

Alarm Bells from Silenced Voters

by Isela Gutierrez and Bob Hall*

“I have voted at this library in every election, but today I was told to vote somewhere else. I’ve already waited in line for 30 minutes and I don’t know if I’ll get to vote today. I may not have time to get to the right precinct.”

– Durham County voter at North Regional Library

“I am a veteran who has issues with being around a lot of people – I take medication to deal with it. I was sent to 3 different precincts to vote. The whole process took me 3 ½ hours and left me very anxious. I asked if I could go to the front of the line because of my anxiety, but was told I could not. I had to try very hard not to be ugly.”

– Alamance County voter at South Melville precinct

This report builds on our earlier analysis¹ of the impact of the major 2013 election law changes on North Carolina voters during the 2014 general election. While most of the 2.9 million voters who cast ballots found the experience relatively easy, we called attention to situations that discouraged voter participation and damaged the integrity of the voting process.

The main problems included:

- Long lines and wait times made worse by the loss of straight-ticket voting and out-of precinct voting;
- Lack of preparation and insufficient number of staff, machines, and voting booths;
- Inconsistent distribution of provisional ballots, with wide variations between counties and even among precincts in a county;
- Problems related to inadequate parking, traffic control, poor signage and poor lighting; and
- Inadequate access and long waits for curbside voters.

Based on our analysis of elections data, 1,400 hotline calls and reports from more than 300 poll monitors, we concluded that the new voting limitations and polling-place problems reduced turnout by at least 30,000 voters in the 2014 election. We noted that North Carolina had the most expensive US Senate race in the nation in

2014, yet the turnout rate was only 44.4% of the state’s 6.6 million registered voters, a small gain over the 43.7% rate in the 2010 election. A one percent increase in the turnout rate for 2014 — to 45.4% — would have added 66,000 more votes.

Finally, we emphasized that the message from these silenced voters is more important than their exact count. Rather than wait for similar problems to disenfranchise an even larger number of voters in the 2016 presidential election, election officials and lawmakers must heed the warnings from 2014. They must invest in intensified voter education, larger staffs at polling centers, improved training of poll workers, more equipment, and better procedures to facilitate voter access.

In the months since our initial report, we have dug deeper into the data and the reports from our poll monitors. We analyzed turnout at precincts where problems were reported, interviewed scores of individual voters, and reviewed the coding of thousands of provisional ballots. In the process, we found:

- More than 2,300 voters who cast rejected provisional ballots would have had their votes count if the back-up provisions of same-day registration and out-of-precinct voting had still been in place.
- Many voters sent away to other precincts eventually managed to successfully cast a ballot, but this often required spending an hour or more at different voting locations.
- The 2014 Election Day turnout was significantly below the 2010 level at dozens of precincts where our poll

monitors reported problems, suggesting that thousands of voters may have simply opted out altogether rather than wait in long lines, drive to another precinct, or demand a provisional ballot.

In the next four sections, we examine different ways to help estimate the total number of the voters blocked by the changes in North Carolina's election law. We also include some of the voices of voters and their stories. At the conclusion, we revisit the major message from their stories for election officials and policymakers.

I. Assessing Rejected Provisional Ballots

In the major elections of 2008, 2010, and 2012, North Carolina voters resolved many last-minute problems at the polls by relying on two problem-solving procedures — same-day registration (SDR) during early voting or out-of-precinct voting on Election Day. But these safety options were eliminated by the 2013 election law. As a result, our research indicates that thousands of North Carolina voters arrived at the polls in 2014 only to be turned away.

To understand the scale of voters affected by the loss of these two options, we examined the 18,749 provisional ballots completed by voters in the 2014 general election. Why? Because these are the voters who left a record of their situation before they were turned away from the polling place. Provisional balloting is a voting method of last resort for those who are not on the list of eligible, registered voters in the precinct. Completing a provisional ballot is complicated and time-consuming, and many voters may not be aware of the option. Voters who cast provisional ballots are tenacious; by definition, these are people determined to have their vote count even if it takes considerable extra time.

Out of the 18,749 provisional ballots, 9,793 were not counted after election officials studied the voter's eligibility in more detail in the days following the election. However, after weeks of research and dozens of public records requests to county elections boards, Democracy North Carolina determined that 2,344 of these 9,793 rejected ballots would have counted under the old law:

- 995 were cast during the early voting period by voters who provided enough information on the envelope of their provisional ballots to become successfully registered at that time; their ballots did not count but county officials registered them for future elections. These are precisely the voters who could have used same-day registration under the old law to register

and vote on the same day during early voting.

- 1,349 were cast by registered voters who went to the wrong precinct in their county on Election Day; their ballots were rejected because the new law banned this type of out-of-precinct voting. Under the old law, their vote would have counted at least in part.

Importantly, poll workers did not offer voters provisional ballots in the same way they did in previous elections. For example, a total of only nine provisional ballots were handed out during early voting in Durham and Forsyth (Winston-Salem) counties. Not a single provisional ballot was offered to early voters in 21 counties, including several with over 100,000 voting-age citizens. It is difficult to imagine that not a single person with a registration problem showed up during early voting in these counties. In another 13 of the state's 100 counties, only one or two provisional ballots were offered.

African Americans are 38% of the 2,344 provisional voters but comprise only 22% of all registered voters.

In fact, in over half the state's counties, 7 or fewer provisionals were cast during early voting. Poll workers knew same-day registration had been repealed, and most people with registration problems simply left. Consequently, the 995 early voters who took the trouble to fill out a provisional ballot is only a fraction of the total number who could have used SDR had it existed in 2014. The same is true for the 1,349 out-of-precinct voters, because as we will see in Section III, the number of provisional ballots offered to out-of-precinct voters plummeted in 2014.

The 2,344 provisional voters who were silenced by the repeal of the two safety options come from all walks of life, all races, genders, and political affiliations. However, the chart below shows that African-American voters are much more likely to be impacted by the election law change. African Americans are 38% of the 2,344 provisional voters but comprise only 22% of all registered voters.

Provisional Ballots Rejected Due to New Law

North Carolina	State Total	White	Black	Other Non-White	Race Not Known	Democrat	Republican	Libertarian	Unaffiliated
Voters Silenced in 2014 General Elec.	2,344	1,109	890	183	162	1,107	598	23	616
% Voters Silenced By Race & Party	100%	47%	38%	8%	7%	47%	26%	1%	26%
For Comparison, % of All Reg. Voters By Race & Party	100%	71%	22%	5%	2%	42%	31%	0.4%	27%

Here are some of the stories of voters silenced in the general election (see page 27 for more stories):

Norman is a white, unaffiliated voter and police officer in Greensboro. He last voted in Randolph County in 2012. After moving to Guilford County, he knew he had to re-register so he filled out a registration form at a market where an organization had a table to help people register to vote in 2014. But, for some reason, his registration application didn't get to the county board of elections. When he went to vote during early voting, he was told his name was not on the registration roll. If the safety provision of same-day registration had still been in effect, he could have registered right then and voted. He didn't do anything wrong, but his voice was silenced.

Ernestine is an African-American woman in her early thirties who lives in Durham County. She is a single mom with two kids. She was working two jobs on Election Day and had limited time to vote. She went to the polling place across the street from her apartment, but the elections officials said she was in wrong place and needed to go elsewhere. She didn't have a ride to the other polling place, so she asked the election official for a provisional ballot. Ernestine had voted with provisional ballots on Election Day in 2008 and 2010, and both times her ballot counted – but this time when she asked for one, the elections official seemed somewhat upset with her. Due to the repeal of out-of-precinct voting, her vote did not count.

Morris is a middle-aged, African-American Democrat who lives in Wayne County. He lived in Wake County for “25 to 30 years” before moving back to Wayne County, where he grew up. When he tried to vote at a Wayne County early voting site, he was told he needed to vote in Wake because he was registered there. But when he went to Wake County, the election officials sent him back to Wayne. So he made a third trip to an early voting site in Wayne County on the last day of early voting, where he cast a provisional ballot that did not count. He says he remembers the DMV examiner asking him if he wanted to change his registration when he changed his license address to Wayne County, but for some reason that change didn't go through. Morris is a very committed, regular voter who has a history of voting in midterm and primary elections. But, due to the elimination of same-day registration during early voting, his three attempts to make his voice heard in 2014 were fruitless.

We have many other profiles from our interviews with similarly situated provisional voters (see some examples on pp. 27-28). Unfortunately, under the current system, provisional ballots are the only form of official documentation that captures the name and address of unsuccessful voters. Because precinct officials limited the distribution of provisional ballots and many frustrated voters simply left the polls, we know these 2,344 documented

lost votes are just the tip of the iceberg.

How else can we quantify the number of voters silenced in 2014? The next two sections address this question by examining the historical use of same-day registration and out-of-precinct voting in North Carolina, especially during the comparable 2010 midterm.

II. Assessing the Repeal of Same-Day Registration

Political science research consistently shows that same-day registration brings new voters into the process who otherwise would not be able to participate.² In the 2010 midterm election, SDR enabled a total of 21,410 citizens to register and cast a ballot during early voting. These were citizens who were unregistered, or who thought they had registered but the information did not reach the election office, or who for other reasons were not on the rolls in the county. They could only vote in 2010 because of SDR.

