can cause long lines with a disparate impact on voters of color.²⁸¹ Long lines at the polls during the 2012 elections led to the creation of the Presidential Commission on Election Administration (PCEA). The PCEA found that “over five million voters in 2012 experienced wait times exceeding one hour and an additional five million waited between a half hour and an hour.”²⁸² According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 39 states (including three that mail ballots to all voters) and the District of Columbia allow any qualified voter to cast an in-person vote during a designated early voting period prior to Election Day with no excuse or justification needed.²⁸³ Eleven states have no early voting and an excuse is required to request an absentee ballot.²⁸⁴ Since 2010, at least seven states have reduced in-person early voting, limiting the days and hours sites are open, and closed locations, all of which disproportionately impacts voters of color.²⁸⁵

One of the most severe examples of cuts to early voting was examined at the Subcommittee’s field hearing in Ohio. For nearly a decade, Ohio expanded voters’ access to the ballot before reversing course and drastically constricting access, limiting early voting and creating frequent

²⁷⁶ *Id.* at p. 8.

²⁷⁷ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Voter List Accuracy* (Aug. 22, 2019), <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/voter-list-accuracy.aspx>.

²⁷⁸ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Dale Ho at p. 25.

²⁷⁹ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 158.

²⁸⁰ *Id.* at p. 159.

²⁸¹ *Id.*

²⁸² *Id.* at p. 160, *citing* U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Presidential Commission on Election Administration, EAC (Jan. 2014), <https://www.eac.gov/election-officials/pcea/>.

²⁸³ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Absentee and Early Voting* (July 30, 2019), <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/absentee-and-early-voting.aspx>.

²⁸⁴ *Id.*

²⁸⁵ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 6.

The seven states are: Florida, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and West Virginia; *see* Tim Lau, *Early Voting Numbers Soar as Midterms Approach*, Brennan Center for Justice (Oct. 29, 2018), <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/early-voting-numbers-soar-midterm-elections-approach>.

confusion for voters. During the 2004 general election, Ohio voters faced exceptionally long lines which left them (in the words of one court) “effectively disenfranchised.”²⁸⁶ Ohio established early, in-person voting largely in response to the well-documented problems of the 2004 general election. The Sixth Circuit summarized the problems in *League of Women Voters of Ohio v. Brunner* as:

“Voters were forced to wait from two to twelve hours to vote because of inadequate allocation of voting machines. Voting machines were not allocated proportionately to the voting population, causing more severe wait times in some counties than in others. At least one polling place [sic], voting was not completed until 4:00 a.m. on the day following Election Day. Long wait times caused some voters to leave their polling places without voting in order to attend school, work, or to family responsibilities or because a physical disability prevented them from standing in line. Poll workers received inadequate training, causing them to provide incorrect instructions and leading to the discounting of votes. In some counties, poll workers misdirected voters to the wrong polling place, forcing them to attempt to vote multiple times and delaying them by up to six hours.”²⁸⁷

In response, Ohio adopted a measure allowing 35 days of in-person early voting. Ohio law allows voter registration up to 30 days before the Election Day, essentially creating five days in which voters could register and vote at the same time, a practice which became known as Golden Week. In 2014, the state eliminated Golden Week, claiming it would help combat voter fraud,²⁸⁸ despite no evidence of widespread fraud. In May 2016, the U.S. District Court of the

“Because of the limit to this one location, voting lines are long, especially during the presidential election cycle. During periods of heavy voting, long lines can be wrapped around the building and down the street for several blocks.”

— Inajo Davis Chappell, Cuyahoga County Board of Elections Member

Southern District of Ohio found that the elimination of Golden Week violated the Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act by placing a disproportionate burden on minority voters.²⁸⁹ In August 2016, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit reversed the ruling. Just hours before Golden Week was slated to begin, the Court declined to intervene, eliminating critical access for voters.²⁹⁰

In 2014, then-Secretary of State, now Lieutenant Governor, Jon Husted also issued a directive eliminating Sunday

286 *Ohio State Conference of the NAACP et al. v. Husted et. al.*, 768 F.3d 524, 531 (6th Cir. 2014).

287 *League of Women Voters of Ohio v. Brunner*, 548 F.3d 463, 477-78 (6th Cir. 2008).

288 Adam Liptak, *Supreme Court Won't Restore 'Golden Week' Voting in Ohio*, N.Y. Times (Sept. 13, 2016), <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/us/politics/supreme-court-wont-restore-golden-week-voting-in-ohio.html>.

289 *The Ohio Organizing Collaborative, et al. v. Husted et al.* Case No. 2:15-cv-1802 (U.S. District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division).

290 Adam Liptak, *Supreme Court Won't Restore 'Golden Week' Voting in Ohio*, N.Y. Times (Sept. 13, 2016), <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/14/us/politics/supreme-court-wont-restore-golden-week-voting-in-ohio.html>.

voting, except the Sunday before the election, and evening voting after 5 p.m.²⁹¹ In addition to eliminating Golden Week, Ohio allows each county only one early, in-person voting site, regardless of population size. Cuyahoga County, with a population of more than 1.2 million people,²⁹² is allotted the same, single early voting site as the smallest counties in the state, such as Vinton County with a population of just over 13,100 people.²⁹³

In 2014, the Brennan Center gathered stories from Ohio organizers and religious leaders illustrating how last-minute changes caused confusion and limited voters' access to the polls. That year many pastors and elected officials said confusion about early voting made it more difficult to coordinate their efforts.²⁹⁴ In 2015, state officials and voting rights advocates settled a separate ongoing lawsuit over early voting hours, which restored one day of Sunday voting and added early voting hours on weekday evenings. The settlement remained in place through 2018.²⁹⁵

At the Ohio field hearing, Inajo Davis Chappell testified that the Secretary of State, Ohio Legislature, and Ohio Association of Election Officials decided in 2014 that uniformity in the rules governing elections in all 88 counties would be the key organizing principle for the 88 county boards of election in Ohio.²⁹⁶ Uniform rules have been adopted and implemented in a manner that limits, rather than expands, ballot access.²⁹⁷ Secretary Husted claimed he was creating uniformity, so all Ohioans had the same opportunity



Figure 3: Lines of voters waiting to cast a ballot during 2018 early voting in Cleveland, Ohio. Photo provided by Inajo Davis Chappell at the Ohio Field Hearing.

291 DeNora Getachew, *Voting 2014: Stories from Ohio*, Brennan Center for Justice (Dec. 5, 2014), <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/voting-2014-stories-ohio>.

292 U.S. Census Bureau, *Quick Facts: Cuyahoga County, Ohio* (as of July 1, 2018), <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/cuyahogacountyohio>.

293 U.S. Census Bureau, *Quick Facts: Vinton County, Ohio* (as of July 1, 2018), <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/vintoncountyohio,cuyahogacountyohio/PST045218>.

294 DeNora Getachew, *Voting 2014: Stories from Ohio*, Brennan Center for Justice (Dec. 5, 2014), <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/voting-2014-stories-ohio>.

295 New Voting Restriction in America, Significant Voting Restrictions in America Since 2010 Election, Brennan Center for Justice (last updated: July 3, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/new-voting-restrictions-america>.

296 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong.* (2019), written testimony of Inajo Davis Chappell at p. 1-2.

297 *Id.* at p. 2.

to vote; however, uniformity has the effect of disadvantaging citizens who live in more populous counties.

In one of the largest counties in Ohio, Cuyahoga County, early voting (both in-person and vote-by-mail) represents 35-40 percent of the votes cast in elections in Cuyahoga County since 2010.²⁹⁸ Ms. Chappell testified that, “in effect, early in-person voting is restricted to one location for all counties, regardless of size.”²⁹⁹ She testified that in limiting early voting to one location, the location in Cuyahoga County is the central elections office building which is downtown, and at which they “have significant space constraints, parking is limited and the site is congested and difficult to manage during periods of heavy voting.”³⁰⁰

In Florida, voters – particularly voters of color – used early voting in high numbers.³⁰¹ However, in 2011 Florida enacted H.B. 1355, which cut early voting and eliminated the final Sunday of early voting.³⁰² Ms. Dianis testified that the cuts to early voting “led to long lines and massive wait times on Election Day that year – wait times that were two to three times longer in Black and Latino precincts than in White precincts.”³⁰³

In July 2018, a federal court struck down Florida’s ban on early voting at public colleges. Hannah Fried, National Campaign Director of All Voting is Local, testified that a post-election analysis published by the Andrew Goodman Foundation found that “nearly 60,000 voters cast early in-person ballots at campus sites that advocates, including [All Voting is Local], helped secure” in the aftermath of the court’s decision.³⁰⁴ However, Florida’s only public Historically Black University was the only major public campus without an early voting site.³⁰⁵ The study, written by Professor Daniel A. Smith of the University of Florida, examined on-campus early voting in Florida during the 2018 general election and found high rates of campus early voting among groups historically disenfranchised, including:

- almost 30 percent of campus early vote ballots were cast by Hispanic voters, compared to just under 13 percent of early ballots cast at non-campus locations, and

298 *Id.*

299 *Id.* at p. 2.

300 *Id.*

301 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p. 2.

302 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Judith Browne Dianis at p. 68.

303 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p. 3.

304 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 6.

“In July 2018, when a federal court struck down Florida’s ban on early voting at public colleges, AVL worked with partners to secure early voting sites on college campuses throughout the state, with a focus on students of color. In particular, AVL helped place an early voting site at the predominantly Hispanic Florida International University. A post-election analysis published by the Andrew Goodman Foundation found that nearly 60,000 voters cast early in-person ballots at campus sites that advocates, including AVL, helped to secure. However, Florida A&M University (FAMU) – the state’s sole public Historically Black University – was the only major public campus without an early voting location.”

305 *Id.*

- more than 22 percent of campus early vote ballots were cast by Black voters, compared to 18 percent of early ballots cast at non-campus locations.³⁰⁶

In Texas, just before the 2018 election, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (“LDF”) filed a motion for a temporary restraining order on behalf of Black students at the historically Black university (“HBCU”) Prairie View A&M University in Waller County, Texas.³⁰⁷ The students sought to stop cuts to early voting hours—cuts that would have left Prairie View without any early voting opportunities on weekends, evenings, or during the first week of early voting. In response to the ongoing litigation, County officials agreed to add several hours of early voting in Prairie View for the 2018 election.³⁰⁸

In Georgia, state elected officials have repeatedly tried to eliminate early voting on Sundays, days that many Black churches utilize for Souls to the Polls initiatives. Sean Young, Legal Director of the ACLU of Georgia testified that in 2014, a state representative criticized his county elections officials for allowing Sunday voting at a convenient location because “this location is dominated by African American shoppers and it is near several large African American mega churches,” and that he would “prefer more educated voters.”³⁰⁹ Legislators in the state continue to introduce legislation preventing early voting on Sundays and advocates have had to work repeatedly to defeat them without the backstop of Section 5 evaluations.

In North Carolina, leading up to the 2016 presidential election, at least 17 counties made significant cuts to early voting days and hours,³¹⁰ and early voter turnout among Black voters

306 *Id.* at p. 6-7, *see also* Dr. Daniel A. Smith & ElectionSmith, Inc., *On-Campus Early In-Person Voting in Florida in the 2018 General Election* (Aug. 9, 2019), <https://andrewgoodman.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/On-Campus-Early-In-Person-Voting-in-Florida-in-the-2018-General-Election-FINAL-8-9.pdf>.

“The Andrew Goodman study, written by Professor Daniel A. Smith of the University of Florida, found high rates of campus early voting among historically disenfranchised groups, including:

- almost 30 percent of campus early vote ballots were cast by Hispanic voters, compared to just under 13 percent of early ballots cast at non-campus locations
- more than 22 percent of campus early vote ballots were cast by Black voters, compared to 18 percent of early ballots cast at non-campus locations.”

307 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Deuel Ross at p. 6.

“LDF also has several pending cases in formerly covered states opposing voting changes under Section 2 or the U.S. Constitution. For instance, on the eve of the 2018 election, LDF filed a motion for a temporary restraining order on behalf of Black students at the historically Black Prairie View A&M University in Waller County, Texas. County officials have long discriminated against Black students in Prairie View. In 2018, the students sought to stop cuts to early voting hours, which would have left Prairie View without any early voting opportunities on weekends, evenings, or during the first week of early voting. In response to LDF’s ongoing case, however, county officials agreed in 2018 to add several hours of early voting in Prairie View.”

308 *Id.*

309 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Sean J. Young at p. 3, *see also* Roth, Zachary, *GOPer opposes early voting because it will boost black turnout*, MSNBC (Sept. 10, 2014), <http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/goper-fran-millar-opposes-early-voting-because-it-will-boost-black-turnout>.

310 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 6, *citing* Insightus, *Super-Suppressors: The 17 North Carolina Counties that are Strangling Early Voting to Death* (Oct. 28, 2019), <https://www.insight-us.org/blog/super-suppressors-the-17-north-carolina-counties-that-are-strangling-early-voting-to-death/>, *see also* *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Tomas Lopez at p. 4.

“In 2016, in an attempt to blunt the impact of the Fourth Circuit’s decision to restore the first week of early voting, many of the Republican-led county BOEs adopted early voting plans with fewer hours and sites during the first restored week. There were dramatic reductions in early voting hours in Guilford (-660), Mecklenburg (-282), Brunswick (-165), Craven (-141), Johnston (-124), Robeson (-121), and Jackson (-113) counties. Of those, Guilford, Craven, and Robeson counties were previously covered

declined almost nine percent statewide compared to 2012.³¹¹ Additionally, the North Carolina legislature passed a 2018 law requiring counties to stage early voting for the same hours across all sites.³¹²

As in Ohio, while uniformity presents theoretical benefits, Tomas Lopez, Executive Director of Democracy North Carolina testified that it has, in practice, reduced the availability of early voting.³¹³ Counties, especially low-resourced areas, had previously made early voting available at different times across a variety of locations during the early voting window, but “the 2018 law makes it impossible by requiring counties that are early voting sites to be open for the same amount of hours if they are open during the week.”³¹⁴ As such, “the most popular way to cast a ballot in North Carolina,” via early voting, is rendered less available.³¹⁵ Post-*Shelby County*, neither the state, nor any of the previously covered counties in North Carolina were required to conduct any analysis of how these changes would impact minority voters and whether or not they would have a discriminatory impact.

Congressman G. K. Butterfield (D-NC-01), a member of the Subcommittee on Elections, noted that in Halifax County, a previously covered county, there is presently only one early voting site to serve the entire county—a county with a poverty rate of 28 percent and in which one in eight households lack transportation.³¹⁶ In 2012, 2014, and 2016, there were three early voting sites, but after the 2018 uniformity law, the county is left with one.³¹⁷ In the 2018 midterm election, turnout was up across the state of North Carolina except in three counties, one of which was Halifax County.³¹⁸ The 2018 law had wide-ranging consequences. Forty-three counties reduced the number of early voting sites in 2018 compared to 2014 and 51 counties reduced the number of weekend days offered.³¹⁹ On October 28, 2019, state and

under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and Mecklenburg and Johnston have significant Black voting populations, 33% and 16% of all registered voters (as of October 22, 2016) respectively.”

311 *Id.*, citing Zachary Roth, *Black Turnout Down in North Carolina After Cuts to Early Voting*, NBC News (Nov. 7, 2016), <https://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/2016-election-day/black-turnout-down-north-carolina-after-cuts-early-voting-n679051>.

312 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript Tomas Lopez at p. 14-15.

313 *Id.* at p. 15.

314 *Id.*

315 *Id.*

“So, we have 43 counties reducing the number of early voting sites in 2018 compared to the last midterm, 51 that have reduced the number of weekend days offered, 67 that have reduced the number of weekend hours. In 8 counties where a majority of voters are Black, 4 have reduced sites, 7 have reduced weekend days, and all 8 reduced the number of weekend hours during early voting, and none saw increases in sites or weekend options.”

316 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Congressman G. K. Butterfield at p. 7.

317 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Tomas Lopez at p. 15.

318 *Id.*

319 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Tomas Lopez at p. 4-5.

“This has produced several consequences in practice:

- 43 counties reduced the number of early voting sites in 2018 compared to 2014.
- 51 counties reduced the number of weekend days offered.
- 67 counties – over two-thirds of North Carolina’s 100 counties – reduced the number of weekend hours.
- Of the eight counties where a majority of voters are Black, four reduced sites, seven reduced weekend days, and all eight reduced the number of weekend hours during early voting. None saw increases in sites or weekend options.

national Democrats filed a lawsuit challenging the restrictions on early voting put in place in 2018.³²⁰ These restrictions also eliminated early voting the Saturday before Election Day, a day on which Democrats and Black Americans tend to vote and on which more than 6.9 percent (135,000) of early voters cast their ballot.³²¹

Alabama continues to have no early, in-person voting. Alabama’s Secretary of State, John Merrill, is opposed to any additions, telling a local media outlet in 2018, “[T]here is no future for early voting as long as I’m Secretary of State.”³²²

Kristen Clarke, President and Executive Director of the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (“Lawyers’ Committee”) highlighted an instance in Utah that required litigation after San Juan County, Utah made a decision in 2014 to move to all-mail balloting, but allowed in-person early voting at a single location, noting that location was “easily accessible to the White population, but three times less accessible to the sizable Navajo population, who had to drive on average three hours to get to the polling place.”³²³ The case was settled with the establishment of three polling locations on Navajo Nation land.³²⁴

Early, in-person voting is a method of accessing the ballot disproportionately used by voters of color. When states target early voting for cutbacks and changes, it can have a disproportionate impact on minority communities that would have otherwise been protected by a Section 5 review.

Polling Place Closures and Movements

A 2019 study published by The Leadership Conference Education Fund examined 757 (nearly 90 percent) of the approximately 860 counties (or county-level equivalent) once covered by Section 5 and found 1,688 polling place closures between 2012 and 2018.³²⁵ The study found 69 percent of the polling place closures occurred after the 2014 midterm election despite increased voter turnout.³²⁶

Prior to *Shelby County*, states and localities were required to notify voters well in advance of polling location closures, to prove that those changes would not have a disparate impact on minority voters, and to provide data to the Department of Justice about the impact.³²⁷ Now,

-
- A ProPublica and WRAL analysis of Early Voting sites elimination found that about 1 in 5 rural voters saw the distance to an Early Voting site increase by more than a mile — and in some counties, like Halifax, the average distance between voters and Early Voting sites increased by as much as 6 miles.”

320 Meg Cunningham, *In North Carolina, legal actions could have a big impact in the upcoming 2020 election*, Yahoo! News (Oct. 31, 2019), <https://news.yahoo.com/north-carolina-legal-actions-could-big-impact-upcoming-081111085--abc-news-topstories.html>.

321 *Id.*

322 John Sharp, *After Midterms, will Alabama reform the way you vote?*, AL.com (Nov. 18, 2018), <https://www.al.com/election/2018/11/after-midterms-will-alabama-reform-the-way-you-vote.html>.

323 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 9.

324 *Id.*, citing *Navajo Nation Human Rights Comm’n v. San Juan County*, 216CV00154, 2017 WL 3976564, at *1 (D. Utah Sept. 7, 2017).

325 The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Democracy Diverted: Polling Place Closures and the Right to Vote* (Sept. 2019) at p. 12, <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/reports/Democracy-Diverted.pdf>.

326 *Id.* at p. 12.

327 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 169.

notification is no longer required, and the Department of Justice is not required to evaluate the impact of changes.

There may be legitimate reasons for closing, consolidating, or moving polling locations, but without the disparate impact data, community consultation, and evaluation to support these changes, there is no way to ensure these closures do not discriminate against minority voters. If Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act was still enforceable, covered jurisdictions would need to collect and analyze this data and submit it to the Department of Justice for approval *before* closing, consolidating, or moving polling locations.

Polling place closures can lead to long lines and extreme wait times and can require voters to drive for miles to reach a polling place. Closing, moving and consolidating polling locations impacts all voters. The Subcommittee heard testimony detailing how decreased access to polling places increases the burden on the voter, leading to long lines and sometimes overly burdensome travel.

Georgia closed nearly 214 polling places from 2012 to 2016.³²⁸ Georgia’s population is 31 percent Black and nine percent Latino.³²⁹ The Leadership Conference report identified Georgia as a state of concern because “its counties have closed higher percentages of voting locations than any other state in our study.”³³⁰

“Last August, in Randolph County, the Board of Elections tried to close 7 out of 9 polling places in a county whose population is 60% Black, affecting thousands of voters on the eve of the state’s high-profile 2018 general election. ... Located in the southwest corner of the state, Randolph County is part of what is known as the Black Belt. [Our] client read the small notice that the county board placed in the legal section of a local weekly paper and reached out for [our] help. With less than two weeks to protect the voter rights of the Randolph County citizens, the ACLU of Georgia immediately implemented a three-pronged strategy that incorporated legal, media, and on-the-ground community organizing.”

— Sean J. Young, ACLU of Georgia

328 The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Democracy Diverted: Polling Place Closures and the Right to Vote* (Sept. 2019) at p. 12, <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/reports/Democracy-Diverted.pdf>.

329 *Id.* at p. 14.

330 *Id.* at p. 18.

Gilda Daniels, Director of Litigation at the Advancement Project, testified that many of those voting precincts were in communities of color and disadvantaged areas.³³¹ In August 2018, the Board of Elections in Randolph County, Georgia, attempted to close seven of nine polling places in a county whose population is 60 percent Black. The ACLU of Georgia became involved after their client “read the small notice that the county board placed in the legal section of a local weekly paper and reached out” for help.³³² The county ultimately reversed its decision to close over 75 percent of the county’s polling places. In the course of their work, the ACLU of Georgia learned “that the board had hired a consultant handpicked by the Secretary of State who had been recommending polling place closures in counties that were almost all disproportionately Black.”³³³

Additionally, in Georgia, the Board of Elections in County violated state law requiring proper public notice in its attempt to close polling places in neighborhoods that were over 80 percent Black, affecting over 14,000 voters.³³⁴ In Irwin County, the Board of Elections attempted to close the only polling place in the county’s sole Black neighborhood, potentially impacting thousands of voters. This was contrary to the recommendations of the non-partisan Association of County Commissioners of Georgia and all while keeping open a polling place at the Jefferson Davis Memorial Park, a 99 percent White neighborhood.³³⁵

Despite these issues in the lead-up to the 2018 midterms, Georgia has continued efforts to close and move polling places. In testimony provided in Washington, D.C., Hannah Fried, Director of All Voting is Local, drew attention to the fact that on September 3, 2019, the City Council of Jonesboro, Georgia voted to move the city’s only polling location to its police department, “without providing the public notice required by Georgia law and without taking into consideration the possible deterrent effect to voters of color.”³³⁶

331 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Gilda Daniels at p. 5.

332 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Sean J. Young at p. 2.

333 *Id.*

334 *Id.* at p. 2-3.

“In Fulton County, the Board of Elections violated state law that required proper public notice in its attempt to close polling places in neighborhoods that were over 80% African-American, affecting over 14,000 voters. *See* Exhibit 3 (proposed polling place changes and number of voters of each race affected). Just to put this into perspective, that was the same year that Atlanta had a high-profile mayoral election that was decided by less than 1,000 votes.

Even after the ACLU of Georgia testified about the discriminatory impact, the board voted to close the polls. The ACLU of Georgia then filed a successful lawsuit over the board’s violation of the state’s public notice law—which we had to put together within days, to nullify the decision. After the ACLU of Georgia nullified the decision through the courts, a coalition of community organizers had to quickly recruit dozens of neighborhood canvassers who worked tirelessly over several days to organize overwhelming opposition. It was only after this furious amount of activity compressed in less than a one-month timeframe that the local board of elections unanimously reversed its prior decision.”

335 *Id.* at p. 3.

“In Irwin County, the Board of Elections tried to close the only polling place that existed in the only Black neighborhood of the county, affecting thousands of voters, contrary to the recommendations of the non-partisan Association of County Commissioners of Georgia... The board alleged that it wanted to close this polling place to save costs, all while keeping open a polling place located at the Jefferson Davis Memorial Park in a neighborhood that was 99% White. After the ACLU of Georgia threatened litigation, the board rejected this discriminatory proposal. The ACLU of Georgia only learned about these proposed closures in this rural Georgia county because one of its members just happened to live in the area and alert us to it.”

336 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 4, *see also* Mark Niese, *Groups Oppose Moving Voting Precinct to Jonesboro Police Station*, Atlanta

Texas has closed at least 750 polling locations since *Shelby County*,³³⁷ 590 of these closures took place after the 2014 midterm election.³³⁸ Six of the 10 largest polling place closures nationwide were in Texas;³³⁹ 14 Texas counties closed at least 50 percent of polling places post-*Shelby County*.³⁴⁰ The State of Texas is 39 percent Latino and 12 percent Black.³⁴¹

Arizona, a state where 30 percent of the population is Latino, four percent is Native American, and four percent is Black, has the most widespread reduction in polling places, closing 320 locations since 2012.³⁴² Post-*Shelby County*, Arizona no longer must analyze and report on the potential disparate impact of these actions on Black, Latino, Native American, and Asian American voters. Four of the top 10 counties with the largest number of poll closures are in Arizona.³⁴³

The Leadership Conference found:

“Almost every county (13 of 15 counties) [in Arizona] closed polling places since preclearance was removed—some on a staggering scale. Maricopa County, which is 31 percent Latino, closed 171 voting locations since 2012—the most of any county studied and more than the two next largest closers combined. Many Arizona counties shuttered significant numbers of polling places, including Mohave, which is 16 percent Latino (–34); Cochise, which is 35 percent Latino (–32); and Pima, which is 37 percent Latino (–31).”³⁴⁴

One reason Arizona may have closed so many polling places is because Arizona, along with Texas, has moved to a “vote center” model of voting.³⁴⁵ Under this model, voters are not assigned a specific polling place, but instead can cast a ballot at a polling place of his or her choosing.³⁴⁶ Arizona and Texas are the only previously covered states that have made clear moves to implement this program. While this could enhance access to voting, this model often leads to massive reductions in polling places.

For example, in 2014, Graham County, Arizona which is 33 percent Latino and 13 percent Native American, closed half of its polling places when it converted to vote centers.³⁴⁷

Journal-Constitution (Oct. 8, 2019), <https://www.ajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/groups-oppose-moving-voting-precinct-jonesboro-police-station/rgeerwVyqS17uDWs0bp5vL/>.

337 The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Democracy Diverted: Polling Place Closures and the Right to Vote* (Sept. 2019) at p. 26, <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/reports/Democracy-Diverted.pdf>.

338 *Id.*

339 *Id.*

“After top-ranked Maricopa County in Arizona, the next six largest polling place closers by number were Texas counties: Dallas (–74), which is 41 percent Latino and 22 percent African American; Travis (–67), which is 34 percent Latino; Harris (–52), which is 42 percent Latino and 19 percent African American; Brazoria (–37), which is 30 percent Latino and 13 percent African American; and Nueces (–37), which is 63 percent Latino.”

340 *Id.*

341 *Id.* at p. 14.

342 *Id.*

343 *Id.* at p. 16.

344 *Id.* at p. 17.

345 *Id.* at p. 23.

346 *Id.*

347 *Id.*, citing Jon Johnson, County Chooses Vote Centers Over Polling Precincts, E. Ariz. Courier (Jun. 9, 2014), https://www.eacourier.com/news/county-chooses-vote-centers-over-polling-precincts/article_32a76a5a-ee88-11e3-a42b-001a4bcf887a.html.

Additionally, Cochise County, Arizona which is 35 percent Latino, closed nearly two-thirds of its polling places once the county converted to vote centers – from 49 in 2012 to 17 in 2018.³⁴⁸ Gila County, which is 16 percent Native American and 19 percent Latino also closed almost half its polling places (33 in 2012 to 17 in 2018).³⁴⁹

In the March 2016 presidential primary, Maricopa County, Arizona received national attention when reports surfaced that frustrated voters waited as long as five hours to cast a ballot.³⁵⁰ At the time, there were 60 polling locations – roughly one polling location for every 21,000 voters.³⁵¹ In part, this was due to Maricopa County officials’ approval of a plan to cut polling locations by 85 percent compared to 2008 and 70 percent compared to 2012.³⁵²

Tribal leaders and Professor Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, Director of the Indian Legal Clinic at the Sandra Day O’Connor School of Law, testified in Arizona that the move toward mail-in voting, closure of polling locations, and consolidation to voting centers disenfranchise Native voters. Native American voters face barriers such as lack of access to transportation, lack of residential addresses, lack of access to mail, and distance.³⁵³ Only 18 percent of Arizona’s reservation voters outside of Maricopa and Pima Counties have physical addresses and are able to receive mail at home.³⁵⁴

Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified that Arizona counties that do not have vote centers require that voters be in the proper precinct in order for their ballot to be counted. However, poll workers sometimes give voters provisional ballots without disclosing that their ballot will not be counted if they are in the incorrect precinct.³⁵⁵ Both President Jonathan Nez of the Navajo Nation and Governor Stephen Roe Lewis of the Gila Indian River Community testified that the lack of traditional addresses and regular mailing services make Arizona’s move toward mail-in ballots difficult for Native voters. Both President Nez and Governor Lewis testified that their members prefer in-person voting, and that it is a time of gathering within the community.³⁵⁶

In North Dakota, Roger White Owl, Chief Executive Officer of the Mandan Hidatsa and Arikara Nation (“MHA Nation”) testified that MHA Nation does not have enough polling places:

In 2012, Graham had 18 polling sites; today, it has half that — six vote centers and three precincts.

348 *Id.*

349 *Id.*

350 Arizona State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Comm’n on Civil Rights, *Voting Rights in Arizona* (July 2018) at p. 2, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/07-25-AZ-Voting-Rights.pdf>.

351 *Id.*, citing Anne Ryman, Rob O’Dell, and Ricardo Cano, *Arizona primary: Maricopa County had one polling site for every 21,000 voters*, *The Republic* (Mar. 22, 2016), <http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/03/22/live-arizona-primary-coverage-presidential-preference-election/82096726/>, see also *Past Polling Place Detail Report for 2016 Presidential Preference Election*, Maricopa County Recorder Website, <https://recorder.maricopa.gov/pollingplace/pastppdetailresults.aspx?view=PPE&election=PRESIDENTIAL+PREFE%20RENCE+ELECTION%2c+3%2f22%2f2016&ElectNo=1290&Type=C>.

352 *Id.* at p. 2.

353 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 2.

354 *Id.* at p. 3.

355 *Id.* at p. 7.

356 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of President Jonathan Nez and Governor of Stephen Roe Lewis.

“Two important polling places on our Four Bear segment and Mandaree segments were recently closed. Four Bears is one of the major economic hubs in our capital. With only a couple polling places, many Tribal members had to drive 80 to 100 miles round trip to cast their vote. This is unacceptable.”³⁵⁷

In Alaska, at one point a polling place was “moved away from a village, and thereafter, Native Alaskan voters could only access their polling place by plane.”³⁵⁸ Additionally, Catherine Lhamon, Chair of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, testified that the Commission’s Louisiana Advisory Committee received testimony which “demonstrated that the racial makeup of an area is a predictor of the number of polling locations in that area and that there are fewer polling locations per voter in a geographical area if it has more Black residents.”³⁵⁹

In Ohio, during the November 2018 elections, All Voting is Local and other organizations partnered to coordinate non-partisan election protection. During their determination of where to deploy poll observers in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), All Voting is Local observed that several polling places had been consolidated and precincts moved.³⁶⁰ Ms. Fried testified that, after the 2018 election, All Voting is Local determined that between 2016 and 2018, “there was a reduction of 41 polling locations countywide, with 15.7 percent of all precincts experiencing a change in location.”³⁶¹ All Voting is Local found “majority Black communities were particularly harmed,” and that data from the Election Protection hotline and nonpartisan observers showed that Cuyahoga County had “more than twice the number of reports of voters at the wrong polling location compared to two other large Ohio counties, Franklin and Hamilton.”³⁶² Ohio has never been a covered state under the Voting Rights Act.

