

LWVAZ Update and Review of the Elections Laws and Election Systems Reform Positions

At the 2015 LWVAZ Convention, delegates approved the update of the LWVAZ elections laws and election systems reform positions. As the work began, it became clear that a reorganization of the LWVAZ government positions was necessary to create a clearer understanding of these positions.

The update has three parts:

1. Reorganize LWVAZ government positions
2. Review and concur on the newly titled LWVAZ Legislative Branch position
3. Review existing positions on voter registration and voting systems and review additional areas for League member discussion and consensus.

Background

The decision made by the delegates at the LWVUS Convention 2016 to focus League efforts on “Making Democracy Work for All” and election 2016, makes it abundantly clear that the Leagues’ work is far from finished in making democracy work for every voter and every voice in our communities. The LWVUS program adopted for the next biennium is as follows:

Voting Rights and Voter Protection

In Congress, we must continue to push for restoration of the Voting Rights Act by supporting the bipartisan Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA). We must continue to support positive reforms such as online voter registration for all, portable voter registration within each state, and reforms to provisional voting, areas for which there are already pending bills. We must continue pushing this administration and the next to comply with the National Voter Registration Act by allowing voters to register through the federally-facilitated health care exchanges.

Money in Politics

Congress can take action to reform money in politics. Including the Stop Super PAC-Candidate Coordination Act in the House, there is legislation on each of the three pillars of our work on campaign finance: disclosure, stopping Super PACs, and public financing of congressional and presidential elections. There is also an anti-bundling bill. In addition, Congress can and must ensure meaningful enforcement of existing and future laws. The Federal Election Commission can’t fix itself, but Congress surely can. These reforms can be made despite recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

Supporting Voting Rights and Voter Protection in the States

In the states the fight continues in statehouses and courthouses to prevent legislation that suppresses the vote. Support also continues for reforms like on-line voter registration and expansion of early voting. These efforts are most successful when state Leagues can rely on LWVUS for resources in the form of shared expertise and coordination of strategies and messaging. State Leagues play a critical role, too, in developing partnerships and coalitions to protect the vote, not only in state legislatures but also in local communities. Collaborating with LWVUS, state Leagues take the leading role in advocacy for voter protection but also in coordinating statewide campaigns around voting issues.

Supporting Voting Rights and Voter Protection in Local Communities

In recent years local League voter service has joined the front lines of voter protection. The 2016 election will be the first presidential election in 50 years in which voters cannot rely on the protections of the Voting Rights Act to ensure free and fair access to the polls. Never has a local presence--real people in real communities--been a greater asset for the League. Registering voters in underserved communities, high schools, community colleges, and at naturalization ceremonies has become the primary focus of our voter service work. Long-standing relationships with elections officials have already produced good results in preventing careless or not so careless decisions regarding precinct locations and distribution of polling place resources in the wake of the Shelby decision. More is required. It is critical that, in this upcoming election, we promote and support a local presence in our most vulnerable communities by working together with community partners and using our 95 years of election experience to protect voters in the next election.

Voting Rights and Voter Protection Following Election 2016

The past five years have shown that elections have important consequences for both candidates and voters. Long lines at the polls in 2012 prompted the president to appoint the Presidential Commission on Election Administration to examine best election practices from the perspective of voter experience. The resulting recommendations provide an excellent road map for election reform at state and local levels. The League and our partners will be on the ground next November, but our election observations are meaningless unless we take them back to the appropriate decision makers.

Election 2016 will be the most expensive in our history. The issue of money in politics does not end the day after an election, nor is it confined to federal elections or the federal government. Leagues are working hard to update our campaign finance reform position, and it is incumbent on all of us to work at every level of government to ensure that power is in the hands of the many and not the few.

Redistricting reform continues to be a goal for the League. Armed with a position every state League can use, we look forward to more robust efforts to accomplish this goal. LWVUS will provide both venues for coordination and expert assistance. Progress has been made already, but League-wide support can strengthen the effort. State Leagues will take the lead in their states as we look to 2020 and beyond.

In addition, given the current political climate, there will likely be continued calls to amend the U.S. Constitution through a convention. The lessons learned through our study of the amendment process will inform LWV's education and advocacy in this area.

Making Democracy Work for All

The League is dedicated to ensuring that all eligible voters – particularly those from traditionally underrepresented or underserved communities, including first-time voters, non-college youth, new citizens, minorities, the elderly and low-income Americans – have the opportunity and the information to exercise their right to vote.