Is it reasonable to believe that 15,000 or more voters would have used SDR to become voters in 2014? We believe so for three reasons – personal stories, historical data, and money.

First, a large majority of the unsuccessful early voters we interviewed thought they had handled their voter registration changes well before the upcoming election. They were not willfully ignoring the requirement that they register at their current address by 25 days before Election Day; they simply had no reason to believe that they were improperly registered. For them, SDR would have functioned as a safety net provision – solving a problem that only surfaced when they arrived to vote. Many voters in previous elections, including the comparable 2010 midterm, used SDR for the same reasons.

Here are a few more examples of voters who could have had their voices heard in 2014 if SDR still existed:

Edward is a white male college student who lives in New Hanover County. *He registered to vote at a “beach club” event where registration forms were being collected. However, apparently his was not turned in or it got lost. When he went to vote early, the poll worker couldn’t find his name on the registration rolls. He filled out a provisional ballot, which got him registered for future elections – but his vote in the 2014 election didn’t count. Before moving to New Hanover County to attend college, he was a regular voter in his hometown of Charlotte. He first registered at age 18 and even voted in municipal elections. With the old back-up provision of SDR, he could have fixed his registration problem and voted, but in 2014 he was shut out.*

Sherry is a middle-aged, African-American woman in Harnett County. *She is retired from the military and finishing a program to become a paralegal. When she moved from Cumberland County to neighboring Harnett County, she updated her license at the DMV, where she thought she had also updated her registration. When she went to vote during early voting, the poll officials told her she was not on the rolls. When she asked questions, poll workers couldn’t answer them and acted frustrated with her, giving her a provisional ballot to complete. She later learned that the ballot was rejected, which she found very disturbing. She loves voting and volunteers to register people to vote. As a college student, her nickname was “Auntie Sam” because she was so committed to voting and registering others.*

Ernest is a middle-aged, white, Republican voter in Buncombe County. He moved to Buncombe in 2014 from Wake County, where he had voted in 2008 and 2012. He remembers receiving two postcards from the elections board about his change of address, which he filled out and mailed back. He also went to the DMV website and changed the address for his NC driver's license, but did not notice anything about changing his voter registration there. He thought the postcards would take care of that anyway. But when he went to vote early, the officials could not find his name, so he used a provisional ballot, which did not count. His vote is a casualty of the repeal of same-day registration.

Our second reason for believing that well over 15,000 voters could have used SDR is history. The use of SDR in North Carolina has been relatively consistent over the last major election cycles. As the chart below illustrates, about the same percentage of total ballots cast in the

2008 and 2012 presidential elections came from first-time voters (new to the state or county). Assuming that the 2014 election would have followed the pattern of the 2010 midterm, then about 23,000 voters with registration problems could have used SDR to vote in 2014.

Use of Same-Day Registration & Voting in NC

Year	Total # Voters	Total SDR	% of Ballots Using SDR
2008	4,354,571	103,535	2.4%
2010	2,687,298	21,410	0.8%
2012	4,542,488	97,312	2.1%
2014	2,937,949	23,500*	0.8%*

* projection based on 2010 SDR use

Awareness of the loss of SDR may have pushed some citizens to address their registration problems before early voting. But even if 30% of the predicted 23,500 had registered successfully before the 25-day deadline without any administrative glitches, that still leaves over 16,000 voters with problems who could have successfully voted in 2014 by using SDR. As the examples above illustrate, many of them would not have known they had a registration problem until they showed up to vote.

Money invested in field turnout is our final reason for thinking 16,000 or even 23,000 may be a low estimate for the number of voters who could have used SDR in 2014. More than \$100 million was spent in the hotly contested US Senate race that year. In the competitive 2008 and 2012 presidential contests, candidates and their allies took advantage of SDR in North Carolina and

pumped substantial money into pushing both registered and unregistered citizens to early voting sites. That effort drove up the numbers of SDR voters, even though the campaigns had also spent heavily on voter registration drives. The well-resourced Senate campaigns in 2014 would have likely followed the same script and implemented strategies to maximize the use of SDR had it been available to them.

While reasonable observers may quibble with our numbers, it seems fanciful to deny an impact from the withdrawal of a provision uniformly found to increase voter turnout. In order to prevent the same challenges on a far greater scale in 2016, aggressive voter education must be conducted by election officials and others about the 25-day registration deadline and ramifications for voters who arrive at the polls with a registration problem.

III. Assessing the Repeal of Out-of-Precinct Voting

On Election Day 2010, more than 5,700 voters cast a provisional ballot in their county coded as “incorrect precinct” — and it counted, at least in part. On Election Day 2012, that number grew to 6,700. After the law changed, it became fairly fruitless to take the time to cast a provisional ballot as an out-of-precinct voter. In the 2014 general election, only 459 such ballots coded as “incorrect precinct” were counted in part or in whole — 396 from Wake (Raleigh) and Mecklenburg (Charlotte) counties and a total of 63 from the other 98 counties. More than 1,400 other provisional ballots coded “incorrect precinct” or “voting out of precinct” were rejected.

Because they knew out-of-precinct ballots would rarely count, many precinct officials in 2014 did not bother to offer them and instead simply told voters they were in the wrong location and needed to go elsewhere to vote. Our poll monitors observed thousands of individuals being turned away from polling places. But how many of them actually voted? And what was the voting experience like? To answer these questions, we interviewed dozens of out-of-precinct voters who provided their contact information to our poll monitors. The majority of voters we spoke with voted successfully, but the process was complicated and time-consuming:

Pam is an unaffiliated, white voter in Durham County. She had seen a sign for voting at the library the previous week, but was told she would have to vote elsewhere when she arrived on Election Day. Because she wasn't working, she was able to spend the time to go to the second polling place to vote. The entire process took about an hour. She described it as “mildly frustrating,” but noted that if she had been working, she “would have been stressed and might not have voted at all.”

Tom is a white, Democratic voter in Durham County. He waited in line for a very long time only to be told he was in the wrong precinct. The poll workers were courteous, but not helpful in redirecting him to his correct precinct. They couldn't give him an address for his correct precinct, instead pointing to a place on the map. He left frustrated and had to look up his correct polling place using his smart phone. He was able to vote successfully, but it took him a good two hours. He's aware that many voters may not have the same technology or time to spend voting, and feels poll workers need to be better equipped to assist out-of-precinct voters.

Some simply gave up completely after being sent to an incorrect precinct:

Dwight is an African-American, Democratic voter in Mecklenburg County. He has voted in the last two presidential elections, but was thwarted in the 2014 election by the elimination of out-of-precinct voting and faulty information from poll workers. He showed up to vote at the same place where he had voted early in 2012. He was redirected to another precinct, but when he arrived there was told that he needed to go to a third precinct. After spending 1.5 hours and going to two different polling places, he “got fed up with the process” and “finally gave up when told that he needed to go to a third place.” He is a casualty of the elimination of out-of-precinct voting.

Based on our limited sample, it seems possible that out-of-precinct voting may have inconvenienced more voters in the 2014 election than it disenfranchised. However, that conclusion comes with two important caveats.

First, spending an hour or more to vote is unusual in a midterm election, even given the high level of interest in the competitive 2014 Senate race. Voter turnout will spike significantly during the 2016 presidential election,

and increased participation will only exacerbate the hassles experienced by 2014 out-of-precinct voters. Additional barriers (e.g., time spent in line, time searching for another polling place) may increase the number of voters who, like Dwight, simply give up on the process.

Second, Dwight's story was only captured because he spoke to one of our on-the-ground poll monitors on

Election Day. Because he did not complete (and was not offered) a provisional ballot, his voting experience is not part of the official 2014 election's record. Thus, he is not included among the 1,349 out-of-precinct voters we examined in Section I. Without additional documentation by election officials of voters who report to the wrong precinct, there is no reliable way to quantify those pushed out of the process by restrictive new laws.

IV. Assessing Election Day Precinct Problems

Despite having all the markers of a high-interest election, Election Day turnout in the 2014 midterm was lower than in 2010 (26.6% of registered voters cast ballots that day in 2014 compared 28.0% in 2010).

The 2014 election featured a hotly contested US Senate race with big investments in get-out-the-vote field operations and total spending in excess of \$100 million; the winner prevailed by a narrow 1.6 percentage point margin. By contrast, the 2010 election featured a far less intense or expensive US Senate race; the victor won by a 12 percentage point margin. The turnout rate in 2014's pre-Election Day period (involving mail-in and early voting) was clearly higher – 17.7% of registered voters cast ballots before Election Day in 2014, compared to the 15.5% pre-Election Day turnout in 2010.

But for some set of reasons, turnout was down on Election Day 2014. While this decrease in turnout could be glibly explained away by the increase in Early Voting, we decided to look more closely at the Election Day dynamics using precinct-level data. Appendix I (pp. 10-26) describes our findings based on (1) precinct assessments from volunteer poll monitors deployed by Democracy

NC, Ignite NC and Common Cause; (2) information from nearly 9,000 Exit Surveys and 300 Incident Reports collected by the monitors; (3) 1,000 phone calls from voters to an Election Day hotline supervised by the UNC School of Law and National Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; and (4) data on provisional ballots, voter registration, and voter turnout from the State Board of Elections for 2010 and 2014.

