Recommendation on Presidential Primary Schedule

9.1.1 We recommend that the Chairs and National Committees of the political parties and Congress make the presidential primary schedule more orderly and rational and allow more people to participate. We endorse the proposal of the National Association of Secretaries of State to create four regional primaries, after the Iowa caucus and the New Hampshire primary, held at one-month intervals from March to June. The regions would rotate their position on the calendar every four years.

9.2 POST-ELECTION TIMELINE

As the nation saw in 2000, a great deal of bitterness can arise when the outcome of a close presidential election turns on the interpretation of ambiguous laws. Had the U.S. Supreme Court not resolved the principal controversy in 2000, the dispute would have moved to Congress pursuant to Article II and the Twelfth Amendment. Unfortunately, the relevant provisions of the Constitution are vague or ambiguous in important respects, and the implementing legislation adopted by Congress over a century ago is not a model of clarity and consistency. If Congress is called upon to resolve a close election in the future, as could well happen, the uncertain meaning of these legal provisions is likely to lead to a venomous partisan spectacle that may make the 2000 election look tame by comparison.

After the debacle following the election of 1876, Congress spent more than a decade fashioning rules and procedures that it hoped would allow future disputes to be settled by preexisting rules. Those rules and procedures have remained on the books essentially unchanged since that time. The core provision (3 U.S.C. § 5) invites the states to establish appropriate dispute-resolution mechanisms by promising that Congress will give conclusive effect to the states’ own resolution of controversies if the mechanism was established before the election and if the disputes are resolved at least six days before the electoral college meets. This “safe-harbor” provision appropriately seeks to prevent Congress itself from having to resolve election disputes involving the presidency, and every state should take steps to ensure that its election statutes qualify the state for favorable treatment under the safe-harbor provision.

Unfortunately, even if all the states take this step, disputes requiring Congress to ascertain the meaning of unclear federal rules could still arise. Although it may not be possible to eliminate all possible sources of dispute, significant steps could be taken to improve the clarity and consistency of the relevant body of federal rules, and Congress should undertake to do so before the next presidential election.

Recommendations on Post-Election Timeline

9.2.1 Congress should clarify and modernize the rules and procedures applicable to carrying out its constitutional responsibilities in counting presidential electoral votes, and should specifically examine the deadlines.

9.2.2 States should certify their presidential election results before the “safe harbor” date. Also, every state should take steps, including the enactment of new statutes if necessary, to ensure that its resolution of election disputes will be given conclusive effect by Congress under 3 U.S.C. § 5.
Conclusion

Building confidence in U.S. elections is central to our nation's democracy. The vigor of our democracy depends on an active and engaged citizenry who believe that their votes matter and are counted accurately. The reforms needed to keep our electoral system healthy are an inexpensive investment in the stability and progress of our country.

As a nation, we need to pursue the vision of a society where most Americans see their votes as both a right and a privilege, where they cast their votes in a way that leaves them proud of themselves as citizens and of democracy in the United States. Ours should be a society where registering to vote is convenient, voting is efficient and pleasant, voting machines work properly, fraud is minimized, and disputes are handled fairly and expeditiously.

This report represents a comprehensive proposal for accomplishing those goals and modernizing our electoral system. We have sought to transcend partisan divides with recommendations that will both assure the integrity of the system and widen access. No doubt, there will be some who prefer some recommendations and others who prefer other proposals, but we hope that all will recognize, as we do, that the best way to improve our electoral system is to accept the validity of both sets of concerns.

The five pillars of our proposal represent an innovative and comprehensive approach. They break new ground in the following ways:

First, we propose a universal, state-based, top-down, interactive, and interoperable registration list that will, if implemented successfully, eliminate the vast majority of complaints currently leveled against the election system. States will retain control over their registration lists, but a distributed database offers a way to remove interstate duplicates and maintain an up-to-date, fully accurate registration list for the nation.

Second, we propose that all states require a valid photo ID card, which would be a slightly modified REAL ID or a photo ID that is based on an EAC-template (which is equivalent to the REAL ID without the drivers license). However, instead of allowing the ID to be a new barrier to voting, we propose using it to enfranchise new and more voters than ever before. The states would play a much more affirmative role of reaching out to the underserved communities by providing them more offices, including mobile ones, to register them and provide photo IDs free of charge. In addition, we offer procedural and institutional safeguards to make sure that the card is not abused and that voters will not be disenfranchised because of the need for an ID.

Third, we propose measures that will increase voting participation by connecting registration and the ID process, making voting more convenient, diminishing irregularities, and offering more information on voting.
Fourth, we propose ways to give confidence to voters that use the new electronic voting machines to ensure that their vote will be recorded accurately and there will be an auditable backup on paper (with the understanding that alternative technologies may be available in the future). Our proposals also aim to make sure that people with disabilities have full access to voting and the opportunity to do so privately and independently like other voters.

