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#### Abstract

Judicial Watch announced today that a September 2020 study revealed that 353 U.S. counties had 1.8 million more registered voters than eligible voting-age citizens. In other words, the registration rates of those counties exceeded 100\% of eligible voters. The study found eight states showing state-wide registration rates exceeding 100\%: Alaska, Colorado, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont.


The September 2020 study collected the most recent registration data posted online by the states themselves. This data was then compared to the Census Bureau's most recent fiveyear population estimates, gathered by the American Community Survey (ACS) from 2014 through 2018. ACS surveys are sent to 3.5 million addresses each month, and its five-year estimates are considered to be the most reliable estimates outside of the decennial census.

Judicial Watch's latest study is necessarily limited to 37 states that post regular updates to their registration data. Certain state voter registration lists may also be even larger than reported, because they may have excluded "inactive voters" from their data. Inactive voters, who may have moved elsewhere, are still registered voters and may show up and vote on election day and/or request mail-in ballots.

Judicial Watch relies on its voter registration studies to warn states that they are failing to comply with the requirements of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, which requires states to make reasonable efforts to clean their voter rolls. Judicial Watch can and has sued to enforce compliance with federal law.

Earlier this month, Judicial Watch sued Colorado over its failure to comply with the National Voter Registration Act. In Judicial Watch's new study, 42 Colorado counties-or two thirds of the state's counties-had registration rates exceeding 100\%. Particular data from the state confirms this general picture. As the complaint explains, a month-by-month comparison of the ACS's five-year survey period with Colorado's own registration numbers for the exact same months shows that large proportions of Colorado's counties have registration rates exceeding 100\%. Earlier this year, Judicial Watch sued Pennsylvaniaand North Carolina for failing to make reasonable efforts to remove ineligible voters from their rolls as required by federal law. The lawsuits allege that the two states have nearly 2 million inactive names on their voter registration rolls. Judicial Watch also sued Illinois for refusing to disclose voter roll data in violation of Federal law.

[^0]across 29 states," said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. "The data highlights the recklessness of mailing blindly ballots and ballot applications to voter registration lists. Dirty voting rolls can mean dirty elections."

Judicial Watch's study updates the results of a similar study from last year. In August 2019, Judicial Watch analyzed registration data that states reported to the federal Election Assistance Commission (EAC) in response to a survey conducted every two years on how states maintain their voter rolls. That registration data was compared to the then-mostrecent ACS five-year survey from 2013 through 2017. The study showed that 378 U.S. counties had registration rates exceeding $100 \%$.

Judicial Watch is a national leader for cleaner elections.
In 2018, the Supreme Court upheld a voter-roll cleanup program that resulted from a Judicial Watch settlement of a federal lawsuit with Ohio. California settled a NVRA lawsuit with Judicial Watch and last year began the process of removing up to 1.6 million inactive names from Los Angeles County's voter rolls. Kentucky also began a cleanup of hundreds of thousands of old registrations last year after it entered into a consent decree to end another Judicial Watch lawsuit.

In September 2020, Judicial Watch sued Illinois for refusing to disclose voter roll data in violation of Federal law.

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of Judicial Watch's clean elections initiative.

States and Counties with Registration Rates Exceeding 100\%
(* means no separate reporting of inactive registrations)
Alabama: Lowndes County (130\%); Macon County (114\%); Wilcox (113\%); Perry County (111\%); Madison County (109\%); Hale County (108\%); Marengo County (108\%); Baldwin (108\%); Greene County (107\%); Washington County (106\%); Dallas County (106\%); Choctaw County (105\%); Conecuh County (105\%); Randolph County (104\%); Shelby County (104\%); Lamar County (103\%); Autauga County (103\%); Clarke County (103\%); Henry County (103\%); Monroe County (102\%); Colbert County (101\%); Jefferson County (101\%); Lee County (100\%); Houston County (100\%); Crenshaw County (100\%)
*Alaska: Statewide (111\%)
Arizona: Santa Cruz County (107\%); Apache County (106\%)
*Arkansas: Newton County (103\%)
Colorado: Statewide (102\%); San Juan County (158\%); Dolores County (127\%); Jackson County (125\%); Mineral County (119\%); Ouray County (119\%); Phillips County (116\%); Douglas County (116\%); Broomfield County (115\%); Elbert County (113\%); Custer County (112\%); Gilpin County (111\%); Park County (111\%); Archuleta County (111\%); Cheyenne County (111\%); Clear Creek County (110\%); Teller County (108\%); Grand County (107\%); La Plata County (106\%); Summit County (106\%); Baca County (106\%); Pitkin County (106\%); San Miguel County (106\%); Routt County (106\%); Hinsdale County (105\%); Garfield County
(105\%); Gunnison County (105\%); Sedgwick County (104\%); Eagle County (104\%); Larimer County (104\%); Weld County (104\%); Boulder County (103\%); Costilla County (103\%); Chaffee County (103\%); Kiowa County (103\%); Denver County (103\%); Huerfano County (102\%); Montezuma County (102\%); Moffat County (102\%); Arapahoe County (102\%); Jefferson County (101\%); Las Animas County (101\%); Mesa County (100\%)
*Florida: St. Johns County (112\%); Nassau County (109\%); Walton County (108\%); Santa Rosa County (108\%); Flagler County (104\%); Clay County (103\%); Indian River County (101\%); Osceola County (100\%)
*Georgia: Bryan County (118\%); Forsyth County (114\%); Dawson County (113\%); Oconee County (111\%); Fayette County (111\%); Fulton County (109\%); Cherokee County (109\%); Jackson County (107\%); Henry County (106\%); Lee County (106\%); Morgan County (105\%); Clayton County (105\%); DeKalb County (105\%); Gwinnett County (104\%); Greene County (104\%); Cobb County (104\%); Effingham County (103\%); Walton County (102\%); Rockdale County (102\%); Barrow County (101\%); Douglas County (101\%); Newton County (100\%); Hall County (100\%)
*Indiana: Hamilton County (113\%); Boone County (112\%); Clark County (105\%); Floyd County (103\%); Hancock County (103\%); Ohio County (102\%); Hendricks County (102\%); Lake County (101\%); Warrick County (100\%); Dearborn County (100\%)

Iowa: Dallas County (115\%); Johnson County (104\%); Lyon County (103\%); Dickinson County (103\%); Scott County (102\%); Madison County (101\%); Warren County (100\%)
*Kansas: Johnson County (105\%)
Maine: Statewide (101\%); Cumberland County (110\%); Sagadahoc County (107\%); Hancock County (105\%); Lincoln County (104\%); Waldo County (102\%); York County (100\%)

Maryland: Statewide (102\%); Montgomery County (113\%); Howard County (111\%); Frederick County (110\%); Charles County (108\%); Prince George's County (106\%); Queen Anne's County (104\%); Calvert County (104\%); Harford County (104\%); Worcester County (103\%); Carroll County (103\%); Anne Arundel County (102\%); Talbot County (100\%)
*Massachusetts: Dukes County (120\%); Nantucket County (115\%); Barnstable County (103\%)
*Michigan: Statewide (105\%); Leelanau County (119\%); Otsego County (118\%); Antrim County (116\%); Kalkaska County (115\%); Emmet County (114\%); Berrien County (114\%); Keweenaw County (114\%); Benzie County (113\%); Washtenaw County (113\%); Mackinac County (112\%); Dickinson County (112\%); Roscommon County (112\%); Charlevoix County (112\%); Grand Traverse County (111\%); Oakland County (110\%); Iron County (110\%); Monroe County (109\%); Genesee County (109\%); Ontonagon County (109\%); Gogebic County (109\%); Livingston County (109\%); Alcona County (108\%); Cass County (108\%); Allegan County (108\%); Oceana County (107\%); Midland County (107\%); Kent County (107\%); Montmorency County (107\%); Van Buren County (107\%); Wayne County (107\%); Schoolcraft County (107\%); Mason County (107\%); Oscoda County (107\%); Iosco County (107\%); Wexford County (106\%); Presque Isle County (106\%); Delta County (106\%); Alpena County (106\%); St Clair County (106\%); Cheboygan County (105\%); Newaygo County (105\%); Barry County (105\%); Gladwin County (105\%); Menominee County (105\%);