All totaled, we find there is a net loss of over 10,000 votes from the expected vote count if the 100 precincts we examined had maintained their 2010

turnout rates for Election Day 2014.

Many factors influence turnout and we are not arguing that every precinct should have achieved the same turnout rate it did in 2010, but the pattern of under-achievement is instructive and provides another indicator of the scale of votes lost as a result of new voting barriers and election administration problems. More than 85% of the precincts with problems had turnout rates below their 2010 level.

Here are few examples of the precinct-level dynamics on Election Day in locations where we had poll monitors:

**All totaled, we find
a net loss of over
10,000 votes from the
expected vote count
in the 100 precincts.**

Alamance County, Precinct 03S, South Boone. *Our poll monitor reported curbside voters had to wait for long periods and endure a slow process as the official was overwhelmed with other responsibilities inside the polling place. The chief judge was very apologetic and explained that one of the poll workers did not show up to work and they were also having computer problems. An official incorrectly told a voter's mother she could not provide assistance to her daughter. The monitor also collected stories of voters being sent to other precincts; they could not use out-of-precinct voting. A shocking 72% of the voters who responded to our Exit Survey said they were not asked the required question about possessing an ID suitable for voting in person in 2016. Election Day turnout of the precinct's registered voters dropped from 23.9% in 2010 to 21.9% in 2014, for a net loss of 102 votes.*

Carteret County, Wildwood Precinct. Poll Monitor found the Chief Judge very defensive when she tried to point out that a high number of voters were indicating on the Exit Survey that they had not been asked if they personally had an acceptable ID. Also: “Chief Judge did not seem to be aware of the ‘unreported move’ law.” In fact, no “unreported move” provisional ballots were issued at this precinct. (Overall, only 18 were provided to “unreported move” voters in Carteret County on Election Day, including 6 in one precinct where the judge apparently understood the rule.) Another Poll Monitor at Wildwood’s closing shift reported that “many, many people came to the wrong precinct; several said they were sent here by another precinct.” They left but it’s unclear if they were able to reach the correct place before the polls closed. A veteran suffering from PTSD said his “nerves were too bad” to make the trip to another poll. 699 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 23.2% to 19.6%, for a net loss of 130 votes.

Cumberland County, Precincts Cross Creek 16 and Cross Creek 22-G2. Poll monitors at these two precincts reported many voters being turned away because they were in the wrong precinct. More staff is needed to handle problems. There were also complaints of waiting times, particularly at Precinct CC16 where voters complained about a shortage of machines. A voter who called the hotline said, “They sent me somewhere I had not voted [previously] and no provisional ballot was offered. I work and could not get to this new location on time.” The combined turnout fell from 21.1% to 19.1%, for a net loss of 137 votes.

Durham County, Precincts 30-1 and 32, both voting at East Regional Library. Poll Monitor said, “Insufficient poll booths, poll workers, curbside poll helpers (people couldn’t find places to park and waited long time for assistance). With 2 precincts voting at the same place, there was serious confusion as to which way to go, which line to get in.” Voters reported waiting for half an hour or more, only to be sent to the back of the other precinct’s line. Also very long lines; by 7 PM the wait was about 2 hours. Poll Monitor on morning shift reported, “Not enough staff to assist with curbside voting, [voters] waited 45 minutes.” Need better signs and assistance for curbside voters; need more poll booths, parking, and precinct officials. 2,621 voted in 2014 at the two precincts. Overall turnout dropped for the two from 36.0% to 28.5%.

There are more than 2,600 other precincts across the state that our monitors did not cover. We suspect many of them also experienced problems, confusion, frustration, and voter rejections exacerbated by the voting law changes.

When combined with the numbers of potential lost voters described in the previous three sections, we reach the estimate of over 30,000 voters silenced by H-589 and the problems it caused, or made worse, for election administrators and voters.

V. Conclusion and Recommendations

To be clear, we make no claims to definitively prove any particular number of voters was disenfranchised. However, we do seek to generally quantify the number of voters potentially affected by the election law changes in 2014, and to highlight the full ramifications of H-589’s wide-ranging provisions. As proponents of the new election law often point out, one vote lost is too many — which is true whether the cause is a needless policy

barrier or in-person voter fraud.

Without hearing the voices of voters and examining in detail data sources beyond simple turnout numbers, it is too easy to simplify the critical debate about our election system into a cartoonish “he said, she said” battle between the two major political parties. By elevating the experiences of real voters and examining the

precinct-level impact of major law changes during a mid-term election, our goal is to demonstrate that the relevant questions aren't simply about voter ID or fears of widespread fraud. Rather, given the substantial evidence that tens of thousands of voters were silenced in 2014, policymakers and election officials must invest resources and take other action to ensure that as few voters as possible are left out of the process, especially in the context of new restrictions on registration and voting. The recommendations below are intended to facilitate that goal.

- **Intensified voter education.** State and county boards of elections should be proactive about making sure that voters understand the importance of the 25-day registration deadline, voting in their home precinct on Election Day, and confirming their registration details well in advance of an election.

Moreover, election officials should be explicit about the potential ramifications of failing to take these actions — “Your vote may not count if you don't take action now.” Mailings, radio ads, social media outreach, and other types of affirmative voter education around all aspects of the new law, not simply voter ID, are critical to ensuring that voters are clear about how the new law may affect them.

- **Improved training for election officials.** The integrity of the election process and the voting experience for millions of North Carolinians depend on the frontline workers at the polls. Poll workers need more rigorous training on aspects of the law that were changed by H-589 as well as long-established regulations related to such practices as providing assistance for voters who need help, curbside voting, and processing voters with an unreported move.

The most troubling incidents at the polls in 2014 were those in which voters were disenfranchised not by their failure to abide by the new rules, but by poll workers who (1) misunderstood under which circumstances a provisional ballot might count and therefore declined to offer them to qualified voters, (2) failed to find a properly registered voter on the rolls and sent them away in error, or (3) became so pressed by the challenges inside the voting room that they failed to attend to curbside voters. Currently, the State Board of Elections mandates two hours of training for precinct officials (judges) only. Lengthier, more comprehensive training for both precinct officials and poll assistants – with a graded test – is critical to making sure that voters are not incorrectly turned

As proponents of the new election law often point out, one vote lost is too many.

away during the crushing turnout of the 2016 presidential election.

- **Documentation of voters who report out of precinct and are sent away.** As noted earlier, there is currently no system to capture voters who go to the wrong precinct in their county on Election Day and are sent elsewhere to vote. The U.S. Election Assistance Commission recommends tracking the names of both the voter and election official involved when a voter is sent to a different precinct, which helps identify any mistakes that were made by the poll worker in the process and provides a record so that those mistakes don't result in voter disenfranchisement.⁴ This kind of documentation would also help quantify the number of voters affected by the prohibition on out-of-precinct voting.
- **More staff at polling places.** In many of the precincts we identified with serious challenges, understaffing was an underlying cause of or exacerbated the delays. The need for more staff will become even more intense in 2016, with the additional time required to examine voters' identification documents and referee ID disputes. Policymakers and state elections officials should fund and require more staffing at polling sites to handle eligibility issues, out-of-precinct voters, curbside voting, ID problems, voter confusion, and basic polling place responsibilities.
- **Policies that promote accessible voting.** Challenges to the repeal of same-day registration and out-of-precinct voting (among other provisions of the new voting law) are currently making their way through the federal courts. Democracy NC hopes to see the courts restore both of these important safety provisions, but even within the confines of the law as it currently stands, reforms like online voter registration and improved compliance with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) would help make sure that voter registration changes go through more reliably and conveniently.

Online voter registration provides a secure, accessible, and modern option for processing and updating registration, and is currently available to voters in more than half the states. Thousands of North Carolina voters have come to rely on the availability of NVRA-mandated voter registration

opportunities at agencies like the Division of Motor Vehicles and Department of Health and Human Services. When breakdowns in this process occur, as happened recently here, voters are silenced through no fault of their own.

Appendix I: Polling Place Problems

This part of the report describes voters' experiences at 100 precinct polling places on Election Day. Turnout rates in this section equal the number of votes cast on Election Day (including approved provisional ballots) divided by the number of registered voters in the precinct. Votes cast through mail-in or in-person early voting are not included. For each precinct described here, we provide: the number of votes cast on Election Day; the turnout

rates for the precinct's registered voters for 2014 and 2010; the expected vote count in 2014 if the precinct had performed at the 2010 turnout level; and the difference between that expected vote count and the actual vote count on Nov. 4, 2014. More than 85% of the monitored precincts experienced a decline in 2014. Overall, there was a net loss of more than 10,000 votes from what the 2010 turnout suggests should have happened.

Alamance County, Precinct 03S, South Boone.

Poll Monitor reported curbside voters had to wait for long periods and endure a slow process, because the official was overwhelmed with other responsibilities inside the polling place. The chief judge was very apologetic and explained that one of the poll workers did not show up to work and they were also having computer problems. An official incorrectly told a voter's mother she could not provide assistance to her daughter. Monitor also collected stories of voters being sent to other precincts; they could not use out-of-precinct voting.