Furthermore, the Subcommittee received testimony that polling locations across the country have been moved to places where many voters may feel intimidated to cast a ballot, including police stations. Elena Nunez, Director of State Operations and Ballot Measure Strategies at Common Cause testified that, in 2016, election officials in Macon, Georgia tried to move a voting precinct to a police station in a largely Black community.³⁶³ Additionally, in September

357 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Roger White Owl at p. 21.

358 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Catherine Lhamon at p. 38, *see also* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018), *citing* Natalie Landreth, *Why Should Some Native Americans Have to Drive 163 Miles to Vote?*, *The Guardian*, (June 10, 2015), <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jun/10/native-americans-voting-rights> (“[I]magine if you had to take a plane flight to the nearest polling place because you cannot get to it by road, which was the case for several Native communities in 2008, when the state of Alaska attempted a “district realignment” to eliminate polling places in their villages. And that’s just half the trip”).

359 *Id.*

360 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 5.

“In November 2018 in Ohio, All Voting is Local partnered with the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and state partners such as the NAACP Cleveland Branch to coordinate nonpartisan Election Protection. In determining where to deploy poll observers in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), AVL noticed that several polling locations had been consolidated and precincts had been moved. After the election, AVL determined that between 2016 and 2018, there was a reduction of 41 polling locations countywide, with 15.7 percent of all precincts experiencing a change in location.”

361 *Id.*

362 *Id.*

363 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Elena Nunez at p. 2.

2019, in Jonesboro, Georgia, the nearly all-White city council announced it would move a polling place to a police station in a locality that is 60 percent Black.³⁶⁴ Ahead of the 2018 election, the President took to his Twitter account to threaten the use of law enforcement to observe polling locations, potentially intimidating and deterring voters.³⁶⁵

Ms. Fried testified that election officials too often close polling places with “little notice to, or meaningful input from, the communities they serve.”³⁶⁶ Ms. Fried also testified there are processes put in place throughout the country, such as “thoughtful studies of the impact on voters from all backgrounds, approval of proposed changes from diverse cross-sections of the community, and outreach to impacted voters through mailed and emailed correspondence, text messages, and public service announcements on local radio,” that could ensure polling place reductions do not discriminate against voters of color.³⁶⁷ Without these safeguards in place, and without Section 5, “widespread polling place closures create barriers to the ballot box that are incredibly difficult, if not impossible, to overcome.”³⁶⁸

The rampant closure of polling places is exactly the type of suppressive voting changes the Voting Rights Act was designed to prevent. If the full force of the law was in effect, states and localities would be required to perform the requisite evaluation of racial impact data, correct for disparate impacts, and justify to the Department of Justice how such a widespread closure of polling locations is not discriminatory. A robust democracy requires all eligible voters have access to the ballot box; traveling long distances and waiting in protracted lines is not true access.

Voter Identification

Voter ID requirements have become a ubiquitous, next-generation poll tax in the 21st century. Requiring voters to show state-specified ID in order to vote is an increasingly common suppression tactic in both previously covered and non-covered jurisdictions. Proponents of voter ID requirements argue that such identification is necessary to prevent voter fraud. However, widespread voter fraud has repeatedly proven to be a myth.³⁶⁹ These ID

“The Brennan Center’s research has shown that, in terms of in-person voter impersonation, you are more likely to be struck by lightning than to commit voter fraud in the United States.”

—Michael Waldman, Brennan Center for Justice

³⁶⁴ *Id.*

³⁶⁵ *Id.* at p. 2-3.

³⁶⁶ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 4.

³⁶⁷ *Id.*

³⁶⁸ *Id.*

³⁶⁹ See Justin Levitt, *The Truth About Voter Fraud*, Brennan Center for Justice (2007), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/truth-about-voter-fraud>, see also *Project: The Myth of Voter Fraud*, Brennan Center for Justice, <https://www.brennancenter.org/issues/ensure-every-american-can-vote/vote-suppression/myth-voter-fraud>.

laws place an unnecessary and often discriminatory burden on voters and lack a legitimate governmental purpose.³⁷⁰

In the post-*Shelby County* landscape, no state or locality is required to evaluate a new voter ID law for discriminatory impact on voters. The Subcommittee repeatedly heard testimony from witnesses describing how voter ID laws are financially burdensome, effectively create a new poll tax, and disproportionately impact minority and low-income voters. In nearly every scenario, obtaining a new ID to vote is not free. Even in cases where the state claims the new IDs are “free,” the documents required to obtain an ID, such as a birth certificate, marriage license, or other documents often cannot be obtained without paying a fee for copies.³⁷¹ Not only do the documents cost money, or the IDs themselves come at a cost, but the transportation and time associated with traveling to and from the DMV or other government agencies often comes at a cost insurmountable for many low-income voters. Imposing a cost on accessing the ballot is a poll tax.

In North Carolina, the day after the *Shelby County* decision, the North Carolina General Assembly amended a pending bill to make the state’s voter ID laws stricter.³⁷² This was a provision of the monster law, which was ultimately found to be racially discriminatory. Since the federal courts invalidated North Carolina’s monster law, the state has moved to resurrect the law via piecemeal approach, including a voter ID requirement. The North Carolina General Assembly introduced, and voters passed, a ballot measure amending the North Carolina Constitution to require photo ID from voters casting in-person ballots, with exceptions.³⁷³ Tomas Lopez testified that, while voters approved broadly worded constitutional language, the North Carolina General Assembly enacted implementing legislation closely mirroring the invalidated voter ID statute during a lame-duck session after an election in which the majority party had lost its ability to override gubernatorial vetoes.³⁷⁴ The North Carolina legislature later overrode the Governor’s veto to enact the voter ID law.³⁷⁵

North Carolina Senate Minority Leader Dan Blue further testified the new voter ID law “puts a tremendous burden on the State and Local Boards of Election without the funding to back

370 *Voting Rights and Election Administration*: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), *see* Texas Listening Session; Georgia Field Hearing; North Dakota Field Hearing; North Carolina Field Hearing; Alabama Field Hearing; Arizona Field Hearing.

371 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 92, https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/Minority_Voting_Access_2018.pdf, *citing* Richard Sobel, *The High Cost of ‘Free’ Photo Voter Identification Cards*, Harv. L. Sch. Inst. For Race & Justice (June 2014), <https://today.law.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/FullReportVoterIDJune20141.pdf>.

“Despite any potential benefits, many opponents of voter ID laws equate these laws to the poll taxes of the Jim Crow era. They argue that even if the ID itself is offered free of charge, there are other costs citizens must pay in order to receive these IDs. For instance, expenses for documentation (e.g., birth certificate), travel, and wait times are significant—especially for low-income voters (who are often voters of color)—and they typically range anywhere from \$75 to \$175. According to Professor Richard Sobel, even after being adjusted for inflation, these figures represent far greater costs than the \$1.50 poll tax outlawed by the 24th Amendment in 1964.”

372 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 60.

373 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Tomas Lopez at p. 2.

374 *Id.*, *see also* S.L. 2018-144.

375 Emily Birnbaum, *North Carolina Enacts Voter ID Law, Overriding Dem Governor’s Veto*, The Hill (Dec. 19, 2018), <https://thehill.com/homenews/state-watch/422183-north-carolina-enacts-voter-id-law-overriding-dem-governors-veto>.

up these obligations” and said the law will cost \$17 million to implement.³⁷⁶ The new law has language allowing the use of student IDs for voting. However, at the time of the hearing,³⁷⁷ of the over 100 eligible institutions, only 37 community colleges, colleges, and universities had submitted the necessary documentation to the State Board of Elections to have their IDs approved for voting in 2020 – of those, 11 were denied, including the University of North Carolina flagship school at Chapel Hill and one HBCU.³⁷⁸ At the time of this writing, many North Carolina college and university student IDs are still not approved as qualified IDs for voting.

In 2011, before the Court invalidated the Voting Rights Act’s preclearance formula, then-Texas Governor Rick Perry signed into law S.B. 14, one of the strictest photo identification laws in the country. Because Texas was subject to preclearance requirements, the law did not go into immediate effect. In 2012, a federal court rejected Texas’ law and denied preclearance on the grounds that S.B. 14 discriminated against Black and Latino voters.³⁷⁹ Less than one year later, after the Court decided *Shelby County*, then-Attorney General Greg Abbott, now Governor Abbott, declared within hours that the state would implement its restrictive voter ID law.³⁸⁰ This despite the previous federal court ruling that held that the same Texas law could not receive preclearance due to its retrogressive effects on people of color.³⁸¹

According to the Brennan Center for Justice, approximately 1.2 million eligible voters in Texas lacked the specific form of ID that S.B. 14 required.³⁸² This included 555,000 eligible Latino voters and 180,000 eligible Black voters.³⁸³ Latino voters were 242 percent more likely than White voters to lack the required ID, and Black voters were 19 percent more likely than White voters to lack the required ID.³⁸⁴ Moreover, more than one in five low-income voters lacked the required Texas photo ID.³⁸⁵ Litigants immediately sued, arguing that Texas’ law racially discriminated against eligible voters and was passed with a discriminatory purpose. In a 2016 ruling rejecting the law, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected lawmakers’ argument that the bill would stop voter fraud, finding only two convictions for in-person voter fraud out of 20 million ballots cast in the decade before the law was passed in 2011.³⁸⁶

In 2017, Texas passed a new law photo ID law—S.B. 5—which is slightly less strict than S.B. 14. This new identification law, now in place, still requires photo ID. However, if a voter lacks one of the acceptable photo IDs, they may provide an alternative non-photo document (options include bank statements and utility bills, among other documents) and execute an

376 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, State Senator Dan Blue at p. 35.

377 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

378 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Tomas Lopez at p. 3.

379 *Texas v. Holder*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 113 (D.D.C. 2012).

380 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Gilda Daniels at p. 3.

381 *Id.*

382 Carson Whitelemons, *Texas Photo ID Trial Update: Case Background*, Brennan Center for Justice (Sept. 2, 2014), <http://www.brennancenter.org/blog/texas-voter-id-trial-begins>.

383 *Id.*

384 *Id.*

385 *Id.*

386 *Veasey, et. al. v. Abbott*, No. 14-41127 (5th Cir. 2016) at p. 27.

accompanying “reasonable impediment declaration” explaining why they do not have the requisite photo ID. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld S.B. 5 in 2018.³⁸⁷

According to the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, “there are intimidating criminal sanctions associated with incorrectly executing the affidavit necessary to claim the ‘reasonable impediment’ exception to the ID law and stakeholders are concerned that this will deter voters who in fact fall under the ID law’s exception.”³⁸⁸

In North Dakota, the Subcommittee heard an egregious example of how voter ID laws target and disenfranchise protected communities. North Dakota enacted a voter ID law that had a significantly disproportionate impact on the state’s Native American communities.

North Dakota has had voter ID laws in place since 2004.³⁸⁹ At the North Dakota field hearing, Jacqueline De León, Staff Attorney at the Native American Rights Fund (NARF) testified that, prior to changes to the law in 2013 the state’s voter ID law was “likely the most friendly in the nation.”³⁹⁰ North Dakota’s voter ID law, while always containing residential address requirements, had built-in fail-safes that allowed voters to cast their ballot if a poll worker could vouch for their identity or the voter signed an affidavit, under penalty of perjury, that they were qualified to vote.³⁹¹ The affidavit fail-safe was in place for nearly a century in North Dakota,³⁹² and provided critical protections for Native American voters who lack residential addresses.

North Dakota debated a new voter ID law in 2011 that would have eliminated these fail-safes. Throughout consideration, concerns about disenfranchisement were raised on both sides of the debate. State Senator Sorvaag noted that “[w]e don’t want people voting if they are not suppose [sic] to vote but we don’t want to disenfranchise people either by making the process too [sic] cumbersome.”³⁹³ In response to concerns raised by state senators, the legislature was notified that “some Native Americans would have a difficult or impossible time obtaining an ID that required a street address.”³⁹⁴ The state legislature ultimately decided not to enact the proposed changes.³⁹⁵

Despite all the concerns raised in 2011, the North Dakota state legislature moved ahead with new restrictive voter ID requirements in 2013.³⁹⁶ H.B. 1332 “significantly altered the voter

387 *Veasey v. Abbott*, No. 17-40884 (5th Cir. 2018).

388 Advisory Memorandum, Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (July 10, 2018) at p. 10, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/07-23-TX-Voting-Rights.pdf>.

389 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 2, citing *North Dakota Again Passes Discriminatory Voter ID Law*, Native American Rights Fund (May 9, 2017), <https://www.narf.org/north-dakota-voter-id-law/>.

390 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 2.

391 *Id.*

392 *Id.*

393 *Id.* at p. 3, citing *Hearing Minutes on H.B. 1447 Before H. Political Subdivision Comm.*, 62nd Leg. Assemb. 1 (N.D. Apr. 12, 2011) (statement of Sen. Ronald Sorvaag, S. Comm. On Political Sub.); the North Dakota State Legislature ultimately rejected the proposed 2011 voter ID law 38-8 given the concerns about disenfranchisement.

394 *Brakebill* First Amend. Compl. ¶ 35, ECF No. 77.

395 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 2-3.

396 *Id.* – “The North Dakota legislature passed the most restrictive voter ID and address requirements in the nation.”

ID requirements and eliminated the ‘fail-safe’ voucher and affidavit provisions” that had long protected voters.³⁹⁷ Ms. De León further testified the legislature never analyzed whether the Native American voters who lacked addresses in 2011 still lacked addresses. Many Native voters still lack the required addresses to this day. The state legislature utilized a “hoghouse” amendment, a parliamentary procedure replacing the entire text of an unrelated bill with the new text, in order to pass the bill without debate and circumvent input from the public and impacted agencies.³⁹⁸

During the 2014 election, North Dakota voters were only allowed to vote with a North Dakota Driver’s License or non-driver’s identification card, a tribal government ID, or an alternative form of ID prescribed by the Secretary of State.³⁹⁹ Ms. De León testified that, “as expected, the impact on the Native American vote in 2014 was severe.”⁴⁰⁰ The voter ID law was amended again the following legislative session, further restricting the forms of qualifying ID.⁴⁰¹ NARF sued North Dakota on the grounds that the law disenfranchised Native American voters and the U.S. District Court in North Dakota agreed, granting an injunction and requiring the state to provide an affidavit failsafe.⁴⁰²

North Dakota again amended the voter ID law in 2017. Rather than providing the affidavit failsafe mandated by the District Court, the legislature implemented a provisional ballot.⁴⁰³ This allowed voters without a valid ID to vote, but the ballot would be thrown out unless the voter could return with a qualifying ID within six days of the election.⁴⁰⁴ Prior to passage, State senators raised concerns that the new law did little to mitigate the discriminatory impact of the law. The legislature chose to move forward, knowing the disparate impact it would have on the Native American community.⁴⁰⁵ Post Office (P.O.) Boxes are utilized significantly by the Native American community — requiring IDs have a residential address disproportionately impacts Native American voters.

Despite efforts to overturn this suppressive requirement, the law remains in effect today. Voters are still required to present a qualifying ID that lists a residential address in order to vote. As the Subcommittee learned at the North Dakota field hearing, obtaining a new ID with a residential address is overly burdensome for many Native American residents.

397 *Brakebill* First Amend. Compl. ¶ 49, ECF No. 77.

398 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 2-3, *citing Brakebill* First Amend. Compl. ¶ 54, ECF No. 77.

399 *Id.* at p. 4, *citing* N.D. Cent. Code § 16.1-05-07.

400 *Id.* at p. 4.

401 *Id.*, *citing Brakebill* First Amend. Compl. ¶ 87-89, ECF No. 77.

402 *Id.* at p. 4

“Following NARF’s investigation, in 2016, NARF filed suit on behalf of seven Turtle Mountain plaintiffs that were disenfranchised by the laws. NARF showed that the law disenfranchised Native American voters and violated both the U.S. and North Dakota Constitutions as well as the Voting Rights Act. The U.S. District Court in North Dakota agreed, granting an injunction in favor of the Native American plaintiffs. The Court found that the law violated the U.S. Constitution and required that North Dakota provide a fail-safe mechanism for the 2016 general election. In his decision, Judge Hovland stated, “it is clear that a safety net is needed for those voters who simply cannot obtain a qualifying ID with reasonable effort.” The injunction required that the state provide an affidavit fail safe, allowing voters without proper ID to sign an affidavit swearing to their qualifications, similar to the law in place for nearly a century.”

403 *Id.* at p. 4-5.

404 *Id.* at p. 5, *citing* N.D. Cent. Code § 16.1-01-04.1 (2017).

405 *Id.*, *citing Brakebill* First Amend. Compl. ¶ 72, ECF No. 77.

Native Americans in North Dakota face a housing crisis across the reservations. Tribal leaders testified that their reservations face significant poverty, unemployment, and homelessness. Many tribal members do not have stable, permanent housing and move from home to home frequently. Many also live in multi-generational homes or in homes that have not been adequately addressed by the state. Addresses listed on IDs made for the 2018 election may become outdated by 2020, and tribes cannot keep issuing new IDs for free.

Chairwoman Myra Pearson of the Spirit Lake Tribe testified that 47.8 percent of residents live below the poverty line, compared to the national average of 13.8 percent. Many members do not have an ID since they do not need one to live day-to-day and IDs cost money.⁴⁰⁶ A tribal ID for a Spirit Lake member ordinarily costs \$11, but the tribe waived the cost leading up to the election. The tribe issued 655 ID cards between October 22, 2018 and November 8, 2018, costing the tribe \$7,315.⁴⁰⁷

“Understand that the fee of \$15 is not exorbitantly high, but \$15 is milk and bread for a week for a poor family.”

—Alysia LaCounte, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians

Alysia LaCounte, General Counsel to the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians testified that the Tribe currently has an unemployment rate around 69.75 percent.⁴⁰⁸ Generally, the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians charges \$15 for a tribal ID. As Ms. LaCounte testified, while the fee for an ID may not seem high, for many the fee poses a choice between voting and feeding a family.⁴⁰⁹

Issuing 2,400 new IDs at no charge was burdensome for the Tribe. The undertaking took a significant amount of financial resources and time. Ms. LaCounte testified that, while the Tribe

406 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Chairwoman Myra Pearson at p. 1.

“Many of our members struggle with housing instability, unemployment, and poverty. In 2015, a survey of 285 people living on the Spirit Lake Reservation indicated that 38 percent of people have an individual income of under \$5,000, and 73 percent have an income of under \$20,000 a year. 47.8 percent of the residents live below the poverty line, as compared to the national average of 13.8 percent. 41 percent reported that they had been homeless at some point in their lives. The Candeska Cikana Community College estimated in September 2014 that there are around 300 homeless people residing on or around the reservation, but also noted that estimate might be conservative due to many members not signing up for housing assistance.

Given these realities, and the fact that many parts of the reservation have not been thoroughly addressed, many members do not have ID since they do not need one to live their lives and they cost money. If the members have IDs at all, they hold tribal IDs that list their address as a P.O. Box if they have one. There are many streets on the reservation that are not labeled, and there are many houses which lack numbers. And even if the county 911 coordinator has assigned a residential address to someone’s home, many are never notified of this address. Mail services do not extend to certain parts of the reservation. For example, in Fort Totten all residents receive their mail through a P.O. Box. There is no U.S. Postal Service delivery to residents in this area so they must rely on a P.O. Box to conduct their affairs.”

407 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript Chairwoman Myra Pearson at p. 12-13.

Normally, the Tribe issues 30 ID cards per month.

408 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Alysia LaCounte at p. 1.

409 *Id.* at p. 2.

does not comment on the intent of the law, “its practical implication acted to disenfranchise the people of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians.”⁴¹⁰

Similar facts were echoed by Charles Walker, Judicial Committee Chairman of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. Mr. Walker testified that many people on Standing Rock do not have an ID. It is not necessary for everyday life, most people know each other, and many do not have a vehicle.⁴¹¹ The family poverty rate in Sioux County, North Dakota is 35.9 percent and the nearest Driver’s License Site is approximately 40 miles away.⁴¹²

“... are you going to eat or are you going to vote? When you have to choose between having supper for your children or grandchildren or multigenerational living units, you are going to choose to take care of your family first.”

—Charles Walker, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

Additionally, the Tribe normally charges a \$5 fee to print a new ID, a fee they waived so members could obtain an ID to vote. In the lead up to the 2018 election, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe issued “807 new tribal IDs between October 15, 2018 and November 6, 2018.”⁴¹³ The Tribe could have charged a fee for 486 of those IDs, meaning the Tribe lost “nearly \$2,500 in income.”⁴¹⁴

Furthermore, the United States Postal Service does not always operate in the rural areas of Reservations. For many people, even if the 911-system or the state government has assigned them an address, it may never have been communicated to them.⁴¹⁵ Many voters move from home to home because they do not have housing of their own. Even though they remain within the reservation, they do not have a consistent address.⁴¹⁶ Mr. Walker further testified the “failsafe mechanisms” in the latest iteration of the voter ID law do not address the problems Native American voters face. If a voter does not have a legitimate residential address, they likely do not have a utility bill or other document required to satisfy the failsafe.⁴¹⁷

Roger White Owl, Chief Executive Officer of MHA Nation testified the Tribe estimates 75-80 percent of the tribal members who received a new ID leading up to the November 6, 2018

410 *Id.* at p. 3.

411 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Charles Walker at p. 3.

412 *Id.*

413 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Charles Walker at p. 9.

414 *Id.* – By comparison, the tribal enrollment office averages only 47 IDs a month.

415 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Charles Walker at p. 3.

416 *Id.*

“We also have a significant portion of the population that is moving from home to home because they do not have housing of their own, which means that even though they remain within in the reservation, they do not have a consistent address. This makes the residential address requirement especially burdensome.”

417 *Id.*

election did not have another form of ID that would have complied with North Dakota’s law; many still do not have an ID that would allow them to vote.⁴¹⁸

This disparate, discriminatory impact is the type of voting barrier the Voting Rights Act was enacted to prevent. The North Dakota voter ID law is a poll tax on many Native Americans, a practice Congress outlawed decades ago.

Alabama also enacted a voter ID law. The law was enacted in 2011, but implementation was delayed pending the decision in *Shelby County*, meaning Alabama was not required to seek preclearance nor prove the law would not have a discriminatory impact. Alabama’s law requires voters to present one of eleven forms of identification to vote either in-person or absentee, or be positively identified by two election officials.⁴¹⁹ If a voter does not have an approved voter ID and cannot be positively identified, the voter may cast a provisional ballot.⁴²⁰ The voter has until 5:00 p.m. on the Friday following Election Day to present “a proper form of photo identification to the Board of Registrars.”⁴²¹ Republicans in Alabama and proponents of the law said strict ID was needed to guard against voter fraud, while some Democrats and opponents argued the law was aimed at making it harder for the poor, elderly and minorities to vote.⁴²² The day after the *Shelby County* decision, Alabama announced it would implement the photo ID law for the 2014 election.⁴²³

On its face, the Alabama voter ID law could appear not to have a discriminatory intent or purpose. However, the Subcommittee heard testimony at the Alabama field hearing of the discriminatory intent underlying its passage. Nancy Abudu of the Southern Poverty Law Center testified the “bill’s proponents in the state legislature had long been explicitly clear about the racist intent behind the legislation.”⁴²⁴ A State Senator who worked for years to pass voter ID told local media his photo ID law would “undermine Alabama’s ‘Black power structure,’ and that the absence of a voter ID law ‘benefits Black elected officials.’”⁴²⁵

418 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Roger White Owl at p. 3.

“Between the time of the Eight Circuit decision and the November 6, 2018 election our Tribal Enrollment Office issued 456 new IDs to tribal members. Normally we issue about 150 to 200 IDs a month. This burdened our system, limited our ability to provide other important services to tribal members, and the MHA Nation absorbed the cost of issuing these IDs. We estimate the about 75 to 80 percent of the tribal members who received a new ID during this time did not have another form of ID that would have complied with North Dakota’s law. Even with all of this additional work, about one-third of our members still do not have a tribal ID.”

419 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jenny Carroll at p. 1-2.

420 *Id.*

421 *Id.*

422 Kim Chandler, *State has yet to seek preclearance of photo voter ID law approved in 2011*, AL.com (pub. June 12, 2013; updated March 7, 2019), https://www.al.com/wire/2013/06/photo_voter_id.html.

423 NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund Inc., *Democracy Defended: Analysis of Barriers to Voting in the 2018 Midterm Elections* (Sept. 6, 2019), https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Democracy_Defended__9_6_19_final.pdf.

424 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Nancy Abudu at p. 2-3.

425 *Id.* at p. 3, citing John Sharp, *After Midterms, Will Alabama Reform the Way You Vote?*, al.com (Nov. 18, 2018), <https://www.al.com/election/2018/11/after-midterms-will-alabama-reform-the-way-you-vote.html>, in a supplemental submission for the record, Ms. Abudu highlighted addition racist statements made by the former State Senator long seen as a leader on voter ID and photo ID:

“The Alabama NAACP and Greater Birmingham Ministries challenged Alabama’s 2011 photo ID law as a violation of the Voting Rights Act, the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment given its disproportionate and discriminatory impact on Black voters. In the plaintiffs’ opposition to the state’s motion for summary judgment, they presented evidence showing that as

Jenny Carroll, Professor of Law and Chair of the Alabama State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights testified that her Committee “heard testimony that suggests that the reality is that Alabama’s voter identification law creates impediments for the poor and rural voter who may have limited access to locations that can issue identification, may lack the underlying documentation necessary to receive such identification, or have neither the time nor transportation to gain such identification.”⁴²⁶

Ms. Abudu testified the voter ID laws do have a disparate impact on communities of color, “Black and Latinx voters are about twice as likely as White voters to lack an acceptable form of identification.”⁴²⁷ The NAACP LDF estimated 118,000 registered voters in Alabama lacked the necessary ID, or almost five percent of registered voters.⁴²⁸ A study by Dr. Zoltan Hajnal at the University of California, San Diego found that turnout in Alabama’s most racially diverse counties declined by almost five percentage points after implementation of the voter ID law when comparing the 2012 and 2016 presidential elections.⁴²⁹

Even though the state claims “free state-issued photo IDs” are available, there are costs associated with obtaining the documents required to obtain an ID such as birth certificates and the transportation necessary to get to and from agencies to retrieve documents, and time off from work to do so.

In October 2015, Governor Robert Bentley drastically increased the burden of voter ID requirements by moving to close 31 driver’s license issuing offices, predominantly located in Alabama’s rural “Black Belt” in response to a budget dispute.^{430,431} A 2012 Brennan Center

the debate over voter identification continued throughout the late 90s and 2000s, Sen. Dixon repeatedly made racist statements about voter identification and Black voter turnout. For example, in 2001, five years after the original “black power structure” comment, Sen. Dixon said publicly that voting without photo identification “benefits black elected leaders and that’s why they’re opposed to it.”⁵ In 2010, fourteen years after the quote included in SPLC’s testimony, the FBI recorded Sen. Dixon and other state legislators planning to defeat a gambling referendum because they believed its presence on the ballot would increase Black voter turnout. Sen. Dixon reportedly said, “if we have a referendum in the state every black in this state will be bused to the polls.” He then added, “every black, every illiterate” would be “bused on HUD financed buses.” Finally, he predicted that coach buses “will meet at the gambling casino to get free certificates for blacks.”

426 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jenny Carroll at p. 1-2.

427 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Nancy Abudu at p. 3, citing Debbie Elliott, *Judge Throws Out Challenge to Alabama Voter ID Law*, NPR (Jan. 10, 2018), <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2018/01/10/576868379/judge-throws-out-challenge-to-alabama-voter-id-law>.

428 *Id.*

429 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Deuel Ross at p. 6.

“And, in 2015, LDF brought a lawsuit challenging Alabama’s discriminatory photo voter ID law. Among other evidence, LDF showed that a state senator who had for over a decade led the effort to enact a strict photo ID law had promised that it would undermine Alabama’s “black power structure” and that other legislative sponsors had been recorded planning ways to discourage Black people from voting. A study by Dr. Zoltan Hajnal at the University of California, San Diego, comparing the 2012 and 2016 presidential elections, found that, after Alabama implemented its ID law, turnout in its most racially diverse counties declined by almost 5 percentage points, which is even more than the drop in similarly diverse counties in other states. This case is currently pending on appeal before the Eleventh Circuit.”

430 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 173-74.

431 Adam Gitlin and Christopher Famighetti, *Closing Driver’s License Office in Alabama*, Brennan Center for Justice (Oct. 7, 2015), <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/closing-drivers-license-offices-alabama>.

In an analysis of the planned closures, the Brennan Center found:

- 26.3 percent of the total Alabama population is African American.

report found that more than a quarter of voting-age citizens in Alabama lived more than 10 miles from an ID-issuing office and did not have vehicle access.⁴³² Public pressure resulted in a partial reversal. Rather than permanently closing the offices, the State decided to keep the offices open one day a month, still severely restricting access to photo ID.⁴³³

The U.S. Department of Transportation launched an investigation which eventually resulted in the Department of Transportation and the State of Alabama entering into a settlement agreement. The investigation alleged Alabama's closure of the 31 DMV offices disparately occurred in the "Black Belt" and disproportionately impacted Black and Latino voters in violation of the Civil Rights Act.⁴³⁴ The Department of Transportation's investigation found that:

"African-Americans in the Black Belt region are disproportionately underserved by ... [the state's] driver's licensing services, causing 'a disparate and adverse impact on the basis of race, in violation of Title VI.'"⁴³⁵

The agreement reopened and fully restored the hours of driver's license offices in nine predominantly Black counties in the Black Belt. The agreement also requires Alabama to seek pre-approval from the Department of Transportation before initiating any office closures or other reductions in service.

Arizona recently expanded the scope of its photo ID requirement. If a voter casts a ballot by mail, the voter's signature on the envelope serves as the required ID.⁴³⁶ For years, early in-person voting was conducted in the same manner. However, in the spring of 2019, the Arizona state legislature passed S.B. 1072, a new law requiring a photo ID for in-person, early voting, in addition to a voter's signature.⁴³⁷ Now, voters who cast an early, in-person ballot must produce both a photo ID and a matching signature. Without Section 5, the state was not required to evaluate if this new law was racially neutral.⁴³⁸

-
- Currently, in 11 Alabama counties, African Americans comprise more than 50 percent of the population. Driver's license offices will close in eight of these counties, which will leave only three majority-African American counties with a driver's license office.
 - Under Alabama's plan, license-issuing offices will close in all six counties in which African Americans comprise over 70 percent of the population.
 - Conversely, 40 license-issuing offices will remain open in the 55 Alabama counties in which Whites comprise more than 50 percent of the population.
 - In 2012, the Brennan Center reported that 32 percent of Alabama's voting-age population lived more than 10 miles away from the nearest license issuing office that was open more than two days per week.