Crawford County (105\%); Muskegon County (105\%); Kalamazoo County (104\%); St. Joseph County (104\%); Ottawa County (103\%); Clinton County (103\%); Saginaw County (103\%); Manistee County (103\%); Lapeer County (103\%); Calhoun County (103\%); Ogemaw County (103\%); Macomb County (103\%); Missaukee County (102\%); Eaton County (102\%); Shiawassee County (102\%); Huron County (102\%); Lenawee County (101\%); Branch County (101\%); Osceola County (101\%); Clare County (100\%); Arenac County (100\%); Bay County (100\%); Lake County (100\%)
*Missouri: St. Louis County (102\%)
*Montana: Petroleum County (113\%); Gallatin County (103\%); Park County (103\%); Madison County (102\%); Broadwater County (102\%)
*Nebraska: Arthur County (108\%); Loup County (103\%); Keya Paha County (102\%); Banner County (100\%); McPherson County (100\%)

Nevada: Storey County (108\%); Douglas County (105\%); Nye County (101\%)
*New Jersey: Statewide (102\%); Somerset County (110\%); Hunterdon County (108\%); Morris County (107\%); Essex County (106\%); Monmouth County (104\%); Bergen County (103\%); Middlesex County (103\%); Union County (103\%); Camden County (102\%); Warren County (102\%); Atlantic County (102\%); Sussex County (101\%); Salem County (101\%); Hudson County (100\%); Gloucester County (100\%)
*New Mexico: Harding County (177\%); Los Alamos County (110\%)
New York: Hamilton County (118\%); Nassau County (109\%); New York (103\%); Rockland County (101\%); Suffolk County (100\%)
*Oregon: Sherman County (107\%); Crook County (107\%); Deschutes County (105\%); Wallowa County (103\%); Hood River County (103\%); Columbia County (102\%); Linn County (101\%); Polk County (100\%); Tillamook County (100\%)

Rhode Island: Statewide (101\%); Bristol County (104\%); Washington County (103\%); Providence County (101\%)
*South Carolina: Jasper County (103\%)
South Dakota: Hanson County (171\%); Union County (120\%); Jones County (116\%); Sully County (115\%); Lincoln County (113\%); Custer County (110\%); Fall River County (108\%); Pennington County (106\%); Harding County (105\%); Minnehaha County (104\%); Potter County (104\%); Campbell County (103\%); McPherson County (101\%); Hamlin County (101\%); Stanley County (101\%); Lake County (100\%); Perkins County (100\%)

Tennessee: Williamson County (110\%); Moore County (101\%); Polk County (101\%)
Texas: Loving County (187\%); Presidio County (149\%); McMullen County (147\%); Brooks County (117\%); Roberts County (116\%); Sterling County (115\%); Zapata County (115\%); Maverick County (112\%); Starr County (110\%); King County (110\%); Chambers County (109\%); Irion County (108\%); Jim Hogg County (107\%); Polk County (107\%); Comal County (106\%); Oldham County (104\%); Culberson County (104\%); Kendall County (103\%); Dimmit County (103\%); Rockwall County (102\%); Motley County (102\%); Parker County (102\%);

Hudspeth County (101\%); Travis County (101\%); Fort Bend County (101\%); Kent County (101\%); Webb County (101\%); Mason County (101\%); Crockett County (101\%); Waller County (100\%); Gillespie County (100\%); Duval County (100\%); Brewster County (100\%)

## Vermont: Statewide (100\%)

Virginia: Loudoun County (116\%); Falls Church City (114\%); Fairfax City (109\%); Goochland County (108\%); Arlington County (106\%); Fairfax County (106\%); Prince William County (105\%); James City County (105\%); Alexandria City (105\%); Fauquier County (105\%); Isle of Wight County (104\%); Chesterfield County (104\%); Surry County (103\%); Hanover County (103\%); New Kent County (103\%); Clarke County (103\%); King William County (102\%); Spotsylvania County (102\%); Rappahannock County (102\%); Albemarle County (101\%); Stafford County (101\%); Northampton County (101\%); Poquoson City (100\%); Frederick County (100\%)

> Washington: Garfield County (119\%); Pend Oreille County (112\%); Jefferson County (111\%); San Juan County (108\%); Wahkiakum County (108\%); Stevens County (103\%); Pacific County (103\%); Clark County (102\%); Island County (102\%); Klickitat County (102\%); Thurston County (102\%); Lincoln County (101\%); Whatcom County (100\%); Asotin County (100\%)

*West Virginia: Mingo County (104\%); Wyoming County (103\%); McDowell County (102\%); Brooke County (102\%); Hancock County (100\%)
*
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