The League is deeply committed to reforming our nation's campaign finance system to ensure the public's right to know, combat corruption and undue influence, enable candidates to compete more equitably for public office and allow maximum citizen participation in the political process. We will continue this fight in Congress, with state legislatures, with the executive branch and, where appropriate, the courts.

The League supports redistricting processes and enforceable standards that promote fair and effective representation at all levels of government with maximum opportunity for public participation.

Voting Rights in Arizona

In Arizona, the League of Women Voters' work on the protection of voting rights is focused on both education and advocacy. The Leagues in Arizona distribute voter education materials, help voters understand voting requirements and the necessary documentation needed to cast their ballots.

The Arizona League and the League of Women Voters of the United States were involved in the Supreme Court voting rights case, *Arizona v. The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc. (ITCA)*, which examined whether the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) prevented states from passing laws that restrict the voter registration process. At stake was Arizona's Proposition 200, which required, among other things, that voters produce proof-of-citizenship when registering to vote, including when using the federal mail-in registration form. Citing provisions in the NVRA, the Supreme Court invalidated the part of the law requiring proof of citizenship for the *federal* voter registration form, resulting in a partial victory for voters.

After that victory, however, the Arizona State Attorney General (and Kansas Secretary of State, as well) tried a different tactic: they asked the U.S. Elections Assistance Commission to change the federal form to allow the requirements of

documentary proof of citizenship on the form. The Arizona League, along with the League of Women Voters of the United States and the League of Women Voters of Kansas, intervened as defendants in the case, which became Kobach, et al v. U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). The case worked its way up to the Supreme Court, which let stand a 10th Circuit Court opinion denying the request to allow proof of citizenship requirements when registering to vote using the federal form (for federal elections only).

In the 2014 state legislative session, the League of Women Voters of Arizona lobbied against bills that made it harder for third party candidates to qualify for the ballot, prohibited community organizations from assisting voters with getting their ballots to the ballot box, and that created a flawed process for purging permanent voting lists (PVL). Unfortunately, the Legislature passed an omnibus voter suppression bill -- HB2305 -- with all of the above provisions in it. League members throughout the state helped collect signatures to bring a referendum on HB2305 to the November 2014 ballot. The referendum qualified for the ballot, but the 2015 Legislature repealed HB2305, so the referendum became moot. Then in the 2016 legislative session, the "ballot harvesting bill" was passed and signed. The bill makes it a felony to assist voters with getting their ballots to the ballot box.

Local Leagues have developed good working relations with their county elections officials in the ongoing process of community education about the voting administration in their counties. Community education has become a very important activity, given the recent voting problems with the statewide elections (presidential preference, May special election, and the primary election) held in 2016.

Campaign Finance in Arizona

The League of Women Voters of Arizona believes that the political process must be open, equitable and honest. The process must provide opportunity for maximum citizen participation. There should be limits on the size and type of campaign contributions. There should be full disclosure of contributions and expenditures to combat undue influence in the electoral and governmental processes.

This position was the basis for LWVAZ involvement in the writing of the Citizens' Clean Elections Initiative and the passage of the Clean Elections Act in 1998. In 2011, after the passage of SCR1009 which was designed to disallow the use of public money to fund political campaigns, the United States Supreme Court ruled that matching funds should be blocked in Arizona's clean elections law. Today, the Clean Elections Act is still the campaign finance law for Arizona, but it continues to be under assault by the Arizona Legislature.

In the 2016 state legislative session, the League of Women Voters of Arizona lobbied against SB1516. The goal of SB1516, to simplify the state's complicated election regulations, is laudable. But the devil is in the details. The new campaign finance laws include these provisions that the League of Women Voters is opposed to:

1. Allowing 501c4 social welfare organizations to spend unlimited amounts on ballot measures
2. Not requiring 501c4 organization to disclose the amount they spend on ballot measures
3. Not requiring 501c4 organizations to reveal their donors

Redistricting in Arizona

The League of Women Voters of Arizona has been actively involved in the process of redistricting since we adopted our position in 1967, which states that the LWVAZ supports the retention of an independent commission to redistrict legislative and congressional districts at regular intervals, subject to judicial review.

LWVAZ was a part of a group of individuals and organizations that filed an amicus brief against the attempts by the lawyers for the AZ Legislature to overturn the independent redistricting process in Dec. 2013.