Finally, we recommend a restructuring of the system by which elections have been administered in our country. We propose that the Election Assistance Commission and state election management bodies be reconstituted on a nonpartisan basis to become more professional, independent, and effective.

Election reform is neither easy nor inexpensive. Nor can we succeed if we think of providing funds on a one-time basis. We need to view the administration of elections as a continuing challenge for the entire government, and one that requires the highest priority of our citizens and our government.

For more than two centuries, our country has taught the world about the significance of democracy, but more recently, we have evinced a reluctance to learn from others. Typical of this gap is that we insist other countries open their elections to international observers, but our states close their doors or set unfair restrictions on election observing. We recommend changing that provision and also building on the innovations of the new democracies by establishing new election management bodies that are independent, nonpartisan, and effective with a set of procedures that would make American democracy, once again, the model for the world.

The new electoral edifice that we recommend is built on the five pillars of reforms. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents may differ on which of these pillars are the most important, but we have come to understand that all are needed to improve our electoral system. Indeed, we believe that the structure is greater than the sum of its pillars. Substantively, the system's integrity is strengthened by the increased access of its citizens, and voter confidence is raised by accuracy and security of new technology and enforcement of election laws. And the political support necessary to implement these reforms is more likely to materialize if all the pillars are viewed as part of an entire approach. If adequately funded and implemented, this new approach will move America down the path of transforming the vision of a model democracy into reality.
APPENDIX

Estimated Costs of Recommended Improvements

The Commission's recommendations are estimated to cost $1.35 billion to implement. This estimate is the sum of the cost of making state voter databases interoperable and upgrading voting machines to make them both accessible and transparent.

The total cost for making voter databases interoperable is estimated at $287 million. This cost breaks down as follows:

- The 11 states without top-down voter registration systems will need to spend a total of $74 million to build such systems.74
- The system to share voter data among states is estimated to cost $77 million.75
- The cost for all states to adopt the recommended template for shared voter data is estimated at $21 million. Since every state except Vermont requires a Social Security number to issue a driver's license, states will need to collect Social Security numbers from only a small portion of the adult population.80
- Since all states currently collect digital images of signatures when they issue driver's licenses, there will be no significant cost for collecting signature images for voter registration.
- For voter identification, states that use REAL ID for voting purposes will need additional funds only to provide a template form of ID to non-drivers. The template form of ID will be issued to an estimated 23 million U.S. citizen non-drivers at a cost of $115 million.81

The total cost for upgrading voting machines, to make them both accessible and transparent, is estimated at $1.06 billion. This is the amount needed, in addition to the HAVA funds already obligated, to replace remaining punch card and lever machines with direct recording electronic (DRE) systems or with optical scan systems with a computer-assisted marking device for blind and visually impaired voters, to retrofit DREs with a voter-verifiable paper audit trail, and to add a ballot marking device for blind voters to existing optical scan systems. The estimates are based on current distributions of various voting machines and on current costs for DREs, voter-verifiable paper audit trails, and ballot-marking devices for optical scan systems.

The Commission recommends that Congress provide $1.35 billion in funding over a two-year period, so that voter databases will be made interoperable and voting machine upgrades will be completed before the 2008 elections.
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Report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform
Summary of Recommendations

1: GOALS AND CHALLENGES OF ELECTION REFORM

1.1 HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT: STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

1.1.1 The Help America Vote Act should be fully implemented by 2006, as mandated by the law, and fully funded.

1.1.2 The Commission urges that the Voting Rights Act be vigorously enforced and that Congress and the President seriously consider reauthorizing those provisions of the Act that are due to expire in 2007.

2: VOTER REGISTRATION AND IDENTIFICATION

2.1 UNIFORMITY WITHIN STATES — TOP-DOWN REGISTRATION SYSTEMS

2.1.1 The Commission recommends that states be required to establish unified, top-down voter registration systems, whereby the state election office has clear authority to register voters and maintain the registration list. Counties and municipalities should assist the states with voter registration, rather than have the state assist the localities. Moreover, Congress should appropriate funds for disbursement by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to states to complete top-down voter registration systems.

2.2 INTEROPERABILITY AMONG STATES

2.2.1 In order to assure that lists take account of citizens moving from one state to another, voter databases should be made interoperable between states. This would serve to eliminate duplicate registrations, which are a source of potential fraud.

2.2.2 In order to assist the states in creating voter databases that are interoperable across states, the EAC should introduce a template for shared data and a format for cross-state data transfers. This template should include a person’s full legal name, date and place of birth, signature (captured as a digital image), and Social Security number.