See also Alabama Field Hearing, written testimony of Nancy Abudu at p. 3.

432 Keesha Gaskins and Sundeep Iyer, *The Challenge of Obtaining Voter Identification*, Brennan Center for Justice (Update July 29, 2012), https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/Democracy/VRE/Challenge_of_Obtaining_Voter_ID.pdf.

433 NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund Inc., *Democracy Defended: Analysis of Barriers to Voting in the 2018 Midterm Elections* (Sept. 6, 2019), https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Democracy_Defended__9_6_19_final.pdf.

434 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 173-74.

435 *Id.*

436 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Alex Gulotta at p. 4.

437 *Id.*

438 *Id.*

Additionally, LDF filed an amicus brief in a case before the Arkansas Supreme Court in 2014 in a successful challenge to the state’s voter ID law.⁴³⁹ According to testimony from Deuel Ross, Senior Counsel at NAACP LDF, “LDF offered unique evidence that 1,000 ballots were rejected because of this law.”⁴⁴⁰ Ms. Fried testified that, in Wisconsin, “the All Voting is Local campaign assisted hundreds of Wisconsin voters through the arduous process of getting an ID, which can include providing officials with a birth certificate or passport, filling out multiple forms, and repeat trips to the DMV” in the lead-up to the 2018 election.⁴⁴¹ Wisconsin enacted a strict voter ID law in 2011, and a recent study by the University of Wisconsin-Madison found 6 percent of registered voters in Dane and Milwaukee counties who did not vote in the 2016 general election were prevented from doing so because they did not have the requisite ID.⁴⁴² Additionally, the study found 11.2 percent of registered voters who did not vote in the 2016 election were deterred by the ID law; the study’s author noted 11.2 percent represents the lower bound of those voters affected.⁴⁴³ The study also found that the law does not impact all voters equally, impacting low-income and Black voters more severely.⁴⁴⁴

Brenda Wright, Senior Advisor for Legal Strategies at Demos said, “a lot of harm has been done in the name of combating voter fraud.”⁴⁴⁵ One example cited is the disenfranchisement of a group of nuns following the implementation of Indiana’s voter ID law. The nuns did not have driver’s licenses, they did not have passports, and they had to be turned away from the polls, even though the poll worker was a nun who lived with them at the convent and they had always voted at that polling place.⁴⁴⁶ Chasing the specter of non-existent voter fraud should not prevent otherwise eligible voters from casting their ballot.

Exact Match and Signature Match

Exact Match

In the lead up to the 2018 midterm elections, Georgia put on hold 53,000 voter registrations due to lacking an “exact match” in name, Social Security number, or other discrepancies.⁴⁴⁷ While the population of Georgia is 32 percent Black, Black voters were more than 70 percent

439 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Deuel Ross at p. 7, citing *Martin v. Kohls* 444 SW 3d 844 (Ark. 2014).

440 *Id.*, citing Amicus Curiae Brief by NAACP LDF, et al., *Martin v. Kohls*, 2014 WL 4950020 (Aug. 11, 2014).

441 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 11.

442 *Id.*, citing Kenneth R. Meyer & Michael G. DeCrescenzo, *Supporting Information: Estimating the Effect of Voter ID on Nonvoters in Wisconsin in the 2016 Presidential Election* (Sept. 25, 2017), <https://elections.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/483/2018/02/Voter-ID-Study-Supporting-Info.pdf>.

443 *Id.*

444 *Id.* at p. 11-12.

“More troubling still, the impact of Wisconsin’s strict photo ID law is not felt equally by all Wisconsin voters. This same study further found that the law deterred:

- 21.1 percent of low-income registrants (household income under \$25,000) compared to 7.2 percent for those over \$25,000 and 2.7 percent of high-income registrants (over \$100,000 household income)
- 27.5 percent of African-American registrants compared to 8.3 percent of White registrants.”

445 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Brenda Wright responding to questions from Congressman Pete Aguilar at p. 54.

446 *Id.*

447 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Gilda Daniels at p. 4-5.

of the names on the hold list. Eighty percent of applicants on the list were Black, Asian, or Latino voters.⁴⁴⁸

Civil rights organizations have sued the State of Georgia three times to stop this exact match practice.⁴⁴⁹ The state's exact match practice required information on voter registration forms to exactly match information about the applicant on Social Security Administration or the state's Department of Driver's Services (DDS) databases.⁴⁵⁰ In 2019, the Georgia legislature amended the exact match law to permit applicants who fail the exact match process for reasons of identity to become active voters, but made no changes to reform the process that continues to inaccurately flag U.S. citizens as non-citizens.⁴⁵¹

Signature Match

Some states have moved to an "exact match" for voters' signatures, both on in-person and absentee ballots.⁴⁵² Some state laws require the voter's signature on file to match the signature on one's ballot, a practice Elena Nunez testified has been used increasingly to arbitrarily disenfranchise voters.⁴⁵³ Georgia law provides that election officials are required "to reject absentee ballots (and absentee ballot applications) if the absentee ballot signature does not match the signature elections officials have on file."⁴⁵⁴ Signature laws such as Georgia's "primarily affect the disabled, the elderly, and people of color."⁴⁵⁵

In Florida, ballots can be marked "invalid" because of a missing signature or signature mismatch.⁴⁵⁶ Eighty-three thousand votes in the 2018 election were rejected for signature mismatch.⁴⁵⁷ In Florida, Andrew Gillum, former Mayor of Tallahassee and 2018 Gubernatorial candidate testified that, in a recent case regarding whether Florida's law allowing county election officials to reject vote-by-mail and provisional ballots for mismatched signatures passes constitutional muster, Judge Mark Walker of the Northern District of Florida found it did not.⁴⁵⁸ Additionally, the ACLU of Florida and the University of Florida produced a report analyzing the 2014 and 2016 elections, which found younger and ethnic minority voters were

"In an effort to capture voters of color, Georgia held 53,000 voter registrations, due to lacking an "exact match" in name, Social Security number and other minor discrepancies, e.g., an extra space, a missing hyphen or other typographical errors in the spelling or spacing of their names."

448 *Id.*

449 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 6.

450 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 6.

451 *Id.*, citing *Third Sector Development, et al. v. Kemp, et al.*, No. 2014CV252546, 2014 WL 5113630 (Fulton Cty. Super. Ct. Ga. Oct. 10, 2014); *Georgia State Conference of NAACP, et al., v. Brian Kemp, et al.*, No. 2:16-cv-00219 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 14, 2016); *Georgia Coal. for People's Agenda, Inc. v. Kemp*, 347 F. Supp. 3d 1251 (N.D. Ga. 2018).

452 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Elena Nunez at p. 4.

453 *Id.*

454 Max Feldman and Peter Dunphy, *The State of Voting Rights Litigation (December 2018)*, Brennan Center for Justice, <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/state-voting-rights-litigation-december-2018>.

455 Mark Joseph Stern, *Federal Judge Bars Georgia From Disenfranchising Voters On the Basis of Amateur Handwriting Analysis*, Slate (Oct. 24, 2018), <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2018/10/georgia-brian-kemp-signature-mismatch.html>.

456 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Andrew Gillum.

457 *Id.* at p. 1.

458 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Andrew Gillum at p. 16.

much more likely to have their vote-by-mail ballots rejected and less likely to have their vote-by-mail ballots cured when flagged for a signature mismatch.⁴⁵⁹ Nancy Batista, Florida State Director of Mi Familia Vota, testified her own mail-in ballot was voided due to a signature mismatch in the primary election, even though she had not changed her signature since high school.⁴⁶⁰

In striking down Florida’s signature matching law, Judge Walker found Florida’s practice of curing signature mismatch had “no standards, an illusory process to cure and no process to challenge the rejection” and was therefore unconstitutional.⁴⁶¹ Judge Walker further noted that it was problematic that the boards are staffed by laypersons who are not required to undergo formal handwriting-analysis education or training.

In 2017, California was sued by the ACLU for invalidating tens of thousands of voters’ vote-by-mail ballots without warning.⁴⁶² At issue was a state law allowing election officials with no expertise in handwriting to reject vote-by-mail ballots without providing notice if they feel the signature on the envelope did not match the one on file.⁴⁶³ The complaint filed by the ACLU alleged as many as 45,000 ballots were rejected in the 2016 general election due to perceived signature mismatch.⁴⁶⁴ In 2018, a judge in San Francisco ruled the state must notify voters before rejecting their mail-in ballots for signature concerns.⁴⁶⁵

Language Access and Assistance

Over time, the protections of the Voting Rights Act were expanded to prohibit discrimination against language minority, or limited-English proficiency (LEP), voters. These sections were not overturned by *Shelby County*, and they remain key components of the Voting Rights Act. As this report shows, more must be done to ensure states and localities are following through on the legal protections afforded language minority voters. As this section will illustrate, we are falling short on those protections still enshrined into law.

Sections 4(e) and 4(f)(4), along with Sections 203 and 208, are considered the “language minority” provisions of the Voting Rights Act.⁴⁶⁶ Section 4(e) provides rights to U.S. citizens educated “in American flag schools” in a language other than English.⁴⁶⁷ This provides specific protections to citizens educated in Puerto Rico in Spanish, prohibiting the conditioning of their right to vote on the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret English. This

459 *Id.*

460 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Nancy Batista at p. 19.

461 David Smiley and Steve Bosquet, *Judge gives thousands of voters with rejected ballots time to fix signature problems*, Miami Herald (Nov. 15, 2018), <https://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/election/article221698270.html>.

462 *ACLU Challenges California’s Voter Signature-Matching Law* (Aug. 24, 2017), <https://www.aclunc.org/news/aclu-challenges-california-s-voter-signature-matching-law>.

463 *Id.*, filing *La Follette v. Padilla*.

464 *La Follette v. Padilla Complaint* (CA Court of Appeals), <https://www.aclu.org/legal-document/la-follette-v-padilla-complaint>.

465 Billy Kobin, *California voters with sloppy signatures must have a chance to correct them, court rules*, The Sacramento Bee (Mar. 6, 2018), <https://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article203746944.html>.

466 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 28-29.

467 52 U.S.C. § 10303(e).

protection exists within all 50 states, whether the voter lives in a jurisdiction covered under the population threshold of Section 203 or not.⁴⁶⁸

Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act requires that language access for limited-English proficient (LEP) voters be equal to that of English-speaking voters. Section 203 was created during the 1975 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act after congressional findings of discrimination and intimidation of voters with limited-English proficiency. The Voting Rights Act's language access requirements were not affected by the *Shelby County* ruling. According to data from the 2018 American Community Survey, nearly 22 million adult U.S. citizens speak Spanish; approximately 6,320,000 of whom are not fluent in English.⁴⁶⁹ Another 5,089,000 adult citizens speak another language and are not fluent in English.⁴⁷⁰ Arturo Vargas of NALEO testified that, "Americans who depend upon language assistance are becoming more diverse and more geographically dispersed, and these factors heighten the importance of effective language assistance."⁴⁷¹

Section 203 requires the Director of the Census Bureau to publish his or her determinations as to which political subdivisions are subject to the minority language assistance provisions. The Census Bureau makes this determination every five years, the last being in December 2016.⁴⁷² Under the 2006 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, the language minority assistance provisions were extended until August 5, 2032. In its 2016 evaluation, the Census Bureau found 263 jurisdictions met the threshold of coverage under Section 203.⁴⁷³ Between 2011 and 2016, 15 additional counties and cities were added to the list of localities required to provide language assistance materials, as well as four new states.^{474,475} Political subdivisions within Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin currently fall under Section 203 coverage.⁴⁷⁶

468 52 U.S.C. § 10303(e)(1), *see also* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 29.

469 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Arturo Vargas at p. 4.

470 *Id.*

471 *Id.* at p. 4-5.

472 Federal Registrar, Voting Rights Act Amendments of 2006, Determinations Under Section 203 (pub. Dec. 5, 2016), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/05/2016-28969/voting-rights-act-amendments-of-2006-determinations-under-section-203>.

473 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 187.

"The Census found "68,800,641 eligible voting-age citizens in the covered jurisdictions, or 31.3% of the total U.S. citizen voting-age population." Moreover, 16,621,136 Latino, 4,760,782 Asian, and 357,409 American Indian and Alaska Native voting-age citizens live in the covered jurisdictions."

474 Section 203 applies in jurisdictions in which (1) more than 5 percent of citizens of voting age are members of a single language minority group and are LEP; or in which over 10,000 citizens of voting age meet the same criteria; or in Indian Reservations in which a whole or part of the population meets the 5 percent threshold; and (2) the literacy rate of the citizens in the language minority as a group is higher than the national illiteracy rate. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 10503(b)(2)(A)(i) and (ii).

475 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Arturo Vargas at p. 5.

476 Federal Registrar, Voting Rights Act Amendments of 2006, Determinations Under Section 203 (pub. Dec. 5, 2016), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/05/2016-28969/voting-rights-act-amendments-of-2006-determinations-under-section-203>.

The importance of the Voting Rights Act’s language access provisions and continued lack of compliance with language access requirements was highlighted during the Subcommittee’s field hearing in Broward County, Florida. Florida has a rapidly growing Puerto Rican population.⁴⁷⁷ As of 2016, in addition to statewide coverage for Florida, 10 counties are required to provide Spanish-language assistance under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act.⁴⁷⁸ The first time Florida was covered under Section 203 for Spanish was 2011.⁴⁷⁹ Despite this, no significant changes for Spanish speakers were made to the materials produced by the Florida Division of Elections.⁴⁸⁰ Anjenys Gonzalez-Eilert, Program Director of Common Cause Florida, testified that the first time the Division of Elections made a statewide Voter Registration and Voting Guide in Spanish available was just three weeks before the August 2014 primary.⁴⁸¹ Language minority voters must rely on programs like Google translate to access the Division of Elections website.⁴⁸²

“It is remarkable that it takes a coalition of voting rights organizations and individuals to sue in federal court to seek minimal compliance with the plain language of a venerable 53-year-old law.”

— Judge Mark Walker, Northern District of Florida

Juan Cartagena, President and General Counsel of LatinoJustice, testified that, though Florida is a covered state, “it usually takes litigation to force Florida election officials to abide by the will of Congress.”⁴⁸³ Florida was sued in 2000 by the Department of Justice for failure to provide the proper language materials and in 2009 by LatinoJustice for failure to provide required assistance to voters from Puerto Rico.⁴⁸⁴ Again, in *Rivera Madera v. Detzner* (now *Lee*), LatinoJustice and

others sued 32 Florida counties in August 2018 for failing to comply with Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act. In his order, Judge Mark Walker made a telling observation about the state of voting rights protection in Florida: “It is remarkable that it takes a coalition of voting rights

477 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Juan Cartagena at p. 2.

“Based on 2017 Census data Florida now has the highest number of Puerto Rican residents than any other state in the country at 1,128,225 and it grew by over 30% since 2010. Among all Latino populations in Florida Cubans are still the plurality at 28.5% with Puerto Ricans second at 21% ...”

478 *Id.* at p. 3.

Broward, DeSoto, Hardee, Hendry, Hillsborough, Lee, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach Pinellas, Polk and Seminole counties are covered under the Voting Rights Act.

479 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Anjenys Gonzalez-Eilert at p. 3.

480 *Id.* at p. 4.

481 *Id.*

482 *Id.*

483 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Juan Cartagena at p. 3.

484 *Id.*, discussing a 2002 Department of Justice suit against Osceola County resulting in a settlement to stop the discriminatory failure to provide voting access to Spanish-speaking voters under Section 2; also discussing a 2009 LatinoJustice suit against Volusia County to provide Spanish-language assistance to Puerto Rican voters under Section 4(e), which was settled.

organizations and individuals to sue in federal court to seek minimal compliance with the plain language of a venerable 53-year-old law.”⁴⁸⁵

As Mr. Cartagena further explained, the population on the island of Puerto Rico is roughly 65 percent Spanish-language dominant.⁴⁸⁶ In Puerto Rico, all government proceedings happen in Spanish, and voter turnout for elections is upwards of 80 percent.⁴⁸⁷ This makes the language access protections afforded to Puerto Ricans educated on the island of Puerto Rico under Section 4(e) critical to their ability to fully participate in elections in the 50 states.

In Georgia, only Gwinnett County has been designated under Section 203,⁴⁸⁸ but all localities are also required under Section 4(e) to provide Spanish language materials to U.S. citizens from Puerto Rico. During his testimony in Georgia, Sean Young noted, for example, that Hall County was obligated to provide these materials – but the board refused.⁴⁸⁹

Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act requires Arizona to provide election materials and assistance in Spanish, Navajo, and Apache.⁴⁹⁰ As of 2016, at least 10 of Arizona’s 15 counties must comply with Section 203 by providing translated election materials in Spanish or Native American languages.⁴⁹¹ Providing only written materials in multiple languages may not serve all voters. Some Native languages are not traditionally written, and a written ballot sent to an interpreter may not be the proper way to ensure adequate language access. Some voters may need a physical polling place so voters can obtain oral language assistance,⁴⁹² which can be difficult depending on the distance to the polls and access to transportation. Plaintiffs in San Juan County, Utah, alleged the county failed to meet the standard set forth in Section 203 for Navajo speakers. A settlement reached by the Lawyers’ Committee and partner organizations requires the county to provide in-person language assistance on the Navajo reservation for 28 days prior to each election through the 2020 general election and take additional action to ensure quality interpretation of election information and materials.⁴⁹³

According to the U.S. Census, Asian Americans are the nation’s fastest growing racial group; there are now 22.6 million Asian Americans living in the U.S.⁴⁹⁴ Asian Americans are not monolithic, instead consisting of a multitude of cultures and languages. According to John C. Yang, President and Executive Director of Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC,

485 *Id.* at p. 4, citing *Rivera Madera v. Detzner*, Slip Op. at p. 25 (Sept. 7, 2018).

486 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Juan Cartagena at p. 85.

487 *Id.*

488 Federal Registrar, Voting Rights Act Amendments of 2006, Determinations Under Section 203 (pub. Dec. 5, 2016), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/05/2016-28969/voting-rights-act-amendments-of-2006-determinations-under-section-203>.

489 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Sean J. Young at p. 40.

490 Federal Registrar, Voting Rights Act Amendments of 2006, Determinations Under Section 203 (pub. Dec. 5, 2016), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/05/2016-28969/voting-rights-act-amendments-of-2006-determinations-under-section-203>.

491 Arizona State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Comm’n on Civil Rights, *Voting Rights in Arizona* (July 2018) at p. 2, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/07-25-AZ-Voting-Rights.pdf>.

492 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 193.

493 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 9.

494 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of John C. Yang at p. 2.

“[T]he country’s fastest growing Asian American ethnic groups were South Asian, with the Bangladeshi and Pakistani American populations doubling in size between 2000 and 2010. Chinese Americans continue to be the largest Asian American ethnic group, numbering nearly 3.8 million nationwide in 2010, followed in size by Filipino, Indian, Vietnamese, and Korean Americans.”⁴⁹⁵

Mr. Yang testified that a major obstacle facing Asian American voters is the language barrier. Nationally, about three out of every four Asian Americans speak a language other than English at home and one-third of the population is limited-English proficient (LEP).⁴⁹⁶ Access to properly translated materials and assistance at the polls is essential to allowing Asian Americans full access to the vote, “when properly implemented, Section 203 increases civic engagement among Asian American citizens.”⁴⁹⁷

Additionally, Section 208 is critical to ensuring every citizen has access to the assistor of their choice when voting. Section 208 provides voters the right to assistance in the voting booth from a person of the voter’s choice because of blindness, disability, or inability to read or write, and has been used as an important complement to Section 203.⁴⁹⁸ Section 208 protections have been interpreted to include a right to in-person assistance for LEP voters.⁴⁹⁹ While Section 203 does not apply nationwide, Section 208 does. As Mr. Yang testified, “all citizens who have difficulty with English, no matter where they live or what their native language is, have the right through Section 208 to an assistor of their choice to help them in the voting booth.”⁵⁰⁰

Language accessibility remains a fundamental component to ensure access to the ballot. The language access provisions of the Voting Rights Act are critical to ensuring free and fair access to the ballot box. While these provisions were not struck down in *Shelby County*, the Subcommittee’s hearings clearly show a need for better implementation. This will continue to be important as new American populations move about the country, bringing new localities under compliance requirements.

Discriminatory Gerrymandering

At nearly every hearing, the Subcommittee heard about the use of gerrymandering as a suppression tool and the effect gerrymandering can have on diluting the voting power and voice of minority voters. This is especially true of states where partisan legislatures are responsible for drawing maps. Discriminatory gerrymandering and vote dilution affect elections from school boards to congressional districts.

After *Shelby County*, redistricting plans are no longer precleared, meaning states with and without a history of racial discrimination can implement new districts for state and federal

495 *Id.*

496 *Id.* at p. 5.

497 *Id.* at p. 8.

498 *Id.* at p. 10.

499 *See, e.g., U.S. v. Berks County, P.A.*, 250 F. Supp. 2d 525, 538 (E.D. Pa. 2003).

500 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong.* (2019), written testimony of John C. Yang at p. 2.

offices following the 2020 census that could be in effect for several election cycles, while simultaneously being challenged in court as discriminatory. If the Supreme Court had not gutted Section 4(b), covered states would have been required to send their new district lines for preclearance approval *before* implementation and before any discriminatory impact occurred.

North Carolina has been particularly egregious in its use of redistricting to dilute and suppress voters' power. In 2016, after the District Court ruled against the state's maps, North Carolina Republican legislators drew new maps, this time admitting the purpose of the maps was partisan.⁵⁰¹ In 2017, the Court upheld the lower court's rejection of two North Carolina congressional maps on the grounds that North Carolina's Republican-controlled legislature relied too heavily on race in drawing the maps.⁵⁰²

According to Tomas Lopez of Democracy North Carolina, North Carolina's maps have been the subject of continuous litigation since the 2011 redistricting.⁵⁰³ Mr. Lopez went on to say that this continuous litigation "suggests the current remedies against gerrymandering are ineffective; if the courts take nearly a decade to address the problem, and legislatures are able to avoid penalties for their bad behavior, then the incentive to distort the maps will only be reinforced."⁵⁰⁴

In 2019, the Court decided another case involving North Carolina's gerrymandered maps. In a case combined with a partisan gerrymandering case originating in Maryland, the Court ruled that federal judges have no power to stop politicians from drawing electoral districts based on partisan power.⁵⁰⁵ The Majority abdicated the role of the Court in deciding when partisan gerrymandering has crossed constitutional bounds, with Chief Justice Roberts writing, "but the fact that such gerrymandering is incompatible with democratic principles does not mean that the solution lies with the federal judiciary."⁵⁰⁶ In writing for the dissent, Justice Kagan strongly disagreed, writing that "the gerrymanders here – and others like them – violated the constitutional rights of many hundreds of thousands of American citizens."⁵⁰⁷

The Court's decision jeopardizes the rights of millions of minority voters. By ceding the field to state courts, the Court fails to set a national protection standard, leaving the rights of voters open to 50 different interpretations of what a gerrymandered district looks like.

501 Adam Liptak, *Partisan Gerrymandering Returns to a Transformed Supreme Court*, N.Y. Times (March 18, 2019), <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/18/us/politics/gerrymandering-supreme-court.html>.

502 *Cooper v. Harris*, 581 U.S. ___ (2017), see also Adam Liptak, *Justices Reject 2 Gerrymandered North Carolina Districts, Citing Racial Bias*, N.Y. Times (May 22, 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/22/us/politics/supreme-court-north-carolina-congressional-districts.html?module=inline>.

503 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Tomas Lopez at p. 8.

504 *Id.*

505 Robert Barnes, *Supreme Court says federal courts don't have a role in deciding partisan gerrymandering claims*, The Washington Post (June 27, 2019), https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/courts_law/supreme-court-says-federal-courts-dont-have-a-role-in-deciding-partisan-gerrymandering-claims/2019/06/27/2fe82340-93ab-11e9-b58a-a6a9afaa0e3e_story.html, see also *Rucho v. Common Cause*, 588 U.S. ___ (2019).

Chief Justice Roberts writing for the majority: "We conclude that partisan gerrymandering claims present political questions beyond the reach of the federal courts ... Federal judges have no license to reallocate political power between the two major political parties, with no plausible grant of authority in the Constitution, and no legal standards to limit and direct their decisions."

506 *Id.*

507 *Id.*

Without the full protection of the Voting Rights Act requiring states and localities with a history of discriminatory practices to preclear their new maps, states could arguably create discriminatory maps, but color them in the rhetoric of party affiliation, not race.

Despite the Court's decision to render federal courts powerless to act, on October 28, 2019, a North Carolina state court again threw out the state's congressional district maps, saying the record of partisan intent was so extensive that opponents of the maps were poised to show "beyond a reasonable doubt" that the maps were unconstitutionally gerrymandered to favor the Republican Party over the Democratic Party, and North Carolina voters would be irreparably harmed if the 2020 elections were held using these maps.⁵⁰⁸

One of the map's primary drafters, Republican State Representative David Lewis was quoted in 2016 as saying he wanted maps drawn that would give a partisan advantage to 10 Republicans and three Democrats because "I do not believe it's possible to draw a map with 11 Republicans and 2 Democrats."⁵⁰⁹ The same three-judge panel struck down most of the State Legislature's maps in September as an impermissible partisan gerrymander.⁵¹⁰ Republicans decided to redraw the maps, which were approved by the same court on October 28.⁵¹¹

In a separate yet related case, hard drives belonging to Thomas Hofeller, a consultant who helped draw North Carolina's maps, were recently discovered. The recovered data outlined the significant role racial discrimination played in drawing legislative maps. Hofeller played a critical part in the administration's attempt to add a citizenship question to the 2020 census,⁵¹² which is the constitutionally mandated instrument that counts all persons living in the United States and whose data congressional representation is based upon when states draw their legislative districts.

Hofeller's hard drives included files proving he wrote a 2015 study which concluded that "adding a citizenship question to the census would allow Republicans to draft even more extreme gerrymandered maps to stymie Democrats."⁵¹³ Hofeller also wrote a significant portion of the Department of Justice's letter claiming the citizenship question was needed to enforce the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a justification later used by the Administration.⁵¹⁴

Critics of the proposed policy argued that it would likely depress responses from minority groups and non-citizens, leading to a potential undercount and skewing the results. Maps are traditionally drawn based on a state's total population, not just the population of voting-age citizens. Following his analysis of Texas state legislative districts, Mr. Hofeller concluded such maps "would be advantageous to Republicans and non-Hispanic Whites," diluting the power of the state's Hispanic residents.⁵¹⁵

508 Michael Wines, *State Court Bans Using North Carolina House Map in 2020 Elections*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 28, 2019), <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/28/us/north-carolina-gerrymander-maps.html?action=click&module=Top%20Stories&pgtype=Homepage>.

509 *Id.*

510 *Id.*

511 *Id.*

512 Michael Wines, *Deceased G.O.P. Strategist's Hard Drives Reveal New Details on the Census Citizenship Question*, N.Y. Times (May 30, 2019), <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/30/us/census-citizenship-question-hofeller.html>.

513 *Id.*

514 *Id.*

515 *Id.*

In a 5-4 decision, the Court blocked the addition of a citizenship question to the 2020 census, upholding the lower court’s decision to remand the case back to the agency, writing, “[A]ltogether, the evidence tells a story that does not match the Secretary’s explanation for his decision.”⁵¹⁶ Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross had stated his reason was to better enforce the Voting Rights Act, but the Court found, “[U]nlike a typical case in which an agency may have both stated and unstated reasons for a decision, here the Voting Rights Act enforcement rationale—the sole stated reason—seems to have been contrived.”⁵¹⁷

In North Dakota, tribal leaders raised concerns that, though there is only one at-large representative at the federal level, their reservations are divided in such a way during state-level redistricting that no Native American can win a seat representing the tribal lands.⁵¹⁸ State Representative Ruth Buffalo is the only Native American serving in the North Dakota State House. Representative Buffalo represents District 27—Fargo, North Dakota—which is 370 miles from her traditional homelands of the Fort Berthold Reservation.⁵¹⁹ The District that represents Fort Berthold encompasses a White population that overwhelms the Native American population.⁵²⁰

In Alabama, Georgia, Ohio, and Texas, the Subcommittee heard additional testimony regarding the impact of discriminatory gerrymandering. An attempted move to at-large districts in a City Council race in Alabama was denied by the Department of Justice on the grounds it was racially discriminatory and gave rise to the lawsuit that became *Shelby County*.⁵²¹ In the Texas case *Veasey v. Abbott*, the court found that “[i]n every redistricting cycle since 1970, Texas has been found to have violated the Voting Rights Act with racially gerrymandered districts.”⁵²² Since Texas came under Section 5 preclearance in 1965, it has been barred by law from discriminating against minority voters, yet Federal judges have ruled at least once every decade since then that Texas violated federal protections for voters in redistricting.⁵²³

As described in this report, the ACLU of Georgia engaged in a lawsuit to overturn a discriminatory gerrymandering plan in Sumter County, Georgia, that would take five years to resolve.⁵²⁴ Deuel Ross of NAACP LDF testified that, in 2015, in Fayette County, Georgia, “the County Commission tried to revert to an at-large voting system in a special election to replace a Black Commissioner who had died unexpectedly.”⁵²⁵ LDF filed a lawsuit under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to stop this move and require the election to use single-member

516 *Department of Commerce v. New York*, 588 U.S. ____ (2019).

517 *Id.* at p. 5.

518 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), see hearing transcript.

519 *Id.*

520 *Id.*

521 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

522 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 77, see also *Veasey v. Abbott*, 71 F. Supp. 3d at 636 (2017).

523 Alexa Ura, *How a decade of voting rights fights led to fewer redistricting safeguards for Texas voters of color*, The Texas Tribune (Sept. 10, 2019), <https://www.texastribune.org/2019/09/10/texas-enters-2021-redistricting-fewer-safeguards-voters-color/>.

524 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Sean J. Young at p. 1-2.

525 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Deuel Ross at p. 5-6.

districts, allowing Black voters to again elect the candidate of their preference.⁵²⁶ In Emanuel County, the Lawyers’ Committee represented plaintiffs who alleged the boundaries for seven school board districts “impermissibly diluted the voting strength of African American voters by ‘packing’ them into one district.”⁵²⁷ A negotiated settlement resulted in the creation of two majority-minority single-member districts.⁵²⁸

In Arizona, Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified that, without Section 5 review, tribes are concerned the Redistricting Commission may not consider retrogression when drawing the maps since the state is no longer required to seek preclearance.⁵²⁹ Tribes participated in the previous round of redistricting and defended the single majority-minority Native American legislative district. Tribal communities remain concerned they may lose the limited opportunity to elect candidates of their choice in state government.⁵³⁰ The testimony collected during the Subcommittee’s field hearings clearly demonstrates that discriminatory gerrymandering is rampant. Without the pre-*Shelby County* protections in place, the maps drawn after the 2020 census are likely to exacerbate this problem and it will take years for courts to remedy the issue. In the meantime, citizens will continue to be denied meaningful representation.

Section 2 Litigation

While important components of the Voting Rights Act were overturned by the *Shelby County* decision, many critical elements remain, including the ability to pursue litigation under Section 2. Section 2 allows both the Attorney General and private citizens to challenge a practice or procedure on discriminatory grounds. This standard was expanded during subsequent reauthorizations, allowing plaintiffs to challenge laws and election practices without needing to prove discriminatory intent and adjusting the burden of proof requirement to a “results or effects” test, reducing the burden on the plaintiffs.⁵³¹ Section 2 applies nationwide and does not expire.

At each field hearing, the Subcommittee heard that while critical, litigation under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is not, and cannot, be an adequate remedy on its own. Section 2 was designed as a tool for the Attorney General and private citizens to enforce 14th and 15th Amendment protections nationwide. After the *Shelby County* decision, Section 2 is one of the few mechanisms left for enforcing the right to vote and preventing voting changes that have a disparate impact on, and reduce the ability of, minority citizens to vote.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in their 2018 statutory Minority Voting Access report, found the number of Section 2 cases increased fourfold following the *Shelby County*

526 *Id.*, citing Ga. State Conf. of the NAACP v. Fayette Cty. Bd. of Comm’rs, 118 F.Supp.3d 1338 (ND Ga. 2015)

527 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 11.

528 *Id.*

529 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 8.

530 *Id.*

531 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 35.

decision.⁵³² The Department of Justice has litigated far fewer enforcement suits than private groups. At the time of the report's publishing, the Department of Justice had filed four of the 61 Section 2 cases since the *Shelby County* decision, including one case about the required language access measures, and no cases on the right to voting assistance.⁵³³ There is disagreement over whether the Department of Justice is failing to adequately enforce the Voting Rights Act or voting discrimination has decreased.⁵³⁴ As this report clearly demonstrates, discrimination in voting has not decreased.

Additionally, USCCR Vice-Chair Patricia Timmons-Goodson testified that, from the USCCR's perspective, the loss of Section 5 preclearance has made tracking voting changes more difficult; "at one point, there was a single source or a limited number of places that we could go to get that information, but when it is left to individual citizens and organizations to do the filing, it makes it far more difficult to track them."⁵³⁵ Illustrative of the scope of changes voters and advocates now have to track and potentially reactively litigate against, the Department of Justice reported that in just the three years before *Shelby County*, between 2010-2013, it considered 44,790 voting changes under Section 5.⁵³⁶

Section 2 lawsuits can be very lengthy, often taking years to fully litigate. This can result in discriminatory laws that may have otherwise been prevented from implementation under Section 5 remaining in place for multiple election cycles, denying voters access to the ballot while lawsuits move through the court process. According to Dale Ho, Director of the ACLU's Voting Rights Project, "in 10 recent Section 2 cases that resulted in favorable outcomes for [our] clients, more than 350 federal, state, and local government officials were elected under regimes that were later found by a court to be racially discriminatory or were later abandoned by the jurisdiction."⁵³⁷

Section 2 also reverses the burden of proof, requiring the federal government or citizens to prove the voting change is discriminatory and harms minority voters, rather than the burden being on the state or locality to prove they are not violating peoples' constitutional right to vote. Kristen Clarke of the Lawyers' Committee testified that, "although Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act remains a viable weapon in the fight against racial discrimination in voting, it is nowhere near as potent a weapon as was Section 5."⁵³⁸ These challenges are only exacerbated by the shifting priorities of the Department of Justice. Ms. Clarke testified that,

532 *Id.* at p. 9.

533 *Id.* at p. 10.

534 See *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Minority witness Logan Churchwell.

535 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Patricia Timmons-Goodson at p. 47.

536 U.S. Department of Justice, *Section 5 Changes By Type and Year, Total Section 5 Changes Received By The Attorney General 1965 Through 2013* (updated Aug. 6, 2015), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/section-5-changes-type-and-year-2>.

537 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Dale Ho at p. 3.

538 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 4.

as of the date of the Subcommittee’s Washington, D.C. hearing, the current administration has not filed a single Section 2 lawsuit.⁵³⁹

Overreliance on Section 2 forces private citizens to recognize when they are discriminated against and muster the resources to challenge the state or local government. In every state the Subcommittee visited, witnesses provided testimony outlining just how burdensome relying on Section 2 to protect voting rights can be.

“The ACLU of Georgia’s litigation in Sumter County perfectly illustrates the damage that the Shelby decision has caused. In 2011, 67 percent of the Sumter County Board of Education was African American. Then, the General Assembly proposed a plan that would reduce that percentage to 28 percent. The DOJ did not preclear the plan, but then the Shelby County decision was handed down, and that discriminatory plan was put into effect immediately. So, the ACLU filed a voting rights lawsuit under Section 2. And last summer, after 5 years of litigation, the Federal District Court issued a ruling finding that the plan was discriminatory and violated the Voting Rights Act. That is 5 years of time consuming litigation, hundreds if not thousands of attorney hours, and thousands of dollars in expert fees. That is 5 years of discriminatory elections taking place over and over again in Sumter County. And that is 5 years in which African American school children and their parents did not have their interests adequately represented in the board. And we are 2 years away from another round of redistricting, in which all of this can happen again. If the preclearance requirement were in place, none of this would have happened and that plan wouldn’t have seen the light of day.”

— Sean J. Young, ACLU of Georgia

⁵³⁹ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Kristen Clarke at p. 29-30.

In Atlanta, Georgia, Sean Young, Legal Director, ACLU of Georgia, gave testimony about the ACLU of Georgia’s litigation in Sumter County.⁵⁴⁰ The Department of Justice did not preclear a redistricting plan that would have diluted the Black population of the Sumter County Board of Education from 67 percent in 2011 to 28 percent. Following the *Shelby County* decision, the discriminatory plan was put into effect immediately. The Section 2 suit filed by the ACLU went on for five years, requiring “hundreds if not thousands of attorney hours,” and costing “thousands of dollars in expert fees.”⁵⁴¹ All the while, years of voting took place under these discriminatory practices. Gilda Daniels, Litigation Director at the Advancement Project reiterated the time and expense of Section 2, saying “Section 2 cases last an average of three years, and cost more than \$1 million.”⁵⁴²

In North Carolina, Caitlin Swain, Co-Director of Forward Justice, estimated the recent Section 2 litigation in North Carolina cost more than \$10 million on the plaintiff’s side alone.⁵⁴³ Ms. Swain continued, saying the cost more than doubled when including nonprofit groups, as well as the State’s costs associated with outside counsel representing the Governor and the General Assembly.⁵⁴⁴ When the state is sued, the state’s costs are then often borne disproportionately by the taxpayers,⁵⁴⁵ placing burdens on the voter at both ends of the lawsuit. Deuel Ross, of the NAACP LDF, testified that it has been found that voting rights cases take up the sixth most judicial resources in terms of cases.⁵⁴⁶

In North Dakota, Jacqueline De León, Staff Attorney at NARF, testified that Section 2 litigation is very expensive and “it is prohibitively expensive for a small organization like NARF to reach every single instance of discrimination that is happening across the country.”⁵⁴⁷ In NARF’s 2016 challenge to the North Dakota voter ID law, the total sought for Plaintiffs’ attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses was \$1,132,459.41. This included attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses, including expert reports. The case necessitated thousands of attorney hours over almost two years to build a legal record and respond to the State’s defense of the law.⁵⁴⁸

In Ohio, Naila Awan, Senior Counsel at Demos, testified that Plaintiff-side expenses in bringing Section 2 litigation often reach the six- and seven-figure range.⁵⁴⁹ In Alabama,

540 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Sean J. Young at p. 26.

541 *Id.*

542 *Id.*, hearing transcript, Gilda Daniels at p. 53.

543 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Caitlin Swain at p. 46.

544 *Id.*

545 *Id.*

546 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Deuel Ross at p. 31.

547 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Jacqueline De León at p. 64.

548 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 4.

“The effort and resources necessary to mount this legal challenge were significant. The total sought for Plaintiffs’ attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses was \$1,132,459.41. This sum represents \$832,977 in attorneys’ fees and \$299,482.41 in litigation expenses, including expert reports. Thousands of attorney hours over almost two years were expended in order to build a legal record and respond to numerous motions filed by the State in defense of the law.”

549 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), supplemental written statement for the record, Naila Awan.

Attorney James Blacksher testified it would cost “at least hundreds of thousands of dollars” to bring a successful case challenging polling place changes.⁵⁵⁰ Mr. Blacksher further testified that it “cost us millions of dollars in the last go-around of redistricting the House and Senate of Alabama” to challenge discriminatorily gerrymandered maps.⁵⁵¹ Mr. Blacksher elaborated that, “in fact, today, it is impossible for private counsel like [him] to bring one of these [Section 2] lawsuits without substantial assistance, financial and legal, from big law firms.”⁵⁵²

In Arizona, Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified she has been involved in several Section 2 cases in the State of Arizona, one after the 2000 redistricting on behalf of the Navajo Nation and another on the voter ID litigation brought on behalf of the Navajo Nation and other Native American citizens in the State.⁵⁵³ Currently, there is ongoing Section 2 litigation in Arizona Federal District Court dealing with the lack of access to early voting, voter registration, and noncompliance with Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act.⁵⁵⁴ In the two decades Professor Ferguson-Bohnee has been working on voting litigation in the State of Arizona, the Department of Justice has not initiated any Section 2 cases on behalf of Arizona Tribes.⁵⁵⁵ Additionally, Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified that “Tribes have limited resources to bring voting litigation,”⁵⁵⁶ and that Section 2 cases can cost up to \$1 million.⁵⁵⁷

As the Subcommittee’s hearings illustrate, Section 2 is a critical tool for protecting the right to vote and preventing discrimination, but, alone, it is not enough.

CONCLUSION

Without federal protections, new and old barriers to voting have emerged. Improperly purging voter registration rolls can disproportionately impact minority voters and recently naturalized citizens, and lead to the disenfranchisement of otherwise eligible voters. Cutbacks to early voting have a disparate impact on minority communities, working people, students, and the poor, leading to long wait times voters often cannot endure. In the post-*Shelby County* era, previously covered jurisdictions have closed over one thousand polling places. Jurisdictions not previously covered have also closed, moved, or consolidated polling places, leading to voter confusion and disenfranchisement. After the *Shelby County* decision, states and localities are no longer required to evaluate these decisions for their potential discriminatory impact.

550 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, James Blacksher at p. 26-27.

551 *Id.* at p. 27.

552 *Id.* – at the time of the hearing, Mr. Blacksher testified he had four cases where he was local counsel “for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, who is challenging photo ID; for the Campaign Legal Center, who is challenging the felon disenfranchisement; for the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights, who is challenging the at-large election of the Alabama Supreme Court; and the SEIU, Service Employees International Union...”

553 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 54-55.

554 *Id.* at p. 55.

555 *Id.* at p. 56.

556 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 8.

557 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 55-56.

Voter ID requirements disproportionately impact minority voters who are less likely than White voters to have the required ID. Voter ID also creates a modern-day poll tax, requiring voters to purchase an ID to vote or, even in cases in which states purport to provide free IDs, the requisite underlying documents are often not free for voters. There are also costs associated with time off from work and transportation required to reach the agency dispensing the IDs. The use of exact match and signature match requirements can disenfranchise voters. The language access provisions of the Voting Rights Act remain intact, but far more needs to be done to ensure limited-English proficiency voters have access to the properly translated materials and assistance they need to fully participate in the election process. Finally, discriminatory gerrymandering persists, diluting the vote and voice of minority communities. As the 2020 Census approaches, followed swiftly by a cycle of redistricting, a lack of preclearance puts at risk the state, local, and federal representation of communities for the next decade.

While Section 2 is a vital tool to protecting the right to vote, it is not a panacea. Litigation under Section 2 requires a significant investment of time and resources, neither of which most voters have. Without a proactive Section 5, and without a Department of Justice actively protecting the right to vote, advocates and litigators are left to fill in the gap. Section 2 is also a reactive solution, only to be deployed after a discriminatory practice or procedure is instituted. A case can take years to litigate, leaving voters vulnerable while the court process unfolds. To truly protect the right to vote, Congress must act proactively to protect a right as fundamental as participation in the democratic process.

CHAPTER THREE

Obstacles Faced by Native American Voters

BACKGROUND

Native Americans have historically faced significant barriers to full participation in our democracy. This land's original inhabitants were disenfranchised at the time of our nation's founding, and since then their votes and voices have been systematically suppressed. When the Constitution was written and ratified, it provided for representation of "the whole number of free Persons," fully including indentured servants who were mostly White, but counting enslaved persons as only three-fifths of a person and excluding "Indians not taxed."⁵⁵⁸ Native Americans were not considered citizens in the 1800s, were specifically excluded from the 14th Amendment, and were not granted full voting rights until the 1920s. Even after these advances, it took decades for every state to fully comply with federal guarantees.

For many years, Native Americans were denied the same rights as other Americans. The Court distinguished tribal nations from sovereign foreign nations or official parts of the United States, instead considering them domestic dependent nations.⁵⁵⁹ In 1856, Attorney General Caleb Cushing outlined the federal government's rationale as to why domestic subjects could not be made citizens absent a treaty or specific congressional act, explaining that general naturalization statutes did not apply to Native Americans because "Indians are not foreigners" and have no other allegiance, but are "within our allegiance, without being citizens of the United States."⁵⁶⁰ This meant Native Americans did not have access to the same naturalization process as immigrants, nor did they have the same rights as other natural-born citizens. It was effectively impossible for Native Americans to realize the same rights as other American citizens, including the right to vote.

When emancipated enslaved people were granted citizenship rights under the 14th Amendment in 1868, the U.S. government interpreted the Amendment to exclude Native Americans on reservations.⁵⁶¹ The Reconstruction amendments and implementing legislation excluded Native Americans, rationalizing that tribal members were in fact citizens of Indian nations, not the United States,⁵⁶² and were ineligible to vote.⁵⁶³ Then-Michigan Senator Jacob Howard said,

558 U.S. Const., Art. I, § 2, cl. 3.

"Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons."

559 *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 30 U.S. 1, 17 (1831), *see also* Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099.

560 Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099, *citing* Relation of Indians to Citizenship, 7 Op. Att'y Gen. 746, 749-50 (1856).

561 Natalie A. Landreth, Matthew L. Campbell, Jacqueline De León, *A History of Native Voting Rights*, Native American Voting Rights Coalition, <https://www.narf.org/cases/voting-rights/>.

562 Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099 at p. 1102.

563 *Id.*

“I am not yet prepared to pass a sweeping act of naturalization by which all the Indian savages, wild or tame, belonging to a tribal relation, are to become my fellow-citizens and go to the polls and vote with me[.]”⁵⁶⁴ The 14th Amendment itself expressly states that Native Americans did not count for the purposes of representative apportionment.⁵⁶⁵

The Civil Rights Act of 1866 also specifically excluded Native Americans. Under this law, tribal citizens were “subjects of” the United States, but not “subject to” the jurisdiction of the United States and therefore not citizens.⁵⁶⁶ In 1884, the Court held that Native Americans could not become citizens through naturalization or birth.⁵⁶⁷ When women gained the right to vote under the 19th Amendment, it enfranchised predominantly White women because many Native American women still lacked citizenship.⁵⁶⁸

It was not until 1924, under the Indian Citizenship Act, that Native Americans won full citizenship and voting rights without impairing their right to remain a tribal member.⁵⁶⁹ Prior to passage of the Indian Citizenship Act, obtaining citizenship required tribal members to sever tribal ties, renounce tribal citizenship, and assimilate to the dominant culture.⁵⁷⁰ Native Americans had been denied citizenship and the right to vote “based on the underlying trust relationship between the federal government and the tribes and their status as tribal citizens.”⁵⁷¹ With the passage of the Indian Citizenship Act, a Native American who is a citizen of the United States is also a citizen of his or her state of residence.⁵⁷² However, some states continued to deny Native Americans the right to vote in state and federal elections through the same suppressive tactics used to disenfranchise other minority voters, including poll taxes, literacy tests, and intimidation.⁵⁷³

In 1928, Peter Porter and Rudolph Johnson of the Gila River Indian Community, were denied the right to register to vote in Pinal County.⁵⁷⁴ The County recorder deemed Porter and Johnson unqualified to vote for two reasons: (1) they resided on the reservation and thus not within the State of Arizona; and (2) as Native Americans they remained under guardianship of the federal government and under Arizona law, individuals under guardianship were not entitled to vote in Arizona elections for state and federal officers.⁵⁷⁵

564 Natalie A. Landreth, Matthew L. Campbell, Jacqueline De León, *A History of Native Voting Rights*, Native American Voting Rights Coalition, *citing* the Congressional Globe, May 30, 1866 at p. 2895, <https://www.narf.org/cases/voting-rights/>.

565 U.S. Const. amend. XIV.

566 Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099 at p. 1103.

567 *Elk v. Wilkins*, 112 U.S. 94, 103 (1884).

568 U.S. Const. amend. XIX – passed by Congress June 4, 1919; ratified August 18, 1920.

569 Indian Citizenship Act, Pub. L. No. 68-175, 43 U.S. Stat. 253 (1924).

Authorized the Secretary of the Interior to issue certificates of citizenship to Indians.

570 Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099 at p. 1103-4.

571 *Id.* at p. 1103.

572 *Id.*

573 *Id.*

574 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Governor Stephen Roe Lewis at p. 1-2.

575 *Id.*, see also Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099 at p. 1108.

Congress' passage of the Nationality Act of 1940 reaffirmed the citizenship of Native Americans.⁵⁷⁶ As late as 1948, Arizona and New Mexico enforced state laws expressly barring many Native Americans from voting.⁵⁷⁷ Professor Patty Ferguson-Bohnee testified that, historically, despite the Indian Citizenship Act in 1924 and the Arizona Supreme Court affirming the right of Native Americans to vote in *Harrison v. Laveen*,⁵⁷⁸ the right to vote for Native Americans was still not secure.⁵⁷⁹ Native American voters continued to be disenfranchised by literacy tests for decades.⁵⁸⁰ Many Native voters did not vote because they were illiterate and could not speak English; English literacy tests were the biggest obstacle preventing Native Americans from voting.⁵⁸¹ Illiteracy rates for Native Americans in 1948 were estimated at 80 to 90 percent.⁵⁸² In 1970, the right was finally affirmed when the Court upheld the ban on literacy tests.⁵⁸³

A recent study conducted by the Native American Voting Rights Coalition⁵⁸⁴ found that low levels of trust in government, lack of information on how and where to register, long distances to register and to vote, low levels of internet access, hostility towards Native Americans, and intimidation are obstacles to Native American voter participation in Arizona.⁵⁸⁵ Research by the National Congress of American Indians indicates the voter turnout rate among American Indian and Alaska Native registered voters is five to 14 percentage points lower than the rate of many other racial and ethnic groups.⁵⁸⁶

The Subcommittee on Elections held field hearings in North Dakota and Arizona, gathering testimony and evidence from tribal leaders, litigators, and advocates about the barriers Native American communities continue to face when attempting to cast a ballot. These two hearings were not an exhaustive evaluation of the barriers faced by Native American voters but provided critical insight and testimony on the barriers faced by voters living on reservations

576 Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099 at p. 1103-4, see footnote 69:

Congress revised and codified the nationality laws of the United States. Section 201(b) of the Nationality Act of 1940 affirmed that “[a] person born in the United States to a member of an Indian, Eskimo, Aleutian, or other aboriginal tribe... shall be nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.” Nationality Act of 1940, Pub. L. No. 76-853, § 201(b), 54 Stat. 1137, 1138.

577 Peter Dunphy, *The State of Native American Voting Rights*, Brennan Center for Justice (Mar. 13, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/state-native-american-voting-rights>.

578 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 2.

579 *Id.*

580 Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, *The History of Indian Voting Rights in Arizona: Overcoming Decades of Voter Suppression*, Ariz. St. L. J. 47:1099 at p. 1112.

581 *Id.*

582 *Id.* citing Tucker et al., *supra* note 84, at 285 (citing DVD: The History of Indian Voting In Arizona (Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc. 2004)). In the 1960s, about half of the Navajo voting age population could not pass a literacy test. See MCCOOL ET AL., *supra* note 13, at 19.

583 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 2, see also *Oregon v. Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112 (1970).

584 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 4, see also Native American Voting Rights Coalition, *Voting Barriers Encountered by Native Americans in Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, and South Dakota* (Jan. 2018), <https://www.narf.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/2017NAVRCsurvey-summary.pdf>.

585 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 34-35.

586 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 7, citing National Congress of American Indians, *Top 10 States with the Highest Populations of Voting-Age Natives*, Native Vote (2018), http://www.ncai.org/initiatives/campaigns/NCAI_NativeVoteInfographic.pdf.

and the need for consultation with tribes when crafting voting laws. The Native American Rights Fund and their collaborative partners conducted a series of independent hearings and plan to publish their finding in a forthcoming report.

This chapter focuses on barriers to voting as expressed and experienced by the Native American community. Their barriers include: nontraditional addresses that lead to issues with voter ID laws, vote-by-mail, and voter registration requirements; lack of access to early voting, polling locations, and resources for on-reservation voting; vote dilution due to gerrymandering; and lack of language access materials and assistance in Native languages. Some barriers are similar to those experienced by non-Native voters and discussed elsewhere in this report, while others are unique to the experience of Native Americans.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT PROTECTIONS FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 prohibited discrimination in voting on the basis of race.⁵⁸⁷ As discussed earlier, Sections 4(b) and 5 of the Voting Rights Act required covered states to seek preclearance for changes to “any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting.”⁵⁸⁸ Native American voters were included as a protected class when the federal government was reviewing proposed voting changes for potential discrimination.⁵⁸⁹

Subsequently, the 1975 amendments to the Voting Rights Act created Section 203 which required voting materials be provided in the language of the “applicable minority language group,” including Native Americans and Native Alaskans.⁵⁹⁰ Section 203 includes a formula for determining which jurisdictions are required to provide bilingual materials and assistance.⁵⁹¹

The 1992 amendments to the Voting Rights Act expanded the coverage formulas for language access to include not only jurisdictions where five percent of eligible voters have limited-English proficiency (LEP), but also those that have at least 10,000 LEP citizens who are members of a single language minority group. The amendments also expanded language access coverage formulas for Native Americans living on Indian Reservations.⁵⁹² Additionally, Section 208 allows a disabled or LEP individual to bring an assistant of their choosing to help them vote.

587 Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. Law No. 89-110, Sec. 2.

“No voting qualifications or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.”

588 52 U.S.C. § 10304(a).

589 *Id.*

590 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 34.

591 *Id.*

592 *Id.* at p. 36-37, *citing* James Thomas Tucker, *Enfranchising Language Minority Citizens: The Bilingual Election Provisions of the Voting Rights Act*, N.Y.U. J. Leg. & Pub. POL’Y 215 (2016), <http://www.nyu.edu/legis/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/TUCKER-ENFRANCHISING-LANGUAGE-MINORITY-CITIZENS-TEH-BILINGUAL-ELECTION-PROVISIONS-OF-THE-VOTING-RIGHTS-ACT.pdf>.

Arizona was brought under Voting Rights Act preclearance following the 1975 reauthorization, which expanded coverage to more fully include language minority populations, including Latino, Asian American, and Native American populations.⁵⁹³ North Dakota was never covered under Sections 4(b) and 5, however, neighboring South Dakota was a partially-covered state, with two counties covered.⁵⁹⁴

Native Americans have been particularly hurt by the *Shelby County* decision, and it is clear that Section 2 litigation alone is not an adequate protection of the right to vote for tribal members. In North Dakota, Jacqueline De León testified that the lawsuit challenging North Dakota’s discriminatory voter ID law in 2016 cost over \$1.1 million in plaintiff’s attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses and took thousands of attorney hours to develop.⁵⁹⁵ Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified that she has been involved in several Section 2 cases in the State of Arizona, including one after the 2000 redistricting cycle on behalf of the Navajo Nation and another regarding voter ID brought on behalf of the Navajo Nation and other Native American citizens in Arizona. She is also involved in ongoing litigation in Federal District Court regarding the lack of access to early voting, voter registration, and noncompliance with Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act.⁵⁹⁶ However, Professor Ferguson-Bohnee went on to note that in the two decades she has been working on voting litigation in the State of Arizona, the Department of Justice has not initiated any cases on behalf of tribes.⁵⁹⁷ Tribes have limited resources and Section 2 is not a viable replacement for Section 5 oversight given that a Section 2 case can cost up to \$1 million.⁵⁹⁸

ONGOING BARRIERS FACED BY NATIVE AMERICANS

“Native Americans do not have equal access to voter registration. Many voters must travel long distances off-reservation to register to vote, in some cases 95 miles one way.”

— Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, Sandra Day O’Connor School of Law

Nontraditional Addresses, Voter ID, and Vote-by-Mail

Many Native Americans living on tribal reservations lack traditional street addresses. This is a problem the Subcommittee heard in both North Dakota and Arizona. When states require voter IDs to have a street address rather than allowing Post Office Boxes, it disenfranchises voters who live in multi-family homes,

593 U.S. Department of Justice, *History of Federal Voting Rights Laws: The Voting Rights Act of 1965* (updated July 28, 2017), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/history-federal-voting-rights-laws>.

594 U.S. Department of Justice, *Jurisdictions Previously Covered by Section 5* (last updated Aug. 6, 2015), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/jurisdictions-previously-covered-section-5>.

595 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 4.

596 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 54.

597 *Id.* at p. 56.

598 *Id.* at p. 55-56.

have unstable housing situations, or live in rural areas that have not been provided traditional street addresses.

For example, Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified that, in Arizona only, “18 percent of reservation voters outside of Maricopa and Pima Counties have physical addresses and receive mail at home.”⁵⁹⁹

North Dakota

To vote in North Dakota, voters must present a residential address on one of the following IDs: a North Dakota Driver’s License or nondriver’s identification card, a tribal government ID, or an alternative form of identification prescribed by the Secretary of State, which included a student identification certificate or a long-term care identification certificate.⁶⁰⁰ North Dakota’s voter ID law has been amended multiple times over the last several years. As the evidence below illustrates, these changes have a disparate impact on North Dakota’s Native American voters.

In 2011, concerns over disenfranchising voters led the state Senate, on a bipartisan basis, to vote 38-8 to reject changes to the state’s voter ID law that would have eliminated long-standing fail-safe provisions that provided critical protections, especially for Native American voters who lacked a qualifying residential street address.⁶⁰¹ However, following the 2012 election, in which Senator Heidi Heitkamp won the North Dakota Senate race, the state changed course, enacting strict changes to its voter ID requirement in 2013 and eliminating the fail-safe mechanisms that had protected voters.⁶⁰² Senator Heitkamp narrowly won her 2012 Senate race by less than 3,000 votes, or just fewer than one percentage point, which media outlets at the time and witnesses at the Subcommittee hearing attributed to the voters of the Native American community.⁶⁰³

The fail-safe mechanisms that were eliminated by the 2013 law had allowed a voter to cast their ballot if a poll worker could vouch for their identity or the voter signed an affidavit, under penalty of perjury, that they were qualified to vote.⁶⁰⁴ This fail-safe system worked well, particularly for the tribal communities. Tribal leaders testified that their members serve as poll workers and can vouch for almost every person within their small communities.⁶⁰⁵ Prior to passing the new law, the North Dakota state legislature failed to analyze whether the Native American voters who lacked addresses during the 2011 legislative debate still lacked

599 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 3, citing *Democratic Nat’l Comm. V. Reagan*, 329 F. Supp. 3d at 869-70.

600 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 4.

601 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 2-3.

602 *Id.* at p. 3.

603 *Id.* at p. 2, *see also* hearing transcript.

604 *Id.* at p. 2.

605 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Charles Walker at p. 2.

addresses in 2013.⁶⁰⁶ In fact, the state still had data from previous legislative debates indicating that many Native Americans lacked proper street addresses.

The legislature nevertheless passed a law restricting the acceptable forms of ID and eliminating the poll worker voucher and affidavit fail-safes, aware that such a requirement would disenfranchise Native American voters. Indeed, many Native American voters continue to lack addresses to this day.⁶⁰⁷ Jacqueline De León testified that the legislature used a hodgepodge amendment, a parliamentary procedure in which an unrelated bill was replaced with the voter ID bill, for the purposes of enabling the legislature to pass the bill without public hearings.⁶⁰⁸ North Dakota State Representative Corey Mock objected to the passage of the bill without debate because it would “completely change the way North Dakota handles voters” and circumvent input from the public and agencies impacted by the bill.⁶⁰⁹

In the 2015 legislative session, North Dakota again amended its voter ID laws, further restricting the forms of acceptable ID.⁶¹⁰ In 2016, NARF filed suit on behalf of Turtle Mountain plaintiffs that were disenfranchised by the laws.⁶¹¹ The U.S. District Court in North Dakota found for the voters, finding the law violated both the U.S. and North Dakota constitutions as well as the Voting Rights Act and required North Dakota to provide a fail-safe mechanism for the 2016 election.⁶¹²

“Bottom line, members of Standing Rock Sioux Tribe feel that the North Dakota ID law was meant to target them and dissuade them from exercising their constitutional right to vote. It was hurtful to our members to be excluded this way, and our community remains outraged.”

— Charles Walker, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

In April 2017, the North Dakota enacted H.B. 1369, preserving the previously enacted strict voter ID requirements, requiring a street address, and failing to preserve the affidavit option as required by the court.⁶¹³ The legislature instead allowed for a provisional ballot.⁶¹⁴ While a provisional ballot would allow voters without a proper ID to cast a ballot, the ballot would ultimately be thrown out if the voter could not return with a qualifying ID within six days of the election.⁶¹⁵ This failed to address disenfranchisement concerns for

606 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 3; see also *Brakebill* First Amend. Compl. ¶ 64.

“The Legislature required residential addresses despite being warned in the previous Legislative session by Deputy Secretary of State Jim Silirum that Native Americans in particular would be disproportionately impacted by such a change.”

607 *Id.* at p. 3.

608 *Id.* at p. 3, see also *Brakebill* First Amend. Compl. ¶ 54-59.

609 *Id.* at p. 3.

610 *Id.* at p. 4.

611 *Id.*

612 *Id.*

613 *Id.* at p. 4-5.

614 *Id.*

615 *Id.*

voters who are otherwise qualified to vote but could not obtain a qualifying ID or who had no residential address to put on an ID.⁶¹⁶ NARF again filed suit on behalf of voters. Ultimately, on September 27, 2018, the Court denied an emergency appeal and allowed a decision by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals to stand, allowing the state to implement the strict voter ID for the 2018 election.⁶¹⁷

The law in place for the 2018 election required a residential address and did not allow for the use of a Post Office Box. The impact on Native American voters and response from the community was significant. Tribal leaders, litigators, and advocates testified about the barriers requiring a residential street address places on their tribal members. The resources marshalled to ensure voters received an ID, compounded with the burden it placed on the tribes to comply, amounted to an unfunded mandate and a poll tax.

Chairwoman Myra Pearson of the Spirit Lake Tribe said, “many of our members struggle with housing instability, unemployment, and poverty.”⁶¹⁸ The Candeska Cikana Community College estimated in September 2014 that there are approximately 300 homeless people residing on or around the Spirit Lake reservation, but that estimate may be an undercount, as not all homeless tribal members sign up for housing assistance.⁶¹⁹ A 2015 survey of 285 people living on the Spirit Lake Reservation indicated that 38 percent of people have an income under \$5,000, and 73 percent have an income less than \$20,000 per year.⁶²⁰

Many parts of the Spirit Lake reservation have not been provided acceptable forms of street addresses and many members do not have ID, nor do they need one to live their lives.⁶²¹ If members do have IDs, they are predominantly tribal IDs that list a Post Office Box. The United States Postal Service does not deliver to certain parts of the reservation, and if the county 911 coordinator has assigned a residential address to someone’s home, they may never be notified of that address.⁶²²

“The Tribe does not have the resources to indefinitely provide adequate IDs to tribal members in order to vote in all future elections.”

— Chairwoman Myra Pearson, Spirit Lake Tribe

Chairwoman Pearson testified to the effort undertaken by the Tribe to ensure every possible voter obtained state sanctioned ID. Between October 22, 2018 and November 8, 2018, the Tribal Enrollment Office was open overtime. Robin Smith, Director of the Enrollment Department for the Spirit Lake Tribe, worked 21.25 hours of overtime, costing the Tribe additional money in overtime

616 *Id.* at p. 5.

617 *Id.* at p. 6.

618 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Chairwoman Myra Pearson at p. 1.

619 *Id.* at p. 1.

620 *Id.*

621 *Id.*

622 *Id.*

pay for the Director of the Enrollment Department.⁶²³ The Tribe also waived the traditional \$11 fee for the ID.⁶²⁴

The Spirit Lake Tribe purchased a new printer and supplies, incurring costs upwards of \$3,500.⁶²⁵ The Tribe issued 665 ID cards between October 22 and November 8.⁶²⁶ Typically, the Tribe issues approximately 30 IDs per month. The fee waiver cost the Spirit Lake Tribe \$7,315 in income.⁶²⁷

Issuing IDs also proved difficult. When tribal staff encountered an individual without a street address, staff would attempt to determine an address or contact a 911 coordinator.⁶²⁸ If an applicant was homeless or relied on a Post Office Box, staff would attempt to determine where

“... we are not a wealthy tribe, we have scrapped and scrimped to survive these past 200 years. With this understanding the government waived fees for Tribal Identifications to meet the requirements to allow our members to vote.”

— Alysia LaCounte, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians

the individual stayed most recently and most often.⁶²⁹ One tribal member made three separate visits to finally obtain an acceptable address.⁶³⁰ Given that Spirit Lake tribal IDs expire every five years and many residents move frequently, there are concerns the voter ID law will disenfranchise tribal residents and continue doing so in a discriminatory manner.

The Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians faced similar struggles. Unemployment on the Turtle Mountain reservation hovers at 69.75

⁶²³ *Id.* at p. 2.

“In order to ensure that its members had valid IDs the Tribe chose to extend its hours at the Tribal Enrollment Office. Between October 22, 2018 and November 8, 2018, the enrollment office was open from 8:00AM until as late as 7:00PM, depending on need. Robin Smith, the Director of the Enrollment Department for the Spirit Lake Tribe, had to work through her lunch break on a regular basis in order to ensure that needs were met. Ms. Smith worked a total of 21.25 hours of overtime between this timeframe at a rate of \$37.50/hr., which cost the Tribe an additional \$796.88.”

⁶²⁴ *Id.*

⁶²⁵ *Id.*

“In order to meet the needs of the members and the additional requests for IDs, the Tribe purchased a new printer for \$2,655.95 and \$1,105.78 worth of supplies such as ink and the cards themselves. The Tribe issued a total of 665 ID cards between October 22, 2018 and November 8, 2018. Normally the Tribe issues about 30 IDs per month. Due to the fee waiver, the Tribe lost \$7,315.00 in income during that time.”

⁶²⁶ *Id.*

⁶²⁷ *Id.*

⁶²⁸ *Id.*

⁶²⁹ *Id.* at p. 2.

“There were several difficulties in issuing the IDs. For instance, if a person was homeless or relied on a P.O. Box number because they did not have a consistent address, the enrollment staff would have to find out where the individual stayed most recently and most often. Usually, the individual would give a relative or a friend’s house. Enrollment staff would then have to look up the relative or friend and verify with that person that the individual had stayed there. In other instances, members would arrive and not know their physical address. In those circumstances, enrollment staff had to assist the member in determining their physical address. This process involves checking internal records about the physical addresses of other members that live at the same residence. If that did not determine an address, staff would then call the Benson County 911 coordinator to determine the address or have an address assigned.”

⁶³⁰ *Id.* at p. 3.

percent, along with a high poverty rate.⁶³¹ To ensure members could vote in the 2018 election, the Tribal government enacted a law enabling voters to receive tribal IDs for free.⁶³² Generally, Turtle Mountain Tribal IDs cost \$15.⁶³³ As discussed in Chapter 2, \$15 may not seem like a significant expense, but to a tribal member it can mean a week’s worth of milk and bread.⁶³⁴ The Tribe issued 2,400 new ID cards,⁶³⁵ at an estimated cost of at least \$36,000.

“The first day of free tribal IDs our ID machine melted down the actual physical IDs because it became too hot. As a result, we sought assistance through any means necessary, social media, news outlets, and moccasin telegraph.”

— Alysia LaCounte, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians

Alysia LaCounte testified that the use of addresses and street names began only recently on the Turtle Mountain Reservation – “uniform addressing, and numbering of residences only occurred within the last ten years.”⁶³⁶ Most private residences still lack a house number. The Tribe experienced numerous technical difficulties issuing 2,400 IDs. Still, the Tribe undertook significant efforts to ensure everyone who wanted one could obtain an ID and vote. The Tribal college opened a help line, the Tribe purchased new machines to produce the IDs and placed them

throughout the community, staff worked 14 hours a day for two weeks before the election, and they held get-out-the-vote rallies.⁶³⁷ Organizing a response to this discriminatory law required a great amount of time and resources.

The people of Mandan Hidatsa and Arikara Nation (“MHA Nation”) faced similar obstacles. The MHA Nation has more than 5,600 members of voting age that live on or near the Reservation.⁶³⁸ Until 2016, the Tribe allowed members to list a Post Office Box as their address on their tribal ID cards, as MHA Nation also has parts of the reservation with homes without assigned street addresses.⁶³⁹ Following the decisions of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Court, the Tribe began allowing tribal members to exchange their IDs with Post Office Boxes for new IDs with residential street addresses free of charge.⁶⁴⁰ Shortly thereafter, the Tribe began issuing new, free tribal IDs to members for any reason.⁶⁴¹

631 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Alysia LaCounte at p. 1.

632 *Id.* at p. 2.

633 *Id.*

634 *Id.*

635 *Id.*

636 *Id.*

637 *Id.* at p. 3.

638 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Roger White Owl at p. 1-2.

639 *Id.* at p. 2-3.

640 *Id.* at p. 3.

641 *Id.*

“Once again, the MHA Nation was forced to bear the burden of federal laws, policies and decisions giving improper authority to the State over elections on our Fort Berthold Indian Reservation.”

— Roger White Owl, MHA Nation

“In many cases we could not identify an address for someone even when looking at a map of their house. Or, they may have given me a family member’s house address where they are currently staying. This is not voter fraud. This is the result of unworkable state laws being applied to our Reservation.”

— Roger White Owl, MHA Nation

Roger White Owl, Chief Executive Officer of MHA Nation, testified their efforts were slowed by a lack of staff resources to do the unexpected work and significant distances separating communities.⁶⁴² Between September 24, 2018 and November 6, 2018, MHA Nation issued 456 new IDs. In contrast, they typically issue about 150 to 200 IDs a month.⁶⁴³ Mr. White Owl testified, “some tribal members had to drive for hours just to get a new ID.”⁶⁴⁴ MHA Nation estimated about 75 to 80 percent of the tribal members who received a new ID leading up to the election did not have an ID that complied with North Dakota’s law.⁶⁴⁵ Furthermore, the addresses on the new IDs may not be accurate in future years, as “about one in four tribal members who came in for a new ID did not know their residential address.”⁶⁴⁶

Despite these efforts, Mr. White Owl said roughly one-third of MHA Nation members still do not have a tribal ID. The Tribe was also unable to count the number of members who never received a new ID, were discouraged from voting, or were unable to vote due to the new voter ID law.⁶⁴⁷ In addition to the ID barriers voters were required

⁶⁴² *Id.*

⁶⁴³ *Id.*

“Between the time of the Eight Circuit decision and the November 6, 2018 election our Tribal Enrollment Office issued 456 new IDs to tribal members. Normally we issue about 150 to 200 IDs a month. This burdened our system, limited our ability to provide other important services to tribal members, and the MHA Nation absorbed the cost of issuing these IDs. We estimate the about 75 to 80 percent of the tribal members who received a new ID during this time did not have another form of ID that would have complied with North Dakota’s law. Even with all of this additional work, about one-third of our members still do not have a tribal ID.”

⁶⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁴⁶ *Id.*

“In addition, many of the current residential addresses that we used to make these IDs may not be accurate in future years. About one in four tribal members who came in for a new ID did not know their residential address. In many cases we could not identify an address for someone even when looking at a map of their house. Or, they may have given me a family member’s house address where they are currently staying. This is not voter fraud. This is the result of unworkable state laws being applied to our Reservation.”

⁶⁴⁷ *Id.* at p. 3.

to surmount, MHA Nation had to provide buses to bring voters to the polls after two polling locations were closed, requiring some members to travel 30 to 45 miles to vote.⁶⁴⁸

The people of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe faced a similar challenge. Charles Walker testified that many people on Standing Rock do not have an ID because “it is simply not necessary for everyday life.”⁶⁴⁹ The family poverty rate in Sioux County, North Dakota, is 35.9 percent.⁶⁵⁰ The nearest driver’s license site is approximately 40 miles away.⁶⁵¹ Generally, unless a member is elderly, the Tribe charges for an ID to fund the cost of staff time and printing.

The United States Postal Service does not always operate in the rural areas of the Standing Rock Reservation. Like other reservations, many members use and share Post Office Boxes, many of the homes are not marked with house numbers, and many streets lack signage. Even if the state government has an address listed for a residence, it may never have been communicated to the homeowners.⁶⁵² Charles Walker testified the state also uses multiple addressing systems, so an address may be different across different government agencies.⁶⁵³ Additionally, Alysia LaCounte testified that the 911 system fails to enumerate unit numbers, making proper addressing difficult.⁶⁵⁴ Chairwoman Pearson testified that she has lived at the same home for more than 20 years, and a company could not verify her address for a delivery.⁶⁵⁵ A significant portion of the population also moves from home to home because they do not have housing of their own, meaning they do not have a consistent address even if they remain within the reservation.⁶⁵⁶

During the 2018 election cycle, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe waved a \$5 fee usually charged to members under age 60 for a new ID. The Tribe issued 807 new tribal IDs between October 15, 2018, and November 6, 2018.⁶⁵⁷ During this time, the Tribe would have charged a fee for 486 of those IDs. As a result, the Tribe lost nearly \$2,500 in income and spent almost \$500 to print them.⁶⁵⁸ Previously, the Fort Yates office printed an average of only 47 IDs per month.⁶⁵⁹

648 *Id.* at p. 3-4.

649 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Charles Walker at p. 3.

650 *Id.*

651 *Id.*

652 *Id.*

653 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Charles Walker at p. 8.

654 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Alysia LaCounte at p. 16-17.

655 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Chairwoman Myra Pearson at p. 13-14.

656 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Charles Walker at p. 3.

657 *Id.* at p. 4.

“This election cycle the Tribe responded by expending valuable resources to try to make sure that our members were not disenfranchised. We normally charge a \$5 fee to print new IDs for any tribal member under the age of 60; we waived this fee leading up to the election. We issued 807 new tribal IDs between October 15, 2018 and November 6, 2018. We would have charged a fee to print 486 of these IDs, which means we lost nearly \$2,500 in income and spent almost \$500 to print all of these IDs.”

658 *Id.* at p. 4-5.

659 *Id.*

“Simply put, it is a massive hurdle for many on the Standing Rock Reservation to figure out their actual residential address.”

—Charles Walker, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

The North Dakota legislature claimed changes to the voter ID law were necessary to prevent voter fraud. None of the witnesses testifying at the North Dakota field hearing cited any risk of voter fraud. In fact, the Subcommittee heard the opposite – “There is little to no risk of voter fraud on the Standing Rock Reservation, and there has never

been an issue with it before with more lenient voter ID laws.”⁶⁶⁰ Implementation of a strict voter ID requirement runs counterintuitive to North Dakota’s lack of a voter registration requirement,⁶⁶¹ and witnesses at the hearing reiterated that they do not want a voter registration requirement.⁶⁶²

There is also evidence the new fail-safe mechanism does not address the problems faced by Native American voters. While the law allows voters to supplement a non-qualifying ID with a utility bill, bank statement, check, or government issued document, this fails to address the issues faced by voters who could not reasonably obtain an ID or who had no residential address to place on the ID.⁶⁶³ If the issue is a lack of residential address, the voter likely does not have a utility bill or other document addressed to that address.⁶⁶⁴ Each tribal leader who testified at the North Dakota field hearing highlighted the high levels of housing insecurity, homelessness, and poverty experienced by residents on their reservations. These factors contribute to the likelihood that residents will not have utility bills with an address on them.

Additionally, if a voter casts a set-aside ballot on Election Day because they could not obtain an address in time for the election, there is little evidence suggesting they would be able to do so in the six days following the election as the law now requires.⁶⁶⁵

The state failed to offer any resources to help tribes provide IDs that complied with the new law. Mr. Walker testified that the state has not offered any money or assistance in complying with the law, no effort to update the addressing system, make it 911-compliant, or mark unmarked homes.⁶⁶⁶ Additionally, there was a lack of communication between tribes and the state as to what addresses the state would accept.

⁶⁶⁰ *Id.* at p. 4.

⁶⁶¹ North Dakota is the only state without a voter registration requirement.

⁶⁶² *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019).

⁶⁶³ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jacqueline De León at p. 5.

⁶⁶⁴ *Id.* at p. 4.

“Further, the “failsafe mechanisms” in the latest iteration of the voter ID law do not actually address the problems that Indian voters face. If the problem is simply a lack of legitimate residential address, they likely do not have a utility bill or some other document addressed to that address. The same is true for the set-aside ballots; if a voter couldn’t obtain an address in time for the election, there is little evidence to suggest that they would be able to do so in the six days following the election.”

⁶⁶⁵ *Id.* at p. 4.

⁶⁶⁶ *Id.* at p. 5.

“Access to the polls and participation in the political process are impacted by isolating conditions such as language barriers, socioeconomic disparities, lack of access to transportation, lack of residential addresses, lack of access to mail, the digital divide, and distance.”

— Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, Sandra Day
O’Connor School of Law

Arizona

The State of Arizona is home to 22 federally recognized Native American Tribes and 21 reservations.⁶⁶⁷ Roughly 27 percent of the land in the state is tribal land, and more than five percent of the state’s population is Native American.⁶⁶⁸ The poverty rate for Native Americans in Arizona is 35.7 percent.⁶⁶⁹ Comparatively, Non-Hispanic Whites in Arizona experience a poverty rate of 10.9 percent.⁶⁷⁰ Native Americans in Arizona are more likely to work multiple jobs, lack reliable transportation, and lack adequate childcare resources.⁶⁷¹ These factors,

when compounded with barriers erected by the state, can impact a Native voter’s ability to access the ballot.

Native Americans in Arizona also face significant homelessness or near homelessness due to extreme poverty and a lack of affordable housing.⁶⁷² Many residents also lack traditional street addresses. In Arizona, only 18 percent of reservation voters outside of Maricopa and Pima Counties have physical addresses and receive mail at home.⁶⁷³ Many Native American voters in Arizona, similar to North Dakota, rely on Post Office Boxes to receive their mail. Some tribal members must travel up to 140 miles round trip to receive mail.⁶⁷⁴

Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified the lack of formal addresses in Indian Country makes it “especially hard for voters to comply with address requirements to register to vote or to produce identification in order to vote on Election Day.”⁶⁷⁵ President Jonathan Nez, of the Navajo Nation, testified a majority of Navajo citizens residing on the reservation do not have traditional street addresses, with the reservation having at least 50,000 unmarked properties.⁶⁷⁶

667 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 2.

668 *Id.* at p. 2.

669 *Id.* at p. 3.

670 *Id.* – the national poverty rate for Native Americans is 26.8%.

671 *Id.* at p. 3, citing *Democratic Nat’l Comm. v. Reagan*, 904 F.3d 686, 704 (9th Cir. 2018), *reh’g en banc granted*, 911 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2019) (Dissent, Thomas).

672 *Id.* – A study by Housing and Urban Development found that between 42,000 and 85,000 people in tribal areas are couch surfers, staying with friends or relatives only because they had no place of their own.

673 *Id.* at p. 3.

674 *Id.* at p. 3-4.

675 *Id.* at p. 4.

676 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of President Jonathan Nez at p. 1.

“Some of the highest rates of near homelessness and overcrowding in Indian Country is found in Arizona. This lack of permanent housing impacts the ability of these tribal members to have a permanent physical address, yet this should not impede their ability to exercise their right to vote.”

— Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, Sandra Day
O’Connor School of Law

Arizona’s voter registration forms allow a space for an individual to draw a map location of their home, but these maps often do not allow for enough detail to properly locate their residence, resulting in registrars assigning voters to incorrect pre-cincts.⁶⁷⁷ Incorrect precincts can result in longer travel times, the county rejecting ballots, or the county failing to process their registration form.⁶⁷⁸

For residents of the Navajo Nation, which spans three states, a voter’s Post Office Box could be in a different state or county than their residence.⁶⁷⁹ President Nez stated that

“a discrepancy in the state or county location between an individual’s [Post Office] Box and their physical residence leads to difficulties for individual Navajos in registering to vote.”⁶⁸⁰ Multiple family members also share Post Office Boxes, which can lead to lost or delayed ballots and other voter notifications. Additionally, the number of Post Office Boxes per location is limited.

If a voter is unable to secure a Post Office Box or is removed from their family box, they may have to travel 30 to 40 miles to the next closest post office, at times in addition to the 30 miles they already traveled to reach their local post office.⁶⁸¹ President Nez testified that some Navajo citizens must drive more than 100 miles to register to vote.⁶⁸² Governor Stephen Roe Lewis, of the Gila River Indian Community, testified that non-traditional addresses and inaccurate poll address lists present barriers to voting for their members as well. Governor Lewis testified, “Reservation voters in Maricopa County were assigned standard addresses prior to the 2012 General Election, which changed their voting precincts. Unfortunately, these changes were neither communicated in advance nor delivered clearly to voters.”⁶⁸³ This resulted in frustrated voters being turned away from the polling location without casting a ballot. In very few instances, voters cast a provisional ballot.⁶⁸⁴

The move toward mail-in ballots, online registration, and voting centers in Arizona has a significant impact on Native American voters. As has been discussed extensively, Native

⁶⁷⁷ *Id.* at p. 1.

⁶⁷⁸ *Id.*

“In 2012, Apache County, Arizona purged 500 Navajo voters because their addresses were deemed ‘too obscure.’”

⁶⁷⁹ *Id.* at p. 2.

⁶⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁶⁸¹ *Id.* at p. 2-3.

⁶⁸² *Id.* at p. 3.

⁶⁸³ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Governor Stephen Roe Lewis at p. 4-5.

⁶⁸⁴ *Id.*

voters living on reservations have limited access to adequate addressing, Post Office Boxes, and postal services that limit utilization of vote-by-mail. Additionally, less than half of homes on tribal lands in Arizona have reliable broadband internet access, limiting access to online voter registration for Native Americans living on reservations.⁶⁸⁵ Individuals with non-traditional addresses cannot use the online voter registration system.⁶⁸⁶

Voter ID is also a problem for Native American voters in Arizona. Even valid tribal IDs can be (and are) rejected on Election Day due to insufficient poll worker training or issues arising from nonstandard addresses.⁶⁸⁷ During the 2006 election, 428 Navajos voted using provisional ballots that went uncounted because they could not verify their identification.⁶⁸⁸ The Navajo Nation sued, alleging a violation of Section 2 and the case was settled to expand the acceptable forms of ID.⁶⁸⁹ Governor Lewis explained that, in 2012, voter ID laws were strictly enforced on the Pinal County portion of the Reservation and “many Community voters were turned away from the polls when their address did not match the voter rolls at the polls.” In very few instances, voters were offered and allowed to cast a provisional ballot, but the majority who were turned away were denied a ballot altogether.⁶⁹⁰ It was later discovered that Community members’ addresses did not match the rolls because the County had reassigned the physical addresses of all Community voters to match the service center where they vote, and no voter’s address matched the rolls.⁶⁹¹

In 2019, the State enacted a law requiring voters show ID if they vote early in-person, resulting in an additional burden on voters who chose in-person early voting as opposed to voting by mail. Previously, voters could vote early in-person without showing an ID. Voters who vote early by mail still do not have an ID requirement.⁶⁹² Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified this violates equal protection and disproportionately impacts Native American voters, specifically Native language speakers who only receive language assistance in person.⁶⁹³ Professor Ferguson-Bohnee also testified that poll workers sometimes provide voters provisional ballots without telling voters it will not count if they are in the wrong precinct.⁶⁹⁴

In addition to proper addressing issues, Election Day is a culturally significant event for tribal members. President Nez testified that “when there is a day of elections, it is a day to bring everybody together, to catch up with family member(s), to catch up on politics, and it

685 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 35.

686 *Id.*

687 *Id.* at p. 36.

688 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 6.

689 *Id.*

690 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Governor Stephen Roe Lewis at p. 4.

691 *Id.*

692 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 36.

693 *Id.* at p. 36.

694 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 7.

is really a social event.”⁶⁹⁵ The Navajo Nation held Navajo elections alongside County, State, and Federal elections. State Senate Bill 1154, which would change the elections to the first Tuesday in August, significantly impacts voter turnout and tribal elections, because tribes will be forced to move their elections to maintain voter turnout or Tribal members will have to travel to vote two times a year.⁶⁹⁶

Election Day is similarly important to the Gila River Indian Community—it centers around family and community.⁶⁹⁷ The Tribe sponsors traditional meals at polling sites while community members “proudly come out and vote as their right as U.S. citizens but also members of sovereign nations[.]”⁶⁹⁸ Governor Lewis testified that a significantly smaller percentage of Gila River Indian Community members vote by mail than among the general population.

Recently, Arizona enacted H.B. 2023, which prohibits the gathering of ballots and places heavy penalties on individuals who turn in ballots other than their own unless they meet certain stringent exceptions – like being a family member or caretaker. Proponents of this ban argue it is intended to combat voter fraud, however neither President Nez nor Governor Lewis had ever heard of issues relating to voter fraud on their respective reservations.⁶⁹⁹ When questioned about how significant a problem “ballot harvesting” is in Arizona at the Arizona Field Hearing, State Senator Michelle Ugenti-Rita stated that “maybe a dozen” people came to speak with her about the alleged problem of “ballot harvesting” before she created the current law.⁷⁰⁰ The

695 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, President Jonathan Nez at p. 16-17.

696 *Id.* at p. 18.

697 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Governor Stephen Roe Lewis at p. 20.

698 *Id.*

699 *Id.* at p. 28-29.

700 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, State Senator Michelle Ugenti-Rita at p. 75-76.

“Chairwoman Fudge: ... Secondly, and I think, to the senator, I understand clearly what you have been saying to me. I am just curious; how many people came to you about the harvesting that it was so important an issue that you needed to take it to make a law?

Ms. Ugenti-Rita: Yes. Thank you, ma’am. Generally speaking, probably maybe a dozen.

Chairwoman Fudge: And what is the size of the State of Arizona?

Ms. Ugenti-Rita: It is — the population?

Chairwoman Fudge: Yes.

Ms. Ugenti-Rita: 6.5 million, but there is no correlation between the two, if that is what you are trying to—

Chairwoman Fudge: Well, no. That is your decision. My thinking is that if 12 people come, and you are going to make a law that affects 6-1/2 million people, I think that that is a problem, but that is just — I am not asking to debate it. That is my opinion.

The other thing that I really do want to address, and I am solely truly not trying to pick on you, but you just have said some things that I think concern me. Let me just say to you that mailing a bill is not a right. Voting is. You cannot compare those two things, because voting is a right given to us by the Constitution — I am not asking you a question — by the Constitution of the United States. And I can promise you that if my neighbor wanted me to mail their bill, I could, but I can’t take their ballot. You cannot compare those two things.

Because what I know is there was a time in this Nation where being a good neighbor meant something. We helped elderly people. We helped sick people. We helped the people who were disabled. We helped people. Now what we have done is say, I can’t help you if you have a problem. That is — and I don’t see that harvesting has been a major problem anywhere other than in North Carolina. It is the only place that I am aware of that it ever has been a problem. So, we continue to find solutions for problems that don’t exist.”

population of the State of Arizona is approximately more than 7 million people.⁷⁰¹

Similarly, at the time North Dakota was contemplating a voter ID requirement in 2013, there were also no instances of voter fraud during the 2012 election.⁷⁰² There were only two probable cases of double voting arising during the 2016 election.⁷⁰³

Additionally, President Nez and Governor Lewis raised a concern that laws enacted without consideration of cultural differences can disenfranchise tribal voters. The definition of “family” is different for Native American families than it is for Anglo-centric families. Barring certain individuals from turning in ballots without input from the tribes has a deleterious effect on their ability to participate in government and the democratic process.⁷⁰⁴

Alaska

The Alaska State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights included an evaluation of Alaska’s proposed shift to vote by mail and its potential impact on Alaskan Native voters. The Committee included findings in its recent report despite the state’s position that it is not moving to a vote-by-mail process at this time. As a shift toward vote by mail has happened elsewhere across the country, it is important that jurisdictions evaluate how this change would impact the most rural communities in America.

Mail delivery is a significant issue in Alaska. The State Advisory Committee reported serious concerns regarding the interest in vote by mail, as mail delivery is slow in Alaska and can take up to two to three weeks.⁷⁰⁵ Mail delivery often relies on air service, and testimony before the State Advisory Committee revealed that some villages may be inaccessible by air for several weeks at a time due to inclement weather.⁷⁰⁶ Voters faced similar issues with Post Office Boxes as expressed by rural tribal communities in Arizona. Post Office Boxes are often shared, sometimes with multiple families. As such, voters may not be receiving sufficient or complete election-related materials.⁷⁰⁷

The United States Postal Service transfers mail from villages to a central hub in Anchorage, where it is then postmarked. Rural residents who vote in a village and mail their ballot on time may not have their ballots counted because they are postmarked late.⁷⁰⁸ A shift to vote by mail requires reliable postal services, which many rural voters cannot access. States conducting elections via vote-by-mail are still required to comply with Section 203 language requirements. Prior to implementing a vote-by-mail system, tribes must be consulted to ensure their voters can avail themselves of all necessary avenues to cast a ballot and receive that ballot adequately translated.

701 United States Census Bureau, *Quick Facts: Arizona* (July 1, 2018), <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/AZ>.

702 *Brakebill First Amend. Compl.* at p. 17.

703 *Id.* at p. 29.

704 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Governor Stephen Roe Lewis and President Jonathan Nez at p. 29-31.

705 Alaska State Advisory Committee, *Alaska Native Voting Rights: A Report of the Alaska Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights* (June 2019), <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2019/09-19-AK-SAC-Voting-Report.pdf>.

706 *Id.*

707 *Id.*

708 *Id.*

LACK OF ACCESS TO THE POLLS AND RESOURCES

The closing of polling locations, lack of on-reservation sites, distance from reservations, and lack of resources can impose unreasonable difficulties for Native Americans seeking to cast a ballot.

During the 2018 elections, two long-standing voting locations were closed within the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota.⁷⁰⁹ North Dakota State Representative Buffalo argued that if the state’s elected representatives “more accurately reflected the MHA people, they would have known that these were important voting sites and would not have shut them down.”⁷¹⁰

In Arizona, eight tribes are located across two or more counties, subjecting one reservation to two or more sets of local election policies. Four reservations span three counties, increasing the disparate standards of election requirements with which they must comply and compounding the difficulties for tribal voters.⁷¹¹ In parts of the Navajo Nation, only one in 10 families owns a vehicle, limiting transportation options and access to services.⁷¹²

“One of the most egregious examples of lack of access to in-person early voting involves the Kaibab Paiute Tribe. Kaibab Paiute residents must travel over 280 miles one way to participate in early voting. These voters do not have a polling location on or near the reservation on Election Day.”

— Patty Ferguson-Bohnee, Sandra Day
O’Connor School of Law

President Nez highlighted how transportation challenges affect a voter’s access to the polls, especially when polling places are located at great distances. In 2018, Apache County had only two early voting locations on the Navajo Nation, in the southern part of the reservation.⁷¹³ Community members from the Teec Nos Pos Chapter of Navajo Nation, located near the Utah border, were forced to drive 95 miles each way to cast an early ballot.⁷¹⁴

The Leadership Conference’s report on polling place closures found that Arizona closed 320 polling locations

709 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Ruth Buffalo at p. 1.

710 *Id.*

“In the recent mid-term election of 2018, two traditional voting precincts were shut down within the exterior boundaries of the Fort Berthold Reservation 1) Dunn County North Fox precinct located in Mandaree at the St. Anthony Church 2) McKenzie County Four Bears precinct. If the county representatives more accurately reflected the MHA people, they would have known that these were important voting sites and would not have shut them down.”

711 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 2.

712 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of President Jonathan Nez at p. 8.

713 *Id.*

714 *Id.*

since 2012.⁷¹⁵ After *Shelby County*, Arizona is no longer required to analyze and report on the potential disparate impact of these closures on Native American voters. Nearly every county has closed polling places since preclearance was removed.⁷¹⁶ Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified that, while every county has in-person early voting off-reservation, there are limited opportunities for in-person early voting on-reservation.⁷¹⁷ In 2016, 10 reservations had some form of in-person early voting. Only five reservations had in-person early voting in 2018.⁷¹⁸

A lack of adequate resources is a common issue heard from tribal witnesses. Four Directions, Inc.,⁷¹⁹ sued and assisted in suits in multiple states after state and county public officials refused to provide satellite voting offices on American Indian Reservations, violating Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.⁷²⁰ The court found in *Sanchez v. Cegavske* that tribes and tribal citizens are not required to fund equal access to the ballot box by counties,⁷²¹ O.J. Semans testified Four Directions has found “Secretaries of State and local officials do not believe they are under any obligation under Section 2 to provide equal access to in-person voter registration locations, in-person early voting locations, and in-person Election Day polling places on American Indian Reservations.”⁷²² Voting options such as mail-in ballots are not an adequate substitute for access to polling locations and early voting, and a lack of these alternatives disenfranchises Native voters.

Four Directions was successful in 2014, and to the present, in persuading the South Dakota Board of Elections to utilize HAVA funds to pay for satellite voting offices on Indian Reservations in South Dakota.⁷²³ However, Mr. Semans detailed several instances in which officials declined to establish satellite voting locations on reservations, both with funding offered and without, even when voting locations are available to state residents not living on reservations.⁷²⁴ Mr. Semans testified that Standing Rock Chairman Mike Faith made a written request to North Dakota Secretary of State Jaeger to establish early voting on Standing Rock – which was available in Fargo, Bismarck, Manda, Grand Forks, and Minot, North Dakota – on October 28, 2018.⁷²⁵ Secretary Jaeger declined the request, highlighting a need for Congress to act by providing HAVA funding for Indian Country. Mr. Semans recommended Congress

715 The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Democracy Diverted: Polling Place Closures and the Right to Vote* (Sept. 2019) at p. 12, <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/reports/Democracy-Diverted.pdf>.