We joined the amicus group because of our long-standing position on redistricting, our involvement in the campaign in support of the Independent Redistricting Commission, and our participation in two redistricting processes since the passage of Prop.106, that created the Redistricting Commission.

Initiative and Referendum in Arizona (I & R)

The LWVAZ's position on initiative and referendum was adopted in 1976. LWVAZ believes in the constitutional right of the people to enact direct legislation; therefore, the League opposes any attempt by the Legislature to repeal or amend initiative or referendum rights by means such as requiring more than just majority approval of I & R propositions. A minority of voters should not have a stronger voice in voting for or against a citizen-driven initiative or referendum. (???) This type of legislation to amend the initiative and referendum process has been introduced almost every legislative session over the past 20 years and there is a strong possibility that it will occur again in 2017 and beyond.

Judicial Independence and Merit Selection in Arizona

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports the selection of judges by appointment, with voter approval for retention; adequate judicial salaries; longer terms; higher qualifications for justices of the peace and magistrates; a judicial nominating commission responsible to the governor; and a competency review commission.

In each session of the Legislature there are efforts to either return to the old system of electing judges or to weaken the current merit system. Constitutional amendments have been proposed by legislators that would divert the selection and retention of judges away from a vote of the people and into the Legislature's hands, handily ignoring the fact that there are three branches of government for very good reasons. Election vs. appointment of judges could, and probably would, lead to quid pro quo promises by judges to campaign funders, damaging the independence of our judiciary. In previous attempts, citizens have seen through these diversions of power. But year after year the attempts go on. The 2016 Legislature was no different.

Next Steps

This brief background, current efforts and the review of the League's work in these areas over the past few years presents the importance of our ongoing mission to Make Democracy Work for all. Use this information in your discussion of the proposed reorganization of the LWVAZ Government Positions, the new concepts we propose be added, and in the concurrence on the new position of the Arizona Legislative Branch.

Part 1: Proposed reorganization of the LWVAZ Government Positions

GOVERNMENT

ARIZONA ELECTION SYSTEMS AND LAW

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports an accessible system of voter registration and election participation, with uniform and standardized procedures throughout the state.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona believes in the election system principle that "every vote should count". Providing for the broadest voter representation possible in elections should have a positive effect on voter participation.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports measures to ensure the regular redistricting of Arizona legislative and congressional districts on an "equal population" basis.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona believes that the political process must be open, equitable and honest. The process must provide opportunity for maximum citizen participation, uninhibited by the costs of running a campaign. There should be limits on the size and type of campaign contributions. There should be full disclosure of contributions and expenditures to combat undue influence in the electoral and governmental processes.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona believes in the constitutional right of the people to enact direct legislation (enacting, amending, or repealing legislative acts and amending the Arizona Constitution).

Voter Registration

The LWVAZ supports:

- Mail-in registration procedures
- Online registration

Voting Systems

The LWVAZ supports:

- The monitoring of vote counting in state and local elections
- *The education of the voting public is important to election systems.*
- Giving Arizona voters the option of more choice among election system that they more accurately represent the wishes of voters: Adopting the Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) system for single seat races; adopting proportional representation for multi-seat races, specifically Ranked Choice Voting.

Legislative and Congressional Redistricting

The LWVAZ supports:

- The retention of an independent commission to redistrict legislative and congressional districts at regular intervals, subject to judicial review. The Legislature itself should not be the reapportioning agency.
- Legislative districts that provide equitable representation, accountability and responsibility, competitive elections, and close contact with constituents. *(Footnote: To allow for greater flexibility, this position was amended on March 5, 2005, by removing the words "single member." As background information, three points were made: 1) impacts may differ in rural and urban districts, 2) the change is neither an automatic endorsement for multi-member districts nor an automatic opposition to single member districts, 3) even members who strongly favor multi-member districts often do so only when such districts are accompanied by other electoral changes.)*

Campaign Finance

The LWVAZ supports:

- An income tax check-off to provide partial funding of legislative elections through the subsidy of some television time for issue discussion by ballot qualified candidates.
- A requirement for complete financial disclosure by candidates for public office.
- A cap on gifts to public officials, and reporting of all gifts.

- Prohibiting elected officials lobbying for remuneration of any kind for at least one year after leaving office.
- Prohibiting election officials from using surplus campaign funds for personal use, or from taking them along when leaving office.
- All government agencies being required to report all their lobbying activities, expenditures and gifts to public officials.