2.2.3 With assistance and supervision by the EAC, a distributed database system should be established to make sure that the state lists remain current and accurate to take into account citizens moving between states. Congress should also pass a law mandating that states cooperate with this system to ensure that citizens do not vote in two states.

2.2.4 Congress should amend HAVA to mandate the interoperability of statewide registration lists. Federal funds should be appropriated for distribution by the EAC to states that make their voter databases interoperable, and the EAC should withhold federal funds from states that fail to do so. The law should also provide for enforcement of this requirement.

2.2.5 With proper safeguards for personal security, states should allow citizens to verify and correct the registration lists information on themselves up to 30 days before the election. States should also provide “electronic roll-books” to allow precinct officials to identify the correct polling site for voters.

2.2.6 With interoperability, citizens should need to register only once in their lifetime, and updating their registration will be facilitated when they move.
2.3 PROVISIONAL BALLOTS

2.3.1 Voters should be informed of their right to cast a provisional ballot if their name does not appear on the voter roll, or if an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote, but States should take additional and effective steps to inform voters as to the location of their precinct.

2.3.2 States, not counties or municipalities, should establish uniform procedures for the verification and counting of provisional ballots, and that procedure should be applied uniformly throughout the State. Many members of the Commission recommend that a provisional ballot cast in the incorrect precinct but in the correct jurisdiction should be counted.

2.3.3 Poll workers should be fully trained on the use of provisional ballots, and provisional ballots should be distinctly marked and segregated so they are not counted until the eligibility of the voter is determined.

2.4 COMMUNICATING REGISTRATION INFORMATION

2.4.1 States and local jurisdictions should use Web sites, toll-free numbers, and other means to answer questions from citizens as to whether they are registered and, if so, what is the location of their precinct, and if they are not registered, how they can do so before the deadline.

2.5 VOTER IDENTIFICATION

2.5.1 To ensure that persons presenting themselves at the polling place are the ones on the registration list, the Commission recommends that states require voters to use the REAL ID card, which was mandated in a law signed by the President in May 2005. The card includes a person’s full legal name, date of birth, a signature (captured as a digital image), a photograph, and the person’s Social Security number. This card should be modestly adapted for voting purposes to indicate on the front or back whether the individual is a U.S. citizen. States should provide an EAC-template ID with a photo to non-drivers free of charge.

2.5.2 The right to vote is a vital component of U.S. citizenship, and all states should use their best efforts to obtain proof of citizenship before registering voters.

2.5.3 We recommend that until January 1, 2010, states allow voters without a valid photo ID card (Real or EAC-template ID) to vote, using a provisional ballot by signing an affidavit under penalty of perjury. The signature would then be matched with the digital image of the voter’s signature on file in the voter registration database, and if the match is positive, the provisional ballot should be counted. Such a signature match would in effect be the same procedure used to verify the identity of voters who cast absentee ballots. After January 1, 2010, voters who do not have their valid photo ID could vote, but their ballot would count only if they returned to the appropriate election office within 48 hours with a valid photo ID.

2.5.4 To address concerns about the abuse of ID cards, or the fear that it could be an obstacle to voting, states should establish legal protections to prohibit any commercial use of voter data and ombudsman institutions to respond expeditiously to any citizen complaints about the misuse of data or about mistaken purges of registration lists based on interstate matching or statewide updating.

2.5.5 In the event that Congress mandates a national identification card, it should include information related to voting and be connected to voter registration.
2.6 QUALITY IN VOTER REGISTRATION LISTS

2.6.1 States need to effectively maintain and update their voter registration lists. The EAC should provide voluntary guidelines to the states for quality audits to test voter registration databases for accuracy (correct and up-to-date information on individuals), completeness (inclusion of all eligible voters), and security (protection of unauthorized access). When an eligible voter moves from one state to another, the state to which the voter is moving should be required to notify the state which the voter is leaving to eliminate that voter from its registration list.

2.6.2 All states should have procedures for maintaining accurate lists such as electronic matching of death records, drivers licenses, local tax rolls, and felon records.

2.6.3 Federal and state courts should provide state election offices with the lists of individuals who declare they are non-citizens when they are summoned for jury duty.

2.6.4 In a manner that is consistent with the National Voter Registration Act, states should make their best efforts to remove inactive voters from the voter registration lists. States should follow uniform and strict procedures for removal of names from voter registration lists and should adopt strong safeguards against incorrect removal of eligible voters. All removals of names from voter registration lists should be double-checked.

2.6.5 Local jurisdictions should track and document all changes to their computer databases, including the names of those who make the changes.