A shocking 72% of the voters responding to the Exit Survey said they were not asked the required question about possessing an ID suitable for voting in person in 2016 – by far, the worst compliance record of the 5 Alamance precincts monitored. 1,106 voted in this precinct on Election Day, 2014. The Election Day turnout dropped from 23.9% in 2010 to 21.9% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,106
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,208
Missing votes: -102

Alamance County, Precinct 12N, North Burlington.

Poll Monitor reported that curbside voters had to wait a long time to get help from the election officials. 754 votes were cast in 2014. Turnout declined from 22.7% in 2010 to 22.0%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 754
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 780
Missing votes: -26

Alamance County, Precinct 127, Burlington 7.

Poll Monitor reported lines of over 1 hour in the 5:00 to 7:30 PM period. Monitor reported confusion over voters coming to this site and being told to go to another site to vote. 879 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 21.6% to 22.8%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 879
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 831
Missing votes: 0

Alexander County, Precincts B1 and B2, Bethlehem.

Poll Monitors reported an unspecified number of voters had to leave because they were in the wrong precinct, particularly at B2/Bethlehem Community Fire Station, which had served as an early voting site. B1 and B2 are the two largest precincts in the county. Half of the respondents on the Exit Surveys collected by Poll Monitors at the two precincts said they were not asked the required question about possessing a photo ID. 867 voted in B1 in 2014; turnout dropped from 40.6% to 31.7%. 1,000 voted in B2; turnout fell from 35.7% to 31.7%.

2014 Election Day Votes:
B1: 867
B2: 1,000
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout:
B1: 1,110
B2: 1,126
Missing votes:
B1: -243
B2: -126

Beaufort County, Precinct CHOCO, Chocowinity.

Poll Monitor reported occasional long lines and issues related to parking: "It was harder to vote today than usual" because of the time it took and lack of parking, said one voter. "Poll volunteers have taken all the parking," said another. This is the county's biggest precinct. 730 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 27.5% in 2010 to 20.5% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 730
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 977
Missing votes: -247

Buncombe County, Precinct 08.2, Shiloh Community Center

Poll Monitor reported inadequate parking, with spaces next to the building occupied by cars of election officials. At different times, the Monitor and two campaign volunteers complained to the election official in charge, but to no avail. The parking lot had "only one way in and out, so cars were jammed up frequently. To be honest, I spent a good bit of my time directing traffic." The site has a lower lot, downhill and past two basketball courts. "That worked for some younger voters, but was difficult for older voters." Overall, traffic congestion and parking problems created problems

for would-be voters. Poll Monitor also reported that a couple dozen voters were turned away and sent to another precinct. 518 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.4% to 20.7%

2014 Election Day Votes: 518
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 560
Missing votes: -42

Buncombe County, Precinct 02.1, Isaac Dickson Elementary School.

Poll Monitor reported serious problems with inadequate parking because the school district was conducting a workshop that day and the parking places were mostly taken by the participants. The Chief Judge said it is "beyond my control." Several voters commended the efficient, helpful staff, but on the Exit Survey, 50% of the 222 respondents said they were not asked the required question about possessing "one of these IDs that will be required in 2016." 901 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 25.6% in 2010 to 23.8% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 901
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 971
Missing votes: -70

Buncombe County, Precinct 10.1, Southside Center.

Poll Monitors collected 124 Exit Surveys in this precinct, a very strong sampling since only 440 voters cast ballots all day. Bottom line: 52% of the respondents said they were not asked the required ID question – the worst compliance rate in Buncombe County. 440 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 27.4% to 25.8%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 440
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 467
Missing votes: -27

Burke County, Precinct 0031/Morganton 01, Foothill Learning Center.

Poll Monitor reported many frustrated voters because the regular polling site had moved to this location. (There was a fire at the previous location.) 333 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.0% to 16.7%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 333
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 439
Missing votes: -106

Burke County, Precinct 0034/Morganton 04, Senior Center.

Poll Monitor reported many people came to this polling place because it was an early voting location and waited in moderate lines, only to be told to go elsewhere. "Some people really didn't understand the need to vote at your own precinct and were very upset." 326 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 21.8% in 2010 to 16.8% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 326
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 423
Missing votes: -97

Carteret County, Wildwood Precinct.

Poll Monitor found the Chief Judge very defensive when she tried to point out that a high number of voters were indicating on the Exit Survey that they had not been asked if they personally had an acceptable ID. Also: "Chief Judge did not seem to be aware of the 'unreported move' law." In fact, no "unreported move" provisional ballots were issued at this precinct. (Overall, only 18 were provided to "unreported move" voters in Carteret County on Election Day, including 6 in one precinct where the judge apparently understood the rule.)

precinct; several said they were sent here by another precinct." They left but it's unclear if they were able to reach the correct place before the polls closed. A veteran suffering from PTSD said his "nerves were too bad" to make the trip to another poll. 699 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 23.2% to 19.6%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 699
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 829
Missing votes: -130

Another Poll Monitor at Wildwood's closing shift reported that "many, many people came to the wrong

Chatham County, Precinct MCH10, Manns Chapel.

Poll Monitors received Exit Survey responses from about 1 in 6 voters throughout the day; 45% said they were not asked the required question about the photo ID. Voters generally had positive voting experience, but some said the officials had a difficult time finding their names on the voter rolls, or said more officials with computer skills were needed. Others complained about the lack of straight-ticket voting. 1,092 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 25.5% to 21.3%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,092
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,306
Missing votes: -214

Chatham County, Precinct NWM117, Cole Mill Plaza. Poll

Monitor in morning shift estimated that more than 25 voters were turned away and sent to other precincts. At opening, the sign said "photo ID required" in large letters and "In 2016" in small letters, but that sign was changed later in the day. As elsewhere, voters complained of loss of straight-ticket voting. 873 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 21.6% to 19.4%

2014 Election Day Votes: 873
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 973
Missing votes: -100

Chatham County, Precinct PIT113, Pittsboro.

Poll Monitors collected a large number of Exit Surveys and 55% said they were asked if they personally possessed a photo ID. A voter complained that while she heard others being asked the question, she was not asked and she was the only African American in the polling enclosure at the time. 1,399 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.9% to 22.0%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,399
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,457
Missing votes: -58

Cleveland County, Shelby Central Precinct.

Monitor reported confusion and frustration related to consolidation of former Precincts S1, S2 and S3 into this new precinct, including poor signage at the old polling locations. Some voters also complained about long lines. 1,321 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.8% to 19.7%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,321
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,533
Missing votes: -212

Cleveland County, Shelby South Precinct.

Monitor reported confusion and frustration related to consolidation of former Precincts S6 and S7 into this new precinct, poor signage at the old polling location about where to go, and longer wait times. 1,053 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 26.0% to 18.2%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,053
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,504
Missing votes: -451

Columbus County, Precinct P22A, South Whiteville.

A voter reported that machines were not working when she went to cast her ballot at 7:30AM. Poll workers told her that the machines had not been working since poll opening. According to voter's friend, machines were still down at 8 AM. 505 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 27.0% to 24.2%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 505
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 562
Missing votes: -57

Craven County, Precinct N4, H. J. MacDonald Middle School.

Poll Monitor said curbside voters had to endure very long waits (apparently the bell to alert precinct officials to the presence of curbside voters was broken), and the voting lines in the late afternoon were up to an hour long. Monitor encourages better use of parking spaces, because the partisan poll volunteers took up most of the spaces closest to the entrance. Inside, the wait at the help table was so bad that voters left without voting. 867 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 18.7% to 18.4%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 867
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 881
Missing votes: -14

Cumberland County, Precinct CC05.

Poll Monitor reported that curbside voting access was blocked by parked cars and that the bell to alert poll workers to presence of curbside voters was broken. 470 voted in 2014. Turnout slipped from 20.6% in 2010 to 20.0% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 470
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 483
Missing votes: -13

Cumberland County, Precincts CC16 and G2B (Cross Creek 22-G2)

Poll Monitors at these two precincts reported many voters being turned away because they were in the wrong precinct. More staff is needed to handle problems. There were also complaints of waiting times, particularly at Precinct CC16 where voters complained about a shortage of machines. A voter who called the hotline said, "They sent me somewhere I had not voted [previously] and no provi-

sional ballot was offered. I work and could not get to this new location on time." 1,293 voted in these two precincts in 2014. The combined turnout fell from 21.1% to 19.1%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,293
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,430
Missing votes: -137

Cumberland County, Precinct CC21.

Poll Monitors reported long lines at the precinct, including "100 people outside waiting and only 1 hour and 30 minutes remaining." They also reported problems with the ballot reading machines at one point which caused the ballots to be placed in a safety bin. 784 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.4% to 21.3%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 784
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 824
Missing votes: -40

Cumberland County, Precinct G9B-1 (Hope Mills 2A-G9).

Poll Monitor reported "at least 3 dozen people were directed to another polling place. Those I spoke to never received a confirmation card from the Cumberland Board of Elections." The precinct was created by dividing G9B into two sections, so it's difficult to compare 2010 and 2014. It's not clear if the redirected voters should have voted at Hope Mills 2B-G9, the other part of the old precinct, or at another precinct.

New precinct; no comparable data available.

Davidson County, Precinct 80A, Wallburg.

Voters report long lines at this polling site in the late afternoon and in some locations in Thomasville. A newspaper letter writer who served as poll observer in Thomasville reported that it took two hours to get help for a voting machine that ran out of paper and lines were so long that some people left. 1,358 voted in Wallburg. Turnout dropped from 35.2% to 31.7%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,358
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,509
Missing votes: -151

Davidson County, Precinct 86A, Abbots Creek 1.

A voter called the hotline in search of another voting location because she reported the line was 200 people long at 7 PM. She was disappointed to learn that was the only polling place where her vote would count. 976 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 31.4% to 31.8%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 976
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 966
Missing votes: 0

Duplin County, Warsaw Precinct.

Poll Monitor reported that there was no one assisting with curbside voting. As a result, elderly and disabled voters were having trouble getting to the polling place. 847 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 30.1% to 26.9%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 847
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 945
Missing votes: -98

Durham County, Precinct 21, Club Blvd Humanities Magnet School.

Voter reported that precinct set-up had been changed from past years, "making it harder to find and harder for older people to access." The entrance had been moved from front to back of gym, which has many more steps without handrails and no ramp. 692 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 33.6% in 2010 to 36.0% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 692
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 645
Missing votes: 0

Durham County, Precinct 22, VFW Post.

Poll Monitor reported long lines in the final hours and problems with size of parking area, with cars lined up to get into gravel lot, "where voters had very little space to maneuver in and out of the lot." Monitor said "many voters who lived in large apartment complex directly across from the polling place had recently been reassigned to a new site, but did not learn of the change until they arrived to vote. Since they thought they could walk to vote, they did not have rides to another site." Also, there were not enough voting booths or pens for a precinct this large. 1,321 voted in 2014. Turnout fell from 25.5% to 24.2%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,321
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,394
Missing votes: -73

Durham County, Precincts 30-1 and 32, both voting at East Regional Library.

Poll Monitor said, "Insufficient poll booths, poll workers, curbside poll helpers (people couldn't find places to park and waited long time for assistance). With 2 precincts voting at the same place, there was serious confusion as to which way to go, which line to get in." Voters reported waiting for half an hour or more, only to be sent to the back of the other precinct's line. Also very long lines; by 7 PM the wait was about 2 hours. Poll Monitor on morning shift reported, "Not enough staff to assist with curbside voting, [voters] waited 45 minutes." Need better signs and assistance for curbside voters; need more poll booths, parking, and precinct officials. 2,621 voted in 2014 at the two precincts. The combined turnout for both dropped from 36.0% to 28.5%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 2,621
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 3,312
Missing votes: -691

Durham County, Precinct 34-2, Ivy Community Center.

This is another precinct with long delays for voters. "The line was way too long," one voter reported. "Each line was all the way back up to the wall and moving very slowly. I could not wait." 1,397 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 27.5% in 2010 to 25.2% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,397
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,526
Missing votes: -129

Durham County, Precinct 35.3, Parkwood Volunteer Fire Department; Precinct 33, Lowes Grove Baptist Church.

Precinct 35.3 is a merger of Precincts 35-1 and 35-2. Voters complained about lines and need for more voting booths for voting in privacy. Poll Monitors collected over 300 Exit Surveys from this precinct and only 36% of the respondents said they were asked if they personally possessed a photo ID. By contrast, in Precinct 33, where lines seemed to move more quickly, 76% of the voters were asked the required ID question. 2,517 voted in Precinct 35.3 in 2014; turnout dropped from 32.8% in the two previous precincts to 31.6% in the combined one. In Precinct 33, 1,437 voted in 2014; turnout dropped from 23.5% to 21.6%.

2014 Election Day Votes:
35.3: 2,517
33: 1,437
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout:
35.3: 2,612
33: 1,564
Missing votes:
35.3: -95
33: -127

Durham County, Precinct 44, North Regional Library.

Poll Observer working from 6:30 to 10:30 AM reported that “85 people were turned away because, while they were properly registered in Durham County, they were supposed to vote in a different location. I heard by mid-afternoon as many as 300 people were turned away. . . . I watched one woman throw her arms in the air and shout, ‘I just don’t have the time.’ (There was a long line waiting to vote the entire morning.)” 1,635 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 29.0% to 24.8%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,635
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,915
Missing votes: -280

Durham County, Precinct 53-2, Triangle Church.

Voters reported that the main road leading to the polling place, Barbee Chapel Road, was closed for re-paving. There was no signage or staff redirecting voters; as a result many had trouble reaching the polling place to vote. 1,408 voted in 2014. Turnout fell from 33.2% in 2010 to 32.3% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,408
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,447
Missing votes: -39

Durham County, Precinct 54, South Regional Library.

Poll Monitor reported long lines throughout late afternoon and evening, not enough staff, many voters turned away for being at the wrong place, and an estimated wait time of 1.5 hours for curbside voters. The Monitor in the morning shift counted over 50 voters who said they were told they need to go to another precinct to vote. Although the out-of-precinct voters were of all races, the majority were African Americans. 1,594 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 26.9% to 22.7%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,594
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,890
Missing votes: -296

Edgecombe County, Precinct 1201, Rocky Mount 1.

Poll Monitor reported that “lots of voters referred to other polling places,” often because of confusion about the rules for out-of-precinct voting. Precinct officials were fairly consistent in asking the required question about IDs – 79% of the Exit Survey respondents said they were asked the question. 792 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 19.0% to 16.9%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 792
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 889
Missing votes: -97

Forsyth County, Precinct 304.

Poll Monitors reported “high number of folks sent to other polling places; at first we did not tally until we realized this was happening with regularity. We counted 18 during the lunch shift. Asked one voter if she had moved recently. No, she lived just blocks away and voted here last year. She had not received any notice of change of polling place. [The change and loss of out-of-precinct voting] seemed to create burden for those voting on lunch hour or with curbside voters.” Monitors also reported a “constant flow of curbside voters; two poll workers were

kept busy full time with curbside voters; courteous and helpful.” The compliance rate for asking the ID question was very poor at all the Forsyth precincts we monitored; 83% of Exit Survey respondents were not asked in Precinct 304. 507 voted in 2014. Turnout was basically steady, 22.1% in 2010 and 22.2% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 507
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 506
Missing votes: 0

Forsyth County, Precinct 402.

Poll Monitor reported “there is only one person helping curbside voters and the line is getting backed up.” In the evening, a voter reported that “voters are being turned away because their polling location has changed” and not being offered provisional ballots. 410 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 23.5% to 24.4%

2014 Election Day Votes: 410
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 394
Missing votes: 0

Forsyth County, Precinct 404.

Poll Observer stayed nearly all day and sent this report: “[T]he chief judge at the East Winston Heritage Center required every single voter to raise his or her hand and swear they were signing truthfully, which was clearly intimidating and beyond her authority. . . . I estimate I personally saw 150 voters turned away. . . . These were registered voters, working people who got an hour off to go vote, waited in line, and then found out they could not vote because they were at the wrong precinct.” 448 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 15.9% in 2010 to 17.0% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 448
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 419
Missing votes: 0

Forsyth County, Precinct 507.

Poll Monitor reported long lines during her shift in the final hours of Election Day. One voter reported, “I have waited 1 hour 35 minutes just to get within an hour of the voting booth. Extremely long lines; very slow moving. Arrived at about 7:10 p.m. At 8:47 I am still about another hour away from the voting booth. It’s so sad that probably 25% of voters gave up and left after the first hour or so of waiting and more time to go. So many people had to leave.” 1,037 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.4% in 2010 to 21.2% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,037
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,100
Missing votes: -63

Gaston County, Precinct 04, Forest Heights.

Poll Monitor talked with several voters who had gone through various runarounds to find the right precinct or who were sent off to another one. An African American voter who had registered during the Early Voting period, after the regular deadline, was unable to vote. If same-day registration was still in place, she could have registered and voted at the same time. 972 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 24.8% to 20.5%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 972
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,177
Missing votes: -205

Gaston County, Precincts 23, 28, 44 and 46.

In each of these 4 precincts, officials mistakenly turned away a voter who was properly registered. For example, Jessica L. Jackson could not be found because her registration had been removed by mistake when her record was merged with another Jessica Jackson in Gaston County. She was given a provisional ballot, but it was denied. Democracy NC discovered several other rejected provisional ballots from voters who seemed to be properly registered. We sent our research to the director of the Gaston County Board of Elections, and he determined that Ms. Jackson and 3 other voters (one in each of these precincts) were disenfranchised by mistake. A Poll Monitor at Precinct 46 reported mid-day that 8 or 9 people had been sent to the precinct from another precinct, and then told to go to a third polling place:

"When voters arrive they are told to go yet somewhere else and are tired of getting the runaround and unlikely to go someplace else." 3,784 voted in the 4 precincts in 2014, compared to 4,152 in 2010. Turnout dropped from 29.2% in 2010 to 25.0% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 3,784
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 4,152
Missing votes: -368

Guilford County, Precinct FEN1.

Multiple voters reported "significant number of voters being redirected," voting machines breaking, and a lack of clear signage for curbside voters. Due to the lack of signage, one voter who had difficulty standing in line only learned about the curbside option through a concerned voter. 838 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 23.0% to 22.4%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 838
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 859
Missing votes: -21

Guilford County, Precinct G46.

Poll Monitor reported that a construction crew from City of Greensboro was digging near the entrance to the parking lot for the precinct which was inconvenient. Despite calls to the City Manager and Board of Elections, the construction continued; the crew occasionally asked voters to move their vehicles. 706 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 17.5% to 21.7%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 706
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 569
Missing votes: 0

Guilford County, Precinct G50.

Poll Monitors reported lines of voters waiting for an hour or more, which continued into the closing hour. "A few voters said the site was unorganized and the workers were rude." On the Exit Survey, 74% of the respondents said they were not asked the required ID question, a poor rate of compliance that seemed widespread: in the 6 Guilford County precincts where Monitors collected more than 80 Exit Surveys per precinct, only 30% of

respondents said they were asked the ID question. 699 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 17.2% in 2010 to 20.8% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 699
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 579
Missing votes: 0

Guilford County, Precinct G53.

Poll Monitors reported, "A large number of people came to the wrong polling place and were redirected. Most said they had moved and didn't know their voting place." There's a question about whether the Chief Judge and others understood the "unreported move" provision that allowed in-county movers to cast a provisional ballot that counted. Significantly, election officials in Guilford County, the third most populous in the state, gave only 10 "unreported move" voters provisional ballots. By con-

trast, Forsyth County officials handed out 85 provisional ballots to "unreported move" voters. 696 voted in G53 in 2014. Turnout increased from 22.0% to 22.9%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 696
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 667
Missing votes: 0

Guilford County, Precinct G68.

Poll Monitor reported around 6 PM that a lot of NC A&T students were being turned away from the polls and refused provisional ballots when they requested them. At one point, a precinct official told the Poll Monitor that the polling place had run out of provisional ballots. Precinct official was unpleasant at first, but later apologized to Monitor. 413 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 14.3% in 2010 to 12.5% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 413
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 473
Missing votes: -60

Guilford County, Precinct G69.

Poll Monitor and several voters reported that when the precinct opened it had the poll book for a different precinct, G70. As a result, some voters left. According to some voters, even when the poll book error was corrected, there was still only one computer to check voters in and the poll worker had trouble finding voters' names. Poll Monitor also reported a lack of curbside voting, and "poll workers are making handicapped voters park and come into the polls to vote." 638 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 19.9% to 17.8%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 638
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 713
Missing votes: -75

Halifax County, Precinct SN, Scotland Neck.

Poll Monitor reported long waiting time for curbside voters. She told precinct judge about a 100-year-old woman who said she had to leave because she could not wait any longer. 1,017 voted in 2014 compared to 1,096 at Precincts SN1 and SN2 in 2010, which were combined into Precinct SN. Turnout fell from 39.2% in 2010 for SN1 & SN2 to 37.3% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,017
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,069
Missing votes: -52

Halifax County, Precinct Weldon 3.

Poll Monitor reported that the precinct ran out of Authorization to Vote forms and had to retrieve more forms from another precinct. In the interim, voters were not able to cast a ballot. 558 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 32.6% to 25.4%

2014 Election Day Votes: 558
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 715
Missing votes: -157

Johnston County, Precinct PR04, Bentonville.

Voters reported the poll did not open on time in the morning. About 70 people left without voting because the polling place opened about one hour and half late. The State Board of Elections decided not to extend hours. 478 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 45.3% in 2010 to 39.9% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 478
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 543
Missing votes: -65

Johnston County, Precinct PR35, Banner at American Legion Building, Benson.

Poll Monitor reported that the curbside voting was arranged so there was room for only one vehicle at a time and then when a vehicle was parked outside the polling place, it would block one lane of traffic coming. 1,165 voted in 2014, compared to 1,793 in the three 2010 precincts that were merged to create PR35 (West, South, and North Banner). Turnout dropped from 44.8% to 27.5%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,165
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,899
Missing votes: -734

Johnston County, Precinct PR34, South Clayton; and Precinct PR11B, West Clayton-2.

Voter living in Precinct PR34 went to Church at Clayton Crossing, where she had voted on Election Day before. She looked the location up on the website before going with three other voters; the SBOE website for her address in PR34 showed a picture of the Church at Clayton Crossing. They waited in line about an hour because only one precinct official was checking in people, then they learned the polling place for PR34 had moved to Mount Calvary Baptist Church. (The Clayton Crossing church had become the poll for PR11B.) The voter said officials were "unprepared, it was a fiasco." She watched over 100 voters leave without voting and believes many did not vote. (News articles confirm the polling site change for PR34, multiple complaints called in, and incorrect polling place pictured on website. The NC Democratic Party asked the State Board of Elections to extend the closing time based on the problems but the request

was denied.) Two PR34 voters (both African Americans) cast provisional ballots at PR11B, but they did not count. 1,225 voted in PR34 in 2014. Turnout dropped from 23.0% to 20.1%. 1,013 voted in PR11B in 2014. Turnout dropped from 26.0% to 23.3%.

2014 Election Day Votes:
34: 1,225
11B: 1,013
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout:
34: 1,401
11B: 1,134
Missing votes:
34: -176
11B: -121

Lee County, Precinct A1, Southern Lee High School.

Poll Monitor said computers were not working when the polls opened in the morning. 733 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 18.4% in 2010 to 16.5% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 733
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 817
Missing votes: -84

Lee County, Precinct A2, J. Glenn Edwards Elementary School.

Voter reported "really unorganized polling location, long lines, and inefficient poll workers." 763 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 17.4% to 15.6%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 763
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 853
Missing votes: -90

Lincoln County, Precinct LS12, Lincolnton/South.

Poll Monitor reported “an unusually large percentage of voters that came to this polling location . . . were not registered to vote here: roughly 30% of more. And 75% of those were African American or Latino. They were registered at a different polling place in Lincoln County and were told where to go to vote.” 401 voted in 2014. Turnout fell from 27.0% to 23.9%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 401
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 454
Missing votes: -53

Lincoln County, Precinct OR21, Ore Bank.

Concerns expressed about signage and lighting: A voter said she drove to the voting location, but “the lights were off and [it] looked like no one was there.” She “drove around the whole area and didn’t find anything” and saw “other cars were leaving too.” The voter left and her record confirms she did not vote. 525 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 37.1% to 25.6%

2014 Election Day Votes: 525
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 761
Missing votes: -236

Mecklenburg County, Precinct 016.

Poll Monitor reported that “about 6:00 PM, long lines began to form.” Earlier in day, there were occasional lines but they were moving fairly quickly. 767 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 27.3% in 2010 to 22.5% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 767
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 929
Missing votes: -162

Mecklenburg County, Precinct 025.

Poll Monitor reported, “Several people at start of day were at wrong precinct.” Voters said officials were helpful but more machines were needed inside (DRE voting machines). African Americans are over 90% of the registered voters in this precinct. 556 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 25.2% to 17.8%. Election Day participation fell in 9 of the county’s 14 precincts where African Americans are 80% or more of the registered voters. 7,607 voted in these 14 precincts in 2014; 8,021 on Election Day in 2010. Turnout in the 14 fell from 21.2% to 17.8%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 556
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 784
Missing votes: -228

Mecklenburg County, Precinct 056.

Poll Monitor reported, “No apparent arrangements to accommodate elderly or handicap voters. Sign designating area in which to park for those unable to leave car was totally inadequate.” The Poll Monitor reported, “We have seen at least 8 people with canes or walkers walking from the distant parking lot to vote. One voter used a cane and was unsteady on her feet. She had to park in the lot and walk approximately 100 yards to vote. Upon leaving, she fell off the curb. I helped her up.” 388 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.6% in 2010 to 19.5% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 388
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 451
Missing votes: -63

Mecklenburg County, Precincts 003, 060, and 104.

Poll Monitor who floated between these precincts reported periodic long lines, as well as poor logistics and long waits for curbside voters. "If they are going to stick with 'no straight ticket voting,' they need a lot more machines and a lot more staff to get folk in and out, and they need larger facilities that can accommodate the vehicles and the large number of voters," she said. 1,863 voted in 2014 in the three precincts. Combined turnout fell for them from 26.6% in 2010 to 21.4% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,863
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 2,324
Missing votes: -461

Mecklenburg County, Precincts 031 and 135.

Poll Monitors during heavy periods collected Exit Surveys from a significant sample of the day's voters at Precinct 135 – and 87% said they were not asked the required question about possessing a photo ID. By contrast, in the much smaller Precinct 031, 76% of the Exit Survey respondents said they were asked the question. 457 voted in Precinct 031 in 2014. Turnout dropped from 16.5% to 14.7%. In Precinct 135, 1,446 voted. Turnout dropped from 21.2% to 19.6%.

2014 Election Day Votes:
031: 457
135: 1,446
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout:
031: 511
135: 1,559
Missing votes:
031: -54
135: -113

Mecklenburg County, Precinct 145.

At 7 PM, a voter reported "long lines" that were "discouraging people from voting." This is one of the biggest precincts in the state with over 9,000 registered voters. 2,649 voted on Election Day, 2014, the second highest number for any precinct (Wake's Precinct 20-13 was number 1). Turnout dropped from 29.0% in 2010 to 28.0% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 2,649
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 2,752
Missing votes: -103

Mecklenburg County, Precinct 146.

Poll Monitor reported several of the DRE voting machines became broken in the afternoon and over 30 people left without voting before they were fixed. There were problems with occasional long lines and difficulty with curbside voters getting service. 888 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 21.5% in 2010 to 18.3% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 888
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,045
Missing votes: -157

Mecklenburg County, Precinct 210.

Poll Monitor reported long lines during the last shift and problems with inadequate parking. More than 75% of the registered voters in the precinct are black voters. One African-American man who voted in 2008 and 2012 made a point of filling out an Incident Report to say he could not wait. Another voter, an African-American woman, said she could not vote because she arrived "a minute late" because she could not find a parking place. 1,319 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 25.3% to 20.3%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,319
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,647
Missing votes: -328

Nash County, Precinct 0015, Nashville.

Poll Monitor observed longer lines after 5:45 PM. The Exit Surveys collected in Nash County indicated more than 75% of voters were asked the required question about possessing a photo ID, a much better compliance rate than most other counties. 1,500 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.6% to 22.1%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,500
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,533
Missing votes: -33

Nash County, Precincts 0011, 0033, 0034 and 0040A.

Poll Monitors and voters reported moderate lines in some precincts where African Americans were a significant share of the registered voters and also a need for more polling booths. In Precinct 0011 in Spring Hope, 743 voted in 2014, down from 1,017 in 2010. In Precinct 0033 in Rocky Mount, 467 voted in 2014, down from 624 in 2010. In Precinct 0034 in Rocky Mount, 779 voted in 2014, down from 889 in 2010. In Precinct 0040A in Rocky

Mount, 1,138 voted in 2014, down from 1,273 in 2010. The overall turnout in the 4 precincts dropped from 26.9% in 2010 to 22.3% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 3,127
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 3,774
Missing votes: -647

New Hanover County, Precinct W15, Mosley Performance Learning Center.

In contrast to Precinct W25, 92% of the 173 voters who completed an Exit Survey said they were asked if they possessed one of the IDs needed to vote in 2016. Voters also gave the poll officials high marks for being “polite and informative” and said curbside voting was convenient. However, there were still issues with out-of-precinct voters and turnout dropped from 2010. 840 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 16.5% to 14.1%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 840
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 983
Missing votes: -143

New Hanover County, Precinct W24, UNC-Wilmington.

Dozens of UNC-W students thought they were registered but were refused regular ballots. The county board of elections would not accept voter registrations with dorm addresses, and it rejected a policy directive from the State Board of Elections to help students, for example by using a university handout to convert the dorm address to a street address. Instead, students were given the option to vote a provisional ballot – but the ballot apparently didn't count unless the original registration included a street

address. In 2010, officials at campus-based Precinct W24 handed out only 8 provisional ballots for voters with “no record of registration,” but that number jumped to 121 in the 2014 general election, with only 25 counted at least in part. 539 voted in 2014 for a dismal 11.1% turnout, but that was better than the 10.7% turnout achieved in 2010.

2014 Election Day Votes: 539
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 521
Missing votes: 0

New Hanover County, Precinct W25, Cape Fear Community College.

Poll Monitors collecting Exit Surveys found that 41% of the voters said they were not asked if they possessed one of the IDs that would be required to vote at the polls in 2016. This is a higher rate of non-compliance than Monitors found at the two other New Hanover precincts they surveyed (W15 and W27). New Hanover is another relatively large county where only a small number of provisional ballots were provided to voters with “unreported moves” – a total of 20 were cast in just 9 of the county's 38 precincts. By contrast, the county

handed out 246 provisional ballots to “unreported moves” in 2010, and all but 3 counted at least in part. We also found that fewer Election Day votes were cast in 2014 than in 2010 in all 8 of the county's 43 precincts where African Americans are more than 25 percent of the registered voters. 702 voted in Precinct W25 in 2014. Turnout dropped from 19.9% to 16.5%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 702
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 843
Missing votes: -141

Orange County, Precincts OW and LC in Carrboro.

Poll Monitors reported that students particularly were not aware they needed to change their registration when they moved and that they had to vote in their own precinct on Election Day. As a consequence, many were turned away. 1,242 voted in these two precincts in 2014. Combined turnout dropped from 25.0% in 2010 to 20.9% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,242
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,481
Missing votes: -239

Orange County, Precinct PA in Chapel Hill.

Poll Monitors reported complaints about the loss of straight-ticket voting and extra time needed to vote. Unlike the other Orange precincts where Exit Surveys were collected, this PA/Patterson Precinct had a very poor compliance rate for asking voters about personally possessing a photo ID – 65% of respondents said they were not asked the question. 1,038 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 26.1% in 2010 to 22.6% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,038
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,200
Missing votes: -162

Pitt County, Precinct 1507, Greenville 7.

Poll Monitor reported, “Even with low turnout, dozens of voters were sent to other precincts to vote. It was hard to determine how many actually did that or just gave up and didn’t vote.” 635 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 16.3% to 13.2%

2014 Election Day Votes: 635
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 780
Missing votes: -145

Pitt County, Precinct 1504A, Greenville 4A.

Poll Monitor gave a similar report of low turnout and voters having to travel to a second precinct. 469 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 18.7% to 14.0%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 469
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 625
Missing votes: -156

Robeson County, Precinct 19, Maxton.

Poll Monitor reported that voting machines were not working in the morning and it took a couple visits to get them repaired. Doors got locked a few times and voters had to knock to get in. Officials ran out of ballots and had to essentially close the poll for about 45 minutes. This is the polling site that was given extended hours. The Poll Monitor also reported the curbside voting area was not protected by buffer zone, so partisan advocates could ap-

proach them, and the curbside voters didn't have a way to notify poll officials that they were waiting. 912 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 27.4% to 28.6%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 912
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 873
Missing votes: 0

Robeson County, Precinct 39, Union Elementary School.

Poll Monitors reported complaints about the loss of straight-ticket voting. 60% of the voters in Precincts 39 and 19 who responded to the Exit Survey said they were not asked the required question about possessing a photo ID. 418 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 29.2% to 26.6%

2014 Election Day Votes: 418
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 459
Missing votes: -41

Rowan County, Precinct 38, Park Avenue Community Center.

Poll Monitor reported that the parking lot and area around the building had poor lighting, which they said should be addressed given the darkness in the early morning and evening. 645 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.9% in 2010 to 22.4% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 645
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 660
Missing votes: -15

Wake County, Precinct 01-22, Southeast Raleigh Magnet High School.

Voters said poll officials were pleasant but they were not inclined to provide provisional ballots to voters with issues, which seemed to be a pattern across the state. Only 6 provisional ballots were provided in Precinct 01-22, half the number used in 2010. Two out of three of the voters responding to the Exit Survey in Precinct 01-22 said they were asked if they personally had a photo ID, a better compliance rate than the other Wake County precincts surveyed; the worst was Precinct 10-04 where 70% of

the respondents said they were not asked the required question. In Precinct 01-22, 1,099 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 28.8% to 26.7%

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,099
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,185
Missing votes: -86

Wake County, Precinct 01-26, Chavis Community Center.

Poll Monitors reported a great deal of confusion among voters arriving at this site. Throughout the day, they counted more than 300 voters who said they were told they were in the wrong precinct. In the past two presidential elections, Chavis was an early voting location – which may explain why so many voters were convinced they should

be able to vote there for this election. 579 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 14.7% in 2010 to 13.6% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 579
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 626
Missing votes: -47

Wake County, Precinct 06-05, Holly Ridge Middle School.

Poll Monitor reported voters waiting in long lines at different times of the day and also problems with traffic control because cars with voters were in the same line with cars letting off students for school. The Monitor also spent time helping curbside voters who needed attention from poll officials. 1,375 voted in 2014. Turnout increased from 37.6% in 2010 to 42.0% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,375
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,229
Missing votes: 0

Wake County, Precinct 17-05, Trinity Presbyterian Church.

Caller reported problems with the access for curbside voting; a daughter and elderly mom in wheelchair were challenged by the set up. 1,436 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 35.7% to 33.3%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,436
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,539
Missing votes: -103

Wake County, Precinct 18-01, Temple of Pentecost.

Poll Monitor reported lines lasting 45 minutes and longer in the last few hours of the day. Monitor also reported about two dozen voters during these final hours were sent to other polling places and some would not have time to vote as a consequence. The process moved well earlier in the day, but the help table had longer lines at various times and some people could not wait. 1,331

voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 25.0% in 2010 to 22.9% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,331
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,456
Missing votes: -125

Watauga County, Precinct 05, Boone 2, Legends Night Club.

Poll Monitor reported that many voters, primarily college students, were being turned away for being out of precinct. Transportation to other polling sites was limited late in the day. Monitor noted that the number of voters turned away seemed to be increasing as the night went on. Earlier in the day, another Poll Monitor at the same location reported that the person directing traffic outside of the polling place was sharing her political views with voters. 248 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 14.9% to 12.3%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 248
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 301
Missing votes: -53

Watauga County, Precinct 12, Boone 3, Agricultural Conference Center.

Poll Monitor who was there most of day reported that by 2 PM over 30 voters had been turned away from this polling place; many were students. Some received transfers to a new precinct. 177 voted in 2014. Turnout fell from an already embarrassingly low of 5.8% in 2010 to 3.8% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 177
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 274
Missing votes: -97

Wilson County, Precinct PRTA, Taylors, New Hope School.

Poll Monitor reported there was insufficient signage indicating where the polling place was and there were long lines all day, often extending for over an hour. The Monitor was told there were only 3 precinct officials inside with 2 computers and they were processing voters slowly. On a positive note, 80% of Exit Survey respondents in the precinct said they were asked the required question about possessing a photo ID. 1,473 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 26.7% in 2010 to 24.3% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,473
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,622
Missing votes: -149

Wilson County, Precinct PRT0, Elm City Elementary School.

Poll Monitor reported that curbside voters had long waits in the morning – an hour for some – but that situation improved later in the day. Long lines frustrated some morning voters going into the polls and some left; the monitor counted seven people who “left without voting after standing in the line for too long.” 1,101 voted in 2014. Turnout edged up from 28.1% to 28.2%.

2014 Election Day Votes: 1,101
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 1,100
Missing votes: 0

Yancey County, Precinct 01 BUR, Burnsville.

Poll Monitor collected Exit Surveys during the first part of the day; only 39% of the respondents said they were asked if they personally possessed a photo ID suitable for voting in-person in 2016. 741 voted in 2014. Turnout dropped from 22.6% in 2010 to 21.0% in 2014.

2014 Election Day Votes: 741
Expected Votes if had 2010 Turnout: 797
Missing votes: -56

Appendix II: More Silenced Voters

In addition to the voters profiled on pages 3 to 6, here are 15 more who illustrate the diversity of citizens silenced in 2014 by changes to NC's election law. They could have voted if two safety features in the old law still existed: (1)

same-day registration and voting during early voting or (2) out-of-precinct voting on Election Day. We give only the first name here, but can provide reporters with contact information for these and other voters.

Buncombe County: Kevin, White, Male, Democrat, Age 38. In 2012, he was deployed overseas by the National Guard and finally returned to his same address in 2014. He voted in the county in 2006, 2008 and 2010, and by mail in 2012. But when he went to vote early in 2014, the election officials said his registration had been removed. He used a provisional ballot, but it did not count. If same-day registration still existed, he could have voted.

boro. He had to use a provisional ballot because the precinct officials couldn't tell him where to vote; they said his address was a commercial building, not a residence. He's been registered since he was 18 and was very upset by the whole experience.

Cabarrus County: Ernesto, Latino, Male, Unaffiliated, Age 40. He moved from Charlotte and changed his driver's license address online. He took it for granted that it would update his voter registration address, too. When he went to vote early, he was surprised to learn that he was not on the registration rolls. He cast a provisional ballot, but it did not count.

Harnett County: Todd, White, Male, Republican, Age 19. He was surprised when the poll official said his name was not on the registration rolls. He remembers pre-registering as a 17 year old at the DMV in September 2012. For whatever reason, his information did not reach the board of elections, and his provisional ballot did not count.

Craven County: Shenika, Black, Female, Democrat, Age 24. She registered here in 2011, but then registered in Swain County where she was briefly in Job Corps. "It was the 2012 voting season and I wanted to vote." When she returned to Craven County, she could not change her registration back during early voting and her provisional ballot was rejected.

Hertford County: Margaret, Black, Female, Democrat, Age 60. When she went to "Motor Vehicles" to get her license updated, she said she wanted to register to vote. But when she went to vote early, the poll worker said her "paperwork wasn't there." They said they "have had several complaints" with DMV. When told her provisional ballot didn't count, she said, "I'm shocked, I'm so disappointed."

Durham County: Micaela, Latina, Female, Democrat, Age 41. She went to one polling place, waited in line, and was told to go to another location. She went there, waited, and they also could not find her name on their rolls (it's a double Latina surname). She wound up using a provisional rather than go to a third location. She said, "It was okay in the end, I voted." But on learning that her ballot didn't count, she said, "Wow, you mean I did all that for nothing?"

Nash County: Daniel, White, Male, Unaffiliated, Age 23. He registered after turning 18 and kept the same address as his permanent address while attending college in Tennessee for two years. He did not register or vote in Tennessee. When he returned home to vote, he was told he was not on the registration rolls. He used a provisional ballot, but it did not count. He is now a law enforcement officer in NC.

Forsyth County: James, Black, Male, Democrat, Age 28. He "really wanted to vote and it was the last day," so he got a ride with a friend to a poll she knew about. He works long hours as a construction worker, but got a chance to get off on Nov. 4. However, because out-of-precinct voting is no longer allowed, his provisional ballot was rejected.

New Hanover County: Sharon, White, Female, Unaffiliated, Age 65. She has lived in the same place since 1985 and registered at that address. When she married in 2005, she changed her name on her driver's license. She is an infrequent voter but decided to use early voting in 2014. The poll officials could not find her name, so she cast a provisional ballot, but it was rejected.

Guilford County: Stephen, White, Male, Unaffiliated, Age 41. He lives in his art studio's space in downtown Greens-

Pender County: Eric, White, Male, Republican, Age 28. He moved "just 5 minutes down the road" from Onslow County where he was registered to vote. He used DMV's online system to update his driver's license and assumed his voter registration would be updated, too. "It should be easy to have these integrated together," he said. "Why

should this be so hard?" He takes pride in having voted steadily since he turned 18 and is upset that his vote didn't count in 2014.

Perquimans County: Mary, Black, Female, Democrat, Age 50. She moved from Wisconsin to where she grew up as a child. She told the DMV she wanted to register to vote, but she worried that everything was going too fast because it was the end of the day. The registration didn't get to the county board of elections, so her provisional ballot did not count.

Pitt County: Luke, White, Male, Republican, Age 25. He moved from Ohio and registered to vote at the DMV when he got his license in May 2014. At the early voting site, he was surprised to learn that "the paperwork wasn't filed" for him and everything became "quite a hassle." The Pitt County Board of Elections found many mistakes at DMV but their research could not verify that he registered at

DMV so his ballot did not count.

Vance County: Sylena, Black, Female, Democrat, Age 28. She registered and voted in Wake County in 2008 and 2012 while attending NC State University. She moved back home to Vance County in 2013 and thought she changed her registration, but the poll worker at the early voting center could not find her name; her provisional ballot did not count.

Wilson County: Roberta, Black, Female, Democrat, Age 40. On Election Day, she went to the New Hope Elementary School where she had voted before (it was an early voting site in 2012). The precinct official explained that she needed to go to another polling place, but since it was late in the day, the official said she could vote with a provisional ballot. The official said she would get it to "the right place so it would count." But it didn't.

Notes

* Isela Gutierrez is associate research director and Bob Hall is executive director at Democracy North Carolina

¹ Gutierrez, I., & Hall, B. (2014). *Preliminary Report: Impact of Election Law Changes on Voter Turnout in North Carolina, 2014*. Democracy North Carolina. Retrieved from <http://www.democracy-nc.org/downloads/RejectedVoters2014.pdf>

² Alvarez, R. M., Ansolabehere, S., & Wilson, C. H. (2002). *Election Day Voter Registration in the United States: How One-Step Voting Can Change the Composition of the American Electorate*. Retrieved from http://vote.caltech.edu/sites/default/files/vtp_wp5.pdf. Burden, B. C., & Stewart III, C. (2014). *The Measure of American Elections*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Burden, B. C., Canon, D. T., Mayer, K. R., & Moynihan, D. P. (2014, January). Election Laws, Mobilization, and Turnout: The Unanticipated Consequences of Election Reform. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(1), 95-109. doi:10.1111/ajps.12063. CIRCLE (The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement). (2013). *All Together Now: Collaboration and Innovation for Youth Engagement*. Medford, MA: CIRCLE. Kawashima-Ginsberg, K., Nover, A., & Kirby, E. H. (2009). *State Election Law Reform and Youth Voter Turnout*. CIRCLE (The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning & Engagement). Retrieved from http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/FactSheets/State_law_and_youth_turnout_Final.pdf. Leighley, J. E., & Nagler, J. (2011). Absentee Ballot Regimes: Easing Costs or Adding a Step? *Bush v. Gore, 10 Years Later: Election Administration in the United States*. Laguna Beach, CA. Retrieved from http://vote.caltech.edu/sites/default/files/nagler_post_bushvgore3_pdf_4db85368bc.pdf. Leighley, J., & Nagler, J. (2013). *Who Votes Now: Demographics, Issues, Inequality, and Turnout in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Rigby, E., & Springer, M. (2011, June). Does Electoral Reform Increase (or Decrease) Political Equality? *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(2), 420-434. doi:10.1177/1065912909358582

³ United States Election Assistance Commission. (n.d.). *Provisional Voting: Challenges and Solutions*. Retrieved May 10, 2015, from United States Election Assistance Commission: http://www.eac.gov/research/provisional_voting_challenges_and_solutions.aspx

⁴ National Conference of State Legislators. *Online Voter Registration*. Retrieved May 15, 2015, from National Conference of State Legislators: <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/electronic-or-online-voter-registration.aspx>