Initiative & Referendum

The LWVAZ supports:

- The requirement that only qualified electors (registered voters) may sign any initiative, referendum or recall petition.
- The reduction of the required number of signatures on a statutory initiative petition to qualify placing it on the ballot from ten percent to not more than eight percent of the votes cast for governor at the last gubernatorial election.
- The amendment of the constitution to limit the power of the Legislature to repeal or amend the initiative or referendum measures by means such as requiring more than just majority approval, or setting a minimum time limit before the Legislature can act on such measures, or some other limitation short of complete elimination of power.
- ~~Removal of the governor's power to veto initiative or referendum measures. (Delete this statement – The governor cannot by law veto an initiative or referendum measure.)~~
- The disclosure of financial contributions to committees supporting and opposing an initiative and referendum.

ARIZONA EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports measures to strengthen the executive branch of state government, and to integrate its administration by centralizing authority and responsibility in the governor's office.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona believes that a clear line of succession in the Executive Branch of the State of Arizona should be more obvious to the public than it is in the current system where the Secretary of State assumes the role of Governor in times of absence, removal, resignation, death or other such changes. To avoid mid-term changes in party, continuity problems or policy reversals, League of Women Voters of Arizona supports the creation of an Office of Lieutenant Governor with duties separate from that of the Secretary of State.

In addition, the League of Women Voters of Arizona believes that the governor and the elected office, which is next in line of succession to the governor, should run on the same party ticket. If that office continues to be held by the Secretary of State, League of Women Voters Arizona strongly believe that all partisan aspects of elections should be removed from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State and managed by an independent body/commission.

ARIZONA LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports four-year terms for all State Legislators, with no limit on the number of terms which they may serve,

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports Increase in pay for legislators.

ARIZONA JUDICIAL BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports the selection of judges by appointment, with voter approval for retention; adequate judicial salaries; longer terms; higher qualifications for justices of the peace and magistrates; a judicial nominating commission, responsible to the governor; and a competency review commission.

To assure that our judges are free of political bias and possessed of the proper qualities of temperament and intellect, and yet retain ultimate control of the courts in the hands of the people.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports:

- Appointment of judges by the governor from list of qualified nominees submitted by a bipartisan commission of legal and lay members.
- Retention of a judge in office, after an established period of time, only by a "yes" vote of the people, a "no" vote requiring a new appointment by the governor.

(This system of judicial selection and tenure was implemented in Pima, Maricopa and Pinal counties after they reached the constitutionally required population of 250,000. Counties not having reached that population can adopt merit selection by a vote of their electorate. Although we have basically accomplished our goal, we retain the position because in each session of the Legislature, there are efforts to return to the old elective system.)

JUVENILE JUSTICE

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports early intervention programs beginning in elementary schools with the help of:

- counselors, social workers, psychologists, volunteers in school programs and individualized programs, including those that foster self-esteem,
- clinics on parenting skill
- conflict resolution skills training,
- drug education. Funding for the above should come from federal, state, local, private and corporate sources.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports measures for adequate funding with emphasis on prevention, rehabilitation, incarceration and non-incarceration facilities, and intervention programs, trained personnel and education for parents of problem children. State funding should be dispersed to the local levels.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona believes that programs and policies should be adopted which promote rehabilitation and education within the Juvenile Justice system and should include:

- schooling while in detention,
- counseling for the family and the individual while in detention,
- alternative living and educational programs and experiences to prevent and discontinue gang involvement.

The League Women Voters of Arizona believes that for the protection of the community and schools, delinquent children should:

- receive swift and firm justice,
- be removed from dysfunctional homes after family intervention and long-term family counseling,
- and be treated as an individual according to the age, need and type of crime and be sent first to juvenile court.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports laws that include:

- swift punishment for weapon possession by juveniles,
- swift and harsh punishment of adults who provide weapons to juveniles,
- the exchange of records among schools, court and social agencies but not to the public or the media,
- a juvenile hearing before transfer to adult court.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports the concept of an approach to juvenile problems through Restorative Justice programs, which give priority to and accountability for wrongdoing by repairing the damage or harm done to victims and the community through a process of victim involvement, community participation, mediation and reparation. Skilled mediators should be involved in this process.