3: VOTING TECHNOLOGY

3.1 VOTING MACHINES

3.1.1 Congress should pass a law requiring that all voting machines be equipped with a voter-verifiable paper audit trail and, consistent with HAVA, be fully accessible to voters with disabilities. This is especially important for direct recording electronic (DRE) machines for four reasons: (a) to increase citizens' confidence that their vote will be counted accurately, (b) to allow for a recount, (c) to provide a backup in cases of loss of votes due to computer malfunction, and (d) to test — through a random selection of machines — whether the paper result is the same as the electronic result. Federal funds should be appropriated to the EAC to transfer to the states to implement this law. While paper trails and ballots currently provide the only means to meet the Commission's recommended standards for transparency, new technologies may do so more effectively in the future. The Commission therefore urges research and development of new technologies to enhance transparency, security, and auditability of voting systems.

3.1.2 States should adopt unambiguous procedures to reconcile any disparity between the electronic ballot tally and the paper ballot tally. The Commission strongly recommends that states determine well in advance of elections which will be the ballot of record.
3.2 AUDITS

3.2.1 State and local election authorities should publicly test all types of voting machines before, during, and after Election Day and allow public observation of zero machine counts at the start of Election Day and the machine-certification process.

3.3 SECURITY FOR VOTING SYSTEMS

3.3.1 The Independent Testing Authorities, under EAC supervision, should have responsibility for certifying the security of the source codes to protect against accidental or deliberate manipulation of vote results. In addition, a copy of the source codes should be put in escrow for future review by qualified experts. Manufacturers who are unwilling to submit their source codes for EAC-supervised testing and for review by independent experts should be prohibited from selling their voting machines.

3.3.2 States and local jurisdictions should verify upon delivery of a voting machine that the system matches the system that was certified.

3.3.3 Local jurisdictions should restrict access to voting equipment and document all access, as well as all changes to computer hardware or software.

3.3.4 Local jurisdictions should have backup plans in case of equipment failure on Election Day.

4: EXPANDING ACCESS TO ELECTIONS

4.1 ASSURED ACCESS TO ELECTIONS

4.1.1 States should undertake their best efforts to make voter registration and ID accessible and available to all eligible citizens, including Americans with disabilities. States should also remove all unfair impediments to voter registration by citizens who are eligible to vote.

4.1.2 States should improve procedures for voter registration efforts that are not conducted by election officials, such as requiring state or local registration and training of any “voter registration drives.”

4.1.3 Because there have been reports that some people allegedly did not deliver registration forms of those who expressed a preference for another party, states need to take special precautions to assure that all voter registration forms are fully accounted for. A unique number should be printed on the registration form and also on a detachable receipt so that the voter and the state election office can track the status of the form. In addition, voter registration forms should be returned within 14 days after they are signed.

4.2 VOTE BY MAIL

4.2.1 The Commission encourages further research on the pros and cons of vote by mail and of early voting.

4.3 VOTE CENTERs

4.3.1 States should modify current election law to allow experimentation with voting centers. More research, however, is needed to assess whether voting centers expand voter participation and are cost effective.

4.3.2 Voting centers need a higher-quality, computer-based registration list to assure that citizens can vote at any center without being able to vote more than once.
4.4 MILITARY AND OVERSEAS VOTING

4.4.1 The law calling for state offices to process absentee ballots for military and overseas government and civilian voters should be implemented fully, and these offices should be under the supervision of the state election offices.

4.4.2 New approaches should be adopted at the federal and state levels to facilitate voting by civilian voters overseas.

4.4.3 The U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) should supply to all military posted outside the United States a Federal Postcard Application for voter registration and a Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot for calendar years in which there are federal elections. With adequate security protections, it would be preferable for the application forms for absentee ballots to be filed by Internet.

4.4.4 The states, in coordination with the U.S. Department of Defense’s Federal Voting Assistance Program, should develop a system to expedite the delivery of ballots to military and overseas civilian voters by fax, email, or overnight delivery service, but voted ballots should be returned by regular mail, and by overnight mail whenever possible. The Defense Department should give higher priority to using military aircraft returning from bases overseas to carry ballots. Voted ballots should not be returned by email or by fax as this violates the secrecy of the ballot and is vulnerable to fraud.

4.4.5 All ballots subject to the Uniform and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act must be mailed out at least 45 days before the election (if request is received by then) or within two days of receipt after that. If the ballot is not yet set, due to litigation, a late vacancy, etc., a temporary ballot listing all settled offices and ballot issues must be mailed.

4.4.6 States should count the ballots of military and overseas voters up to 10 days after an election if the ballots are postmarked by Election Day.