716 *Id.* at p. 17.

717 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 35.

718 *Id.*

719 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of O.J. Semans, Sr. at p. 1-2.

“Four Directions, Inc. is a nonprofit organized to benefit the social welfare of Native American citizens by conducting extraordinarily successful Native voter registration and get-out-the-vote drives, voter protection programs, and improved Native voter access through litigation, litigation threats, and persuasion with local and state government officials in Nevada, Arizona, North Carolina, Montana, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota over the past 16 years.”

720 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of O.J. Semans at p. 5.

721 *Id.* at p. 7.

722 *Id.* at p. 7.

723 *Id.* at p. 4.

724 *Id.* at p. 7-9.

725 *Id.* at p. 8.

appropriate additional HAVA funds explicitly for “in-person equal access to the ballot box for Native voters living on tribal lands.”⁷²⁶

President Nez testified there are limited resources available for providing information to Navajo citizens. The Navajo reservation is rural, and they lack broadband capability to allow for better information on elections and changes in election law.⁷²⁷ Governor Lewis highlighted the need for improved poll worker training. The Gila River Indian Community found “numerous instances of poll workers not even offering provisional ballots as an option for Community members” when issues arise.⁷²⁸ Proper training along with cultural sensitivity could address these election administration issues to ensure tribal voters can cast their ballot with assistance from poll workers.

At the Subcommittee’s hearing in Washington, D.C., USCCR Chair Catherine Lhamon testified that the Native American Rights Fund highlighted one polling place which was moved away from a village. As a result, Native Alaskan voters’ only option to travel to their polling place was by plane.⁷²⁹ A 2015 investigation by the Department of Justice found Native voters had to travel farther distances than White voters in a number of states.⁷³⁰ Subsequently, the Department of Justice proposed legislation to require jurisdictions “whose territory includes part or all of an Indian reservation, an Alaska Native village, or other tribal lands to locate at least one polling place in a venue selected by the tribal government,” and to require an equal number of resources at those polling sites.⁷³¹ This bill, known as the Native American Voting Rights Act, has yet to pass Congress.

In the Alaska State Advisory Report, the State Committee noted that some rural Alaska Native villages have unreliable internet service or may lack access to broadband internet, which is often necessary to meaningfully participate in elections. The Report highlighted that “an Alaska Native elder walked two miles from her home to the nearest public library that had internet access to download the necessary election forms to participate in early voting.”⁷³²

VOTE DILUTION

Representative Ruth Buffalo is the only Native American representative in the North Dakota State House. The district she represents is 370 miles from her traditional homelands of the

726 *Id.* at p. 9 – Four Directions estimates \$20 million in HAVA per election cycle would likely provide the financial resources necessary.

727 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, President Jonathan Nez at p. 8.

728 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Governor Stephen Roe Lewis at p. 5.

729 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Catherine Lhamon at p. 5, *see also* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 178.

730 *Id.*

731 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 179.

732 Alaska State Advisory Committee, *Alaska Native Voting Rights: A Report of the Alaska Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights* (June 2019), <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2019/09-19-AK-SAC-Voting-Report.pdf>.

Fort Berthold Reservation.⁷³³ She testified that if she were to run for elected office on the Fort Berthold Reservation, the district would not be majority Native American due to the way the district is drawn, as the White population overwhelms the Native population.⁷³⁴ Furthermore, the reservation is divided into six counties, effectively diluting the Native American presence to the point that they have no representation among county seats.⁷³⁵

In Arizona, tribes have fought to preserve the sole majority-minority Native American state legislative district.⁷³⁶ In the 2010 redistricting cycle, Arizona's Redistricting Commission consulted an expert to ensure district maps did not retrogress. As a result, Arizona's maps received preclearance on its first submission for the first time since it became a covered jurisdiction.⁷³⁷ There is concern that the Commission might not consider retrogression in the next cycle, as the state is no longer required to seek preclearance approval, leading to tribal communities losing their limited opportunity for elected representation.⁷³⁸

LANGUAGE ACCESS

Arizona

In Arizona, the language access provisions of Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act mandate coverage of several Native languages for minority language access assistance.⁷³⁹ In 2000, Arizona was required to provide bilingual registration and voting materials in six different Native American languages, while after 2015 only two were still required.⁷⁴⁰ Arizona is currently required to provide language assistance for Navajo and Apache speakers.⁷⁴¹

The Navajo language is widely spoken by Navajo voters and is covered under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act.⁷⁴² The State is required to provide all elections materials in English and Navajo. Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified only one of nine covered jurisdictions in 2016 subject to Section 203 for Native American languages provided translated voter registration

733 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Ruth Buffalo at p. 1.

734 *Id.* at p. 1.

735 *Id.*

736 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 55.

737 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 8.

738 *Id.*

739 Federal Registrar, Voting Rights Act Amendments of 2006, Determinations Under Section 203 (pub. Dec. 5, 2016), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/05/2016-28969/voting-rights-act-amendments-of-2006-determinations-under-section-203>.

740 Austen Bundy, *Distance, language can still pose challenge to Native American Voting*, Cronkite News Arizona PBS (May 14, 2018), <https://cronkitenews.azpbs.org/2018/05/14/distance-language-can-still-pose-challenge-to-native-american-voting/>, see also Federal Registrar, Voting Rights Act Amendments of 2006, Determinations Under Section 203 (pub. Dec. 5, 2016), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/05/2016-28969/voting-rights-act-amendments-of-2006-determinations-under-section-203>.

741 Federal Registrar, Voting Rights Act Amendments of 2006, Determinations Under Section 203 (pub. Dec. 5, 2016), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/12/05/2016-28969/voting-rights-act-amendments-of-2006-determinations-under-section-203>.

742 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of President Jonathan Nez at p. 1.

information in the covered language.⁷⁴³ Furthermore, “potential voters had to travel 95 miles one way to obtain in-person voter registration assistance.”⁷⁴⁴

Written language materials are only one form of assistance. Some Native languages are not traditionally written, they are spoken. Moving to predominantly vote-by-mail and providing voting materials in only written translations disenfranchises voters who need a physical polling place so voters can obtain oral language assistance.⁷⁴⁵

Alaska

In a recently submitted report, the Alaska State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights examined Alaska’s implementation and compliance with the *Toyukak v. Mallott* settlement and order related to language access.⁷⁴⁶ Alaska has been required to provide language access materials to limited-English proficiency voters since the 1975 extension of the Voting Rights Act. Alaska was subject to statewide Section 5 requirements at the time of *Shelby County*.⁷⁴⁷ In the last 30 years, Alaska has undergone, and lost, two court cases regarding compliance with Section 203.⁷⁴⁸

In July 2013, two Alaska Native citizens and four tribal governments sued the Lieutenant Governor of Alaska and the Division of Elections for failing to provide effective language assistance to limited-English proficient Alaska Native voters in certain areas covered by Section 203.⁷⁴⁹ They alleged the state failed to produce an Official Election Pamphlet and other pre-election information in any of the covered Alaska Native languages, effectively denying an opportunity to meaningfully participate in elections.⁷⁵⁰ The State reached a settlement to provide materials in Yup’ik and Gwich’in and make additional election administration changes.⁷⁵¹

During the August 2016 primary election, federal observers visited 19 villages and found no translated voting materials available in six villages, while others were severely lacking in

743 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 4-5, *citing* Indian Legal Clinic, Arizona Native Vote – Election Protection Project: 2016 Final Report at 34.

744 *Id.*

745 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 193.

746 Alaska State Advisory Committee, *Alaska Native Voting Rights: A Report of the Alaska Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights* (June 2019), <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2019/09-19-AK-SAC-Voting-Report.pdf>.

Toyukak v. Mallott is only the second Section 203 case fully tried and the first one since the Reagan Administration.

747 U.S. Department of Justice, *Jurisdictions Previously Covered by Section 5* (last updated Aug. 6, 2015), <https://justice.gov/crt/jurisdictions-previously-covered-section-5>.

748 U.S. Department of Justice, *Language Minority Citizens: Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act* (updated Feb. 26, 2018), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/language-minority-citizens>.

“Section 203 provides: “Whenever any State or political subdivision [covered by the section] provides registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots, it shall provide them in the language of the applicable minority group as well as in the English language.”

749 Alaska State Advisory Committee, *Alaska Native Voting Rights: A Report of the Alaska Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights* (June 2019) at p. 36, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2019/09-19-AK-SAC-Voting-Report.pdf>, *citing* Complaint, *Toyukak v. Mallott*, No. 3:13-cv-00137-SLG (D. Alaska September 8, 2015), (Dkt. No. 1).

750 *Id.*

751 *Id.*

translated materials.⁷⁵² Observers returned for the general election and found six of 12 polling locations had no translated sample ballot for voters. Testimony before the State Advisory Committee noted that while progress has been made, much work still needs to be done.⁷⁵³

CONCLUSION

It was not until 1924 that Native Americans gained equal citizenship and the right to vote. Despite this, Native American voting rights were not fully affirmed until the Court outlawed literacy tests in 1970. Today, Native American voters still face barriers to their full and equal exercise of the franchise.

Unique voting barriers faced by Native Americans must be properly considered before states and localities implement voting changes. Native Americans living on reservations experience high rates of poverty and homelessness, a lack of traditional addresses, difficulties obtaining required IDs and registering to vote, and long distances to travel to polling locations, among other issues.

The issues discussed in this Chapter are just a small cross-section of issues faced by Native voters and do not constitute an exhaustive evaluation of barriers faced by Native American voters. Native voters are considered a protected class under the Voting Rights Act. Testimony shows that tribes must be consulted as changes to voting laws and procedures are considered. The federal government must bear in mind the historic government-to-government relationship between tribes and the federal government, re-evaluate whether states should dictate how elections are administered on reservations, and consider tribal needs in crafting federal voting laws.

⁷⁵² Alaska State Advisory Committee, *Alaska Native Voting Rights: A Report of the Alaska Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights* (June 2019) at p. 36, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2019/09-19-AK-SAC-Voting-Report.pdf>.

⁷⁵³ “Dr. Tucker testified that there was a lack of translated written materials required under the Toyukak Order despite reporting from the Division of Elections that the majority of materials had been translated. For example, when federal observers visited 19 villages during the August 2016 primary election, they found: no translated voting materials were available in six villages (Alakanuk, Kotlik, Arctic Village, Beaver, Fort Yukon, and Venetie); the ‘I voted’ sticker was the only material in an Alaska Native language in Marshall and Mountain Village; in Emmonak, the Yup’ik glossary was the only translated material available; and 10 villages had a sample ballot written in Yup’ik but only two (Koliganek and Manokotak) had written translations of the candidate lists.”

⁷⁵³ *Id.*

CHAPTER FOUR

Election Administration Barriers Hindering the Right to Vote

How elections are administered significantly impacts a voter’s experience and access to the ballot. Congress has passed legislation to alleviate burdens and ease access, including the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993 and the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. These laws were intended to increase access to voter registration opportunities and improve voting systems and voter access. As the Subcommittee learned over the course of its hearings, many issues facing election administration have not been adequately addressed, including:

- General election administration, such as:
 - Lack of compliance with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA);
 - Attempts to add documentary proof of citizenship requirements;
 - Inconsistent poll worker training;
 - Lack of adequate resources; and
 - The use (and potential overuse) of provisional ballots
- Continued disenfranchisement of American citizens, including those that:
 - Were formerly incarcerated; and
 - Those in prison/jail
- Misinformation and disinformation campaigns
- Climate disaster response
- The conflict of interest presented when individuals serve as both candidate in and arbiter of the same election

GENERAL ELECTION ADMINISTRATION

Failure to Comply with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA)

The NVRA, commonly referred to as the “motor-voter” law, was enacted by Congress in 1993 and requires states to establish voter registration procedures for federal elections that enable all eligible voters to register to vote when applying for a driver’s license both by mail and at public assistance or disability agencies.⁷⁵⁴ The NVRA also created a federal mail-based form

⁷⁵⁴ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Increasing Compliance with Section 7 of the National Voter Registration Act, A Briefing Before the United States Commission on Civil Rights* (Aug. 2016), <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/docs/NVRA-09-07-16.pdf>.

for voter registration that all states are required to accept.⁷⁵⁵ Various proposals were introduced in Congress during the 1970s and 1980s to set national standards for voter registration, but passage of the NVRA in 1993 marked the first comprehensive federal effort to address voter registration.⁷⁵⁶

Brenda Wright of Demos testified that “the requirement of pre-registration to exercise the right to vote is still the number one barrier to participation in our democracy. Fifty to 60 million eligible voters, disproportionately people of color, young people, and low-income people, remain unregistered.”⁷⁵⁷ Failure to properly comply with and enforce the NVRA hinders access to the franchise. Ms. Wright further testified that, in the November 2016 general

“The experience of one Black mother of two from Irving is illustrative. After moving to a new neighborhood, Totysa Watkins went online to update her driver’s license and checked “yes” in response to a question in the online form asking whether she wanted to register to vote. She did not learn that, in fact, her attempt at registration would not count under the State’s policies until she showed up at the polling place in 2014, children in tow.”

— Mimi Marziani, Texas Civil Rights Project

election, nearly 1 in 5 people who were eligible but did not vote cited registration issues as their main reason for not doing so.⁷⁵⁸

As the Subcommittee learned in Texas, the state has failed to comply with the NVRA. Mimi Marziani testified at the Texas listening session that, “Texas does not offer simultaneous voter registration, as required by the NVRA, to the 1.5 million Texans who update their driver’s licenses online each year.”⁷⁵⁹ Failure to properly implement the NVRA makes registering to vote and keeping accurate, up-to-date voter rolls more difficult for both voters and the state. It places a heavier burden on voters who are frequent movers, applicants who tend to be poorer, younger and – in Texas – more often people of color.⁷⁶⁰

755 National Voter Registration Act of 1993, P.L. 103-31, May 20, 1993, 107 Stat. 77; 52 U.S.C. Ch. 205.

756 Sarah J. Eckman, *Federal Role in Voter Registration: The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and Subsequent Developments*, CRS Report R45030 (updated Jan. 23, 2019).

757 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Brenda Wright at p. 7-8.

758 *Id.* at p. 8, citing Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, November 2016 Voting and Registration Supplement. Reasons cited for not voting include “did not meet registration deadlines,” “did not know where or how to register,” and “did not meet residency requirements/did not live here long enough.”

759 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Texas*: Listening Session Before the Comm. on House Administration, 116th Cong. (2019); written testimony of Mimi Marziani at p. 4.

760 *Id.*

“The experience of one Black mother of two from Irving is illustrative. After moving to a new neighborhood, Totysa Watkins went online to update her driver’s license and checked “yes” in response to a question in the online form asking whether she wanted to register to vote. She did not learn that, in fact, her attempt at registration would not count under the State’s policies until she showed up at the polling place in 2014, children in tow. Ms. Watkins told [us], “I felt that my voice was taken away from me

The Lawyers' Committee, along with other civil rights organizations, brought actions to enforce Sections 5 and 7 of the NVRA, which require states to provide voter registration assistance to individuals visiting motor vehicle and public assistance agencies. North Carolina settled one case in 2018 by agreeing to substantial improvements in how the department of motor vehicle and social services agencies offer and process voter registration applications.⁷⁶¹ The Lawyers' Committee also successfully challenged Georgia's runoff election voter registration in 2017 for violating Section 8 of the NVRA.⁷⁶² At the time, Georgia required voters register approximately three months before the federal runoff election – the NVRA deadline is set at 30 days.⁷⁶³

In Washington, D.C., Brenda Wright of Demos testified that, while Demos and partner organizations have worked to assess and improve compliance with the NVRA, under the current administration the Department of Justice has filed no enforcement actions under Section 5 or Section 7 of the NVRA.⁷⁶⁴ Deuel Ross testified that NAACP LDF was successful in a 2014 suit against the Louisiana Secretary of State in which the Fifth Circuit ruled the Secretary is responsible for enforcing compliance with the NVRA across relevant state agencies.⁷⁶⁵

Attempts to Add Documentary Proof of Citizenship Requirements

All states require proof of citizenship to register to vote. However, an attestation of citizenship under penalty of perjury has generally been considered sufficient.⁷⁶⁶ Some states have attempted to add stricter proof of citizenship requirements to voter registration forms, purporting to combat non-citizens voting in American elections. These claims have been proven false.

Alabama, Arizona, Kansas, and Georgia have enacted laws requiring voters produce documentary proof of citizenship when registering to vote. Additionally, former Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Executive Director Brian Newby attempted to allow Alabama, Georgia, and Kansas to require stringent proof of citizenship instruction when registering to vote using the federal form. The court has currently stopped this practice from moving

when my vote wasn't counted. Voting has always been something I value and is a right I have instilled in my children. Texas should not be able to take that away."

761 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 5, citing *Action NC, et al. v. Kim Westbrook Strach, et al.*, No. 1:15-cv-01063 (M.D.N.C. 2018).

762 *Id.*, citing *Georgia State Conference NAACP v. Georgia*, No. 1:17-CV-1397 (N.D. Ga. May 4, 2017).

763 *Id.*

764 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Brenda Wright at p. 42, see also written testimony of Brenda Wright at p. 7-8.

765 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Deuel Ross at p. 7, citing *Scott v. Schedler*, 771 F.3d 831 (5th Cir. 2014)

766 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Dale Ho at p. 4, citing As the Tenth Circuit has noted, see *Fish v. Kobach*, 840 F.3d 710 (10th Cir. 2016), Congress chose to rely on an attestation to establish eligibility for a wide range of federal programs. See, e.g., 7 U.S.C. § 2020(e)(2)(B)(v) (requiring state applications for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program aid be signed under penalty of perjury as to the truth of the information contained in the application and the citizenship or immigration status of household members); 26 U.S.C. § 6065 (requiring that any tax "return, declaration, statement, or other document" be "verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury"); 42 U.S.C. § 1395w-114(a)(3)(E)(iii)(I) (requiring "an attestation under penalty of perjury" as to assets for receipt of prescription drug plan subsidies); 42 U.S.C. § 1436a(d)(1)(a) (requiring an attestation of citizenship or "satisfactory immigration status" for the receipt of housing assistance).

forward. According to a 2017 analysis by the Brennan Center, between five and seven percent of the citizen voting age population, millions of otherwise eligible voters, do not have ready access to documents that would prove their citizenship.⁷⁶⁷ This rate is twice as high among citizens earning less than \$25,000 per year.⁷⁶⁸ Arizona, along with Kansas, sued the EAC seeking to require the agency to modify the federal voter registration form to require proof of citizenship.

In 2013, the Court held that requiring proof of citizenship was inconsistent with the NVRA.⁷⁶⁹ Arizona contends the Court's ruling in *Arizona v. The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona* applies only to federal elections,⁷⁷⁰ and created a two-tiered registration system allowing individuals to register with the federal registration form for federal elections, while requiring voters in state and local elections to meet a new, strict citizenship requirement.⁷⁷¹ Civil rights organizations sued, alleging the two-tiered system is an unconstitutional burden on the right to vote.

The ensuing settlement allows the state to continue requiring proof of citizenship to register in state elections, but requires the state to treat federal and state registration forms the same and check motor vehicle databases for citizenship documentation prior to limiting residents to vote only in federal elections.⁷⁷² In 2013, the Lawyers' Committee intervened on behalf of the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona to defeat yet another attempt by Arizona and Kansas to modify the state-specific instructions of the federal mail voter registration form to require applicants residing in those states submit proof of citizenship in accordance with state law.⁷⁷³

Under Arizona's documentary proof of citizenship law, only limited forms of documents were accepted. While copies of passports and birth certificates could be submitted by mail, naturalization papers were required to be original papers and must be presented in person or be verified with the federal government.⁷⁷⁴

Notwithstanding the litigation history and precedent established around proof of citizenship requirements, Alabama, Georgia, and Kansas again requested changes be made in 2016 to the

767 Ian Vandewalker, *Analysis: The Effects of Requiring Documentary Proof of Citizenship to Register to Vote*, Brennan Center for Justice (July 19, 2017), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/effects-requiring-documentary-proof-citizenship>.

768 *Id.*

769 See *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona*, 570 U.S. 1, 15 (2013).

770 NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, *Democracy Diminished: State and Local Threats to Voting Post-Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder* (June 2019) at p. 20-21, <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/June-2019-Democracy-Diminished-Report.pdf>.

771 Arizona State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *Voting Rights in Arizona* (July 2018) at p. 3-4, <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2018/07-25-AZ-Voting-Rights.pdf>.

772 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 6, citing *League of United Latin Am. Citizens Arizona v. Reagan*, No. CV17-4102, 2018 WL 5983009 (D. Ariz. Nov. 14, 2018).

773 *Id.*, citing *Kobach v. U.S. Election Assistance Commission*, 772 F. 3d 1183 (10th Cir. 2015).

774 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 128.

"Arizona submitted its documentary proof of citizenship rules for preclearance under Section 5, and in 2005, the Attorney General precleared them. Arizona was immediately subject to litigation under Section 2, and a preliminary injunction was issued, but that was overturned by the Supreme Court in October 2016. The Section 2 claim was also ultimately unsuccessful on the merits. Therefore, although Arizona was later blocked from including documentary proof of citizenship on the Federal Form through separate litigation, it was allowed to keep the rules on the state form."

federal form allowing documentary proof of citizenship requirements.⁷⁷⁵ Then-EAC Executive Director Brian Newby unilaterally acted to change the instructions accompanying the federal voter registration form to respond to these states' request.⁷⁷⁶

In February 2016, the Brennan Center and others filed suit on behalf of the League of Women Voters and state affiliates (*League of Women Voters v. Newby*) challenging the letter sent by EAC Executive Director Brian Newby in January 2016 allowing Alabama, Georgia, and Kansas to require applicants using the federal voter registration form to provide documentary proof of citizenship.⁷⁷⁷ In September 2016, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals enjoined the EAC from changing the federal voter registration form. In February 2017, the court remanded the matter to the EAC to determine whether Mr. Newby had authority to allow states to require proof of citizenship. The preliminary injunction remains in place and a final decision is pending.⁷⁷⁸ Documentary proof of citizenship is not currently on the federal form.

Kansas enacted a requirement in 2011 that voter registration applicants submit a copy of a legal document establishing U.S. citizenship, such as a birth certificate or a passport.⁷⁷⁹ At the time, Kansas was the only state to require a copy of a physical citizenship document to register to vote.⁷⁸⁰ The Kansas law went into effect in 2013 and, as Dale Ho testified, the law had a significant effect on the ability of Kansas residents to register to vote.⁷⁸¹

Little more than three years after the law had gone into effect, 30,732 voter registration applications (approximately 12 percent of the total applications submitted) had been denied.⁷⁸² The ACLU challenged the law. Kansas' then-Secretary of State Kris Kobach claimed there were more than 18,000 non-citizens registered to vote in Kansas, but Kobach's own expert witness during trial estimated that of the 30,000 people whose registrations were blocked, more than 99 percent were in fact United States citizens.⁷⁸³ In a 2016 preliminary injunction,

775 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 132.

776 NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, *Democracy Diminished: State and Local Threats to Voting Post-Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder* (June 2019) at p. 20-21, <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/June-2019-Democracy-Diminished-Report.pdf>.

777 Max Feldman and Peter Dunphy, *The State of Voting Rights Litigation (March 2019)*, Brennan Center for Justice (Mar. 25, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/state-voting-rights-litigation-march-2019>, see *League of Women Voters v. Newby* (D.D.C., No. 1:16-cv-00236; D.C. Cir. No. 16-5196).

778 *Id.*

779 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong.* (2019), written testimony of Dale Ho at p. 4.

“Kansas’s law went into effect in 2013, and the effects were devastating for voter registration in the state. By March 2016, after the law had been in effect for a little more than three years, a total of 30,732 voter registration applicants had been denied registration, representing “approximately 12% of the total voter registration applications submitted since the law was implemented.” It was as if one out of every eight voter registration applications were thrown in the trash. An analysis by political scientist Michael McDonald from the University of Florida determined that affected voters were disproportionately under the age of 30 (43.2% of rejected registration applicants) and unaffiliated with a political party (53.4% of rejected applicants). And voter registration drives ground to a halt, as the League of Women Voters reported that, after the law went into effect, the number of completed registrations it collected from drives fell by 90%.”

780 *Id.*, see also footnote 10: Three states have similar laws: Alabama, Arizona, and Georgia. Alabama and Georgia have never enforced their respective documentary proof-of-citizenship laws and have indicated no definitive plans to do so; Arizona’s law is less stringent, and can be satisfied with a driver’s license number, in lieu of a copy of a document. See A.R.S. § 16-166(F)(1).

781 *Id.*

782 *Id.*, citing *Fish v. Kobach*, 309 F. Supp. 3d 1048, 1068 (D. Kan. 2018).

783 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong.* (2019), hearing transcript, Dale Ho at p. 16-17.

Judge Jerome Holmes of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals found the law had caused a “mass denial of a fundamental constitutional right,” and partially blocked the law for the 2016 election.⁷⁸⁴ At trial in 2018, evidence presented by the State of Kansas from its own investigation showed that, only 39 non-citizens had been registered to vote in Kansas over the last 19 years—about two per year, which could be “largely explained by administrative error, confusion, or mistake.”⁷⁸⁵

The cost of adding a proof of citizenship question is not limited to the potential disenfranchisement of voters. Taxpayers often bear the brunt of litigation costs as well. As Dale Ho testified, four separate lawsuits were needed to block the Kansas law. These suits were not without cost. Secretary Kobach was sanctioned for concealing relevant documents - “taxpayers paid a thousand dollar fine for that” behavior.⁷⁸⁶ The court also found Kobach willfully disobeyed a preliminary injunction, writing, “Kansas taxpayers paid approximately \$26,000 for that.”⁷⁸⁷ Additionally, the court found “a pattern of flaunting disclosure and discovery rules” ordering Secretary Kobach to take several hours of continuing legal education.⁷⁸⁸

“In 2011, Kansas passed a law requiring voter registration applicants submit a citizenship document, like a birth certificate or a passport. It sounds innocuous, but the effects were devastating. Over 3 years, more than 30,000 voter registration applicants were denied, about 12 percent of all applications during that period. One was our client Donna Bucci, who did not possess a copy of her birth certificate and couldn't afford one. Another was our client Wayne Fish, who was born on a decommissioned Air Force Base in Illinois and spent 2 years searching for his birth certificate. Two others were our clients Tad Stricker and T.J. Boynton, who actually showed their birth certificates at the DMV, which then failed to forward them along with their voter registration applications. All four were disenfranchised in the 2014 midterms.”

— Dale Ho, ACLU Voting Rights Project

“The court found that the number of non-citizens on the list was, in fact, statistically indistinguishable from zero.”

784 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Dale Ho at p. 5.

785 *Id.* at p. 6, citing *Fish v. Kobach*, 309 F. Supp. 3d 1048, 1092 (D. Kan. 2018).

786 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Dale Ho at p. 17.

787 *Id.*

788 *Id.*

Poll Worker Training

The individuals working polling locations each election cycle, the training they receive, and the manner in which they administer election laws are critical to ensuring equal access to the ballot. A poll worker’s understanding of voting rights, election administration rules, and language access can make the difference between a voter successfully casting a ballot, being forced to cast an unnecessary provisional ballot that may never be counted, or never casting a ballot at all.

In Arizona, Governor Stephen Roe Lewis of Gila Indian River Community testified that poll workers are often not trained in a culturally appropriate manner to work within tribal populations and do not effectively help and inform tribal voters who may not understand how to best handle issues at the polls.⁷⁸⁹

In Florida, Ms. Gonzalez-Eilert highlighted how more stringent training for poll workers could reduce the improper issuance of provisional ballots. For example, when workers do not check whether a vote-by-mail ballot has been received by the Supervisor of Elections’ office, they erroneously issue a provisional ballot when a voter should have been provided a regular ballot.⁷⁹⁰ Additionally, there is currently no set of standardized instructions for poll workers to refer to in the Polling Procedures Manual for Language Assistance, which could help poll workers assist limited-English proficiency voters.⁷⁹¹

Mr. Yang testified language minority voters are often denied much-needed and federally required assistance at polling places for a variety of reasons, including poll workers who do not fully understand voting rights laws.⁷⁹² Specifically, poll workers have denied Asian Americans their right to an assistor of their choice or asked for ID when it is not needed.⁷⁹³ Additionally, poll workers have been hostile to, or discriminated against, Asian American voters at the polls.⁷⁹⁴

In Ohio, a State General Assembly bill considered reducing the number of poll workers per precinct from four to two. Elaine Tso, Chief Executive Officer of Asian Services In Action, Inc. (ASIA, Inc.) testified would “disproportionately impact anyone who needed additional

789 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Governor Stephen Roe Lewis at p. 3.

790 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Anjenys Gonzalez-Eilert at p. 4.

791 *Id.* at p. 4.

792 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of John C. Yang at p. 6.

793 *Id.*

“For example, during the 2012 general election, a poll worker in New Orleans [mistakenly] thought only LEP voters of languages covered by Section 203 of the VRA were entitled to assistance in voting under Section 208. Since Vietnamese was not a Section 203-covered language either for the county or the state, the poll worker denied LEP Vietnamese voters the assistance of their choice when voting.”

794 *Id.*

“Poll workers have also been hostile to, or discriminated against, Asian American voters at the polls. For example, sometimes only Asian American voters have been singled out and asked for photo identification whether it was legally mandated or not. During the 2008 election, in Washington, D.C., an Asian American voter was required to present identification several times, while a White voter in line behind her was not similarly asked to provide identification. Also, in 2008, poll workers only asked a Korean American voter and his family, but no one else, to prove their identity in Centreville, VA.”

assistance at the polls, whether that is inviting a helper for a limited English proficient voter or anyone who needs an accommodation of some sort, because that would need some approval from a poll worker.”⁷⁹⁵ Inajo Davis Chappell testified that the Board of Elections hires “a huge group of individuals to work the polls.” Moving the marathon day of voting to the weekend may help improve the number and quality of poll workers they are able to recruit.⁷⁹⁶

Lack of Resources

A lack of adequate resources impacts a voter’s ability to access the polls, as well as the ability of states and localities to carry out elections. This includes the lack of accessible polling locations for voters with disabilities.

Michelle Bishop, Voting Rights Specialist for the National Disability Rights Network (NDRN), testified at a Washington, D.C. hearing that, according to an ongoing Government Accountability Office (GAO) study, only 40 percent of polling places surveyed had an accessible path of travel in 2016,⁷⁹⁷ an all-time high, and up from just 16 percent in 2000.⁷⁹⁸ Accessibility at voting stations is decreasing, with 65 percent deemed inaccessible in 2016.⁷⁹⁹ In 2016, after GAO combined architectural access data with voting station data, only 17 percent of polling places in America were considered fully accessible for voters with disabilities.⁸⁰⁰

The large shift in polling place closures discussed in Chapter Two does not only impact minority voters, but also voters with disabilities.⁸⁰¹ Ms. Bishop testified that some jurisdictions are claiming “lack of ADA compliance,” including “grossly inflated cost estimates for bringing polling places into compliance with the ADA” as a pretext for closing polling locations.⁸⁰² Disability rights advocates and the Department of Justice do not advocate for closing polling locations due to lack of ADA compliance, but instead prefer low-cost best practices to ensure accessible polling places.⁸⁰³

The Help America Vote Act and the resources it provides are critical to increasing accessibility. Ms. Bishop testified, that “immediately preceding the passage of the Help America Vote Act, the gap in voter participation between those with and without disabilities was closer to 20 percent;” in 2018, it was 4.7 percent.⁸⁰⁴

In Florida, Ms. Gonzalez-Eilert testified that county election offices are funded by the Board of County Commissioners and augmented by federal HAVA funds via grants from the states.

795 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Elaine Tso at p. 29-30.

796 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Inajo Davis Chappell at p. 70.

797 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michelle Bishop at p. 2.

798 *Id.*

799 *Id.*

800 *Id.* at p. 2-3.

801 *Id.* at p. 3.

802 *Id.*

803 *Id.*

804 *Id.* at p. 4.

The state's original HAVA funds are projected to be fully expended at the end of Fiscal Year 2020, leaving a hole in election resources.⁸⁰⁵

Michael Waldman of the Brennan Center testified his organization's study found that, in the 2012 election, voters in precincts with more minority voters experienced longer waits and tended to have fewer voting machines.⁸⁰⁶ A more recent study led by economist Keith Chen of the University of California – Los Angeles, found voters in Black neighborhoods waited longer to cast a ballot than voters in White neighborhoods, and were approximately 74 percent more likely to wait longer than half an hour.⁸⁰⁷

Ms. Bishop testified, “congressional funding is sorely needed to ensure that elections officials can continually acquire, maintain, and improve their polling locations and equipment.”⁸⁰⁸

O.J. Semans of Four Directions testified in North Dakota that “Congress should urge the EAC to make clear to States that the funds added to HAVA in 2018 by Congress can be used to improve the administration of federal elections, and therefore can be used to fund satellite offices on American Indian Reservations.”⁸⁰⁹

Use and Potential Overuse of Provisional Ballots

HAVA also created a fail-safe in the voting process if voters do not bring ID to the polls, providing for the use of provisional ballots.⁸¹⁰ Provisional ballots are offered to voters who believe they are eligible to vote, but are turned away at the polls.⁸¹¹ HAVA does not require states to count provisional ballots, but administrators must notify voters as to whether the ballot was counted.⁸¹² Voters may cast a provisional ballot because their name does not appear in the poll book, they lack proper identification, or have recently moved or changed their name.⁸¹³

Ms. Hannah Fried testified that, “widespread polling place changes lead to the overuse of provisional ballots.”⁸¹⁴ All Voting is Local's analysis of 717 former Section 5-covered counties found that voters in counties with polling place closures are more likely to be asked to cast

805 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Anjenys Gonzalez-Eilert at p. 5.

806 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michael Waldman at p. 7, citing Christopher Famighetti et al., *Election Day Long Lines: Resource Allocation*, Brennan Center for Justice (2014), at p. 1-2, https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_ElectionDayLongLines-ResourceAllocation.pdf.

807 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 2, citing M. Keith Chen, Kareem Haggag, Devin G. Pope, Ryne Rohla, *Racial Disparities in Voting Wait Times: Evidence from Smartphone Data* (Sept. 4, 2019), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.00024>.

808 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Michelle Bishop at p. 107.

809 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of O.J. Semans, Sr. at p. 3-4.

810 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States, 2018 Statutory Report* (Sept. 2018) at p. 86-87, citing Help America Vote Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-252, 116 Stat. 1666 (codified as amended in scattered sections of 32 U.S.C., 56 U.S.C.), <https://www.eac.gov/assets/1/6/HAVA41.PDF>.

811 *Id.*

812 *Id.*

813 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Mike Brickner at p. 5.

814 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Hannah Fried at p. 69.

provisional ballots.⁸¹⁵ Ms. Fried testified further that, “HAVA contemplated that provisional ballots would be used as a failsafe, but they are less likely to be counted than a regular ballot. Their overuse is the canary in the coal mine, signaling systemic problems that result in voters not knowing where or how to vote.”⁸¹⁶

In Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania, which is 41 percent Black, voters are five times more likely to be given a provisional ballot than voters in Allegheny, which is 12.7 percent Black, or Berks, which is four percent Black.⁸¹⁷ In 2018, at Ohio’s two Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), voters cast a “disproportionate number of provisional ballots and were twice as likely to have their ballots rejected than voters countywide.”⁸¹⁸

Mike Brickner, Director of All Voting is Local in Ohio, testified that Ohioans, particularly people of color, face high rejection rates for provisional ballots.⁸¹⁹ While the number of provisional ballots cast in Ohio has decreased recently, Ohio still has one of the highest overall numbers of provisional ballots cast.⁸²⁰ In a study of Franklin County, one of Ohio’s largest counties, All Voting is Local found “people of color, millennials, and low-income voters were all significantly more likely to cast a provisional ballot.”⁸²¹ In the 2018 general election, over one in five provisional ballots rejected statewide came from Franklin County.⁸²² In Greene County, home to one of Ohio’s HBCUs, nearly half the ballots cast in the precinct that serves Central State University were provisional ballots.⁸²³

In Arizona, when individuals are unable to produce required identification at the polls when voting early in-person or on Election Day they are forced to use a provisional ballot. However, individuals who vote early by mail do not have to show ID to have their ballot counted.⁸²⁴ This means that provisional ballot voters without the required ID in-person would have been able to vote using a regular ballot if they had voted by mail. Additionally, Professor Ferguson-Bohnee testified that counties in Arizona that do not have vote centers require voters to vote in their proper precinct in order to have their voters counted, but poll workers sometimes give provisional ballots to voters without telling them they will not count if they are at the wrong precinct.⁸²⁵

815 *Id.*

816 *Id.*

817 *Id.* at p. 70.

818 *Id.*

819 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Mike Brickner at p. 2.

820 *Id.* at p. 5.

821 *Id.*

“Franklin County accounts for 10.93 percent of the state’s electorate, only slightly trailing Cuyahoga County. Depending on where one lives in the county, voters have very different experiences with provisional ballots. In 2018, the countywide rate of provisional ballots cast was 1.84 percent. However, All Voting is Local’s analysis found people of color, millennials, and low-income voters were all significantly more likely to cast a provisional ballot. Of the three polling locations near Franklin County’s Ohio State University campus, nearly one in ten voters cast a provisional ballot. On campus at the Ohio Union, nearly 65 percent of the provisional ballots cast were rejected by the board of elections.”

822 *Id.*

823 *Id.* at p. 5-6.

824 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Alex Gulotta at p. 4.

825 *Id.*, written testimony of Patty Ferguson-Bohnee at p. 7.

CONTINUED DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

Disenfranchisement of Formerly Incarcerated Persons

Each year, millions of Americans who are no longer incarcerated are denied their constitutional right to vote because of a past felony conviction. The number of Americans disenfranchised because of a felony conviction has risen substantially as the U.S. prison population has grown, rising from 1.17 million in 1976 to 6.1 million in 2016.⁸²⁶ The Sentencing Project estimates more than 6 million Americans were ineligible to vote in the 2018 midterm elections because of a felony conviction.⁸²⁷ The Sentencing Project further estimated that nearly 4.7 million of these individuals are not incarcerated, but live in one of the 34 states that, at the time of the election, prohibited voting by people on probation, parole, or who have completed their sentence.⁸²⁸

The United States' criminal justice system disproportionately targets, arrests, sentences, and incarcerates people of color.⁸²⁹ According to The Sentencing Project, disenfranchisement policies for felony convictions also disproportionately impact communities of color.⁸³⁰ Voting-age Black Americans are four times more likely to lose their right to vote than the rest of the population.⁸³¹ Black Americans and Whites use drugs at similar rates, yet the imprisonment rate of Black Americans for drug charges is almost six times that of Whites.⁸³² Because of these disparities in the criminal justice system, felony disenfranchisement law have stripped one in every 13 Black Americans of their right to vote, four times the disenfranchisement rate of non-Black Americans.⁸³³

Eleven states continue restricting voting rights even after a person has served his or her prison sentence and is no longer on probation or parole – these individuals account for over 50

826 Jean Chung, *Felony Disenfranchisement: A Primer*, The Sentencing Project (June 27, 2019), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/felony-disenfranchisement-a-primer/>.

827 The Sentencing Project, *6 Million Lost Voters: State-Level Estimates of Felony Disenfranchisement: 2016* (Oct. 6, 2016), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/6-million-lost-voters-state-level-estimates-felony-disenfranchisement-2016/>.

828 Morgan McLeod, *Expanding the Vote: Two Decades of Felony Disenfranchisement Reforms*, The Sentencing Project (Oct. 17, 2018), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/expanding-vote-two-decades-felony-disenfranchisement-reforms/>.

829 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Brenda Wright at p. 9, *citing see* Dorothy E. Roberts, *Constructing a Criminal Justice System Free of Racial Bias: An Abolitionist Framework Symposium on Pursuing Racial Fairness in Criminal Justice: Twenty Years after McCleskey v. Kemp*, *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 39 (2007): 261–86; Jeff Manza & Christopher Uggen, *Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement and American Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Michelle Alexander, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness* (New York: The New Press, 2012); NAACP Criminal Justice Fact Sheet, <https://www.naacp.org/criminal-justice-fact-sheet/>; and *Everyone's America: 26 state policies for a race-forward, populist agenda to empower all Americans*, Demos 2018: 176, <https://www.demos.org/research/everyones-america>.

830 *Id.*

831 *Id.*

832 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Brenda Wright at p. 9-10.

833 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Brenda Wright at p. 10.

“As of June 2019, only two states, Maine and Vermont, did not restrict the right to vote of anyone with a felony conviction, including allowing those in prison to vote. In the 2016 elections, approximately 2.5 percent of all Americans who would otherwise be able to vote could not vote due to felony convictions; that number jumps to 7.4 percent for African Americans. Communities of color therefore experience reduced political power and the underrepresentation of their interests in government. Ending felony disenfranchisement would help bring equality and equity to the democratic process. Encouraging voting has also been found to aid with reentry and thus promote public safety.”

percent of disenfranchised persons.⁸³⁴ Four states, Florida, Kentucky, Iowa, and Virginia, have constitutions that permanently disenfranchise citizens with felony convictions and grant the governor authority to restore voting rights.⁸³⁵ Iowa and Kentucky permanently disenfranchise anyone convicted of a felony. Florida recently passed Amendment 4 which restores the rights of more than one million Floridians, while in Virginia, the restoration of voting rights is dependent upon the governor.

Some states have moved to re-enfranchise formerly incarcerated individuals, while others continue to restrict the constitutional rights of otherwise eligible Americans. In North Carolina, state law restores the right to vote automatically upon completion of a sentence for a felony conviction, however the bar continues based on a person's probation or parole status, including when fines and fees are not fully paid, which Caitlin Swain of Forward Justice testified results in both confusion and discriminatory denial of the right to vote.⁸³⁶

Prior to 2018, Florida was among four states that permanently denied voting rights to every citizen with a felony conviction,⁸³⁷ one of the most punitive disenfranchisement policies in the nation. The power to restore voting rights was delegated to the Governor, who was able to set his own clemency policy. Former Governor Rick Scott's clemency policy was among the most restrictive in years. After nearly five years in office (by December 2015), Governor Scott had restored the rights of fewer than 2,000 individuals, while more than 20,000 applications remained pending.⁸³⁸

Between 2010 and 2016, the number of disenfranchised Floridians grew from 150,000 to approximately 1.68 million.⁸³⁹ Fully 10 percent of Florida's voting population was excluded from voting, including one in five Black Americans.⁸⁴⁰ According to Advancement Project's Democracy Rising report, 43-44 percent of Florida's Returning Citizen (persons' released from incarceration and reentering the community) population is Black, while the state's Black population is only about 17 percent.⁸⁴¹ The vast majority of those denied the right to vote due to a criminal record are no longer incarcerated, have served their time and living in the communities with no voice in how they are governed.⁸⁴² Twenty-seven and one half percent of the country's disenfranchised, formerly incarcerated citizen population lives in Florida.⁸⁴³

834 Jean Chung, *Felony Disenfranchisement: A Primer*, The Sentencing Project (June 27, 2019), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/felony-disenfranchisement-a-primer/>.

835 Brennan Center for Justice, *Voting Rights Restoration Efforts in Florida* (May 31, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-rights-restoration-efforts-florida>.

836 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in North Carolina*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Caitlin Swain at p. 3.

837 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p. 4.

838 Brennan Center for Justice, *Voting Rights Restoration Efforts in Florida*, (Apr. 11, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/voting-rights-restoration-efforts-florida>.

839 Advancement Project, *Democracy Rising*, (Mar. 19, 2019), <https://advancementproject.org/resources/democracyrising/>, see also Brennan Center for Justice, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-rights-restoration-efforts-florida>.

840 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p. 4.

841 Advancement Project, *Democracy Rising*, (Mar. 19, 2019), <https://advancementproject.org/resources/democracyrising/>.

842 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p. 4.

843 Advancement Project, *Democracy Rising*, (Mar. 19, 2019), <https://advancementproject.org/resources/democracyrising/>.

“We were unambiguous as voters, seeing as that amendment gained more votes than the sitting Governor, more votes than me, and, again, won with a historic 64 percent of the voters casting ballots saying that we were going to be a State that didn't judge people forever by their worst day.”

— Andrew Gillum, Forward Florida

In 2018, as noted above, after years of advocacy, Florida voters approved Amendment 4 by nearly 65 percent of the statewide vote. The passage of Amendment 4 intended to restore the franchise to 1.4 million Floridians. The Amendment became effective on January 8, 2019. On May 3, 2019, the State Legislature undermined the will of the voters with legislation requiring individuals to pay all fines and fees *before* their rights are restored, or have them forgiven by a judge.⁸⁴⁴ S.B. 7066 was signed into law by Governor Ron DeSantis on June 28, 2019.⁸⁴⁵ The exact amount of fines and fees owed

statewide is unclear, but the South Florida Sun Sentinel estimated in May 2019 that the amount exceed more than \$1 billion in just three of Florida's counties.⁸⁴⁶ This amounts to a modern-day poll tax. In June 2019, NAACP LDF and others filed a lawsuit to halt the implementation of S.B. 7066.⁸⁴⁷

On October 19, 2019, a federal judge ruled the state cannot prevent formerly incarcerated persons with a felony conviction from voting, even if they fail to pay court-ordered fines and fees.⁸⁴⁸ U.S. District Judge Robert Hinkle ruled that the state can ask that the fines be paid, but cannot bar anyone from voting if they cannot afford it, writing “when an eligible citizen misses an opportunity to vote, the opportunity is gone forever; the vote cannot later be cast. So, when the state wrongly prevents an eligible citizen from voting, the harm is irreparable.”⁸⁴⁹ The ruling only applies to the 17 individuals named in the lawsuit, but the Florida Supreme Court is slated to hear a separate suit on the issue in November 2019.⁸⁵⁰

This problem extends beyond Florida. The 1901 Alabama constitution permits disenfranchisement of individuals convicted of crimes involving “moral turpitude.” Until

844 Brennan Center for Justice, *Gruver v. Barton (consolidated with Jones v. DeSantis)* (Aug. 3, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/legal-work/gruver-v-barton>.

845 *Id.*

846 Dan Sweeney, *South Florida felons owe a billion dollars in fines – and that will affect their ability to vote*, South Florida Sun Sentinel (May 31, 2019), <https://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/politics/fl-ne-felony-fines-broward-palm-beach-20190531-5hxf7mveyree5cjhk4xr7b73v4-story.html>.

847 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Deuel Ross, *see also* NAACP LDF Press Release, Groups File Motion for Preliminary Injunction to Block SB7066 (Aug. 8, 2019), <https://www.naacpldf.org/press-release/groups-file-motion-for-preliminary-injunction-to-block-sb7066/>.

848 Lori Rozsa, *Judge rules Florida can't block felons from voting, even if they have unpaid fines*, The Washington Post (Oct. 19, 2019), https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/judge-rules-florida-cant-block-felons-from-voting-even-if-they-have-unpaid-fines/2019/10/19/81ba7452-f274-11e9-8693-f487e46784aa_story.html.

849 *Id.*

850 *Id.*

2017, the state of Alabama did not define which crimes involved “moral turpitude,” leaving who was to be disenfranchised open to interpretation by individual county voter registrars.⁸⁵¹

In 2016, Greater Birmingham Ministries and disenfranchised individuals challenging the state’s disenfranchisement process in court. Plaintiffs argued that the state’s disenfranchisement of individuals convicted of a “felony involving moral turpitude” and its conditional restoration of voting rights based on the payment of fines, court costs, fees, and restitution violates the U.S. Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.⁸⁵²

In 2017, Governor Ivey signed a law defining moral turpitude and restoring voting rights to many people with previous felony convictions.⁸⁵³ In 2017, the court allowed part of the plaintiff’s case to move forward, challenging that the “moral turpitude” provision of the Alabama Constitution violates the 8th, 14th, and 15th Amendments as well as the Ex Post Facto clause of the Constitution, and that the fees and fines provision of state law violates the 14th Amendment.⁸⁵⁴ The case remains pending.

Despite the recent law standardizing and limiting disenfranchisement crimes, Professor Carroll, Chair of the Alabama State Advisory Committee to the USCCR testified that studies suggest 286,266 people (7.62 percent) of Alabama’s voting age population are disenfranchised.⁸⁵⁵ The law affected close to 60,000 Alabamians. However, Secretary of State Merrill reportedly refused to publicize the change or inform those who had been re-enfranchised and incorrectly stated that eligibility was dependent on paying all outstanding fines and fees, a statement he later clarified.⁸⁵⁶ The Alabama Voting Rights Project submitted supplemental written testimony that, in their efforts to assist more than 2,500 Alabamians with past convictions in regaining their right to vote, they have encountered many individuals who are now eligible under the 2017 law but were unaware because Alabama has not promoted or explained the change.⁸⁵⁷

Arizona has the eighth highest rate of felon disenfranchisement in America.⁸⁵⁸ According to testimony from Darrell Hill of the ACLU of Arizona, over 220,000 potential voters, or 4.25 percent of Arizona’s voting-age population are ineligible due to a felony conviction.⁸⁵⁹ Arizona’s rate of felony disenfranchisement has nearly tripled over the last 25 years.⁸⁶⁰ Disenfranchisement laws disproportionately impact minority voters, with more than one in

851 Alabama State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Access to Voting in Alabama: A Summary of Testimony received by the Alabama Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights* (June 2018) at p. 16.

852 Max Feldman and Peter Dunphy, *The State of Voting Rights Litigation (March 2019)*, Brennan Center for Justice (March 25, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/state-voting-rights-litigation-march-2019>.

853 ACLU of Alabama, *Crimes of Moral Turpitude* (last revised May 1, 2018), <https://www.aclualabama.org/en/crimes-moral-turpitude>.

854 *Id.*

855 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Jenny Carroll at p. 10-11.

856 Peter Dunphy, *When It Comes to Voter Suppression, Don’t Forget About Alabama*, Brennan Center for Justice (Nov. 5, 2018), <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/when-it-comes-voter-suppression-dont-forget-about-alabama>.

857 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Alabama*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony for the record of Alabama Voting Rights Project at p. 2.

858 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Arizona*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Darrell Hill at p. 7.

859 *Id.* at p. 7.

860 *Id.* at p. 8.

10 Black adults ineligible to vote in Arizona.⁸⁶¹ Additionally, over 115,000 of those voters ineligible because of a felony conviction have completed their sentence, probation and/or parole.⁸⁶² Several aspects of the process for rights restoration are prescribed by statute, but others are left to the discretion of state and county officials.⁸⁶³ In April 2019, Governor Doug Ducey signed a law alleviating requirements that people convicted of a first-time felony offense pay outstanding fines in order to have their rights automatically restored.⁸⁶⁴

In 2018, Texas charged Crystal Mason with illegally voting in the 2016 presidential election. Ms. Mason had been recently released from prison and was still on community supervision at the time of the elections but was never informed she could not vote. Ms. Mason was indicted on a charge of illegally voting in Tarrant County, Texas, found guilty, and sentenced to five years in prison – for voting while on probation.⁸⁶⁵ In Texas, the right to vote is restored upon completion of a sentence, including prison, parole, and probation.

The point at which the right to vote is restored for formerly incarcerated individuals varies widely from state to state and, in some instances, is subject to the whim of the Governor. In Iowa, then-Governor Vilsack issued an Executive Order in 2005 automatically restoring voting rights for all persons who had completed their sentence. This order was subsequently rescinded by Governor Branstad in 2011.⁸⁶⁶ New York Governor Andrew Cuomo used his clemency power in 2018 to restore the voting rights of approximately 35,000 New Yorkers under parole supervision and vowed to continue the practice as new residents enter the parole system.⁸⁶⁷ Between 2016 and 2018, then-Governor Terry McAuliffe used his power to individually restore the right to vote to 173,000 Virginians who had completed their sentence.⁸⁶⁸ In contrast, current Governor Ralph Northam has only restored the voting rights of just over 22,000 individuals during his two years in office.⁸⁶⁹

Disenfranchisement of Incarcerated Persons

Several million Americans are also disenfranchised while currently incarcerated. According to the Sentencing Project, 2.2 million people reside in America's prisons or jails, an increase of 500 percent over the last 40 years, making the United States the world's leader in incarceration.⁸⁷⁰ More than 1 million are disenfranchised because of a felony conviction. Incarceration and disenfranchisement disproportionately affect communities of color.

861 *Id.*

862 *Id.*

863 *Id.*

864 The Sentencing Project, *Disenfranchisement News: Arizona eliminates "poll tax" for people with first-time felony offenses* (Aug. 9, 2019), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/news/disenfranchisement-news-arizona-eliminates-poll-tax-people-first-time-felony-offenses/>.

865 Meagan Flynn, *Texas woman sentenced to 5 years in prison for voting while on probation*, The Washington Post (Mar. 20, 2018), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2018/03/30/texas-woman-sentenced-to-5-years-in-prison-for-voting-while-on-probation/>.

866 Jean Chung, *Felony Disenfranchisement: A Primer*, The Sentencing Project (June 27, 2019), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/felony-disenfranchisement-a-primer/>.

867 *Id.*

868 *Id.*

869 Associated Press, *Northam says he's restored voting rights to more than 22k felons*, The Virginia-Pilot (Oct. 10, 2019), <https://www.pilotonline.com/government/virginia/vp-nw-northam-voting-rights-felons-20191010-jes7c5l4mncv3kdgsyslucolge-story.html>.

870 The Sentencing Project, *Criminal Justice Facts*, <https://www.sentencingproject.org/criminal-justice-facts/>.

People of color make up 37 percent of the U.S. population, but 67 percent of the country's incarcerated population.⁸⁷¹ As of June 2019, only two states, Maine and Vermont, did not restrict the right to vote of anyone with a felony conviction, including allowing those in prison to vote.⁸⁷²

Prison-based gerrymandering has also long distorted democratic representation. The United States Census counts incarcerated persons as residents of the prison where they are incarcerated, rather than as a resident of their home community.⁸⁷³ Whole prisons are counted as resident populations in electoral districts, yet in all but two states the people incarcerated within those prisons for felony convictions are denied the right to vote.⁸⁷⁴ Ms. Wright testified, because prisons are often located far from the home community of incarcerated persons, counting them in this manner “awards disproportionate representation to rural or semi-rural communities containing prisons at the expense of representation for the home communities of incarcerated persons.”⁸⁷⁵

When a state does allow incarcerated persons the right to vote, they typically cannot vote as residents of the prison where they are counted for Census purposes, but instead must vote absentee in the community where they resided before incarceration.⁸⁷⁶ Ms. Wright also testified that the practice of prison gerrymandering “defies most state constitutions and statutes, which explicitly state that incarceration does not change a person's legal residence.”⁸⁷⁷

Additionally, in Ohio, Naila Awan of Demos testified that, under Ohio law, registered voters arrested and held in Ohio jails after the absentee ballot request deadline and detained through Election Day are prevented from obtaining and casting an absentee ballot.⁸⁷⁸ Demos, along with partner organizations, filed a challenge to this practice which is estimated to disenfranchise approximately 1,000 voters each election.⁸⁷⁹

Each election, millions of otherwise eligible Americans are prevented from casting a ballot due to prior convictions or current incarceration. When a citizen is incarcerated, we do not take their citizenship from them, yet we continue to deny their basic right of participation in our democracy.

871 *Id.*

872 *Id.*

873 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Brenda Wright at p. 42-43.

874 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Brenda Wright at p. 11.

875 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Brenda Wright at p. 43.

876 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Brenda Wright at p. 11.

877 *Id.* at p. 11.

878 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Ohio*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Naila Awan at p. 9.

879 *Id.* at p. 9.

MISINFORMATION AND DISINFORMATION

Top U.S. intelligence and law enforcement officials have repeatedly warned of the need to bolster our election security, including guarding against interference from foreign powers using misinformation and disinformation campaigns to disseminate incorrect information and sow division among our electorate. Special Counsel Robert Mueller concluded in his March 2019 report on the investigation into Russian election interference that the “Russian government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion.”⁸⁸⁰

The report detailed how Russian operatives used social media and cyberattacks to influence the 2016 presidential election. As to involvement in future American elections, Special Counsel Mueller testified before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that “[t]hey’re doing it as we sit here.”⁸⁸¹ Interference is not limited to the Russian government, nor is it limited to foreign state actors.

The tactics utilized during 2016 included efforts to mislead and deceive voters about the mechanics and requirements of voting and participating in elections. For example, automated social media accounts targeted Black and Latino voters with information claiming incorrectly that voters could “vote from home” for Hillary Clinton.⁸⁸² Researchers found that some Russian tactics of “malicious misdirection” included “Twitter-based text-to-vote scams” and “tweets designed to create confusion about voting rules.”⁸⁸³

In a recently released bipartisan report, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence detailed the extent to which the Russian government specifically targeted minority voters. The panel found, “[N]o single group of Americans was targeted by [Internet Research Agency] information operatives more than African-Americans. By far, race and related issues were the preferred target of the information warfare campaign designed to divide the country in 2016.”⁸⁸⁴ The Senate report’s finding supports the earlier assessment by the United States intelligence community that one of the IRA’s information warfare campaign goals was to undermine public faith in the democratic process.⁸⁸⁵

The dissemination of misinformation and disinformation did not end with the presidential election in 2016. During the 2018 midterms, misinformation campaigns were used to attempt to deter voters, and some organizations sent incorrect information to voters. In late October, the Republican National Committee (RNC) sent a mailer to registered voters in Montana stating they could mail absentee ballots postmarked the day before Election Day as long

880 Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III, *Report on the Investigation Into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election*, Vol. I at p. 1, <https://www.justice.gov/storage/report.pdf>.

881 Transcript of the Hearing: *Former Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller III on the Investigation Into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election* (July 24, 2019), U.S. House of Representatives, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence at p. 66.

882 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Elena Nunez at p. 3-4.

883 New Knowledge, *The Tactics & Tropes of the Internet Research Agency* (Dec. 17, 2018) at p. 8, https://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/4326998/ira-report-rebrand_FinalJ14.pdf.

884 Report of the Select Committee on Intelligence, *United States Senate on Russian Active Measures Campaigns and Interference in the 2016 U.S. Election, Vol. 2: Russia’s Use of Social Media, with Additional Views*, https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Report_Volume2.pdf.

885 *Id.*

as they were received by election officials by November 16 (10 days after Election Day). Montana state law requires that absentee ballots must be received by 8:00 p.m. on Election Day.⁸⁸⁶ In Montana, a mailer was sent to 90,000 voters incorrectly stating they were not registered to vote.⁸⁸⁷

In her testimony, Elena Nunez detailed how, in Missouri, the state Republican Party sent mailers to 10,000 voters with incorrect information about when their absentee ballots were due.⁸⁸⁸ Voters in some states received text messages with incorrect information about their polling locations, as a result, some appeared at wrong location and were subsequently turned away.⁸⁸⁹ In Texas, “thousands of students who live on campus at Prairie View A&M had been incorrectly told to register to vote using an address in a different precinct and would need to fill out a change-of-address form before casting a ballot.”⁸⁹⁰

Michael Waldman testified that in a recent analysis for the Brennan Center, University of Wisconsin Professor Young Mie Kim documented hundreds of messages on Facebook and Twitter designed to discourage or prevent people from voting in the 2018 election.⁸⁹¹

CLIMATE DISASTER RESPONSE

As climate change continues to intensify, so have natural disasters. With Election Day in November, voter registration deadlines and early voting have fallen victim to hurricane season. In 2012, Hurricane Sandy damaged polling places in New Jersey, necessitating backup plans for polling stations.⁸⁹² In 2019, voters in North Carolina’s special congressional elections received conflicting messages. Voters were encouraged to cast their ballots during early voting to avoid potential disruptions from Hurricane Dorian.⁸⁹³ However, North Carolina counties then made changes to early voting schedules with some shutting down early voting sites or shifting hours.⁸⁹⁴

Florida has been struck by several natural disasters during election season in recent years. Hurricanes Matthew (2016) and Michael (2018) both arrived around the voter registration deadline in Florida – 29 days before Election Day.⁸⁹⁵ Hurricane Irma (2017) arrived around

886 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Elena Nunez at p. 3, see also https://billingsgazette.com/news/local/mailler-promoting-absentee-voting-in-montana-has-wrong-information-elections/article_5485a8b4-2500-52f6-bd11-6688cc818008.html.

887 *Id.*

888 *Id.*

889 *Id.*

890 *Id.*, citing <https://www.texastribune.org/2018/10/16/Prairie-View-voter-registration/>.

891 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michael Waldman at p. 7, see also Young Mie Kim, *Voter Suppression Has Gone Digital* (Nov. 20, 2018), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/voter-suppression-has-gone-digital>.

892 Michael Cooper, *Disruption From Storm May Be Felt at the Polls*, N.Y. Times (Nov. 2, 2012), <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/03/us/politics/hurricane-sandy-threatens-to-disrupt-voting-on-election-day.html>.

893 Associated Press, *NC voters encouraged to cast early ballots as Dorian looms* (Sept. 1, 2019), <https://apnews.com/e95781c884c34efd983b675b7f4f01ab>.

894 Dan Kane, *Dorian halts early voting in some NC counties for special congressional elections*, The News & Observer (Sept. 4, 2019), <https://www.newsobserver.com/news/weather-news/article234728472.html>.

895 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Anjenys Gonzalez-Eilert at p. 5.

special and municipal elections.⁸⁹⁶ It is likely hurricanes will continue to impact Florida throughout future election seasons.

Florida has had inconsistent election practices dealing with hurricanes. The Secretary of State has been reluctant to extend registration deadlines as a result of recent hurricanes and court action had to be taken.⁸⁹⁷ Preparations were made by the governor ahead of Hurricane Michael for the election, but without proper communications and consultation that these preparations and changes can still negatively impact voters. Ms. Gonzalez-Eilert testified 90 percent of the Black community in Panama City were not close to the six voting centers set up to replace precinct voting.⁸⁹⁸ After the Supervisor of Elections was contacted by organizations, a vote center was provided for only one day, the day before the election.⁸⁹⁹

In 2016, Chatham County, Georgia was hit by Hurricane Matthew, just a few days before voter registration closed. Almost half the residents lost power during the storm and the county was subject to mandatory evacuation, yet the Governor and then-Secretary of State Brian Kemp refused to extend the voter registration deadline.⁹⁰⁰ The Lawyers' Committee sought and obtained emergency relief to extend the registration deadline.⁹⁰¹ Chatham County has over 200,000 voting age citizens, more than 40 percent of whom are Black.⁹⁰² The relief obtained by the Lawyers' Committee allowed over 1,400 primarily Black and Latino citizens to vote.⁹⁰³

Standardizing election procedures specifically to deal with natural disaster scenarios will help ensure no voter is disenfranchised because of a missed deadline or closed polls. The Election Assistance Commission held its inaugural meeting of the Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Working Group on April 10, 2019, to share information and lay the groundwork for future materials from the Commission designed to assist election officials facing disasters.⁹⁰⁴

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: CANDIDATES AS ELECTION ADMINISTRATORS

The 2018 Governor's race in Georgia forced a reexamination of the roll of Secretaries of State running elections when that Secretary is running for office in the same election. Then-Secretary of State Brian Kemp refused to step down or recuse himself from the election administration roll while he simultaneously ran for Governor of Georgia.

⁸⁹⁶ *Id.*

⁸⁹⁷ *Id.* at p. 5-6.

⁸⁹⁸ *Id.*

⁸⁹⁹ *Id.*

⁹⁰⁰ *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong.* (2019), written testimony of Kristen Clarke at p. 5.

⁹⁰¹ *Id.* citing *Georgia Coalition for the Peoples' Agenda, et al., v. John Nathan Deal, et al.* (S.D. Ga., No. 4:16-cv-0269-WTM-GRS, October 12, 2016).

⁹⁰² *Id.*

⁹⁰³ *Id.*

⁹⁰⁴ Disaster Preparedness and Recovery, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, <https://www.eac.gov/election-officials/disaster-preparedness-and-recovery/>.

As discussed in this report, the State of Georgia and former Secretary Kemp have a record of aggressive purge practices and other actions that undermined confidence in fair election administration. At one point during the gubernatorial campaign, now-Governor Kemp said at a public event that his opponent's (Stacey Abrams) campaign's voter turnout effort "continues to concern us, especially if everybody uses and exercises their right to vote."⁹⁰⁵ Throughout the gubernatorial race, then-Secretary Kemp declined to recuse himself from managing the election.⁹⁰⁶

Former President Jimmy Carter criticized Kemp for refusing to step down, calling Kemp's refusal "counter to the most fundamental principle of democratic elections—that the electoral process be managed by an independent and impartial election authority."⁹⁰⁷

The NAACP LDF urged Kemp to recuse himself, noting his voter suppression tactics "would appear to create needless barriers to the exercise of the fundamental right to vote and abridge the ability of voters of color to elect their candidates of choice in violation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and to vote free from racial discrimination in violation of the 14th and 15th Amendments and other laws."⁹⁰⁸ Kemp eventually resigned his post as Secretary of State after claiming victory in November 2018, while ballots were still being counted.⁹⁰⁹ The Georgia race raised serious concerns regarding Secretaries of State maintaining oversight of the very races in which they are also a candidate.

In Kansas, Secretary of State Kris Kobach campaigned for Governor of Kansas while maintaining his position as Secretary, overseeing the election and initially refusing to recuse himself from the possibility of overseeing a recount.

This issue predates the 2018 election. During the 2000 presidential election in Florida, Republican Katherine Harris served as both the Secretary of State overseeing the recounts and as co-chair of George W. Bush's Florida campaign. The Gore campaign accused Harris of a conflict of interest in the manual recount efforts.⁹¹⁰ The Florida State Attorney General also headed the Gore campaign.⁹¹¹ Harris' decision to certify George W. Bush the winner led to Democrats suing to enforce a recount, ultimately leading to the infamous case of *Bush v. Gore*, in which the Court ruled that no alternative method of recount could be established in a timely manner and ultimately made George W. Bush president.⁹¹²

905 Jamil Smith, *Exclusive: In Leaked Audio, Brian Kemp Expresses Concern Over Georgians Exercising Their Right to Vote*, (Oct. 23, 2018), <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/brian-kemp-leaked-audio-georgia-voting-745711/>.

906 Alan Blinder, *Brian Kemp Resigns as Georgia Secretary of State, with Governor's Race Still Disputed*, N.Y. Times (Nov. 8, 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/08/us/georgia-brian-kemp-resign-stacey-abrams.html>.

907 *Id.*

908 Letter from Sherrilyn Ifill (NAACP-LDF) et al. to Secretary Brian P. Kemp (Oct. 12, 2018), https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/NAACP-LDF-Letter-to-Georgia-Secretary-of-State-Kemp-re-Recusal_10.12.2018-final_0.pdf

909 Alan Blinder, *Brian Kemp Resigns as Georgia Secretary of State, with Governor's Race Still Disputed*, N.Y. Times (Nov. 8, 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/08/us/georgia-brian-kemp-resign-stacey-abrams.html>

910 *Bush v. Gore*, Encyclopedia Britannica, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Bush-v-Gore>.

911 *Id.*

912 Ron Elving, *The Florida Recount Of 2000: A Nightmare That Goes On Haunting*, NPR (Nov. 12, 2018), <https://www.npr.org/2018/11/12/666812854/the-florida-recount-of-2000-a-nightmare-that-goes-on-haunting>.

CONCLUSION

Problems in election administration existed before *Shelby County* and they persist as barriers to accessing the ballot. When compounded with the suppressive, discriminatory tactics being deployed throughout states, election administration affects voters' ability to access the polls. Voter registration hurdles, inadequate funding to states to maintain and secure their election infrastructure, poll worker training, overuse of provisional ballots, disenfranchisement of formerly incarcerated people, and protecting elections in the face of natural disasters continue to be areas of concern.

CONCLUSION

THE PURPOSE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S HEARINGS

“Voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that,” Chief Justice Roberts said in *Shelby County*.⁹¹³ While the Chief Justice acknowledged discrimination exists, he went on to write that the question at hand was whether “extraordinary measures” in the Voting Rights Act were necessary.⁹¹⁴ The *Voting Rights and Election Administration* hearings held by the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration show the answer to that question is an unequivocal yes. Discrimination in voting does still exist, as detailed in this report, as well as the supporting testimony and documents gathered by the Subcommittee. Without the protections of federal oversight, it is nearly impossible to recognize and combat every instance of voter suppression and discrimination.

As Justice Ginsburg pointed out in her dissent, “[T]he Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) has worked to combat voting discrimination where other remedies had been tried and failed.”⁹¹⁵ When the Court struck down Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act in 2013, the Court rendered the protective structure of Section 5 effectively unenforceable. This decision unleashed a modern-day era of discrimination against minority voters and voter suppression tactics. After *Shelby County*, the nation saw an increase in voter suppression. Previously covered states began passing and implementing laws that would have or had already failed the preclearance process. States that were not covered enacted laws of their own as the Court signaled an end to the longstanding federal protection of the right to vote.

Without congressional action, the right to vote for millions of Americans is left vulnerable to suppressive laws and discriminatory tactics outlawed by Congress and the courts decades ago. Congress has a duty to act. At the beginning of the 116th Congress, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi and Committee on House Administration Chairperson Zoe Lofgren reconstituted the Committee on House Administration’s Subcommittee on Elections which House Republicans eliminated six years earlier. The Subcommittee, which is now chaired by Congresswoman Marcia L. Fudge, determined that its first priority would be collecting evidence illustrating the state of voting rights and election administration in America. The Subcommittee then worked to take Congress to the people, collecting stories and evidence from voters and advocates working to combat these tactics within the states and on a national scale.

The Subcommittee on Elections examined the landscape of voting rights and election administration in America post-*Shelby County* to determine whether Americans can freely

913 *Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 133 S.Ct. 2612, 2619 (2013).

914 *Id.*, also citing *Northwest Austin*, 557 U.S., at 203.

“The question is whether the Act’s extraordinary measures, including its disparate treatment of the States, continue to satisfy constitutional requirements. As we put a short time ago, ‘the Act imposes current burdens and must be justified by current needs.’”

915 *Id.*, Justice Ginsberg writing for the dissent.

cast their ballot and if not, what barriers lay in their way. As the Subcommittee held hearings throughout the country, Members of Congress heard time and again that states, both formerly covered and not, have implemented tactics that suppress the votes of minority communities, students, and the poor.

The Subcommittee on Elections held one listening session and eight hearings across eight states and in Washington, D.C. to gather the testimony and evidence analyzed in this report. The Subcommittee heard from 68 witnesses, 66 called by the Majority and 2 called by the Minority, and gathered more than 3,000 pages of testimony and documents. The evidence gathered proves the need for congressional action to protect the right to vote.

FINDINGS

Discrimination in Voting Still Exists

In evaluating the state of minority voting rights in its 2018 statutory report, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found on a unanimous and bipartisan basis that race discrimination in voting has been pernicious and endures today, voter access issues and discrimination continue today for voters with disabilities and limited-English proficiency, and the right to vote “has proven fragile and to need robust statutory protection in addition to Constitutional protection.”⁹¹⁶ Following *Shelby County*, the elimination of the coverage formula and subsequent unenforceability of the preclearance requirement means voters in previously covered jurisdictions with “long histories of voting discrimination have faced discriminatory voting measures that could not be stopped prior to elections because of the cost, complexity and time limitations of the remaining statutory tools;”⁹¹⁷ and that *Shelby County* effectively signaled a loss of critical federal voting rights supervision.

The Subcommittee heard testimony and collected documents outlining persistent discrimination in voting law changes such as purging voter registration rolls, cut backs to early voting, polling place closures and movements, voter ID requirements, implementation of exact match and signature match requirements, lack of language access and assistance, and discriminatory gerrymandering of districts at the state, local, and federal level.

Improperly executed, “list maintenance” can result in voter purges that have a disproportionate and discriminatory impact on minority voters. At least 17 million voters were purged nationwide between 2016 and 2018.⁹¹⁸ The State of Ohio won a case before the Court, allowing it to implement a purge policy that effectively punishes voters for failing to vote.⁹¹⁹

916 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Chair Catherine Lhamon at p. 2-3.

917 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Chair Catherine Lhamon at p. 2-3, *see also* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *An Assessment of Minority Voting Rights Access in the United States* (Sept. 2018)

918 Kevin Morris, *Voter Purge Rates Remain High, Analysis Finds*, Brennan Center for Justice (updated Aug. 21, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/voter-purge-rates-remain-high-analysis-finds>.

919 *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute*, 584 U.S. (2018).

Yet, Ohio’s Secretary of State recently admitted the program was rife with error.⁹²⁰ In multiple states, eligible citizens were wrongfully flagged as potential non-citizens and placed on a purge list.⁹²¹ While states must maintain accurate voter rolls, there are ways to do so that do not have a disproportionate impact on minority voters.

Millions of Americans take advantage of in-person early voting. Despite the high rate of utilization, some states have moved to cut back on early voting, while the Secretary of State in Alabama refuses to endorse early voting. Ohio not only cut back the early voting that had been implemented to alleviate egregiously long lines in previous elections, it eliminated a full week in which voters were able to register and cast their ballot on the same day. Some states have cut early voting on college campuses, while others still have specifically targeted “Souls to the Polls” Sundays traditionally utilized by predominantly Black churches. In Florida, it was estimated that more than 200,000 Floridians did not vote in 2012 due to long lines resulting from cuts to early voting.⁹²² Increased access to early voting is a simple yet substantial way to increase access to the ballot and states should halt efforts to eliminate days Americans can cast their ballots.

Since the *Shelby County* decision, hundreds of polling places have been closed in states previously covered under Section 5. Post-*Shelby County*, states and localities are no longer required to perform disparate impact analyses to determine whether these actions will have a discriminatory impact on voters. Since 2012, Georgia has closed more than 200 polling locations, Texas has closed at least 750, and Arizona has closed 320.⁹²³ In Arizona, the closure of polling places, coupled with a movement toward vote-by-mail and voting centers, has had an outsized impact on Native American voters that should be evaluated and taken into consideration before policy changes are made.

Voter ID has been championed as a necessary move to combat alleged voter fraud by its proponents. While there is no credible evidence of widespread, in-person voter fraud – the only type of fraud voter ID would prevent – these policies continue to be implemented across the country and have a discriminatory impact on minority voters. Voter IDs are financially burdensome for low-income voters, effectively imposing a second-generation poll tax. Even when proponents claim that “free” IDs are available, the IDs are not truly free: acquiring such IDs often requires an applicant to provide underlying documents they may not have and that cost money to obtain and the time and transportation necessary to complete the process is a

920 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried at p. 13, see also Andrew J. Tobias, *Ohio Secretary of State Frank LaRose says Ohio’s system of maintaining voter registrations rife with problems*, Cleveland.com (updated Sept. 25, 2019), <https://www.cleveland.com/open/2019/09/ohio-secretary-of-state-frank-larose-says-ohios-system-of-maintaining-voter-registrations-rife-with-problems.html>, and Nicholas Casey, *Ohio Was Set to Purge 235,000 Voters. It Was Wrong About 20%*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 14, 2019), <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/14/us/politics/ohio-voter-purge.html>.

921 Jonathan Brater, Kevin Morris, Myrna Perez, and Christopher Deluzio, *Purges: A Growing Threat to the Right to Vote*, Brennan Center for Justice (2018), https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/Purges_Growing_Threat_2018.1.pdf.

922 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019); written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p 4-5, citing Scott Powers and David Damron, *Analysis: 201,000 in Florida didn’t vote because of long lines*, Orlando Sentinel (Jan. 29, 2013), <https://www.orlandosentinel.com/business/os-xpm-2013-01-29-os-voter-lines-statewide-20130118-story.html>.

923 The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Democracy Diverted: Polling Place Closures and the Right to Vote* (Sept. 2019) at p. 26, <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/reports/Democracy-Diverted.pdf>.

cost many voters cannot pay. In North Dakota, Native American voters were significantly and disproportionately impacted by the state’s voter ID law requiring a residential street address, since many Native Americans have unstable housing situations or live in homes that do not have street addresses, while many tribal members use Post Office Boxes.

Some states have implemented “exact match” requirements, requiring that a voter’s name and information on his or her registration form exactly match the form of their name on file with certain state agencies. In Georgia, this resulted in the voter registration forms of more than 50,000 predominantly Black, Asian, or Latino voters, being put on hold by the Secretary of State’s office.⁹²⁴ Other states have carried exact match requirements over to signature match requirements, both on in-person and absentee ballots. When enforced by poll workers who are untrained in handwriting analysis, these policies have arbitrarily disenfranchised voters; sometimes without their knowledge.

The language access provisions of the Voting Rights Act remain intact despite the decision in *Shelby County*, but that does not mean they are being properly followed or enforced. In Florida, 32 counties were sued in August 2018 to force compliance with Section 4(e) of the Voting Rights Act. The Judge made a telling observation, noting “[I]t is remarkable that it takes a coalition of voting rights organizations and individuals to sue in federal court to seek minimal compliance with the plain language of a venerable 53-year-old law.”⁹²⁵ More needs to be done to ensure states and localities are following through on the legal protections afforded to language minority voters.

Some jurisdictions are still attempting to dilute the voice and vote of minority communities through discriminatory gerrymandering. Before *Shelby County*, preclearance required covered jurisdictions to submit their redistricting plans to the Department of Justice or the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for approval before implementation. After *Shelby County*, redistricting plans are no longer subject to preclearance. This means states with a history of racial discrimination can implement new political boundaries for districts for state and federal offices following the 2020 census that could be in effect for several election cycles, since as discussed in this report, it could take years of litigation to challenge those redrawn boundaries in court as discriminatory under Section 2.

Election Administration Needs Improvement

Problems in election administration existed before *Shelby County*, but today, new barriers to voting are compounded by the suppressive, discriminatory tactics being deployed across the country. The Subcommittee received testimony on election administration issues that include, but are not limited to: voter registration hurdles, a lack of funding for states to maintain and secure their election infrastructure, insufficient poll worker training, overuse of provisional ballots, disenfranchisement of formerly incarcerated people, and protecting elections in the face of natural disasters.

924 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Georgia*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Gilda Daniels at p. 4-5.

925 The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Democracy Diverted: Polling Place Closures and the Right to Vote* (Sept. 2019) at p. 4, <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/reports/Democracy-Diverted.pdf>, citing *Rivera Madera v. Detzner*, Slip Op. at p. 25 (Sept. 7, 2018).

Congress passed the National Voter Registration Act in 1993, but more needs to be done to ensure states follow the law and voters are being properly registered. Congress must ensure states have proper funding to carry out critical election duties through Help America Vote Act (HAVA) funds. This includes funding to replace outdated voting equipment and other functions. Funding for proper training of poll workers is critical. The Subcommittee heard numerous times how the actions and interpretations of a poll worker can mean the difference between a voter being able to cast a ballot, being forced to cast a provisional ballot, or being turned away entirely.

Congress should make it clearer that proof of citizenship requirements above and beyond the traditional use of an affidavit were not the intent of Congress. HAVA requires election officials offer a voter a provisional ballot in the event of a question concerning their eligibility.⁹²⁶ Uneven implementation of election laws and inadequate training of poll workers, among other factors, lead to the overuse of provisional ballots. As Hannah Fried, Director of All Voting is Local, testified, provisional ballots should be used as a “last resort” for voters who encounter a problem that cannot be resolved at the time they cast their ballot.⁹²⁷ They are less likely to be counted than a regular ballot and every effort should be made to ensure voters cast ballots that will be counted.

We must also address the continued disenfranchisement of formerly incarcerated individuals and the inherent discrimination at hand when otherwise eligible Americans are denied their right to vote. Nearly 6 million American citizens are disenfranchised due to a prior felony conviction, while millions more are incarcerated. Maine and Vermont are the only states that allow incarcerated individuals to vote while in prison but, while the census counts them as residents of the location where they are serving their sentence, they vote absentee in the district in which they previously resided. Disenfranchisement of incarcerated or formerly incarcerated persons is not mandated by the Constitution or federal law, and the formerly incarcerated are not stripped of their citizenship. If the fundamental measure of eligibility to vote is citizenship, perhaps all citizens should be allowed to vote.

A new generation of attacks on voting emerged during the 2016 election. Top U.S. intelligence and law enforcement officials have repeatedly warned about the need to bolster our elections, including guarding against interference from foreign powers using misinformation and disinformation campaigns to disseminate incorrect information and sow division. The Senate Intelligence Committee published a report detailing how the Russian Internet Research Agency (IRA) specifically targeted Black Americans with disinformation campaigns meant to suppress and divide voters. During the 2018 election, hundreds of messages on Facebook and Twitter were documented, designed to discourage or prevent people from voting in the 2018 midterm election.⁹²⁸

926 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Hannah Fried.

927 *Id.* at p. 9.

928 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Michael Waldman at p. 7, *see also* Young Mie Kim, *Voter Suppression Has Gone Digital* (Nov. 20, 2018), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/voter-suppression-has-gone-digital>

Finally, as climate change intensifies, natural disasters have become more severe. With Election Day in November, voter registration deadlines and early voting have been impacted by hurricane season, with mixed levels of protection from state officials. As the frequency and intensity of natural disasters escalate, standardized election procedures and protections for these events would ensure voters are not disenfranchised by circumstances beyond their control.

Section 2 is an Insufficient Replacement for Section 5

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act was, and remains, a critical tool in the fight to protect the right to vote. However, Section 2 was not intended to work in isolation. It was intended to work in concert with the other vital provisions of the Act, including Section 5. Without the full force of those provision in effect as Congress intended, Section 2 is a reactive, inadequate substitute for the proactive preclearance regime. Section 2 lawsuits can be very lengthy, often taking years to fully litigate and can be very expensive. This can result in discriminatory laws, that may have otherwise been blocked from being implemented in the first place under Section 5, remaining in place for multiple election cycles and denying voters access to the ballot while lawsuits move through the court process.

Section 2 also reverses the burden of proof, requiring the federal government, citizens, and advocates to prove the voting change is discriminatory and harms minority voters, rather than the burden being on the state or locality to prove they are not violating the constitutional right to vote, as was the case under preclearance. In the wake of *Shelby County*, civil rights and voting rights organizations have filed numerous lawsuits seeking to protect the right to vote, while the current Administration's Department of Justice has not filed any Section 2 lawsuits and reversed its position in others. Section 2 cases require resources the average voter simply does not have. On average, these cases can cost millions of dollars and take two to five years to be completed.⁹²⁹

Voter Turnout is Up, In Spite of Suppressive Practices

A familiar refrain heard from proponents of suppressive voter measures is that voter turnout is up, so the laws passed by states must not be suppressive as advocates and voters claim. In the first election following *Shelby County*, in 2014, voter turnout was the lowest since World War II.⁹³⁰ Although the 2018 election saw the highest voter turnout since 1914, this has been attributed to historic voter enthusiasm.⁹³¹ This is despite the suite of suppressive, discriminatory laws states have enacted throughout the country – not because of them. While

929 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Deuel Ross at p. 22.

930 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Michael Waldman at p. 46, *see also* Jose A. DelReal, *Voter turnout in 2014 was the lowest since WWII* (Nov. 10, 2014), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2014/11/10/voter-turnout-in-2014-was-the-lowest-since-wwii/>.

931 Pew Research Center, *Voter Enthusiasm at Record High in Nationalized Midterm Environment* (Sept. 26, 2018), <https://www.peoplepress.org/2018/09/26/voter-enthusiasm-at-record-high-in-nationalized-midterm-environment/>, *see also* Jens Manuel Krogstad, Luis Noe-Bustamante and Antonio Flores, *Historic highs in 2018 voter turnout extended across racial and ethnic groups*, Pew Research Center (May 1, 2019), <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/05/01/historic-highs-in-2018-voter-turnout-extended-across-racial-and-ethnic-groups/>.

voter turnout is up, nearly 50 percent of Americans did not vote in the last election.⁹³² Without such restrictive and suppressive barriers in place, turnout could have been higher.

Prior to passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Black Americans who were able to cast a ballot overcame immense barriers to do so. That some voters overcame the barriers put between them and the ballot box, does not excuse or make those barriers just.

Throughout American history, wholly unjust practices were held to be legal, until the American people overcame them. After long, hard-fought battles, they were no longer legal. Slavery was legal, but slavery was not just. Jim Crow was legal, but Jim Crow was not just. Separate but equal was legal, but separate but equal was not just. Suppressing voting laws were at times legal, but they were deemed unjust by the American people and the passage of the Voting Right Act and subsequent reauthorizations. Every eligible American is entitled to the unfettered, unabridged right to vote.

To the extent that turnout was up in 2018, it was the result of a concerted effort by advocates and individuals to cast their ballot despite the obstacles before them. Native American tribes in North Dakota spent considerable resources to ensure their members could vote, despite an unjust voter ID law.⁹³³ Turnout among Native American voters remains below the 50 percent threshold that was the basis for enacting the Voting Rights Act.⁹³⁴ When turnout increases, states and localities should not be closing polling locations, potentially creating long lines and unacceptable wait times many voters cannot endure. Polling conducted ahead of the 2018 elections by Advancement Project, in collaboration with the NAACP and African American Research Collaborative showed that voters of color were driven to vote by widespread attacks on people of color and their access to democracy.⁹³⁵

As Catherine Lhamon, Chair of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights stated, “we ought to be celebrating increased turnout wherever it exists. And we also ought to be recognizing that, across the board, in this country, we have very, very low turnout for voters. And that is, in itself, a concern.”⁹³⁶

In a democracy, government should enable its citizens to easily register and cast their ballots. These voter suppression measures are fundamentally anti-democratic as they have shifted the burden onto individuals and advocacy groups to find the means and resources to overcome them.

932 Jordan Misra, *Voter Turnout Rates Among All Voting Age and Major Racial and Ethnic Groups Were Higher Than in 2014* (Apr. 23, 2019), <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2019/04/behind-2018-united-states-midterm-election-turnout.html>.

933 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in the Dakotas*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), testimony of Tribal leaders, advocates and litigators throughout.

934 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Catherine Lhamon at p. 56.

935 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in Florida*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), written testimony of Judith Browne Dianis at p. 5, citing <https://www.africanamericanresearch.us/survey-results>.

936 *Voting Rights and Election Administration in America*: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Elections, 116th Cong. (2019), hearing transcript, Catherin Lhamon responding to Congressman Rodney Davis at p. 57.

MOVING FORWARD

The fundamental right to vote is under attack. The Court's decision in *Shelby County* has served to accelerate the process, giving a green light to historically discriminatory jurisdictions to implement laws once put on hold because they could not clear federal administrative review. Some may seem innocuous on their face, but these laws have a disparate impact on minority voters. Without the full protection of the Voting Rights Act, states are no longer required to perform an analysis of their proposals' effect or justify their actions to a neutral clearing house.

Some states are taking positive steps to protect voting rights. According to the Brennan Center's *Voting Laws Roundup*, 688 pro-voter bills were introduced in 46 states during their 2019 legislative sessions, leading to reforms across the country.⁹³⁷ For example, New York passed a package of voting reforms including early voting, pre-registration for 16- and 17-year-olds, portability of registration records, consolidated dates for state and federal primaries, and requiring ballots to be distributed to military voters further in advance.⁹³⁸ Additionally, New York passed constitutional amendments permitting same-day registration and no-excuse absentee voting, which need to be passed again and ratified by the voters.⁹³⁹

In Colorado, the state enacted a law restoring voting rights to individuals on release from incarceration and expanded automatic voter registration (AVR).⁹⁴⁰ Maine also enacted AVR. Nevada enacted immediate rights restoration to people on release from incarceration, authorized same-day registration, and other reforms. New Mexico also enacted same-day voter registration.⁹⁴¹ Delaware enacted early in-person voting, Virginia enacted no-excuse early in-person voting, and Washington enacted a Native American voting rights act.⁹⁴² In March 2018, Washington State's Governor signed AVR into law, along with Election Day registration, pre-registration for 16- and 17-year-old, and a state-level Voting Rights Act.⁹⁴³ In April 2018, New Jersey's Governor also signed AVR into law. Prior to authorizing AVR, New Jersey launched electronic voter registration in 2007 and allowed 17-year-olds to pre-register to vote.⁹⁴⁴

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

Article I, Section 4, of the Constitution expressly empowers the Congress with significant

937 Brennan Center for Justice, *Expert Brief: Voting Laws Roundup 2019* (last updated July 10, 2019), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-laws-roundup-2019>.

938 *Id.*

939 *Id.*

940 *Id.*

941 *Id.*

942 *Id.*

943 Brennan Center for Justice, *Voting Laws Roundup 2018* (Apr. 2, 2018), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-laws-roundup-2018>.

944 Brennan Center for Justice, *VRM in the States: New Jersey* (June 28, 2018), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/vrm-states-new-jersey>.

authority to enact legislation regulating “time, place, and manner” of elections.⁹⁴⁵ Although that provision makes states primarily responsible for administering congressional elections, it vests ultimate power in Congress.⁹⁴⁶

The Congress has a clear role in protecting the right of every eligible American to cast his or her ballot. Congress charted a path with the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, one the courts upheld until 2013. The Voting Rights Act was repeatedly reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over the following decades, as Congress continued to hold hearings and gather evidence documenting that ongoing discrimination continued to necessitate congressional action to protect the constitutional right to vote. It is time again to fulfill this obligation.

As the Subcommittee found and has thoroughly documented, the evidence is clear: discrimination in voting still exists. Moreover, states are enacting new suppressive laws that force voters to overcome new hurdles at every turn. Every eligible American has the basic right to participate in our democracy. Even without the full protection of the Voting Rights Act or a Department of Justice that argues cases on behalf of the voter, Congress must uphold its responsibility.

Congress has the constitutional authority to regulate the time, place and manner of federal elections.⁹⁴⁷ Congress also has a responsibility to conduct oversight, to gather evidence to inform the legislative process, and to ensure constitutional rights are protected and federal laws are carried out in a manner consistent with congressional intent.⁹⁴⁸ Protecting the right to vote is no exception to this responsibility.⁹⁴⁹

The evidence detailed in this report demonstrates the clear need for congressional action. It is time to fulfill the responsibility Congress has abdicated since June 2013 and protect the right to vote for every eligible American.

945 U.S. Const. Art. I, sec. 4, National Archives, transcript available at <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>.

“The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.”

946 Nat’l Const. Ctr., Michael T. Morley & Franita Tolson, *Common Interpretation: Elections Clause*, <https://constitutioncenter.org/interactive-constitution/interpretation/article-i/clauses/750>.

947 U.S. Const. Art. I, sec. 4, National Archives, transcript available at <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>.

“The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.”

948 U.S. Const. Art. I, sec. 1.

“All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

949 The power to conduct investigations, while not explicitly laid out in the Constitution, has long been understood to reside in the “legislative powers” of U.S. Const. Art. I, sec. 1, *see also McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135 (1927).

“In actual legislative practice power to secure needed information by such means has long been treated as an attribute of the power to legislate. It was so regarded in the British Parliament and in the Colonial legislatures before the American Revolution; and a like view has prevailed and been carried into effect in both houses of Congress and in most of the state legislatures. ...

We are of opinion that the power of inquiry — with process to enforce it — is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. It was so regarded and employed in American legislatures before the Constitution was framed and ratified.”

In a bipartisan manner, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and reauthorized and expanded protections in 1970, 1975, 1982, 1992, and most recently in 2006. The last reauthorization, in 2006, passed the House of Representatives 390-33, passed the Senate unanimously, and was signed into law by Republican President George W. Bush. As the Court acknowledged in *Shelby County*, a federal district court subsequently found that “the evidence before Congress in 2006 was sufficient to justify reauthorizing” Section 5 and continuing the Section 4(b) coverage formula, and the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit affirmed that decision.⁹⁵⁰

When the Court disagreed – in the face of the overwhelming evidence Congress gathered demonstrating a long history of discriminatory voting practices, its reliance on that record to forge bipartisan congressional intent to take action, and two lower court decisions upholding the reauthorized Voting Rights Act – the Court’s conclusions were based on the determination that “Nearly 50 years later, things have changed dramatically.”⁹⁵¹ While Congress and the lower courts clearly disagreed with that assessment at the time, as the Subcommittee found, in the wake of *Shelby County*, it is ironically the Court’s decision that has precipitated a dramatic change in conditions. This report details a wide range of new discriminatory practices that suppress the vote and not only justify but demand renewed congressional action.

America is not great because she is perfect, America is great because she is constantly working to repair her faults. It is time to repair this fault and recommit to the ideal that every eligible American has the right to vote, free from discrimination and suppression. The Voting Rights Act proved a powerful tool for protecting the cornerstone of American democracy, the right to vote, and to do so freely and fairly. Congress must honor this principle and basic right.

950 *Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 133 S.Ct. 2612, 2622 (2013).

951 *Shelby County, Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 133 S.Ct. 2612, 2625 (2013).



[HTTPS://CHA.HOUSE.GOV/](https://cha.house.gov/)