LOWER COURT REFORM

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports legislation which would give Arizona counties the option to consolidate their lower courts in order to promote uniformity in the administration and quality of justice, and effectiveness and efficiency in court administration.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports adequate protection and representation of consumers, including residential consumers, in the Arizona Corporation Commission process and supports measures to encourage conservation as well as the development and use of renewable energy sources.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports an amendment to the Arizona Constitution to permit counties to decide, by a vote of the people in each county, the governmental structure which best meets county needs.

The LWW of Metropolitan Phoenix supports home rule for Maricopa County. The LWW of Greater Tucson supports a long term goal of consolidated government for Pima County. The League position supporting local option for county governmental structure gives the LWVAZ a position from which to lobby, but does not restrict other local Leagues from positions they may take regarding their own county government.

Part 1: Proposed reorganization of the LWVAZ Government Positions

Due Date: January 31, 2017

Local League_____

of League members participating in the discussion_____

Question: Does your League support the reorganization of the LWVAZ Government Positions?

____ **Yes, Without any changes except the deletion of the one statement in the Initiative and Referendum position.**

____ **Yes, But with the following changes:**

____ **No**

Comments:

Part 2: Proposed New Position – Arizona Legislative Branch of Government

Within the existing Election Law position there are statements about the legislative branch of government. With the reorganization of the government positions, it became clear that a proposed new position – Arizona Legislative Branch of Government was in order. The existing statements are in black below.

To give this position some more context, the suggested addition to this proposed position (in red) comes from the League of Women Voters Principles. Even though principles are most often meant to be used at the federal level only – the proposed statement we suggest is applicable at the state level.

Why do we suggest the addition to the proposed position? LWVAZ for many years has been concerned about the transparency of the Arizona Legislature especially the use of the “strike all” provision. A white paper was written by Joan Novy, League member from LWV Northwest Maricopa County titled “Striker: Gambit or Gimmick”, outlined how the “strike all” provision has been used and sometimes misused by the Arizona Legislature. The suggested addition gives LWVAZ the opportunity to comment more effectively our concerns about the lack of transparency of some of legislative process used by the Arizona Legislature.

Local League members are asked to concur with the proposed new position – Arizona Legislative Branch of Government to include the suggested addition to the position.

ARIZONA LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Suggested addition to the position: The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports a legislative process that protects the citizen’s right to know by giving adequate notice of proposed actions, holding open meetings and making public records accessible.

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports four-year terms for all State Legislators, with no limit on the number of terms which they may serve,

The League of Women Voters of Arizona supports Increase in pay for legislators.

Part 2: Proposed New Position – Arizona Legislative Branch of Government

Due Date: January 31, 2017

Local League _____

of League members participating in the discussion _____

Question: Does your League support the proposed new position on Arizona Legislative Branch with the suggested addition to the position.

____ Yes, Without any changes

____ Yes, But with the following changes:

____ No

Comments:

Part 3: Review existing positions on voter registration and voting systems and review additional areas for League member discussion and consensus.

Summary of Arguments for Revising Election Reform Positions

Broad Goals: Expand access to the ballot and increase voter participation

Automatic Voter Registration (AVR)

- AVR allows anyone with an up-to-date drivers license, Social Security address or other affiliation with a state agency to be registered to vote via interactions with the government independent from the electoral process.
- AVR would ask the Departments of Motor Vehicles and other state agencies to change their current implementation of the [1993 National Voter Registration Act](#), commonly referred to as the “motor voter law,” from opt-in to opt-out. The Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2016 would add up to 50 million new voters by automatically registering eligible citizens to vote.
- Many state agencies are already required to provide citizens the option to update their voter registration status when interacting with them. Under AVR, when a citizen interacts with a government agency — for example, to get a driver’s license, apply for public services, apply for a license for a firearm, register for classes at a public university, or when becoming a naturalized citizen — the agency would be required to notify the citizen that it will go ahead and update his/her voter registration status, unless he/she declines.

Opponents:

- This will inconvenience citizens and waste government resources for no justifiable reason.

Supporters:

- The "fix" works using existing bureaucracy and is the opposite of inconvenient.
- This system would take advantage of technology and be more efficient, streamlined, and less prone to errors, thus increasing security.

Opponents:

- It's not necessary because it will add people to the rolls who have no interest in voting. It's not going to increase voter participation.