4.4.7 As the technology advances and the costs decline, tracking systems should be added to absentee ballots so that military and overseas voters may verify the delivery of their voted absentee ballots.

4.4.8 The Federal Voting Assistance Program should receive a copy of the report that states are required under HAVA to provide the EAC on the number of absentee ballots sent to and received from military and overseas voters.

4.5 ACCESS FOR VOTERS WITH DISABILITIES

4.5.1 To improve accessibility of polling places for voters with disabilities, the U.S. Department of Justice should improve its enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the accessibility requirements set by the Help America Vote Act.

4.5.2 States should make their voter registration databases interoperable with social-service agency databases and facilitate voter registration at social-service offices by citizens with disabilities.

4.5.3 States and local jurisdictions should allow voters with disabilities to request an absentee ballot when they register and to receive an absentee ballot automatically for every subsequent election. Local election officials should determine which voters with disabilities would qualify.

4.6 RE-ENFRANCHISEMENT OF EX-FELONS

4.6.1 States should allow for restoration of voting rights to otherwise eligible citizens who have been convicted of a felony (other than for a capital crime or one
which requires enrollment with an offender registry for sex crimes) once they have fully served their sentence, including any term of probation or parole.

4.6.2 States should provide information on voter registration to ex-felons who have become eligible to vote. In addition, each state’s department of corrections should automatically notify the state election office when a felon has regained eligibility to vote.

4.7 VOTER AND CIVIC EDUCATION

4.7.1 Each state should publish a report on its voter education spending and activities.

4.7.2 States should engage in appropriate voter education efforts in coordination with local election authorities to assure that all citizens in their state have the information necessary to participate in the election process.

4.7.3 Each state should use its best efforts to instruct all high school students on voting rights and how to register to vote. In addition, civic education programs should be encouraged in the senior year of high school, as these have been demonstrated to increase voter participation by youth.

4.7.4 Local election authorities should mail written notices to voters in advance of an election advising the voter of the date and time of the election and the polling place where the voter can cast a ballot and encouraging the citizens to vote. The notice should also provide a phone number for the voter to contact the election authorities with any questions.

4.7.5 States should mail pamphlets to voters, and post the pamphlet material on their Web sites, to provide information about the candidates for statewide office and about ballot initiatives and referenda.

4.7.6 The federal government should provide matching funds for the states to encourage civic and voter education and advertisements aimed to encourage people to vote.

5: IMPROVING BALLOT INTEGRITY

5.1 INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF ELECTION FRAUD

5.1.1 In July of even-numbered years, the U.S. Department of Justice should issue a public report on its investigations of election fraud. This report should specify the numbers of allegations made, matters investigated, cases prosecuted, and individuals convicted for various crimes. Each state’s attorney general and each local prosecutor should issue a similar report.

5.1.2 The U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Public Integrity should increase its staff to investigate and prosecute election-related fraud.

5.1.3 In addition to the penalties set by the Voting Rights Act, it should be a federal felony for any individual, group of individuals, or organization to engage in any act of violence, property destruction (of more than $500 value), or threatened act of violence that is intended to deny any individual his or her lawful right to vote or to participate in a federal election.

5.1.4 To deter systemic efforts to deceive or intimidate voters, the Commission recommends federal legislation to prohibit any individual or group from deliberately providing the public with incorrect information about election procedures for the purpose of preventing voters from going to the polls.
5.2 **ABSENTEE BALLOT AND VOTER REGISTRATION FRAUD**

5.2.1 State and local jurisdictions should prohibit a person from handling absentee ballots other than the voter, an acknowledged family member, the U.S. Postal Service or other legitimate shipper, or election officials. The practice in some states of allowing candidates or party workers to pick up and deliver absentee ballots should be eliminated.

5.2.2 All states should consider passing legislation that attempts to minimize the fraud that has resulted from "payment by the piece" to anyone in exchange for their efforts in voter registration, absentee ballot, or signature collection.

5.2.3 States should not take actions that discourage legal voter registration or get-out-the-vote activities or assistance, including assistance to voters who are not required to vote in person under federal law.

6: **ELECTION ADMINISTRATION**

6.1 **INSTITUTIONS**

6.1.1 To undertake the new responsibilities recommended by this report and to build confidence in the administration of elections, Congress and the states should reconstitute election management institutions on a nonpartisan basis to make them more independent and effective. U.S. Election Assistance Commission members and each state's chief elections officer should be selected and be expected to act in a nonpartisan manner, and the institutions should have sufficient funding for research and training and to conduct the best elections possible. We believe the time has come to take politics as much as possible out of the Institutions of election administration and to make these institutions nonpartisan.

6.1.2 Congress should approve legislation that would add a fifth member to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, who would serve as the EAC's chairperson and who would be nominated by the President based on capability, integrity, and nonpartisanship. This would permit the EAC to be viewed more as nonpartisan than bipartisan and would improve its ability to make decisions. That person would be subject to Senate confirmation and would serve a single term of ten years. Each subsequent vacancy to the EAC should be filled with a person judged to be nonpartisan so that after a suitable period, all the members, and thus the institution, might be viewed as above politics.

6.1.3 States should prohibit senior election officials from serving or assisting political campaigns in a partisan way, other than their own campaigns in states where they are elected.

6.1.4 States should take additional actions to build confidence in the administration of elections by making existing election bodies as nonpartisan as possible within the constraints of each state's constitution. Among the ways this might be accomplished would be if the individuals who serve as the state's chief elections officer were chosen based on their capability, integrity, and nonpartisanship. The state legislatures would need to confirm these individuals by a two-thirds majority of one or both houses. The nominee should receive clear bipartisan support.

6.1.5 Each state's chief elections officer should, to the extent reasonably possible, ensure uniformity of voting procedures throughout the state, as with provisional ballots. Doing so will reduce the likelihood that elections are challenged in court.
6.2 POLL WORKER RECRUITMENT

6.2.1 States and local jurisdictions should allocate sufficient funds to pay poll workers at a level that would attract more technologically sophisticated and competent workers. Part-time workers should also be recruited for the beginning and the end of Election Day. States should amend their laws to allow shifts for part of the day for poll workers on Election Day.

6.2.2 States and local jurisdictions should implement supplemental training and recognition programs for poll workers.

6.2.3 To increase the number and quality of poll workers, the government and nonprofit and private employers should encourage their workers to serve as poll workers on Election Day without any loss of compensation, vacation time or personal time off. Special efforts should be made to enlist teachers and students as poll workers.

6.2.4 Because some jurisdictions have large majorities of one party, which makes it hard to attract poll workers from other parties, local jurisdictions should allow poll workers from outside the jurisdiction.

6.2.5 States should consider legislation to allow the recruitment of citizens as poll workers as is done for jury duty.

6.3 POLLING STATION OPERATIONS

6.3.1 Polling stations should be made user-friendly. One way to do so would be to forbid any campaigning within a certain distance of a polling station.

6.3.2 Polling stations should be required to maintain a "log-book" on Election Day to record all complaints. The books should be signed by election officials and observers and analyzed for ways to improve the voting process.

6.3.3 Polling stations should be organized in a way that citizens would not have to wait long before voting, and officials should be informed and helpful.

6.4 RESEARCH ON ELECTION MANAGEMENT

6.4.1 The Commission calls for continuing research on voting technology and election management so as to encourage continuous improvements in the electoral process.

6.5 COST OF ELECTIONS

6.5.1 As elections are a bedrock of our nation's democracy, they should receive high priority in the allocation of government resources at all levels. Local jurisdictions, states, and the Congress should treat elections as a high priority in their budgets.

6.5.2 Both local and state governments should track and report the cost of elections per registered voter.

7: RESPONSIBLE MEDIA COVERAGE

7.1 MEDIA ACCESS FOR CANDIDATES

7.1.1 The Commission encourages national networks and local TV stations to provide at least five minutes of candidate discourse every night in the month leading up to elections.

7.1.2 The Commission encourages broadcasters to continue to offer candidates short segments of air time to make issue statements, answer questions, or engage in mini-debates.
7.1.3 Many members of the Commission support the idea that legislation should be passed to require broadcasters to give a reasonable amount of free air time to political candidates, along the lines of the provisions of the Our Democracy, Our Airwaves Act of 2003 (which was introduced as S.1497 in the 108th Congress).

7.2 MEDIA PROJECTIONS OF ELECTION RESULTS

7.2.1 News organizations should voluntarily refrain from projecting any presidential election results in any state until all of the polls have closed in the 48 contiguous states.

7.2.2 News organizations should voluntarily agree to delay the release of any exit poll data until the election has been decided.

8: ELECTION OBSERVATION

8.1.1 All legitimate domestic and international election observers should be granted unrestricted access to the election process, provided that they accept election rules, do not interfere with the electoral process, and respect the secrecy of the ballot. Such observers should apply for accreditation, which should allow them to visit any polling station in any state and to view all parts of the election process, including the testing of voting equipment, the processing of absentee ballots, and the vote count. States that limit election observation only to representatives of candidates and political parties should amend their election laws to explicitly permit accreditation of independent and international election observers.

9: PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY AND POST-ELECTION SCHEDULES

9.1 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY SCHEDULE

9.1.1 We recommend that the Chairs and National Committees of the political parties and Congress make the presidential primary schedule more orderly and rational and allow more people to participate. We endorse the proposal of the National Association of Secretaries of State to create four regional primaries, after the Iowa caucus and the New Hampshire primary, held at one-month intervals from March to June. The regions would rotate their position on the calendar every four years.

9.2 POST-ELECTION TIMELINE

9.2.1 Congress should clarify and modernize the rules and procedures applicable to carrying out its constitutional responsibilities in counting presidential electoral votes, and should specifically examine the deadlines.

9.2.2 States should certify their presidential election results before the “safe harbor” date. Also, every state should take steps, including the enactment of new statutes if necessary, to ensure that its resolution of election disputes will be given conclusive effect by Congress under 3 U.S.C. § 5.
Additional Statements

All of the Commission Members are signatories of the report. Some have submitted additional or dissenting statements, which they were asked to limit to 250 words.

For alternative views and additional comments on the Commission’s report, see our Web page at www.american.edu/ia/cfer/comments.

2.3 PROVISIONAL BALLOTS

Kay Coles James

I strongly support the recommendation that states adopt uniform procedures for determining the validity of provisional ballots, and I join a majority of members who support counting provisional ballots when they are cast in the wrong precinct where multiple precincts vote at a single polling place.

However, out-of-precinct voting, in which a voter uses a provisional ballot to cast a ballot in the incorrect precinct, raises four substantial problems: (1) The voter is denied opportunity to vote for all candidates and issues or else casts a vote in a race in which the voter is not qualified to vote. (2) Election officials will not be able to anticipate the proper number of voters appearing at any given polling place and will not be able to allocate resources properly among the various polling places with the result that voters will face long lines and shortage of voting supplies. (3) The post-election evaluation of provisional ballots cast in the wrong polling place is time-consuming, error prone, subject to manipulation, undermines the secrecy of the ballot and will delay the outcome of the election. (4) It is settled law that HAVA does not mandate out-of-precinct voting.

The fact that many members of the Commission support limited out-of-precinct voting should not be understood as this Commission is recommending out-of-precinct voting because a substantial number of Commission members oppose it.

See Daschle, et. al. below for an alternative view of this recommendation.

2.5 VOTER IDENTIFICATION

Tom Daschle joined by Spencer Overton and Raul Yzaguirre

The goals of ballot access and integrity are not mutually exclusive, and the ultimate test of the Commission’s success will be whether voters from diverse backgrounds view its recommendations in their totality as providing them with a fair opportunity to participate in their democracy. Most of the recommendations in this report, such as the recommendation for a voter verified paper audit trail, meet that standard, but others do not. For voters who have traditionally faced barriers to voting – racial and ethnic minorities, Native Americans, the disabled and language minorities, the indigent and the elderly – these recommendations appear to be more about ballot security than access to the ballot.
The call for States to use the new REAL ID driver's license for voter identification at the polls is the most troublesome recommendation in the Report. While this statement identifies some of its problems, unfortunately the space allotted for dissent is inadequate to fully discuss all of the shortcomings of the Commission's ID proposal.

HAVA addresses the potential for fraudulent registration by individuals claiming to be someone they are not, and the Report contains no evidence that this reform is not working or that the potential for fraud in voter registration or multiple voting will not be addressed once the States fully implement the HAVA requirement for computerized, statewide registration lists. In fact, it offers scant evidence that this problem is widespread or that such a burdensome reform is required to solve it.

REAL ID is a driver's license, not a citizenship or a voting card. The Report notes that 12% of the voting age population lack a driver's license. While it recommends that States provide an alternative photo voting card to non-drivers free of charge, States are likely to require the same documentation that is required of drivers.

The documents required by REAL ID to secure a driver's license, and consequently a photo ID to vote under this recommendation, include a birth certificate, passport or naturalization papers, a photo identity document, and proof of Social Security number. Obtaining such documents can be difficult, even for those not displaced by the devastation of Hurricane Katrina. For some, the Commission's ID proposal constitutes nothing short of a modern day poll tax.

Important omissions raise doubts about the completeness of this Report. The lack of a recommendation on counting provisional ballots in Federal and statewide races is unfortunate. Our goal should be to ensure that the maximum number of eligible ballots are counted. Eligibility to vote for President is not dependent upon the precinct in which the voter resides. Similarly, reforms that expand access to the ballot box for working people, the disabled, elderly and minorities, such as early voting and vote-by-mail, are inadequately addressed by this Report.

Election reform must be about empowerment, not disenfranchisement. Raising needless impediments to voting or creating artificial requirements to have one's vote counted are steps backward. The mere fear of voter fraud should never be used to justify denying eligible citizens their fundamental right to vote.