Supporters

- Research shows AVR would add up to 6.8 million people to the voter rolls. While not all would cast ballots, prior research in political science has shown that up to four million people were closed out of the electoral process in 2014 due to missed voter registration deadlines – people who can reasonably be assumed to have wanted to vote, but were not registered.
- The current non-voting population, including unregistered voters, skews lower-income, younger and non-white. It's these new voters who are very much needed if we are to have a truly representative and robust democracy.
- Many Americans become more engaged and interested in voting close to an election. Plus, those who have never before cast a ballot may be unaware of registration rules and requirements. This maybe especially true for young people, given the decline of civics education in our county.

Opponents

- While everyone has a *right* to vote, not everyone in a given election *should* vote.

Supporters

- Literacy tests went out with Jim Crow laws. Voter registration is a question of equal access to the mechanics of voting, not voter information or sophistication.

Opponents

- AVR will increase voter fraud.

Supporters

- State agencies charged with registering voters will still have to request proof of citizenship in some form. They won't be blindly passing along every record they receive to state registrars with no check on citizenship status.
- States use other databases and voter signatures during the voting process to ensure non-citizens are not registering/voting.

Opponents

- What if I want to dodge jury duty?

Supporters

- Citizens retain their right to opt-out of voter registration under an automatic system, so if you *really* want to keep your name off the voter rolls in order to avoid being called, you still can.

Other statements in support:

- Research shows that—in comparison to opt-in systems—opt-out systems that require no additional action increase participation in a wide variety of areas, from retirement savings to organ donation. AVR promises to make a significant difference in voter registration rates.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the federal government retains broad authority to regulate federal elections – including federal voter registration.

Universal Voter Registration (UVR) (Also known as Mandated Voter Registration)

This concept is closely related to Automatic Voter Registration. It requires that state governments automatically register people to vote (or that their previous registration become activated) when they reach voting age or become citizens. This can be done in many ways, e.g. using Motor Vehicle Dept. drivers' licenses, state tax rolls, etc.

Supporters Say:

- UVR will lead to a more representative democracy
- UVR would result in fewer last-minute registrations that put demands on election officials and the polls and that result in errors, shutting millions of people out of the election process.
- UVR would at least create an opportunity for greater voter turnout, particularly among the underprivileged, and research shows greater turnout by this group leads to public policy more attuned to the needs of this demographic.
- Re: the sub-category of pre-registration: Pre-registration creates broader opportunities for youth to register (high school, civic youth activities, DMV) and supports and drives civic habits

Opponents Say:

- Research shows that lack of registration is *not* the reason people don't vote. Most of those not registered are not interested in politics or don't think their vote matters.
- Little evidence supports the assertion that “voter-initiated registration” disproportionately impacts citizens who are minority, low-income or are less educated.
- Using existing government databases to enroll people to vote could damage the integrity of elections because the process:
 - May not require a signature, which is necessary for voter registration id purposes
 - May enroll non-citizens (who for example may have a driver's license)
 - May lead to duplicate registrations or other data errors (if using more than one government database and/or if comparing databases for matching purposes)
- It is well-known that inaccuracies exist in federal and state databases that states sometimes use to match data (and federal databases are not transparent)
- UVR would be costly to implement, especially if little increase in actual voting
- UVR would require the voter registration opt-out question to be dealt with for EVERY transaction with any agency--cumbersome and annoying.

- There are privacy issues:
 - Voter registration lists are public documents
 - Requiring people to 'opt-out' from registration interferes with the basic right of individuals to decide to what extent to participate in the political and democratic process.
- The proposal to provide every U.S. citizen upon birth or naturalization a voter registration number similar to a Social Security number, to be used in all elections and activated when a voter turns 18, would require the creation of a new federal bureaucracy.
- Due to the inherent inaccuracies in state databases, as well as the inability to keep up with all changes in the status of individual voters, states should not be prohibited from removing voters who do not vote in a certain number of elections—after they are sent notice of the impending removal.

Election-Day Registration (EDR)

Election Day registration (EDR) eliminates voter registration deadlines and allows citizens to update their registration *and* cast their ballot in one trip to the polls. To decrease the burden on poll workers, many states permit EDR only at a central office. To avoid fraud, states using EDR ask for two forms of ID: proof of identity and proof of one's residence. Ballots of Election-Day registrants may be segregated and counted after being validated.