*Spencer Overton*

I am a professor who specializes in election law, and I am writing separately to express my dissenting views to the Carter-Baker Commission's photo ID proposal. Unfortunately, the Commission rejected my 597-word dissent and allowed me only 250 words (this limitation on dissent was first announced at our final meeting). I believe that the issues before the Commission are of great consequence to our democracy and deserve more discussion. Thus, my concerns with the Commission's ID proposal and the shortcomings of the Commission's deliberative process are examined in greater detail at www.carterbakerdissent.com.
Susan Molinari

Opponents of a voter photo ID argue that requiring one is unnecessary and discriminatory.

Numerous examples of fraud counter the first argument. In 2004, elections in Washington state and Wisconsin were decided by illegal votes. In Washington, this fact was established by a lengthy trial and decision of the court. In Wisconsin, this fact was established by a joint report written by the U.S. Attorney, FBI, Chief of Police and senior local election official – both Republicans and Democrats. In other states, most notably the states of Ohio and New York, voter rolls are filled with fictional voters like Elmer Fudd and Mary Poppins.

Addressing the second concern, the Commission recommendation is for states to adopt safeguards that guarantee all Americans equal opportunity to obtain an ID required for voting. The safeguards include initiatives to locate those voters without IDs and to provide them one without cost. Under the recommendation, eligible voters can cast a provisional ballot that will be counted if they present their photo ID within 48 hours. Far from discriminatory, a mandatory voter ID provides means by which more Americans may obtain the identification already required for daily functions -- such as cashing a check, entering a federal building, or boarding an airplane.

We present this recommendation on a nationwide basis so that states can avoid some of the problems previously highlighted.

3.1 VOTING MACHINES

Ralph Munro

I have given the majority of my career to the fair and impartial oversight and conduct of elections, serving 20 years as an elected Secretary of State. It has been an honor to serve on the Carter-Baker Commission and I believe this report is timely, accurate and will provide our country with new ideas to continually reform and improve our elections.

My only exceptions to this report are found in Section 3.1 and Section 4.2. Numerous countries are moving ahead of America in the field of election technology. On voting machines and electronic voting devices, limiting voter verified audit trails only to paper is a mistake. New technology has far greater potential than paper in this arena.

4.2 VOTE BY MAIL

Ralph Munro

It is my strong belief that the expansion of voting by mail, under strict guidelines to prevent fraud, will ensure that our voting participation will increase dramatically, especially in local and off-year elections.
4.6 RE-ENFRANCHISEMENT OF EX-FELONS

*Nelson Lund*

I support the Commission’s major recommendations, especially those dealing with improved registration systems and the prevention of election fraud. I have reservations about several other proposals, among which the following require specific comment: Recommendations 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. Substantive decisions about criminal penalties are outside the scope of this Commission’s mission, which deals with election administration. Uniformity should not be imposed on the states, some of which may have very sound policy reasons for denying the franchise to all felons or to a larger class of felons than this Commission prefers.

6.1 INSTITUTIONS

*Nelson Lund*

Recommendations 6.1.1, 6.1.2, and 6.1.4. The Commission mistakenly assumes that putatively nonpartisan election administration is necessarily preferable to other approaches. Moreover, the Commission’s proposal to add to the EAC a fifth, putatively nonpartisan member (who would serve as the chair) is profoundly misguided. All the functions that the EAC has, or could sensibly be given, can be carried out under the current bipartisan, four-member structure. If the EAC were reconstituted in the way proposed by this Commission, it would naturally become a magnet for additional functions, and would probably come eventually to serve as a national election administrator, thus displacing the states from their proper role in our decentralized system of governance. I believe this would be a terrible mistake.

7.1 MEDIA ACCESS FOR CANDIDATES

*Nelson Lund*

Recommendation 7.1.3. This proposal calls for an inappropriate and constitutionally dubious interference with the freedom of the press.

9.1 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY SCHEDULE

*Shirley Malcolm*

With regard to Recommendation 9.1.1, I agree on the need for regional presidential primaries, but I disagree that Iowa and New Hampshire should come first. At present the barriers to candidates unaffiliated with the major political parties gaining a place on the presidential ballot are substantial. Thus, the primary system is the major way for the American people to participate in the process of selecting candidates for president. But it gives disproportionate influence to those states that go first. One problem with Iowa is that the state decides by a caucus rather than a secret ballot, but the bigger problem with Iowa and New Hampshire is that these states have demographic profiles that make them very different from the rest of the country. Iowa and New Hampshire, according to the 2003 census, have populations that are around 94-95 percent White, while nationally Whites are 76 percent of the population. Hence, the debates are shaped in ways that do not necessarily reflect the interests of minority populations or of our diverse nation.