Supporters say:

- With EDR, would-be voters would not be disenfranchised by not registering earlier or by finding that their information is inaccurate once they arrive at the polls.
- EDR reduces the need for provisional ballots
- In the 2014 election, states with EDR averaged 12 percent higher turnout than states without it. States that allow voters to register and update their registration information on Election Day have turnout that averages over time to at least 10 points above states that do not
- EDR allows those who have moved to update their registration (one out of eight registrations in the nation is inaccurate, according to a 2012 [Pew Charitable Trusts report](#).)

Opponents say:

- EDR invites fraud because:
 - e-poll books can't check for people who voted out of state (such as students)
 - e-poll books may not be able to check felony status
- "Convenience voting" ("mail voting, no excuse absentee voting, early voting and election-day registration," may actually *hurt* turnout. (Cited in "Non-Voters, America's No-Shows", 1999)

Permanent Portable Registration (PPR)

Permanent Portable Registration allows voters who move within a state, who are already registered to vote, to update their addresses (and any name changes) at the time they go to vote. (Federal law already allows registered voters who move within an election jurisdiction and congressional district to update their addresses and vote on Election Day.)

Supporters Say:

- Millions of Americans move each year. PPR would help people who move often (young folks, renters, racial minorities and low-income citizens) to participate in voting
- PPR would reduce the use of provisional ballots
- States which have instituted PPR have seen higher voter turnout

Opponents Say:

- PPR is subject to fraud, if databases are not accurate

Online Registration

Supporters:

- Saves money (paper, printing, data entry, distribution of forms)
- Reduction in use of provisional ballots (reduction in transcription errors during data entry)
- Younger voters more likely to register with online tools

Opponents say:

- Online registration will lead to online voting, which is a great setting for fraud
- People in most need of ballot access are not helped by online voting (because they are the ones who don't have a signature on file at the DMV)

Early Voting in Person and by Mail

Research shows that the best in-person early voting laws contain provisions that expand early voting to weekends and to hours that are outside of a normal workday; that provide equitably-distributed polling places in both public and private facilities; and that encourage people to vote early through education about this option. Early voting using mail-in ballots requires signatures that are checked/matched at the election office to reduce chances of fraud.

Supporters Say:

- Convenient for voters and election officials: increases ballot access; allows ballot processing (not counting) to begin before election day
- Less costly
- Allows early identification of registration/voting errors
- Reduces long lines at polls
- Associated with increased voter participation

Opponents Say:

- Mailed ballots are completed out of control of election officials, thus increasing fraud risk
- Mail ballots are more prone to spoilage, voter error, and problems with postal delivery
- Elections conducted entirely by mail will lower turnout among younger and lower income populations who move frequently and rarely use traditional mail – if at all
- Early voters may vote before important event/news occurs that would have influenced their vote

Voting Centers

Jurisdictions that use Vote Centers allow citizens to vote in any of a limited number of designated facilities within the area, regardless of where they live in the jurisdiction. They are an alternative to traditional precincts.

Supporters Say:

- Convenience for the voter
- Election Day expenses reduced, since there are fewer voting places
- Turnout increases, due to convenience

Opponents Say:

- Requires a lot of publicity to avoid confusion
- Technology must be able to provide the correct ballot for each voter (touch screens that can be reset or "print on demand" equipment)
- Electronic poll books (e-books) must be used so all Voting Center locations can record that a voter has voted.
- Does not carry on the tradition of "community voting", doing one's civic duty with others in the neighborhood.

Part 3: Review existing positions on voter registration and voting systems and review additional areas for League member discussion and consensus.

Consensus Questions

Due Date: January 31, 2017

Local League _____

of League members participating in the discussion _____

1. League supports **automatic voter registration** and **universal automatic registration** as long as concerns over registering non-citizens and others who are ineligible to vote are addressed.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral/no consensus Agree Strongly agree

Comments:

2. League supports **election day registration** if the process includes steps to address potential fraud.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral/no consensus Agree Strongly agree

Comments:

3. League supports **permanent portable registration** if the process includes steps to address potential fraud.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral/no consensus Agree Strongly agree

Comments:

4. League supports **online registration** if the process includes steps to address potential fraud.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral/no consensus Agree Strongly agree

Comments:

5. League supports **early voting in person and by mail** if the process includes steps to address potential fraud and to be inclusive of and accessible for all segments of society.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral/no consensus Agree Strongly agree

Comments:

6. League supports **voting centers** if the process includes steps to address potential fraud and provides enough Centers to make voting accessible to all.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral/no consensus Agree Strongly agree

Comments:

General Comments: