



Unequal Access

A County-by-County Analysis of Election Administration
in Swing States in the 2012 Election

By Anna Chu, Joshua Field, and Charles Posner January 2014

Center for American Progress Action Fund



Unequal Access

A County-by-County Analysis of Election
Administration in Swing States in the 2012 Election

By Anna Chu, Joshua Field, and Charles Posner January 2014

Contents

1 Introduction and summary

3 The rankings

5 Factors examined

- 5 Voter turnout
- 6 Voter registration rate
- 7 Voter list maintenance
- 7 Provisional ballots
- 8 Absentee ballots rejected

10 State rankings

- 11 Arizona
- 13 Colorado
- 15 Florida
- 17 Georgia
- 19 Indiana
- 21 Iowa
- 23 Michigan
- 25 Minnesota
- 27 Missouri
- 29 Nevada
- 31 New Hampshire
- 33 New Mexico
- 35 North Carolina
- 37 Ohio
- 39 Pennsylvania
- 41 Virginia
- 43 Wisconsin

Contents

45 Conclusion

47 About the authors and Acknowledgements

48 Methodology

48 Sources

49 Selecting the factors

50 Determining which states and counties to include in our analysis

51 Ranking the counties

53 Endnotes

58 Appendix A

Introduction and summary

Voting is one of the critical ways for citizens to voice their opinions and desires to leaders and express their will for the direction of the country. But while voting is the crucial bedrock of a healthy democracy, within the states where elections are the most hotly contested, citizens' access to voting varies considerably.

As we noted in our earlier report, "Florida's Worst Election Offenders,"¹ an in-depth, county-by-county analysis of the Florida election administration during the 2012 general election, the voting experience and voting process can vary greatly county by county. State voting laws as well as county-based election administration differ across the nation. While some states implement laws that make it easier for citizens to cast their vote, other states actually set up barriers that make it more difficult to vote. A handful of states such as Minnesota enhance access to the ballot by allowing for same-day voter registration,² while other states such as North Carolina are enacting restrictive measures that make it more difficult for a citizen to exercise his or her franchise.³

With election administration delegated to officials and boards in more than 3,000 counties and localities in the United States, the ease with which one exercises his or her right to vote can depend on where he or she lives. As seen in our Florida report, intrastate counties can differ widely on election administration performance factors that affect a voter's ability to cast his or her ballot, or are indicative of the health of a county's voting process.

Take, for example, Florida's Duval County, which during the 2012 election had provisional ballots cast at a rate four times higher than the state average.⁴ This is particularly alarming given that Duval County also rejected more than 34 percent of the provisional ballots cast in the county during the 2012 election.⁵ Similarly, voters in Indiana's Tippecanoe County cast provisional ballots at a rate more than seven and a half times the state average.⁶ While provisional ballots are legally pre-

scribed and serve as a fail-safe mechanism that allow voters to cast a ballot when questions regarding his or her eligibility to vote arise, both examples raise questions as to why these counties issued provisional ballots at rates so much higher than their state's average.

This pattern plays out in every state that we analyzed; some counties stand out for having poor election performance, ranking poorly among a multitude of factors reflecting a voters' ability to participate in the democratic process. Some counties stand out for having low voter participation rates while others stand out for performing exceptionally poorly on voter administration issues. For instance, while there are valid—and often legally binding—reasons for a state to remove names from their voter rolls, reject absentee ballots, and issue and reject provisional ballots, when a county takes these restrictive actions at a rate significantly higher than the other counties in that state, we should all ask, “Why?”

This report evaluates the election performance of counties in the 17 states that had the smallest margin of victory between the two presidential candidates in 2012. This analysis allows us to better understand how well the election process is working within a state, and will hopefully encourage state and local officials to consider how they can improve the voting experience for their citizens.

The rankings

This report examines the electoral process and voters' ability to participate in the democratic process in the states where the presidential election was most hotly contested during the 2012 election cycle. Specifically, we look at the 17 states where the margin of victory during the 2012 presidential election was 10 points or less. These states were:

Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

We analyzed six factors that reflect voters' experiences in the voting system and their ability to participate in the democratic process. We compared the performance of the most populous counties in each of the 17 states by calculating the mean level of performance within each state for each of the 6 factors below, and determined how far from that state-based mean each county scored.⁷ The result is an objective ranking of county-based election administration performance within each state.

The factors examined in this report are:⁸

- Voter turnout
- Overall voter registration rate
- Rate of registered voters removed from voting rolls
- Provisional ballots cast
- Provisional ballots rejected
- Absentee ballots rejected

We used our analysis of these factors to create a county-by-county ranking of election administration performance in each of the 17 states. In addition to the overall performance rankings, we identified the worst-performing counties in each state on each factor and explored why certain counties may have performed better than others. The result is an in-depth analysis of the voting problems that plague swing-state counties, making it harder for citizens to exercise their right to participate in our democracy.

Counties with smaller populations have smaller sample sizes that are more likely to be abnormally influenced by statistically unrelated anomalies. The method by which the rankings were calculated—standard deviations from the mean—would have improperly magnified the significance of these data outliers. In order to have a more consistent data set, we made a methodological decision to exclude counties that had citizen voting-age populations of less than one quarter of the state’s mean citizen voting-age population. Excluding the smallest counties best achieved our goal of providing an accurate picture of voting administration successes and failures in each state.

Factors examined

Voter turnout

As we stated earlier, voter turnout is a critical measure of the health of our democracy and the ability and desire of citizens to participate in the democratic process.⁹ Unfortunately, the United States has a history of low voter turnout. Only about 59 percent of the citizen voting-age population voted in 2012,¹⁰ one of the lowest rates among democracies around the world.¹¹ Part of this may be explained by the cumbersome two-step process to voting in many states—voters must first register to vote before casting a ballot. This is not a common practice in other major democracies. To name a few, Canada, France, and Germany all automatically generate voter lists from larger population databases or other government agencies and all have higher voter turnout rates than the United States.¹²

In the 17 states we examined, the overall voter turnout rate in each state varied considerably. While Minnesota, Wisconsin, Colorado, New Hampshire, and Iowa made up the top five states with the highest voter turnout based on the citizen voting-age population, each above 68 percent, Arizona and New Mexico were at the bottom in terms of voter turnout, at 51.9 percent and 53.2 percent, respectively.¹³

The same wide range in voter turnout played out at the local level as well. Consider, for example, Onslow County in North Carolina and Dallas County in Iowa. In Onslow County, only 41 percent of its citizen voting-age population turned out at the polls, which was nearly 35 percent lower than the North Carolina state average. But nearly 88 percent of Dallas County's citizen voting-age population turned out—more than 26 percent better than the Iowa state average.¹⁴

The turnout rates vary by state or by county for a myriad of reasons. In part, the low voter turnout may be because of barriers to voting such as voter registration restrictions.¹⁵ Other contributing factors may include the number of voting loca-

tions and the ease in which voters can vote in a locality. The counties that stand out as low-performing outliers on voter turnout rates should be scrutinized to determine why fewer citizens in those localities turn out to vote when compared to the state average.

Voter registration rate

In the overwhelming majority of states, the first step to exercising one's right to vote is to register to vote. In fact, every state in the nation, with the exception of North Dakota, requires voter registration.¹⁶ As a rule, voter registration procedures are governed by both federal and state law.

The federal Help America Vote Act, or HAVA,¹⁷ imposes identification-related requirements for voter registration. A first-time voter who registers by mail must provide identification unless the voter can be matched with an existing state record based on his or her driver's license number or Social Security number.¹⁸ At a minimum, voters who have not voted previously in a federal election in the state must present a current and valid photo identification or a utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or government document that shows the voter's name and address.¹⁹

While federal statutes create standards and impose restrictions related to registration, states can go above and beyond the federal statutory requirements and make it easier for residents to register through policies such as online registration and same-day registration.²⁰ States can also take the opposite route and put restrictions on the ability to register, including placing burdensome requirements on third parties that register voters.²¹

Historically, states that make it easier for residents to vote by allowing for same-day registration often lead the nation in voter turnout.²² During the 2008 presidential election, for example, states with same-day registration led the nation in turnout by 7 percentage points.²³ In the 2012 election, of the top six states with the highest voter turnout, five states—New Hampshire, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Maine, and Iowa—had same-day registration.²⁴

On the county level, the worst-performing counties for voter registration—Columbia County in Florida, LaGrange County in Indiana, and Jackson and Pulaski counties in Missouri—had voter registration rates that were up to 43

percent below their state's average.²⁵ These counties come from states that did not offer same-day registration. Those counties that stand out as having smaller voter registration rates than their state average should be scrutinized to see why the citizens there have trouble completing this threshold step in the voting process.

Voter list maintenance

In order to vote, a citizen must be listed on a state's voter registration lists, which are also called voter rolls. Counties regularly conduct maintenance of the voting lists to remove duplicate names and people who have moved, died, or are otherwise ineligible.²⁶ Indeed, federal law requires counties to maintain their voter registration lists.²⁷ HAVA requires each state to establish an official, centralized, and computerized statewide voter registration list that is coordinated with other agency databases and maintain the databases by eliminating the duplicate names and the names of voters who are not registered.²⁸ Voter list maintenance, however, can sometimes be a confusing and frustrating process. A 2008 study by the Brennan Center for Justice notes that election officials at times have difficulty determining changes of address and verifying duplicative records in an accurate manner.²⁹

During the 2012 general election, New Hampshire on average had the highest overall rate of voters removed from their rolls, at 20.6 percent. That was more than 20 percent higher than the rate for the next closest state, Indiana, at 17 percent.³⁰

While removing voters from voter rolls is a legally mandated county action, when counties stand out as removing voters at rates so much higher than the state average, it raises questions about the local procedures employed when maintaining the voter rolls and the amount of discretion that local officials have to do.

Provisional ballots

Another measure of how well elections are administered in a county is the rate at which provisional ballots are cast and rejected. Provisional ballots, which were established after the 2000 presidential election when Congress passed HAVA, serve as a fail-safe mechanism to ensure that voters who show up at the polls can cast a provisional ballot if they claim to be eligible and registered to vote.³¹ For instance, a voter who arrives at the polls but discovers that his or her name is not found on the voter rolls can cast a provisional ballot.³² Election officials will count the provisional ballots once they verify that the voter is registered and eligible to vote.³³

The use of provisional ballots has had mixed results. Poll workers in some counties have failed to properly offer provisional ballots to voters while other counties have applied various methods for counting provisional ballots.³⁴

Among the states examined, Arizona had the highest mean rate of provisional ballots used across its counties, at 21 percent. This is nearly 8 percentage points higher than the state with the next highest mean—Colorado, at 12.1 percent—and raises questions as to why Arizona voters were being pushed to cast provisional ballots at a rate so much higher than other states. Meanwhile, Indiana and Missouri had the highest mean rate of provisional ballots rejected, at 82 percent and 80.5 percent, respectively. Not far behind was Nevada, with a 72.3 percent provisional ballot rejection rate.³⁵

On the local level, Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania; Tippecanoe County, Indiana; and Duval County, Florida stand out for having provisional ballots cast at a rate significantly higher than their state's average. As for rejecting provisional ballots at a rate much higher than their state averages, Logan County, Colorado; Hamilton County, Ohio; and Navajo County, Arizona all stand out.

Although provisional ballots can serve as an important safety net allowing voters to cast a ballot when they arrive at the polls, counties that stand out for having provisional ballots cast at a far higher rate than the state average warrant further scrutiny. A high rate of provisional ballots cast can be an indication of a deeper problem—anything from poor voter education to procedural errors. Some counties that performed poorly on this measure, such as Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania, and Hillsborough County, Florida, had significant election administration problems. In Philadelphia County, many polling locations lacked supplemental poll books with voters' registrations, resulting in many voters being forced to cast a provisional ballot when they should have been allowed to cast a regular ballot.³⁶ Meanwhile, in Hillsborough County, election protection personnel reported that poll workers asked voters to cast provisional ballots without determining their proper polling location.³⁷

Absentee ballots rejected

During the 2012 election, more than 27 million people voted by absentee ballot.³⁸ That is more than 17 percent of all the votes cast during the election, illustrating the importance of absentee ballots as a measure of how voters are able to participate in the democratic process.³⁹

In the states examined in this report, Minnesota had the highest average rate of absentee ballots rejected, at 2.8 percent, followed by New Hampshire, at 2.2 percent. In comparison, the national average of absentee ballots rejected is 1 percent.⁴⁰ As it concerns counties, DeKalb County, Missouri, rejected absentee ballots at a rate of almost seven times the state average, with Denver County, Colorado; Tippecanoe County, Indiana; and Midland County, Michigan, not far behind when it came to topping their state absentee ballot rejection rate list.

Citizens should question why some states and localities reject absentee ballots at multiple times the national and state-based rejection average.

State rankings

Arizona

The Arizona counties with the overall worst election performance were Yuma, Coconino, and Pinal. Maricopa County also merits a mention for performing poorly on the rate of provisional ballots cast and rate of absentee ballots rejected.

Yuma and Pinal counties both performed very poorly on the overall registration rate as well as voter turnout. Pinal had the worst registration rate in the state, while Yuma had the second-worst registration rate. On voter turnout, Yuma performed the poorest, followed by Pinal. Both counties had voter turnout up to 25 percent lower than the state average.

Meanwhile, Coconino County had the second-highest rate of provisional ballots cast in the state, the second-highest rate of provisional ballots rejected, and the second-highest rate of voters removed from the voting rolls.

Finally, Maricopa County stood out for having the highest rate of provisional ballots in the state. More than 37 percent of the ballots cast on Election Day 2012 in Maricopa County were provisional ballots—a rate that was 76 percent higher than the state average.

2012 Arizona voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: Yes⁴¹
- Same-day registration option: No⁴²
- Deadline: 29 days prior to the election⁴³

Voting administration: The elections department in each Arizona county is responsible for coordinating and administering elections.⁴⁴

Voter ID/residency requirements: In addition to HAVA standards, Arizona voters were required to show proper identification at the polls. This consisted of a photo ID or two forms of identification that bear the name and address of the elector.⁴⁵

Arizona: Best and worst counties

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Yuma	1	38.6% (1)	81.0% (2)	22.4% (4)	8.3% (9)	2.92% (1)	17.4% (3)
Coconino	2	54.5% (6)	88.2% (5)	30.8% (2)	23.3% (2)	0.67% (4)	17.8% (2)
Pinal	3	46.3% (2)	80.2% (1)	19.9% (5)	16.5% (4)	0.10% (9)	12.3% (6)
Navajo	4	51.7% (4)	92.1% (9)	11.9% (8)	34.5% (1)	0.82% (3)	16.7% (4)
Maricopa	5	57.2% (8)	90.1% (8)	37.1% (1)	18.6% (3)	0.89% (2)	8.7% (8)
Mohave	6	46.9% (3)	87.3% (3)	12.3% (7)	13.6% (7)	0.16% (8)	13.0% (5)
Pima	7	56.5% (7)	87.3% (4)	27.5% (3)	14.8% (5)	0.63% (5)	8.2% (9)
Yavapai	8	62.2% (9)	89.0% (6)	16.0% (6)	13.1% (8)	0.63% (6)	17.9% (1)
Cochise	9	53.5% (5)	89.4% (7)	11.2% (9)	13.7% (6)	0.18% (7)	9.5% (7)

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Colorado

Across the counties we examined in Colorado, Logan, Morgan, and Mesa counties had the worst three election performance results. Denver County, ranked fifth worst overall in Colorado, also stood out for having the highest rate of provisional ballots cast in the state as well as the highest rate of absentee ballots rejected—more than three times the state average.

Logan County was the worst in the state on four factors: voter registration, voter turnout, rate of provisional ballots rejected, and rate of voters removed from the voting rolls. In particular, Logan County rejected more than half—51.3 percent—of the provisional ballots cast. This is more than 2.5 times the state average of 19.4 percent.

Morgan County was also one of the worst performers on multiple factors. Morgan County had the third-worst voter registration rate, rate of provisional ballots cast, and rate of provisional ballots rejected. It was fourth worst on the rate of voters removed from the voter rolls and overall voter turnout.

Similarly, Mesa County was a poor performer. It had the second-highest rate of provisional ballots rejected in the state—more than double the state average. It also had the fifth-worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls.

Denver County also stood out for having the highest rate of provisional ballots cast and the highest rate of absentee ballots rejected. In Denver County, more than 20 percent of the votes cast on Election Day were provisional ballots—nearly double the state average rate. Denver also rejected absentee ballots at a rate three times greater than the state average.

2012 Colorado voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: Yes⁴⁶
- Same-day registration option: No (Election Day registration was enacted in 2013)⁴⁷
- Deadline: Voters who registered online with a valid Colorado driver's license or ID issued by the Colorado Department of Revenue were required to do so at least eight days before Election Day.⁴⁸ Those registering by mail, at a registration agency, at the DMV, or via a registration drive were required to register at least 22 days before Election Day.⁴⁹

Voting administration: Each county in Colorado has an elections division.⁵⁰ The elections divisions conduct elections according to state law.⁵¹

Voter ID/residency requirements: In addition to HAVA standards, all Colorado voters who voted in person were required to show identification, although a photo ID was not required.⁵²

Colorado: Best and worst counties

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Logan	1	54.4% (1)	72.6% (1)	2.2% (27)	51.3% (1)	0.26% (26)	4.2% (1)
Morgan	2	62.7% (4)	88.5% (3)	19.1% (3)	32.4% (3)	0.63% (15)	3.8% (4)
Mesa	3	68.6% (9)	100.1% (12)	10.0% (18)	41.1% (2)	0.60% (17)	3.8% (5)
Montrose	4	71.3% (12)	96.0% (7)	16.4% (6)	19.2% (8)	0.49% (21)	4.2% (2)
Denver	5	76.2% (19)	120.4% (26)	21.2% (1)	12.5% (23)	2.41% (1)	2.6% (20)
Arapahoe	6	77.7% (21)	103.9% (15)	19.5% (2)	19.2% (9)	0.76% (11)	4.1% (3)
Otero	7	60.9% (3)	91.5% (5)	10.6% (16)	21.8% (7)	0.57% (18)	3.3% (9)
Pueblo	8	67.1% (7)	99.3% (11)	14.5% (10)	16.4% (15)	0.97% (6)	2.9% (17)
Adams	9	66.2% (6)	96.1% (8)	15.5% (9)	17.3% (13)	0.88% (8)	2.5% (22)
Weld	10	70.9% (11)	98.3% (9)	16.2% (7)	18.0% (12)	0.53% (20)	3.2% (10)
Fremont	11	54.5% (2)	85.5% (2)	2.9% (26)	12.1% (24)	0.64% (14)	3.1% (13)
Delta	12	69.9% (10)	91.2% (4)	10.6% (17)	14.5% (20)	0.40% (23)	3.8% (6)
El Paso	13	67.7% (8)	98.7% (10)	15.6% (8)	13.2% (21)	0.93% (7)	2.6% (21)
Garfield	14	71.6% (13)	103.0% (14)	12.8% (12)	27.2% (6)	0.54% (19)	3.2% (11)
La Plata	15	74.3% (16)	104.9% (17)	11.9% (14)	14.7% (19)	1.02% (5)	3.5% (8)
Montezuma	16	65.3% (5)	101.5% (13)	3.1% (25)	28.0% (5)	0.30% (24)	3.5% (7)
Routt	17	75.0% (17)	105.8% (18)	9.7% (22)	15.8% (17)	0.78% (10)	3.0% (14)
Larimer	18	81.3% (23)	107.8% (20)	14.4% (11)	16.1% (16)	0.46% (22)	3.1% (12)
Teller	19	75.2% (18)	111.0% (21)	10.0% (19)	18.4% (11)	0.82% (9)	2.7% (19)
Jefferson	20	79.0% (22)	104.5% (16)	18.2% (4)	12.0% (25)	0.62% (16)	2.1% (23)
Eagle	21	72.9% (14)	106.9% (19)	5.3% (24)	14.9% (18)	1.44% (2)	1.8% (25)
Summit	22	77.1% (20)	127.0% (27)	9.8% (21)	31.4% (4)	1.36% (3)	1.7% (27)
Chaffee	23	73.5% (15)	94.8% (6)	10.0% (20)	1.5% (27)	0.20% (27)	3.0% (15)
Boulder	24	85.0% (24)	117.3% (25)	10.6% (15)	18.4% (10)	0.68% (13)	2.9% (16)
Douglas	25	90.0% (27)	114.2% (24)	16.8% (5)	13.0% (22)	0.30% (25)	2.7% (18)
Broomfield	26	86.5% (26)	112.1% (22)	12.2% (13)	5.7% (26)	1.06% (4)	1.8% (24)
Elbert	27	85.9% (25)	113.2% (23)	7.4% (23)	16.8% (14)	0.76% (12)	1.8% (26)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Florida

The county rankings in Florida are based on a more expansive list of factors that were examined in our report, “Florida’s Worst Election Offenders.” The factors examined in Florida were:

- Voter turnout
- Overall voter registration rate
- Voter registration rate for African Americans
- Voter registration rate for Hispanics
- Rate of voters purged compared to registered voters
- Waiting time
- Provisional ballots cast
- Provisional ballots rejected
- Absentee ballots rejected

Based on these factors, the three worst election performers in Florida were Columbia, Putnam, and Bay counties.

Columbia County in northern Florida was the worst-performing county overall and frequently ranked among the state’s worst counties on a variety of factors. Of the Florida counties examined, Columbia had the worst voter turnout of its citizen voting-age population. That corresponds to the fact that Columbia also had the lowest percentage of registered voters as a ratio of its voting-age population, the second-lowest percentage of eligible African American voter registration, and the third-lowest percentage of eligible Hispanic voter registration. It also had one of the highest percentages of absentee ballots rejected—nearly two times more than the state average.

Putnam County had the second-lowest percentage of overall voter registration, the third-lowest level of voter turnout, and was the third-most active county in removing voters from the voter rolls. Bay County also fared poorly on numerous factors, but it was the worst offender with regard to the percentage of absentee ballots it rejected, rejecting more than two times the state average of absentee ballots. Alachua County purged a greater percentage of its registered voters than any other county other than Hillsborough—more than two times the state average—and issued the third-highest percentage of provisional ballots in Florida.

2012 Florida voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No⁵³
- Same-day registration option: No⁵⁴
- Deadline: 29 days prior to the election⁵⁵

Voting administration: The Florida Department of State’s Division of Elections provides statewide coordination for voting administration and the direction of the state’s county-based supervisors of elections.⁵⁶

Voter ID/residency requirements: In addition to HAVA standards, Florida voters were required to show a photo ID prior to voting.⁵⁷

Florida: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of counties, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report. For data on all factors, including African American registration rate and Hispanic registration rate, please visit the interactive tables or see the Florida-specific report, “Florida’s Worst Election Offenders.”

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Average number of minutes after polls closed, 2012*	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Columbia	1	53.5% (1)	69.6% (1)	-	0.53% (36)	38.8% (17)	1.98% (4)	0.28% (25)
Putnam	2	57.6% (3)	79.2% (2)	-	1.07% (18)	31.6% (29)	1.43% (11)	0.54% (3)
Bay	3	64.3% (12)	89.3% (14)	-	1.57% (6)	39.1% (16)	2.19% (1)	0.44% (7)
Alachua	4	64.7% (14)	87.4% (8)	34 (17)	2.18% (3)	43.9% (13)	1.93% (5)	0.60% (2)
Duval	5	66.7% (21)	89.6% (16)	35 (15)	4.32% (1)	34.6% (25)	1.29% (13)	0.49% (5)
Hillsborough	6	65.9% (18)	89.7% (17)	72 (7)	2.47% (2)	41.6% (14)	0.93% (21)	0.66% (1)
Highlands	7	57.3% (2)	82.4% (3)	-	1.80% (5)	36.2% (22)	0.73% (25)	0.33% (18)
Volusia	8	61.1% (7)	86.2% (7)	75 (5)	0.59% (34)	38.7% (18)	1.44% (10)	0.35% (14)
Lee	9	60.6% (6)	87.9% (11)	115 (1)	1.07% (17)	38.2% (19)	1.02% (17)	0.19% (36)
Sumter	10	77.0% (39)	93.5% (31)	46 (10)	0.23% (39)	26.3% (32)	0.60% (28)	0.38% (10)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Average number of minutes after polls closed, 2012*	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Hernando	31	60.4% (5)	92.1% (27)	-	0.60% (32)	24.6% (34)	0.96% (19)	0.21% (32)
Citrus	32	64.1% (11)	84.8% (5)	0 (26)	0.95% (21)	6.3% (40)	0.24% (36)	0.27% (27)
Lake	33	68.1% (24)	90.1% (20)	20 (21)	0.43% (37)	39.8% (15)	1.12% (14)	0.27% (26)
Sarasota	34	69.8% (29)	92.9% (30)	-	1.21% (13)	35.2% (23)	0.75% (24)	0.19% (35)
Broward	35	68.6% (25)	102.6% (38)	25 (19)	0.87% (22)	61.4% (4)	1.30% (12)	0.36% (12)
Pasco	36	62.1% (8)	89.4% (15)	41 (11)	0.76% (25)	8.5% (39)	0.67% (27)	0.20% (34)
Flagler	37	71.0% (33)	97.2% (36)	-	1.04% (19)	28.2% (30)	0.60% (29)	0.35% (13)
Santa Rosa	38	69.7% (28)	105.4% (39)	-	0.74% (27)	33.0% (27)	0.29% (34)	0.21% (33)
Clay	39	72.1% (37)	98.4% (37)	13 (23)	1.17% (16)	22.7% (36)	0.37% (33)	0.32% (22)
St. Johns	40	83.6% (40)	110.1% (40)	0 (26)	0.85% (24)	37.5% (21)	1.52% (7)	0.16% (38)

*Among counties in which waiting-time data were not available, this factor was omitted from the overall rankings. See the methodology section for more details.

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details. For data on all factors, including African American registration rate and Hispanic registration rate, please visit the interactive tables or see the Florida-specific report, “Florida’s Worst Election Offenders.”

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, and Advancement Project. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Georgia

In Georgia,⁵⁸ the three counties with the worst election performance results were Dooly, Lowndes, and Telfair counties.

Dooly County performed poorly on several factors. Of the counties in Georgia that we analyzed, Dooly County had the second-worst voter registration rate in the state, the fourth-worst voter turnout, the fifth-worst rate of absentee ballots rejected, and the eighth-worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls. Meanwhile, Telfair County had the lowest registration rate in the state. Additionally, it also had the third-lowest voter turnout rate and rate of voters removed from the rolls.

Finally, Lowndes County had the dubious honor of having the highest rate of provisional ballots cast in the state—more than 10 times higher than the state average. The extremely high deviation from the state average on this factor was largely responsible for Lowndes County’s position as one of the worst performers in the state.

2012 Georgia voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No⁵⁹
- Same-day registration option: No⁶⁰
- Deadline: The fifth Monday preceding Election Day⁶¹

Voting administration: Georgia’s elections are governed by a state board of elections⁶² and locally by county election supervisors.⁶³

Voter ID/residency requirements: Georgia voters were required to show photo ID in order to vote.⁶⁴

Georgia: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Dooly	1	38.8% (4)	56.7% (2)	0.44% (10)	0.093% (5)	8.51% (8)
Lowndes	2	50.5% (40)	79.9% (41)	2.79% (1)	0.000% (33)	6.88% (37)
Telfair	3	38.2% (3)	55.3% (1)	0.07% (69)	0.060% (6)	9.24% (3)
Pickens	4	56.6% (69)	85.2% (60)	0.03% (92)	0.483% (1)	5.46% (81)
Franklin	5	46.7% (18)	72.1% (11)	0.04% (89)	0.174% (3)	8.01% (11)
Tattnall	6	37.4% (2)	60.3% (3)	0.21% (32)	0.029% (11)	7.49% (17)
Berrien	7	45.2% (12)	74.2% (16)	0.14% (44)	0.109% (4)	8.91% (5)
Brooks	8	55.1% (59)	83.7% (56)	2.33% (2)	0.000% (33)	6.54% (46)
Emanuel	9	50.0% (35)	80.2% (43)	0.45% (8)	0.029% (12)	10.08% (1)
Chattooga	10	40.6% (5)	69.4% (6)	0.58% (6)	0.000% (33)	6.96% (35)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Coweta	102	64.5% (95)	96.8% (98)	0.07% (75)	0.000% (33)	4.79% (100)
Gwinnett	103	66.0% (99)	102.9% (105)	0.37% (13)	0.004% (30)	4.69% (101)
Bryan	104	64.7% (96)	105.1% (106)	0.08% (65)	0.000% (33)	5.03% (94)
Henry	105	68.0% (102)	100.7% (101)	0.01% (102)	0.000% (33)	4.55% (105)
Lee	106	68.2% (103)	102.1% (103)	0.03% (95)	0.000% (33)	4.37% (106)
Columbia	107	69.8% (108)	105.7% (107)	0.05% (83)	0.000% (33)	4.93% (97)
Cherokee	108	69.0% (106)	99.4% (99)	0.07% (73)	0.000% (33)	3.99% (110)
Forsyth	109	76.8% (109)	107.1% (110)	0.12% (50)	0.010% (27)	4.23% (107)
Fayette	110	79.5% (110)	109.6% (111)	0.08% (67)	0.000% (33)	4.03% (109)
Oconee	111	79.7% (111)	106.9% (109)	0.01% (101)	0.000% (33)	3.50% (111)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, and the Office of the Georgia Secretary of State. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Indiana

Across the counties we examined in Indiana, the three worst election performers were Tippecanoe, LaGrange, and Jennings counties.

The election performance results were poor in Tippecanoe County across multiple factors. For instance, Tippecanoe County had the highest rate of provisional ballots cast in the state—seven times higher than the state average. Tippecanoe also had the second-highest rate of absentee ballots and the second-highest rate of voters removed from the voting lists. Additionally, Tippecanoe had the 5th-worst voter turnout rate and the 16th-worst voter registration rate. Tippecanoe County’s poor rankings across so many factors raises questions about the administration of the elections in the county as well as voters’ low level of participation in the democratic system.

LaGrange County also fared poorly on several factors. It had the worst registration and voter turnout rates in the state and rejected all provisional ballots cast in the county.

Finally, Jennings County performed very poorly on two factors. It had the 3rd-highest rate of absentee ballots rejected and the 13th-worst rate of provisional ballots cast.

2012 Indiana voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: Yes⁶⁵
- Same-day registration option: No⁶⁶
- Deadline: Indiana residents can register to vote online, by mail, or in person up to 29 days before Election Day.⁶⁷ In order to register online, residents must have a valid Indiana driver’s license or an Indiana state-issued ID card.

Voting administration: The Indiana Election Commission administers Indiana’s election laws.⁶⁸ County elections boards conduct all elections, prepare ballots, and distribute ballots to the precincts.⁶⁹

Voter ID/residency requirements: In addition to HAVA standards, all Indiana voters were required to present a photo ID in order to vote.⁷⁰

Indiana: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Tippecanoe	1	47.3% (5)	86.8% (16)	1.28% (1)	71.4% (45)	10.48% (2)	25.5% (2)
Lagrange	2	39.4% (1)	65.8% (1)	0.19% (25)	100.0% (1)	6.36% (5)	16.8% (39)
Jennings	3	51.5% (19)	88.9% (22)	0.37% (13)	80.0% (40)	9.03% (3)	17.1% (35)
Greene	4	53.5% (33)	83.2% (9)	0.00% (61)	-	2.97% (14)	25.6% (1)
Henry	5	51.0% (17)	80.6% (5)	0.01% (60)	100.0% (1)	4.18% (7)	21.1% (7)
Jefferson	6	54.6% (42)	90.5% (30)	0.17% (28)	100.0% (1)	7.22% (4)	19.1% (15)
Vigo	7	48.8% (8)	92.1% (37)	0.43% (9)	96.5% (17)	2.87% (15)	17.5% (29)
Clinton	8	44.3% (2)	89.7% (26)	0.18% (27)	100.0% (1)	2.03% (28)	17.7% (27)
Scott	9	49.4% (12)	107.0% (73)	0.07% (43)	100.0% (1)	10.61% (1)	15.1% (59)
Jay	10	51.9% (20)	80.1% (4)	0.30% (16)	88.2% (29)	0.37% (71)	19.8% (13)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Porter	69	60.8% (66)	94.4% (44)	0.00% (61)	-	0.50% (70)	15.6% (56)
Posey	70	63.5% (73)	97.2% (53)	0.16% (29)	60.0% (51)	0.80% (66)	16.3% (46)
Harrison	71	60.7% (65)	102.7% (68)	0.00% (61)	-	2.06% (26)	14.2% (68)
Warrick	72	57.8% (57)	115.7% (78)	0.00% (61)	-	3.73% (12)	14.5% (65)
Dearborn	73	61.1% (67)	101.1% (64)	0.07% (47)	69.2% (46)	1.76% (32)	11.8% (76)
Dubois	74	62.8% (69)	98.5% (58)	0.00% (61)	-	1.07% (59)	13.8% (71)
Boone	75	71.2% (77)	108.3% (74)	0.13% (33)	84.6% (34)	0.91% (62)	16.0% (47)
Morgan	76	56.3% (53)	93.5% (41)	0.00% (61)	0.0% (60)	0.71% (68)	15.1% (61)
Hamilton	77	77.0% (78)	112.6% (77)	0.03% (55)	80.6% (38)	2.07% (25)	17.1% (34)
Franklin	78	62.8% (70)	108.9% (75)	0.00% (61)	-	1.74% (33)	9.8% (78)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Iowa

Iowa stands out among the states for being one of the few states where voters can register on Election Day. Same-day registration has been found to increase participation in the electoral process. According to a study by Demos, a public policy organization, voter turnout increased and the use of provisional ballots decreased after the enactment of same-day registration in Iowa.⁷¹ This is welcome news as the provisional balloting process can be frustrating for election officials to process and frustrating for voters who undergo the experience.⁷²

Despite the many good things Iowa does to decrease the barriers to voting for Iowans, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at where some of the remaining challenges may be. Out of the Iowa counties we analyzed, the top three counties with the worst election performance results in the state were Franklin, Union, and Buena Vista counties.

Franklin County stood out for having the highest rate of provisional ballots rejected. It also fared poorly on the rate of absentee ballots rejected and the rate of voters removed from the rolls. Franklin County was eighth worst on the voter removal rate and ninth worst on the rate of absentee ballots rejected.

Union County stood out for having worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls. It removed voters from the voter rolls at a rate approximately two and a half times greater than the state average. Union County also had a poor voter registration rate—third worst in the state.

Meanwhile, Buena Vista County had high rates of absentee ballots rejected and of voters removed from the rolls. It had the third-worst absentee ballot rejection rate and the fifth-worst rate of voters removed from the rolls.

2012 Iowa voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No⁷³
- Same-day registration option: Yes⁷⁴
- Deadline: 10 days before primary and general elections⁷⁵

Voting administration: Iowa's elections are governed by a state board of elections⁷⁶ and locally by county auditors and commissioners of elections.⁷⁷

Voter ID/residency requirements:

Other than the HAVA registration requirements, Iowa did not have a voter ID law.⁷⁸ However, voters may be asked to show an applicable ID if they are registering to vote in person on Election Day, moved from where they were registered to vote, had their right to vote challenged, the precinct officials do not know them, or they registered to vote by mail after January 1, 2003, and have never voted in a primary or general election in their county.⁷⁹

Iowa: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Franklin	1	67.8% (41)	95.4% (25)	0.47% (28)	100.0% (1)	2.09% (9)	9.33% (8)
Union	2	63.1% (11)	88.5% (3)	0.58% (25)	11.8% (50)	0.46% (72)	15.46% (1)
Buena Vista	3	64.3% (14)	97.3% (38)	0.39% (37)	19.0% (35)	3.16% (3)	11.17% (5)
Harrison	4	65.1% (21)	82.4% (2)	0.06% (77)	33.3% (19)	0.23% (88)	12.76% (2)
Page	5	57.7% (1)	92.1% (11)	0.68% (20)	3.3% (64)	2.49% (7)	5.46% (56)
Pottawattamie	6	61.9% (7)	93.9% (20)	1.34% (5)	5.3% (62)	1.15% (30)	7.98% (18)
Calhoun	7	68.2% (50)	97.6% (39)	0.14% (56)	100.0% (1)	2.06% (10)	6.37% (32)
Black Hawk	8	68.1% (47)	94.6% (23)	1.35% (4)	24.7% (27)	1.99% (11)	5.75% (46)
Woodbury	9	64.8% (17)	95.6% (27)	1.51% (3)	9.0% (55)	1.37% (24)	6.13% (40)
Floyd	10	68.0% (43)	92.6% (14)	0.21% (48)	40.0% (15)	0.56% (65)	11.97% (3)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Linn	83	76.4% (87)	102.3% (78)	0.89% (13)	15.8% (43)	0.83% (47)	3.84% (92)
Johnson	84	78.2% (90)	121.4% (92)	1.75% (2)	10.9% (51)	1.61% (16)	5.25% (59)
Kossuth	85	74.3% (82)	101.2% (69)	0.48% (26)	0.0% (65)	0.43% (75)	6.37% (34)
Warren	86	77.4% (89)	102.1% (77)	0.44% (30)	19.7% (33)	0.60% (63)	5.69% (47)
Clarke	87	67.7% (39)	98.8% (54)	0.04% (81)	0.0% (65)	0.16% (90)	4.92% (67)
Madison	88	75.8% (86)	107.5% (88)	0.44% (33)	42.9% (13)	0.38% (79)	4.97% (66)
Worth	89	72.1% (75)	101.4% (73)	0.16% (52)	0.0% (65)	1.03% (35)	4.01% (91)
Plymouth	90	71.3% (73)	101.5% (75)	0.04% (80)	0.0% (65)	0.61% (60)	4.71% (77)
Lyon	91	79.1% (91)	104.0% (84)	0.30% (41)	7.7% (57)	0.43% (74)	6.49% (31)
Dallas	92	87.5% (92)	118.3% (91)	0.79% (14)	33.1% (21)	0.85% (44)	4.76% (75)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Michigan

An example of state officials erecting barriers against voting is Michigan Secretary of State Ruth Johnson (R), who prior to the 2012 election, pushed through an election bill that would have broadened the state's photo ID law for voting and required a photo ID for absentee voting.⁸⁰ She also attempted to add a citizenship question on ballot applications.⁸¹ The citizenship question in particular caused great confusion during the primaries and ended up disenfranchising some voters.⁸² But a court blocked Secretary Johnson from requiring the question on ballot applications for the general election.⁸³ Although the rule requirement did not go into effect for the general election, this is a reminder of the outside impact on voting that state officials can have.

The three counties in Michigan with the worst election performance results were Gratiot, Ionia, and Houghton.

Out of the 50 Michigan counties that we analyzed, Gratiot County stands out in Michigan for faring poorly on five different factors. It had the highest rate of provisional ballots cast in the state—three and a half times higher than the state average. The county also had the second-worst voter turnout rate, the third-worst voter registration rate, and the sixth-worst rate of absentee ballots rejected. These poor results raise questions as to why the county fared so much worse than the state average across so many factors.

Ionia County follows closely behind Gratiot County for its poor election performance results. Ionia had the second-highest rate of provisional ballots cast in the state and was eighth worst on provisional ballots rejected. Additionally, Ionia had poor voter participation rates. It was sixth worst in voter registration and eighth worst in voter turnout.

Finally, Houghton County fared poorly on five factors. It had the 2nd-highest rate of absentee ballots rejected, the 12th-worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls, and the 14th-worst rate of provisional ballots cast. Voter participation was also poor in Houghton County. It had the 5th-worst voter registration rate and the 11th-worst voter turnout rate.

2012 Michigan voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: Not available for first-time registrants, but a previously registered voter could update existing registration records online.⁸⁴
- Same-day registration option: No⁸⁵
- Deadline: 30 days prior to Election Day⁸⁶

Voting administration: Michigan's election is governed by the office of the secretary of state and locally by county clerks.⁸⁷

Voter ID/residency requirements: In excess of HAVA's requirements, Michigan voters who voted in person were required to present a photo ID or sign an affidavit attesting that they did not have a photo ID.⁸⁸

Michigan: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Gratiot	1	49.4% (2)	80.2% (3)	0.21% (1)	28.6% (26)	0.82% (6)	3.46% (30)
Ionia	2	54.5% (8)	88.2% (6)	0.21% (2)	50.0% (8)	0.48% (37)	3.49% (29)
Houghton	3	56.0% (11)	87.7% (5)	0.08% (14)	10.0% (37)	1.11% (2)	4.34% (12)
Isabella	4	43.6% (1)	76.8% (1)	0.04% (24)	37.5% (18)	0.77% (13)	2.68% (49)
Wayne	5	62.9% (27)	105.7% (44)	0.20% (3)	84.7% (5)	0.82% (7)	3.67% (25)
Alpena	6	60.6% (20)	101.1% (34)	0.04% (26)	100.0% (1)	0.64% (22)	5.47% (2)
Ingham	7	61.9% (26)	95.6% (13)	0.09% (11)	46.1% (13)	0.81% (9)	5.12% (5)
Sanilac	8	56.5% (12)	90.6% (8)	0.09% (12)	30.8% (25)	0.68% (18)	4.14% (15)
Clare	9	55.9% (10)	96.2% (14)	0.09% (9)	11.1% (36)	0.82% (8)	4.36% (11)
Calhoun	10	58.7% (15)	100.5% (31)	0.04% (23)	94.7% (3)	0.65% (21)	4.06% (18)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Muskegon	41	60.2% (18)	101.6% (36)	0.03% (32)	27.8% (28)	0.34% (49)	3.23% (38)
Grand Traverse	42	72.5% (48)	104.3% (42)	0.03% (30)	0.0% (39)	0.40% (45)	5.37% (3)
Saginaw	43	67.2% (40)	102.1% (39)	0.04% (22)	14.7% (34)	0.59% (28)	3.36% (33)
Clinton	44	71.7% (46)	100.2% (30)	0.08% (13)	36.0% (19)	0.44% (40)	2.95% (45)
Emmet	45	71.2% (44)	107.6% (47)	0.02% (42)	50.0% (8)	0.73% (17)	3.27% (35)
Oakland	46	76.1% (50)	108.7% (48)	0.03% (31)	22.5% (32)	0.55% (30)	4.12% (16)
Lapeer	47	66.1% (35)	100.1% (28)	0.00% (47)	-	0.44% (39)	3.08% (42)
Barry	48	64.9% (30)	98.9% (21)	0.04% (28)	0.0% (39)	0.41% (43)	2.67% (50)
Livingston	49	75.1% (49)	103.9% (41)	0.03% (34)	9.5% (38)	0.60% (25)	3.24% (37)
Shiawassee	50	65.7% (34)	98.7% (20)	0.00% (47)	-	0.35% (48)	2.82% (48)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Minnesota

Similar to Iowa, Minnesota stands out for offering same-day registration, which helps reduce a barrier to voting. Because Minnesota offered same-day registration when HAVA was passed, it is not required to provide voters with an option to cast a provisional ballot. Thus, Minnesota counties are ranked on only four factors: registration rate, voter turnout, rate of absentee ballots rejected, and rate of voters removed from the voter rolls.

Overall, the three counties with the worst election performance results in Minnesota were Polk, Pine, and Nobles. All three counties occupied the worst three ranks in the state for voter registration and voter turnout rates, raising questions as to why the three counties had such poor voter participation.

The three counties also fared poorly on the rate of absentee ballots rejected and the rate of voters removed from the voter rolls. Out of the Minnesota counties that we analyzed, Polk and Pine were among the top 11 worst counties on the rate of absentee ballots rejected—Polk was 4th worst in the state while Pine was 11th worst. Meanwhile, all three counties were in the top 15 worst counties based on the rate of voters removed from the voter rolls—Nobles was 7th worst, Polk was 9th worst, and Pine was 14th worst.

2012 Minnesota voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No (online registration system was launched in 2013)⁸⁹
- Same-day registration option: Yes⁹⁰
- Deadline: No later than 21 days before Election Day or on Election Day with proof of residence⁹¹

Voting administration: Minnesota's elections are governed by the office of the secretary of state and locally by county elections boards.⁹²

Voter ID/residency requirements: Other than the HAVA's registration requirements, Minnesota did not have a voter ID law, although voters registering at the polls on Election Day had to present a photo ID.⁹³

Minnesota: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Polk	1	62.7% (2)	74.9% (3)	5.00% (4)	8.09% (9)
Pine	2	61.6% (1)	72.3% (1)	4.27% (11)	7.49% (14)
Nobles	3	63.0% (3)	74.7% (2)	1.15% (51)	8.53% (7)
Becker	4	67.5% (12)	81.3% (21)	4.43% (10)	7.58% (13)
Faribault	5	68.6% (17)	80.9% (16)	3.80% (15)	8.38% (8)
Todd	6	65.5% (6)	77.8% (4)	3.62% (16)	6.41% (28)
Aitkin	7	69.2% (21)	79.6% (7)	3.20% (21)	7.85% (12)
Ramsey	8	78.6% (50)	88.9% (49)	3.92% (13)	12.36% (1)
Clay	9	66.0% (8)	81.7% (24)	3.59% (17)	6.97% (22)
Roseau	10	64.8% (4)	79.7% (8)	3.17% (23)	6.48% (27)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Goodhue	48	75.1% (45)	86.3% (41)	1.94% (41)	5.86% (38)
Nicollet	49	74.5% (44)	88.4% (48)	2.65% (31)	5.31% (47)
Chisago	50	75.8% (47)	86.6% (44)	1.86% (42)	5.76% (40)
Anoka	51	80.0% (51)	91.2% (51)	3.37% (18)	4.71% (55)
Olmsted	52	78.0% (49)	90.4% (50)	1.53% (46)	5.91% (37)
Dakota	53	83.5% (53)	95.2% (54)	3.11% (24)	5.23% (51)
Wright	54	80.3% (52)	93.0% (52)	1.85% (43)	4.71% (54)
Carver	55	87.2% (57)	97.8% (57)	4.58% (8)	4.62% (57)
Scott	56	84.3% (55)	96.0% (55)	2.53% (32)	4.64% (56)
Washington	57	85.2% (56)	96.7% (56)	2.18% (35)	4.94% (53)

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Missouri

Among the 79 jurisdictions examined in Missouri, the three with the worst election performance results were DeKalb County, Pulaski County, and New Madrid County.

All three counties had poor voter participation rates in the last presidential election. Pulaski was the worst on both voter registration and voter turnout and DeKalb the second worst. New Madrid had the 12th-worst voter turnout. This raises the question as to whether the views of residents in the three counties are fully reflected through the electoral process.

Additionally, DeKalb had the worst rate of absentee ballots rejected in the state—more than six and a half times higher than the state average. Meanwhile, Pulaski had the 18th-worst rate for this factor. New Madrid and Pulaski counties also had high rates of voters removed from the voter rolls. New Madrid was the worst in the state, and Pulaski was the 13th worst. In particular, New Madrid's rate was more than four times the state average.

2012 Missouri voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No⁹⁴
- Same-day registration option: No⁹⁵
- Deadline: 5 p.m. on the fourth Wednesday prior to Election Day⁹⁶

Voting administration: Missouri's election is governed by the office of the secretary of state and locally by county clerks and boards of elections.⁹⁷

Voter ID/residency requirements: In excess of HAVA's requirements, Missouri voters were required to show an ID—although not necessarily photo ID—in order to vote.⁹⁸

Missouri: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
DeKalb	1	42.0% (2)	64.0% (2)	0.00% (62)		11.42% (1)	5.67% (77)
Pulaski	2	36.8% (1)	59.6% (1)	0.01% (58)	100.0% (1)	2.18% (19)	15.39% (13)
New Madrid	3	51.9% (12)	92.7% (51)	0.03% (51)	100.0% (1)	0.85% (54)	43.04% (1)
Pemiscot	4	52.8% (16)	91.3% (44)	0.34% (10)	90.9% (18)	2.61% (13)	18.94% (6)
Mississippi	5	47.1% (4)	80.1% (9)	0.17% (16)	75.0% (35)	3.85% (8)	12.52% (18)
Taney	6	63.9% (59)	92.4% (49)	0.55% (3)	79.2% (28)	5.83% (3)	12.58% (17)
Randolph	7	51.7% (11)	80.7% (12)	0.11% (20)	100.0% (1)	3.62% (9)	9.10% (32)
Washington	8	47.1% (5)	79.3% (6)	0.09% (23)	100.0% (1)	0.69% (58)	12.80% (16)
Crawford	9	52.4% (13)	87.2% (25)	0.01% (57)	100.0% (1)	2.48% (16)	17.83% (9)
Moniteau	10	56.5% (28)	82.5% (17)	0.07% (33)	100.0% (1)	3.61% (10)	7.21% (60)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Gasconade	65	60.7% (47)	90.3% (41)	0.00% (62)		0.88% (52)	6.07% (73)
Pettis	66	59.4% (39)	89.1% (37)	0.05% (43)	57.1% (59)	0.18% (73)	10.45% (27)
Lincoln	67	61.9% (49)	95.0% (62)	0.05% (42)	70.0% (43)	1.72% (26)	6.76% (64)
Franklin	68	62.6% (55)	92.4% (50)	0.08% (25)	62.2% (56)	1.25% (43)	7.72% (51)
St. Louis	69	72.7% (72)	104.2% (74)	0.47% (4)	66.0% (52)	1.65% (30)	6.63% (67)
Miller	70	65.4% (62)	95.7% (64)	0.00% (62)		1.67% (29)	6.74% (65)
Clinton	71	69.5% (69)	92.8% (52)	0.05% (40)	60.0% (57)	1.42% (37)	6.14% (71)
Douglas	72	63.3% (57)	97.1% (68)	0.03% (49)	50.0% (61)	1.10% (47)	9.00% (34)
Christian	73	76.7% (74)	99.6% (70)	0.08% (27)	77.4% (32)	1.39% (38)	7.72% (52)
Lafayette	74	69.6% (70)	96.5% (67)	0.07% (32)	63.6% (53)	0.22% (71)	6.94% (63)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Nevada

In Nevada, of the seven counties we analyzed, the counties with the poorest election performance results were Carson City, Elko, and Clark.

Carson City County performed poorly on four different factors. First, Carson City had a very low voter registration rate—the second worst of the Nevada counties that we analyzed. It also had the worst rate of absentee ballots rejected—more than double the state average—and the second-worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls.

Elko County stands out for having the worst voter participation rates among the counties examined in the state. It had both the worst voter registration rate and the worst voter turnout rate.

Finally, Clark County had the second-worst rate of provisional ballots cast in the state. It also had the third-worst voter registration and voter turnout rates.

2012 Nevada voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: Yes⁹⁹
- Same-day registration option: No¹⁰⁰
- Deadline: The third Tuesday preceding the election for in-person registration.¹⁰¹ The mail-in, online, and registration drive deadline was the fifth Saturday before the election.¹⁰²

Voting administration: Nevada's election is governed by the office of the secretary of state and locally by county clerks.¹⁰³

Voter ID/residency requirements: Other than the standard HAVA requirements, Nevada did not have a voter ID requirement.¹⁰⁴

Nevada: Best and worst counties

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Carson City	1	58.6% (5)	65.2% (2)	0.18% (5)	91.7% (2)	4.39% (1)	16.2% (2)
Elko	2	51.7% (1)	58.3% (1)	0.42% (3)	91.3% (3)	1.27% (4)	9.5% (6)
Clark	3	57.0% (3)	70.1% (3)	3.05% (2)	60.4% (4)	1.38% (3)	10.8% (5)
Nye	4	53.9% (2)	78.2% (4)	0.13% (6)	100.0% (1)	0.19% (7)	11.8% (3)
Washoe	5	66.0% (6)	84.6% (7)	3.64% (1)	50.2% (5)	1.76% (2)	8.8% (7)
Lyon	6	58.5% (4)	79.1% (6)	0.00% (7)		0.84% (5)	10.9% (4)
Douglas	7	72.0% (7)	78.6% (5)	0.40% (4)	40.0% (6)	0.74% (6)	17.6% (1)

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

New Hampshire

Similar to Minnesota, New Hampshire stands out for having same-day registration, which helps reduce a barrier to voting. Because New Hampshire had same-day registration when HAVA was passed, it is not required to provide voters with an option to cast a provisional ballot. Thus, the 10 counties examined in New Hampshire are ranked on only four factors: registration rate, voter turnout, rate of absentee ballots rejected, and rate of voters removed from the voter rolls.

Overall, the three worst election performance results were found in Cheshire, Strafford, and Sullivan counties. In particular, all three have below-average voter participation rates. Out of the New Hampshire counties that we evaluated, Sullivan had the worst voter registration and voter turnout rate in the state, while Strafford rated as the second worst on those two factors. In Sullivan, the voter turnout rate was almost 40 percent lower than the state average.

While these counties were the poorest performers in the state, our analysis revealed that New Hampshire had a remarkably small deviation between its best and worst-performing counties. This indicates a smaller discrepancy in voter accessibility between counties than in many of the other states we analyzed.

2012 New Hampshire voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No¹⁰⁵
- Same-day registration option: Yes¹⁰⁶
- Registration deadline: 10 days before primary and general elections¹⁰⁷

Voting administration: New Hampshire's election is governed by the office of the secretary of state and locally by town and county clerks.¹⁰⁸

Voter ID/residency requirements:

In excess of HAVA's requirements, New Hampshire voters were required to provide photo identification before voting or, alternatively, execute a challenged voter affidavit asserting their identity to receive a ballot.¹⁰⁹

New Hampshire: Best and worst counties

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Cheshire	1	68.5% (4)	85.9% (4)	2.95% (4)	22.1% (1)
Strafford	2	60.8% (2)	75.8% (2)	2.39% (5)	21.6% (2)
Sullivan	3	45.3% (1)	54.1% (1)	1.98% (6)	17.8% (10)
Hillsborough	4	67.6% (3)	82.4% (3)	3.04% (3)	19.6% (8)
Rockingham	5	77.8% (9)	94.7% (9)	3.16% (1)	21.1% (5)
Merrimack	6	74.5% (7)	89.7% (7)	1.75% (7)	21.6% (3)
Carroll	7	75.5% (8)	91.6% (8)	1.42% (8)	21.5% (4)
Belknap	8	73.6% (6)	88.4% (6)	1.30% (10)	20.8% (7)
Coos	9	70.8% (5)	86.3% (5)	1.36% (9)	19.1% (9)
Grafton	10	99.9% (10)	124.2% (10)	3.10% (2)	21.0% (6)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

New Mexico

The three New Mexico counties with the poorest election performance results in 2012 were Doña Ana, Cibola, and Lea.

Doña Ana County stands out because of its poor rankings for provisional ballots issued and absentee ballots rejected. It had the second-worst provisional ballot rejection rate in the state—nearly two times the state average. At the same time, the rate of provisional ballots cast in Doña Ana was also higher than all but two other counties examined in New Mexico. The rate of provisional ballots cast was also nearly twice the state average. Finally, Doña Ana County leads the way on having the worst rate of absentee ballots rejected—more than four times the state average.

Meanwhile, Cibola and Lea counties have very poor voter participation rates. Cibola had the worst voter turnout rate in the state and the fourth-worst voter registration rate. Lea County performed similarly poorly. It had the second-worst voter turnout rate and the second-worst voter registration rate.

It should also be noted that several counties in New Mexico were not included in the state's analysis because of incomplete data.

We excluded Bernalillo, Colfax, Curry, Grant, Los Alamos, Luna, Sandoval, San Miguel, and Valencia, counties because they did not submit complete data to the Election Assistance Commission, and did not make the data we analyzed readily available on state or local election websites.

2012 New Mexico voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: Not available for first-time registrants, but a previously registered voter could update existing registration records online¹¹⁰
- Same-day registration option: No¹¹¹
- Deadline: 28 days prior to an election¹¹²

Voting administration: Elections are administered in New Mexico on the state level by the secretary of state and on the local level by county clerks.¹¹³

Voter ID/residency requirements: Other than the standard HAVA requirements, New Mexico did not have a voter ID law.¹¹⁴

New Mexico: Best and worst counties

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Doña Ana	1	51.9% (8)	87.0% (9)	3.25% (3)	97.6% (2)	9.29% (1)	-
Cibola	2	42.9% (1)	78.2% (4)	2.92% (5)	54.1% (6)	-	0.83% (7)
Lea	3	43.0% (2)	74.3% (2)	0.38% (13)	100.0% (1)	0.00% (12)	0.61% (8)
Roosevelt	4	44.1% (3)	73.7% (1)	0.43% (12)	30.8% (12)	3.13% (3)	-
San Juan	5	53.0% (9)	82.5% (8)	3.44% (2)	66.0% (4)	0.62% (6)	0.29% (9)
Mckinley	6	46.6% (4)	80.9% (6)	4.60% (1)	0.0% (15)	-	0.00% (10)
Rio Arriba	7	54.4% (10)	90.8% (12)	1.79% (6)	61.4% (5)	1.78% (4)	6.02% (2)
Torrance	8	56.2% (11)	88.0% (10)	1.50% (9)	41.9% (9)	0.45% (8)	9.74% (1)
Chaves	9	49.2% (6)	80.8% (5)	1.61% (8)	48.9% (7)	0.60% (7)	3.09% (4)
Socorro	10	58.3% (12)	93.2% (13)	3.08% (4)	48.7% (8)	3.41% (2)	3.68% (3)
Otero	11	46.7% (5)	77.0% (3)	0.95% (11)	33.3% (10)	0.13% (11)	-
Eddy	12	51.0% (7)	81.6% (7)	0.38% (14)	33.3% (10)	0.37% (9)	-
Lincoln	13	59.1% (13)	90.2% (11)	0.08% (15)	66.7% (3)	0.67% (5)	-
Taos	14	61.4% (14)	99.2% (15)	1.14% (10)	23.1% (14)	0.21% (10)	1.83% (6)
Santa Fe	15	69.0% (15)	97.9% (14)	1.61% (7)	24.1% (13)	-	2.66% (5)

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, and New Mexico state and municipal election websites. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

North Carolina

North Carolina enacted same-day registration in 2007, easing a barrier to voting by allowing voters to register on Election Day. As a result, North Carolina issued fewer provisional ballots in 2008 than in 2004.¹¹⁵ At the same time, North Carolina also saw an increase in voter turnout.¹¹⁶

Although it did not affect the 2012 data that we analyzed, it should be noted that North Carolina reversed the gains made in 2007 when Gov. Pat McCrory (R) signed a bill that dramatically increases barriers to voting into law in 2013.¹¹⁷ Not only does the bill end same-day registration, but it also shortens early voting days, institutes an ID requirement to vote, and ends pre-registration for 16- and 17-year-olds who will be 18 on Election Day.¹¹⁸ One Republican official has resigned from a precinct chair post after saying that if the voter ID law “hurts a bunch of lazy blacks that wants (sic) the government to give them everything, so be it.”¹¹⁹ He also claimed that the new voter suppression law was designed to “kick the Democrats in the butt.”¹²⁰

This is an important reminder that while we have found large variances in the voting experience at the county level, restrictive and suppressive measures passed by the state can have far-reaching, detrimental effects on citizens being able to exercise their right to vote.

That being said, the counties with the poorest election performance results in 2012—before the new law was in effect—were Hertford, Pender, and Scotland counties. In particular, all three counties were among the 20 worst in the state on the rate at which voters were removed from the voting list. Out of the 79 North Carolina counties that we evaluated, Hertford also had the highest rate of absentee ballots rejected in the state while Pender was the sixth-worst county on this factor.

2012 North Carolina voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No¹²¹
- Same-day registration option: Yes, but only during early voting, not Election Day (North Carolina’s new law will do away with same-day registration in 2014)¹²²
- Deadline: 25 days before the election, unless registering during early voting¹²³

Voting administration: The North Carolina State Board of Elections is tasked with the responsibility of administering elections in North Carolina. It is the only bipartisan supervisory board in the North Carolina state government.¹²⁴

Voter ID/residency requirements: Other than the standard HAVA requirements, North Carolina did not have a voter ID law.¹²⁵

North Carolina: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Hertford	1	61.1% (31)	85.1% (8)	3.1% (31)	75.5% (7)	3.91% (1)	13.65% (6)
Pender	2	65.0% (47)	94.8% (48)	10.1% (2)	46.6% (58)	2.83% (6)	12.73% (9)
Scotland	3	53.6% (3)	87.0% (16)	6.7% (6)	75.4% (8)	0.55% (51)	11.10% (17)
Granville	4	60.7% (26)	84.5% (6)	4.8% (17)	78.4% (6)	1.98% (12)	9.93% (34)
Halifax	5	63.2% (39)	91.9% (34)	5.4% (11)	50.8% (54)	3.52% (2)	12.00% (13)
Pasquotank	6	59.9% (21)	96.8% (53)	5.4% (12)	55.0% (46)	2.83% (5)	12.99% (7)
Wayne	7	60.7% (25)	88.0% (20)	4.1% (21)	63.6% (26)	3.04% (4)	10.20% (27)
Harnett	8	57.0% (12)	89.8% (26)	7.1% (5)	66.3% (16)	0.75% (46)	11.11% (16)
Onslow	9	41.2% (1)	77.9% (1)	5.5% (10)	34.3% (76)	0.26% (58)	9.87% (36)
Cumberland	10	57.4% (15)	96.8% (52)	5.7% (9)	64.5% (22)	2.33% (9)	10.10% (30)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Iredell	70	68.0% (60)	97.9% (56)	1.3% (68)	58.5% (36)	0.00% (66)	8.80% (63)
Chatham	71	80.3% (76)	105.1% (71)	2.5% (41)	58.0% (39)	1.53% (19)	9.59% (45)
Moore	72	71.3% (70)	98.5% (59)	2.5% (40)	44.5% (63)	0.74% (47)	8.93% (59)
Forsyth	73	72.4% (72)	101.9% (68)	1.8% (61)	53.2% (52)	0.79% (44)	9.25% (49)
Currituck	74	64.4% (45)	100.8% (66)	1.9% (59)	41.7% (67)	0.00% (66)	8.45% (66)
Wake	75	83.4% (79)	111.9% (76)	2.2% (48)	60.0% (33)	1.36% (22)	9.90% (35)
Dare	76	70.0% (66)	109.0% (75)	2.1% (51)	54.5% (49)	0.00% (66)	8.87% (62)
Union	77	74.3% (74)	106.3% (74)	2.4% (43)	45.4% (60)	1.10% (32)	7.86% (75)
Cherokee	78	59.9% (20)	101.6% (67)	0.5% (79)	43.3% (64)	0.00% (66)	6.78% (79)
Mecklenburg	79	75.5% (75)	113.3% (77)	1.8% (60)	49.8% (56)	1.26% (26)	8.13% (72)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Ohio

The three Ohio counties with the worst election performance results were Allen, Scioto, and Athens.

Allen County ranked poorly on several voting administration factors. Out of the Ohio counties that we analyzed, it had the worst rate of absentee ballots rejected, the 6th-worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls, the 13th-worst rate of provisional ballots cast, and the 10th-worst rate of provisional ballots rejected.

Scioto County performed similarly poorly. It had the 4th-worst rate of voters removed from the rolls, the 9th-worst rate of provisional ballots rejected, and the 11th-worst rate of provisional ballots cast. Scioto County also had poor voter participation rates, raising concerns about the ability of its residents to have their voices reflected through the electoral process. It was fourth worst on voter turnout and fifth worst on voter registration rates.

Finally, Athens County stood out on provisional ballots, voter list maintenance, and voter turnout. It had the worst rate of provisional ballots cast among the counties examined in the state—a rate that was more than double the state average. It also had the second-worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls and the fifth-worst voter turnout rate.

2012 Ohio voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: Not available for first-time registrants, but a previously registered voter could update existing registration records online.¹²⁶
- Same-day registration option: Yes, but only during an early voting period and not on Election Day.¹²⁷
- Deadline: 30 days prior to an election unless registering during early voting period.¹²⁸

Voting administration: Each of Ohio's 88 counties has a board of elections office that administers local elections.¹²⁹ A four-person board governs each board of elections with at least two members representing each major political party.¹³⁰

Voter ID/residency requirements: In excess of HAVA's standards, Ohio required voters to provide identification at the polls, but a photo ID was not required.¹³¹

Ohio: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Allen	1	60.9% (27)	86.9% (19)	5.82% (13)	17.7% (10)	2.13% (1)	19.5% (6)
Scioto	2	52.7% (4)	78.4% (5)	5.88% (11)	17.7% (9)	0.77% (43)	21.5% (4)
Athens	3	53.6% (5)	91.5% (37)	9.82% (1)	11.4% (53)	0.78% (41)	23.6% (2)
Hardin	4	51.4% (3)	75.4% (3)	3.80% (53)	16.5% (22)	0.29% (68)	24.2% (1)
Ross	5	50.8% (2)	77.9% (4)	6.13% (8)	9.3% (65)	2.04% (3)	4.7% (62)
Madison	6	53.9% (6)	72.8% (2)	4.92% (28)	14.0% (31)	0.95% (29)	13.2% (19)
Hamilton	7	71.4% (66)	95.5% (58)	6.32% (7)	24.6% (1)	1.74% (5)	14.4% (14)
Clinton	8	58.0% (18)	84.1% (12)	5.07% (23)	12.4% (45)	2.12% (2)	11.3% (30)
Cuyahoga	9	68.0% (55)	97.0% (61)	9.13% (3)	15.3% (25)	1.23% (15)	17.9% (7)
Pickaway	10	57.8% (17)	79.0% (6)	4.49% (36)	16.7% (20)	1.23% (14)	11.3% (31)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Erie	63	67.2% (53)	90.9% (35)	4.65% (32)	5.4% (70)	0.71% (47)	10.4% (38)
Fairfield	64	68.8% (61)	100.8% (68)	5.08% (21)	13.7% (36)	1.02% (25)	1.8% (67)
Medina	65	72.4% (67)	99.5% (67)	3.98% (47)	17.3% (14)	0.51% (59)	7.1% (51)
Geauga	66	75.9% (71)	97.9% (62)	2.38% (70)	13.2% (39)	0.92% (31)	13.1% (20)
Wayne	67	61.0% (28)	91.9% (40)	3.53% (61)	9.3% (66)	0.55% (56)	0.9% (69)
Hancock	68	64.5% (44)	98.0% (63)	3.19% (67)	4.7% (72)	0.62% (51)	11.8% (28)
Mercer	69	72.6% (68)	98.2% (64)	3.93% (49)	10.0% (62)	0.56% (55)	7.6% (48)
Putnam	70	74.1% (69)	94.8% (56)	1.74% (72)	4.7% (71)	1.50% (8)	8.9% (46)
Warren	71	75.6% (70)	99.0% (66)	4.37% (42)	17.4% (13)	0.23% (69)	0.1% (70)
Delaware	72	84.4% (72)	106.8% (71)	4.52% (35)	14.5% (28)	1.50% (9)	1.1% (68)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Pennsylvania

Prior to the 2012 presidential election, Pennsylvania passed a controversial voter ID law that would disenfranchise hundreds of thousands of registered voters, disproportionately affecting “Democrats and members of minority groups.”¹³² Although a court ruled that a photo ID was not required to vote in Pennsylvania during the 2012 election, the court did allow poll workers to ask for a photo ID, though poll workers could not turn voters away if they lacked a photo ID.¹³³ Even with the ruling, massive misinformation abounded in Pennsylvania about the photo ID requirement.¹³⁴ Some polling sites handed out information stating that a photo ID was required to vote, poll workers told voters that photo IDs were required, and mailers were also sent out containing misinformation.¹³⁵ The state was slow to correct this misinformation.¹³⁶

Recently, a state court again blocked the controversial photo ID law, holding that it is arguably unconstitutional, further delaying its implementation.¹³⁷ This attempt by Pennsylvania to increase barriers to voting is another reminder of the far-reaching impact that restrictive policies set at the state level can have on voters’ access to the polls.

Along with combatting the state’s restrictive voting policy and the misinformation surrounding the voter ID law, Pennsylvania voters in Pike, Columbia, and Mifflin counties also dealt with the poorest election performance results during the 2012 election. Pike County stood out on two election administration factors—it was the worst of the Pennsylvania counties we examined on the rate of absentee ballots rejected and the rate of voters removed from the voter rolls. Columbia County fared poorly on election administration factors as well, but stood out for poor voter participation rates. It had the fourth-worst voter turnout rate and the fifth-worst voter registration rate. Finally, similar to Columbia County, Mifflin County also had poor voter participation rates. It had the worst voter registration rate in the state and the third-worst voter turnout rate.

Although Philadelphia County did not appear at the top of the list for poor election performance, it is worth noting its poor performance in terms of provisional ballots. Philadelphia County had the worst rate of provisional ballots cast among the counties examined in Pennsylvania, at more than 4 percent of all ballots cast on Election Day. Its rate of provisional ballots cast was more than eight times the state average. According to reports, the debacle on provisional ballots in Philadelphia County was caused in part by the failure of some polling locations to have supplemental poll books with voter registration information and some poll workers who

2012 Pennsylvania voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No¹⁴⁰
- Same-day registration option: No¹⁴¹
- Deadline: 30 days before each general and primary election¹⁴²

Voting administration: Each county has a county board of elections office that has jurisdiction over the conduct of primaries and elections in the county while the Pennsylvania Department of State’s Bureau of Commissions, Elections and Legislation oversees election administration on the state level.¹⁴³

Voter ID/residency requirements: In addition to the HAVA requirements, Pennsylvania state law required valid photo identification.¹⁴⁴ On October 2, 2012, however, a preliminary injunction blocked the full enforcement of Pennsylvania’s voter identification law for the 2012 general election.¹⁴⁵ As a result, voters were not required to show identification before voting. Poll workers were, however, permitted to ask for identification, but voters without acceptable ID forms were still allowed to cast a ballot.¹⁴⁶

instructed voters to cast provisional ballots without checking supplemental poll books.¹³⁸ A disturbing report by city commissioners found that the majority of voters forced to vote provisionally should have been able to cast regular ballots.¹³⁹

Pennsylvania: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Pike	1	55.5% (22)	99.4% (46)	0.67% (11)	41.3% (42)	10.94% (1)	23.6% (1)
Columbia	2	48.2% (4)	73.0% (5)	0.74% (7)	79.2% (9)	0.33% (19)	20.2% (2)
Mifflin	3	46.1% (3)	68.6% (1)	0.28% (28)	63.6% (22)	0.74% (13)	15.0% (8)
Lycoming	4	52.4% (17)	71.7% (2)	0.25% (32)	82.3% (5)	1.08% (10)	14.4% (9)
Crawford	5	52.4% (16)	76.9% (11)	0.47% (22)	71.5% (14)	0.05% (28)	19.9% (3)
Huntingdon	6	48.4% (5)	79.4% (16)	0.27% (29)	82.2% (6)	0.00% (31)	14.0% (11)
Venango	7	52.4% (15)	73.5% (6)	0.58% (16)	69.1% (18)	0.00% (31)	12.8% (15)
Wayne	8	52.3% (14)	76.0% (10)	0.52% (19)	70.8% (16)	0.00% (31)	9.7% (27)
Indiana	9	51.2% (11)	80.5% (19)	0.54% (18)	81.0% (8)	0.00% (31)	8.7% (32)
Cambria	10	53.3% (18)	75.8% (9)	0.06% (43)	71.4% (15)	0.00% (31)	13.1% (14)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Lackawanna	38	59.5% (37)	88.5% (38)	0.66% (13)	58.3% (28)	0.00% (31)	8.9% (31)
Centre	39	57.1% (28)	89.1% (40)	0.54% (17)	52.5% (32)	0.28% (21)	9.1% (30)
Beaver	40	60.2% (38)	80.7% (20)	0.26% (30)	47.0% (39)	0.16% (23)	10.0% (25)
Lehigh	41	59.3% (35)	85.9% (33)	0.77% (5)	42.5% (40)	0.00% (31)	10.0% (26)
York	42	59.1% (33)	87.2% (35)	0.44% (23)	55.0% (30)	1.35% (8)	5.7% (46)
Delaware	43	70.6% (45)	98.0% (45)	0.68% (9)	67.2% (20)	2.49% (3)	10.7% (20)
Butler	44	64.3% (42)	87.7% (36)	0.25% (33)	60.7% (26)	0.73% (14)	8.2% (35)
Allegheny	45	65.2% (43)	92.2% (41)	0.64% (15)	51.1% (34)	0.00% (31)	7.9% (36)
Chester	46	72.1% (47)	94.3% (42)	0.36% (24)	62.4% (23)	0.08% (25)	10.8% (19)
Bucks	47	69.8% (44)	94.7% (43)	0.15% (36)	67.3% (19)	0.00% (31)	9.5% (28)

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Virginia

Across the localities examined in Virginia, the three with the worst election performance results were Norfolk City, Harrisonburg City, and Radford City. (It should be noted that in Virginia, some election localities are divided by city and some by county. The standard data are also reported in this way.)

The three localities stood out for having poor voter participation rates. All three are at the top of the list for having the worst voter registration rates. They also make up three of the four worst Virginia counties on voter turnout.

Digging deeper, Norfolk City and Harrisonburg City also performed poorly on provisional ballots. Out of Virginia localities we analyzed, Norfolk City had the second-worst rate of provisional ballots cast and the ninth-worst rate of provisional ballots rejected. Meanwhile, Harrisonburg City had the 5th-worst rate of provisional ballots rejected and the 11th-worst rate of provisional ballots cast.

Radford City also performed poorly on a couple of other election administration factors—the rate of absentee ballots rejected and the rate of voters removed from the voter rolls. It had the third-worst rate of absentee ballots rejected and the fifth-worst rate of voters removed from the voter rolls.

2012 Virginia voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No¹⁴⁷
- Same-day registration option: No¹⁴⁸
- Deadline: 22 days before the election¹⁴⁹

Voting administration: Three-member county- and city-based boards; boards composed by political affiliations.¹⁵⁰

Voter ID/residency requirements: In addition to the HAVA requirements, Virginia law required identification to vote, but a photo was not required.¹⁵¹

Virginia: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Norfolk City	1	48.2% (4)	71.7% (3)	1.32% (2)	84.9% (9)	2.5% (8)	14.38% (9)
Harrisonburg City	2	43.1% (2)	67.4% (2)	0.56% (11)	92.5% (5)	1.2% (20)	12.68% (13)
Radford City	3	39.9% (1)	61.4% (1)	0.12% (65)	0.0% (86)	3.4% (3)	15.38% (5)
Fredericksburg City	4	63.9% (50)	90.7% (58)	1.37% (1)	83.5% (10)	0.0% (48)	15.77% (4)
Winchester City	5	57.0% (22)	85.4% (30)	0.29% (33)	65.4% (37)	1.5% (17)	19.89% (1)
Prince Edward	6	51.5% (8)	76.1% (6)	0.00% (101)		2.7% (7)	10.57% (24)
Hopewell City	7	58.9% (27)	87.1% (40)	0.67% (6)	94.8% (2)	0.0% (48)	14.07% (10)
Richmond City	8	64.6% (52)	86.8% (39)	0.68% (5)	77.5% (17)	0.0% (47)	13.99% (11)
Shenandoah	9	62.4% (43)	87.8% (43)	0.32% (31)	69.0% (32)	3.5% (1)	8.08% (66)
Lynchburg City	10	63.5% (48)	94.2% (72)	0.21% (41)	71.4% (26)	3.4% (2)	10.53% (27)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Dinwiddie	92	65.0% (57)	88.7% (47)	0.02% (97)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	8.84% (52)
New Kent	93	79.2% (96)	96.8% (80)	0.04% (91)	25.0% (81)	1.6% (15)	7.93% (73)
Spotsylvania	94	70.0% (75)	97.9% (83)	0.25% (36)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	9.49% (35)
Gloucester	95	69.0% (72)	92.8% (64)	0.08% (80)	7.1% (85)	0.0% (48)	8.06% (67)
Appomattox	96	70.6% (76)	93.2% (67)	0.08% (79)	16.7% (83)	0.0% (48)	7.01% (90)
James City	97	83.9% (100)	108.0% (95)	0.23% (39)	53.1% (57)	0.0% (48)	9.19% (41)
Manassas City	98	76.2% (87)	110.4% (97)	0.17% (47)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	12.98% (12)
Goochland	99	79.1% (95)	94.7% (74)	0.13% (64)	26.7% (79)	0.0% (48)	7.38% (84)
Loudoun	100	88.7% (101)	116.2% (101)	0.33% (29)	56.6% (53)	0.2% (41)	8.23% (64)
Chesterfield	101	78.8% (93)	102.9% (93)	0.18% (46)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	8.03% (70)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Wisconsin

Similar to Minnesota and New Hampshire, Wisconsin stands out for having same-day registration, which helps reduce a barrier to voting.¹⁵² Wisconsin has had same-day registration since 1976, and the law is often cited as a contributing factor to boosting voter turnout.¹⁵³ Because Wisconsin had Election Day registration when HAVA was enacted, it is not required to provide voters with an option to cast a provisional ballot. Thus, Wisconsin counties are ranked on only four factors: registration rate, voter turnout, rate of absentee ballots rejected, and rate of voters removed from the voter rolls.

On the four factors examined, the counties that had the worst election performance results were Dunn, Juneau, and Adams. All three counties had very poor voter participation rates. In particular, out of the Wisconsin counties that we evaluated, Juneau and Adams were among the top five worst on voter registration and voter turnout rates. Dunn had the 13th-worst voter turnout rate and 14th-worst voter registration rate.

Additionally, all three counties also made the top 15 worst list for the highest rate of voters removed from the voter rolls. Dunn and Adams carry the extra distinction of being in the top 15 worst counties on the rate of absentee ballots rejected.

2012 Wisconsin voting law snapshot

Voter registration:

- Online registration option: No¹⁵⁴
- Same-day registration option: Yes¹⁵⁵
- Deadlines: Via mail, and by the third Wednesday before the election.¹⁵⁶ Voters could also register in person at their county clerk's office until the close of business on the Friday before the election.¹⁵⁷

Voting administration: The Wisconsin Government Accountability Board oversees all of Wisconsin's elections.¹⁵⁸ The board and its staff are nonpartisan, and it is made up of six former judges serving staggered six-year terms.¹⁵⁹

Voter ID/residency requirements: Other than the standard HAVA requirements, Wisconsin did not have a voter ID requirement.¹⁶⁰

Wisconsin: Best and worst counties

For the complete list of county data, please see Appendix A or visit the interactive tables that accompany the online version of this report.

Worst 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Dunn	1	64.4% (13)	82.2% (14)	1.21% (5)	22.00% (4)
Juneau	2	57.4% (2)	74.7% (2)	0.52% (25)	14.12% (12)
Adams	3	60.0% (5)	76.0% (4)	0.78% (14)	12.12% (14)
Marinette	4	55.7% (1)	74.6% (1)	0.42% (32)	12.51% (13)
Waushara	5	62.3% (10)	79.7% (7)	1.19% (6)	7.89% (44)
Taylor	6	62.0% (9)	78.2% (5)	1.05% (9)	8.20% (39)
Clark	7	57.6% (3)	75.9% (3)	0.69% (19)	8.11% (42)
Langlade	8	67.7% (23)	81.6% (13)	1.25% (4)	12.12% (15)
Green Lake	9	67.0% (19)	82.8% (15)	0.78% (13)	18.89% (7)
Monroe	10	61.2% (7)	80.2% (8)	0.42% (31)	14.95% (11)

Best 10 counties County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Milwaukee	46	74.8% (47)	97.4% (51)	0.26% (45)	11.47% (17)
Green	47	72.3% (37)	90.6% (38)	0.14% (52)	5.29% (54)
Calumet	48	76.2% (48)	92.9% (42)	0.45% (30)	4.45% (55)
Brown	49	73.3% (42)	94.0% (45)	0.17% (49)	7.24% (46)
Waukesha	50	84.1% (53)	108.1% (54)	1.33% (2)	7.30% (45)
St. Croix	51	77.0% (49)	97.4% (50)	0.39% (35)	9.12% (29)
La Crosse	52	73.0% (40)	97.8% (52)	0.15% (51)	9.73% (27)
Vilas	53	78.7% (51)	97.0% (49)	0.36% (39)	9.87% (26)
Ozaukee	54	86.3% (55)	106.1% (53)	0.49% (29)	20.32% (6)
Washington	55	81.0% (52)	95.2% (47)	0.11% (54)	11.16% (20)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Conclusion

Voting is the fundamental cornerstone of our democracy. Yet Americans find that access to voting varies considerably depending on where they live. The current patchwork system of voting administration has resulted in access to voting that varies by state and, as seen here, by county. The ease with which citizens should be able to access their right to vote should not vary depending on whether they live in the right state or the right county. These discrepancies in voting should be scrutinized because all Americans deserve to have the same ease of access to voting.

About the authors

Anna Chu is the Policy Director for the ThinkProgress War Room at American Progress. She brings experience serving as the policy director for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee during the successful 2012 cycle that saw Democrats adding two seats to their majority in the Senate. As policy director, she oversaw and managed all policy issues for the committee and Democratic Senate candidates. Prior to working at the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, she served as the policy advisor for the House Democratic Caucus. She previously served as a federal law clerk and worked as an associate at Paul Hastings. Chu graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, and has a J.D. from the University of Southern California.

Joshua Field serves as the Deputy Director of Legal Progress, the legal policy program at American Progress. Field is a veteran of both the 2008 and 2012 Obama for America campaigns and joined American Progress after fulfilling several different roles during the 2012 campaign cycle, including senior advisor at the 2013 Presidential Inaugural Committee, Organizing for America – Nevada voter protection director of special projects, and counsel and director of communications for the Democratic National Convention Host Committee in Charlotte, North Carolina. Field’s legal experience includes nearly three years of work in the courtroom as a public defender in Washington State and appellate practice at the Innocence Project Northwest Clinic. Field received his B.A. from The George Washington University and his J.D. from the University of Washington School of Law.

Charles Posner is the State Communications Assistant in the ThinkProgress War Room, where he provides communications, research, and analytical support on a wide range of issues. Prior to joining American Progress, he worked at Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, specializing in U.S. political issues, and with Organizing for America in Ohio on campaigns to overturn a voter suppression law and protect collective bargaining rights for public-sector unions. Posner graduated with a bachelor’s degree in political science from Brown University.

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to extend a special thanks to Brennan Center for Justice and The Pew Charitable Trusts for their work on this issue. The authors also would like to thank University of Arizona Assistant Professor Dr. Ozan Jaquette, Ph.D., and the Bus Federation for their advice and input on this report. Finally, the authors would like to acknowledge the outstanding Center for American Progress interns Alex Brown, Brent DeBeaumont, Lucy Hoagland, Andrew Reagan, William Rusche, and Daniel Schienfeld for their invaluable help on this report.

Methodology

Note: The methodology of this report was very similar to a previous report by the same authors on voting accessibility in Florida, titled “Florida’s Worst Election Offenders: A County-by-County Analysis of the Florida Election Administration in the 2012 Election.”¹⁶¹ This section has been adapted from the methodology section of that report.

Sources

This report relies primarily on two governmental data sources. The bulk of the voting data comes from the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, or EAC, which collects information on voter registration, provisional and absentee ballots, voter purges, and more through its Election Administration and Voting Survey.

For the voting populations, the U.S. Census Bureau provides county-level data on the citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, which is commonly used to determine the number of eligible voters in a given location. This was used to calculate voter turnout rates and rates of registered voters. It should be noted that the most recent CVAP data available were 2011 estimates, while the information on registered voters is from 2012. That, in combination with the margin of error built into the CVAP calculations and the fact that CVAP is an estimate, contributes to why several counties appear to have a higher number of registered voters than the population eligible to vote.

Data were missing for some of the six factors we evaluated for several states and/or counties, either because the state was exempt from reporting the data, or because the data were not found during our research of the EAC and the websites of the state and/or county central election body; for example, the secretary of state and board of elections websites. We treated states and counties that were missing data in the following two ways:

- Georgia, Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin were missing county-level data on one or more factors throughout the entire state. The lack of data is understandable in Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin because they are exempt from offering provisional ballots under the Help America Vote Act because they had same day registration when HAVA was passed.¹⁶² For these states, counties are ranked on only four factors: registration rate, voter turnout, rate of absentee ballots rejected, and rate of voters removed from the voter rolls.
- Data were occasionally missing from some individual counties within a state as well. If an individual county was only missing data for a single factor, it was still included in the analysis for the factors available and was not penalized for the lack of data in the analysis. If the county was missing data for two or more factors, it was removed.

Selecting the factors

The report itself goes into detail about why each of the factors was chosen to be included in the county rankings and its significance to voting accessibility. Broadly, we selected the factors so as to capture the full voting process. It should be noted, however, that the data points used to determine the rankings in this report are limited by the county-based data that the EAC chooses to solicit and ultimately make available. This statistically based analysis should be used as a starting point to investigate why one county's performance in a given data category is different than its state's statistical mean for that data point. To get a holistic view of what happened on Election Day, these rankings should be compared to anecdotal evidence regarding problems that occurred on the ground while votes were being cast.

Rates of registered voters and overall voter turnout provide a wide picture of how each county fares on the basic measures. These include its citizenry's interest in voting, its ability to register, and its ability to get to the polls.

The remaining factors offer a sharper analysis of some of the common problems that complicate, infringe upon, or obstruct the right to vote. These factors include voter purge rates, high rates of provisional ballots cast and rejected, and absentee ballots rejected. Of course, in individual cases, actions such as rejecting provisional or absentee ballots or purging voter registrations are justifiable, neces-

sary, and consistent with the law. As we explain below, however, the rankings are determined not by the simple number of these instances but by deviation from the state average, in which outliers are more likely to be indicative of systematic county-based problems.

When determining the rates for each of the factors, we used the following calculations:

- Voter turnout rate: Total votes cast divided by the citizen voting-age population.
- Voter registration rate: The number of registered voters divided by the citizen voting-age population.
- Voter list maintenance rate: The number of voters removed from the rolls divided by the total number of registered voters.
- Provisional ballot cast rate: The number of provisional ballots cast divided by Election Day votes cast.
- Provisional ballot rejection rate: The number of provisional ballots rejected divided by provisional ballots cast.
- Absentee ballot rejection rate: The number of absentee ballots rejected divided by the number of absentee ballots cast.

Determining which states and counties to include in our analysis

This report focuses exclusively on political swing states, defined as those that had a margin of victory of 10 points or less for either candidate in the 2012 presidential election.

With regard to counties or localities within each state, those with smaller populations have smaller sample sizes that are more likely to be abnormally influenced by statistically unrelated anomalies. The method by which the rankings were calculated—standard deviations from the mean—would have improperly magnified the significance of these data outliers. In order to have a more consistent data set, we made a methodological decision to exclude counties that had citizen voting-age populations less than one quarter of the state’s mean citizen voting-age population. Excluding the smallest counties best achieved our goal of providing an accurate picture of voting administration successes and failures in each state.

Ranking the counties

The counties and localities included for each state were ranked according to how much better or worse the county fared on each of the six factors when compared to the state average. Statistically, this was done by first calculating the standard deviation, represented by S , for each factor using the formula below.

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{\sum(X - \bar{X})^2}{N}}$$

In this way, outlier counties with factors with larger standard deviations are not penalized as much as outlier counties with factors with smaller ones. Then, county t -values were calculated for each individual factor, using the formula below.

$$T_x = \frac{X - \bar{X}}{S}$$

This determines, for each factor, the number of standard deviations away from the mean of each county. Counties that performed worse than the state mean received negative t -values—for example, had a lower registration rate or rejected a higher percentage of absentee ballots—and those that performed better received positive t -values. Finally, the t -values were averaged across the six factors—or if a county was missing data for a single factor, across the number of factors for which it had data—to produce a single number of how much better or worse the county performed than the state average. The county with the smallest number, or the county that on average was the farthest number of standard deviations below the state average, was the worst in that state.

A statistical look

Our ranking method is a statistically competent approach to not only identify the worst-performing counties as a whole but also to provide insight into how counties performed within each factor. Other efforts, such as The Pew Charitable Trusts's Election Performance Index,¹⁶³ have done an excellent job using factors similar to those we evaluated to rank election administration performance at the state level. By evaluating these factors on a county level, we have demonstrated that a voting experience can also vary greatly at the local level. We recognize, however, that numbers are not everything.

While the data used to calculate these rankings are limited to data that are collected and made available by the EAC, offices of the secretary of state, and other groups, anecdotal evidence would provide additional insight into the problems that residents of these states faced on Election Day. These data, however, are not systematically collected, and it is hard to adjust for factors such as population and media saturation.

We hope that our county-based statistical look at election administration in swing states across the country can be used as a foundation for those on the ground to consider ways to improve their performance and begin conversations about what can be done to ensure that all citizens can exercise their right to vote as freely as possible.

Endnotes

- 1 Anna Chu, Joshua Field, and Charles Posner, "Florida's Worst Election Offenders: A County-by-County Analysis of the Florida Election Administration in the 2012 Election" (Washington: Center for American Progress Action Fund, 2013), available at <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/civil-liberties/report/2013/12/09/80605/floridas-worst-election-offenders/>.
- 2 Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State Mark Ritchie, "Register to Vote," available at <http://www.sos.state.mn.us/index.aspx?page=204> (last accessed November 2013).
- 3 The U.S. Department of Justice has now sued North Carolina over the new voting restrictions. At issue are North Carolina's tough new voter ID laws, the shortening of early voting days, elimination of same-day voter registration during early voting, and restrictions on counting provisional ballots. See Evan Perez, "Justice Department sues North Carolina over voting law," CNN, September 30, 2013, available at <http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/30/us/north-carolina-voting-lawsuit/>.
- 4 Chu, Field, and Posner, "Florida's Worst Election Offenders."
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey: A Summary of Key Findings" (2013), available at http://www.eac.gov/assets/1/Page/990-050%20EAC%20VoterSurvey_508Compliant.pdf.
- 7 In selecting and developing these factors, we are grateful to be able to build upon the tINN, llots. ing restrictions. the Florida Election Administration in the 2012 ElectionPew Charitable Trusts's great work on these issues. See The Pew Charitable Trusts, "Elections Performance Index" (2013), available at <http://www.pewstates.org/research/reports/elections-performance-index-85899445029>.
- 8 New Hampshire, Minnesota, and Wisconsin are exempt from the Helping Americans Vote Act's requirements to offer provisional ballots to voters because the three states had same-day registration when HAVA was passed, so they were not evaluated on the provisional ballots cast and rejected factors. See U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey." Meanwhile, Georgia did not submit information on the rate of provisional ballots rejected to the Election Assistance Commission's election administration and voting survey. Georgia's secretary of state also did not make this information readily available online. See U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "Election Administration and Voting Survey," available at http://www.eac.gov/research/election_administration_and_voting_survey.aspx (last accessed December 2013); Georgia Secretary of State Brian P. Kemp, "Georgia Election Results," available at <http://results.enr.clarityelections.com/GA/42277/113204/en/reports.html> (last accessed November 2013). Furthermore, we used nine factors to analyze Florida's election administration performance. This was based on our previous report on Florida that accessed additional data. Any interstate comparisons in this report did not punish Florida for the additional factors that they were evaluated upon. See additional details in our "Methodology" section.
- 9 Chu, Field, and Posner, "Florida's Worst Election Offenders."
- 10 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey."
- 11 Howard Steven Friedman, "American Voter Turnout Lower Than Other Wealthy Countries," Huffington Post, July 7, 2012, available at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/howard-steven-friedman/voter-turnout-europe-america_b_1660271.html.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey."
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Marjorie Randon Hershey, "What We Know about Voter-ID Laws, Registration, and Turnout" (Washington: Brennan Center for Justice, 2009), available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/Democracy/VRE/Hershey.pdf>.
- 16 The Pew Charitable Trusts, "Measuring State Elections Performance," February 5, 2013, available at <http://www.pewstates.org/research/data-visualizations/measuring-state-elections-performance-85899446194>.
- 17 *Help America Vote Act of 2002*, Public Law No. 252, 107th Cong. (October 29, 2002).
- 18 Brennan Center for Justice, "The Help America Vote Act," available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/analysis/HAVA%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf> (last December 2013).
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 See, for example, Wisconsin's same-day voter registration option (Wis. Stat. Ann. § 6.55 (West 2012)). Wisconsin's registration instructions can be found at Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, "Registration and Voting," available at <http://gab.wi.gov/elections-voting/voters/registration-voting> (last accessed January 2014), and Arizona's online voter registration option can be found at Arizona Secretary of State Ken Bennett, "Voter Registration and Education," available at <http://www.azsos.gov/election/VoterRegistration.htm> (last accessed December 2013).
- 21 See, for example, Florida's H.B. 1355, which made it significantly more difficult for citizens to vote by reducing early voting days, creating additional hurdles for voters who moved counties before the election, and heavily restricting third-party voter registrations. Florida House of Representatives, "CS/CS/HB 1355: Elections," available at <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Bills/bills-detail.aspx?BillId=46543&SessionIndex=1&SessionId=66&BillText=&BillNumber=1355&BillSponsorIndex=0&BillListIndex=0&BillStatuteText=&BillTypeIndex=0&BillReferredIndex=0&HouseChamber=H&BillSearchIndex=0> (last accessed September 2013).
- 22 Laura Rokoff and Emma Stokking, "Small Investments, High Yields: A Cost Study of Same Day Registration in Iowa and North Carolina" (New York: Demos, 2012), available at <http://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/SDR-CostStudy-Final.pdf>.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey."
- 25 Ibid.

- 26 Myrna Pérez, "Voter Purges" (Washington: Brennan Center for Justice, 2008), available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/publications/Voter.Purges.f.pdf>.
- 27 42 U.S.C. § 15483(a)(2)(B).
- 28 42 U.S.C. § 15483(a).
- 29 Pérez, "Voter Purges."
- 30 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey."
- 31 Wendy R. Riser, "Are HAVA's Provisional Ballots Working?" (Washington: Brennan Center for Justice, 2006), available at http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/d/download_file_39043.pdf.
- 32 Brennan Center for Justice, "Provisional Ballots," available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/provisional-ballots> (last accessed November 2013).
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Project Vote, "Provisional Voting," available at <http://projectvote.org/provisional-voting.html> (last accessed October 2013).
- 35 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey."
- 36 Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, "The 2012 Election Protection Report: Our Broken Voting System and How to Repair It" (2013), available at <http://www.866ourvote.org/newsroom/publications/document/EP-2012-Full-Report.pdf>; Jan Ransom, "Study finds that majority of provisional ballots weren't necessary," *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, December 7, 2012, available at http://articles.philly.com/2012-12-07/news/35649956_1_poll-workers-provisional-ballots-poll-books.
- 37 Noah Pranksy, "Hillsborough County Supervisor of Elections office loses power, endures other election day problems," *WTSP.com*, November 6, 2012, available at <http://www.wtsp.com/news/local/story.aspx?storyid=281319>.
- 38 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey."
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "Election Administration and Voting Survey."
- 41 Arizona Secretary of State Ken Bennett, "Voter Registration and Education."
- 42 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration," available at <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/same-day-registration.aspx> (last accessed December 2013).
- 43 ServiceArizona, "Voter Registration," available at <https://servicearizona.com/webapp/evoter/register?execution=e1s1> (last accessed December 2013).
- 44 Arizona Secretary of State Ken Bennett, "County Recorder and Election Offices," available at <http://www.azsos.gov/election/county.htm> (last accessed December 2013).
- 45 Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 16-579 (A)(1) (2012).
- 46 Colorado Secretary of State Scott Gessler, "Voter Registration FAQs," available at <http://www.sos.state.co.us/pubs/elections/FAQs/VoterRegistrationFAQ.html> (last accessed December 2013); Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide: Colorado," August 27, 2013, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/student-voting-guide-colorado>; National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration," available at <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/electronic-or-online-voter-registration.aspx> (last accessed December 2013).
- 47 Donetta Davidson and Joan Fitz-Gerald, "Improving Colorado's elections," *The Denver Post*, April 24, 2013, available at http://www.denverpost.com/ci_23090653/improving-our-elections.
- 48 Colorado Secretary of State Scott Gessler, "Voter Registration FAQs"; Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide."
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 State of Colorado, "County Clerk & Recorders: Elections Division Contact Information," available at <http://www.sos.state.co.us/pubs/elections/Resources/files/County-ClerkRosterWebsite.pdf> (last accessed December 2013).
- 51 Jefferson County Government, "Jefferson County Elections Division," available at <http://jeffco.us/elections/> (last accessed December 2013).
- 52 Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, "Colorado Voters' Checklist," available at <http://www.866ourvote.org/state/materials/CO-Checklist-2012-FINAL-2.pdf> (last accessed December 2013).
- 53 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 54 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 55 Long Distance Voter, "Florida Absentee Ballot Guide," available at <http://www.longdistancevoter.org/florida#.UrNO3vRDUso> (last accessed December 2013).
- 56 Florida Division of Elections, "Division Director's Office," available at <http://election.dos.state.fl.us/division/director.shtml> (last accessed December 2013).
- 57 Florida Statutes, §101.043.
- 58 Georgia did not submit information on the rate of provisional ballots rejected to the Election Assistance Commission's Election Administration and Voting Survey. U.S. Election Assistance Commission, "Election Administration and Voting Survey." Georgia's secretary of state also did not make this information readily available online. Thus, the Georgia rankings are based on the five remaining factors for which information was readily available online.
- 59 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 60 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 61 Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide: Georgia," February 29, 2012, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/student-voting-guide-georgia>.
- 62 Georgia Secretary of State Brian Kemp, "State Election Board," available at http://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/state_election_board (last accessed December 2013).

- 63 Georgia Secretary of State Brian Kemp, "County Election Offices," available at <http://sos.georgia.gov/cgi-bin/countyelectionoffices.asp> (last accessed December 2013).
- 64 Georgia Secretary of State Brian Kemp, "Georgia Voter Identification Requirements," available at http://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/georgia_voter_identification_requirements2 (last accessed December 2013).
- 65 Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide: Indiana," June 30, 2012, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/student-voting-guide-indiana>.
- 66 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 67 Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide: Indiana."
- 68 FindLaw, "Ind. Code § 3-6-4.1-14: Indiana Code – Section 3-6-4.1-14: Powers and duties," available at <http://codes.lp.findlaw.com/incode/3/6/4.1/3-6-4.1-14> (last accessed December 2013).
- 69 Ibid; State of Indiana, "Information Maintained by the Office of Code Revision Indiana Legislative Services Agency," available at <http://www.in.gov/legislative/ic/2010/title3/ar6/ch5.html> (last accessed December 2013).
- 70 State of Indiana, "Photo ID Law," available at <http://www.in.gov/sos/elections/2401.htm> (last accessed December 2013).
- 71 Rokoff and Stokking, "Small Investments, High Yields."
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 Iowa Secretary of State Matt Schultz, "Voter Registration," available at <http://sos.iowa.gov/elections/voterinformation/voterregistration.html> (last accessed December 2013).
- 74 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 75 Iowa Code §48A.9 (1).
- 76 Iowa Secretary of State Matt Schultz, "Voters: Find Your County Auditor/Commissioner of Elections," available at <http://sos.iowa.gov/elections/auditors/auditorslist.html> (last accessed December 2013).
- 77 Iowa Secretary of State Matt Schultz, "Voters," available at <http://sos.iowa.gov/elections/voterinformation/index.html> (last accessed December 2013).
- 78 ACLU of Iowa, "Voter ID Laws," available at <http://www.aclu-ia.org/voting-rights-in-iowa/> (last accessed December 2013).
- 79 Iowa Secretary of State Matt Schultz, "Election Day FAQ," available at <http://sos.iowa.gov/elections/voterinformation/edfaq.html> (last accessed January 2014).
- 80 Dave Murray, "Secretary of State Ruth Johnson: Calling reforms voter suppression is 'partisan theatrics' or a misunderstanding," MLive.com, June 13, 2012, available at http://www.mlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2012/06/ruth_johnson_calling_reforms_v.html; Rebecca Cook, "Michigan Republican governor vetoes broader voter ID law," Reuters, July 3, 2012, available at <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/03/us-usa-michigan-voterid-idUSBRE8621CG20120703>.
- 81 Huffington Post, "Michigan Ballot: Citizenship Question Leads to Confusion, Disenfranchisement at Polls," August 8, 2012, available at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/08/michigan-ballot-citizenship-question_n_1756888.html.
- 82 Ibid.
- 83 David Eggert, "Secretary of State Ruth Johnson won't appeal citizenship ruling in time for November election," MLive.com, October 10, 2012, available at http://www.mlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2012/10/secretary_of_state_ruth_johnso_4.html.
- 84 Michigan Secretary of State Ruth Johnson, "Registering to Vote: Step 3," available at http://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,1607,7-127-1633_8716_8726_47669-175880--,00.html (last accessed December 2013); National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 85 Project Vote Smart, "Voter Registration: Michigan," available at http://votesmart.org/elections/voter-registration/MI#.UrCo0_RDuSo (last accessed December 2013).
- 86 Michigan Secretary of State Ruth Johnson, "Registering to Vote: Step 2," available at http://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,1607,7-127-1633_8716_8726_47669-175879--,00.html (last accessed December 2013).
- 87 Michigan Secretary of State Ruth Johnson, "Michigan's Elections System Structure Overview," available at http://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,4670,7-127-1633_8716-27476--,00.html (last accessed December 2013).
- 88 Michigan Secretary of State Ruth Johnson, "Registering to Vote: Step 5," available at http://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,1607,7-127-1633_8716_8726_47669-175882--,00.html (last accessed December 2013); Michigan Department of State, "Notice to Voters: Voter Identification Requirement in Effect," available at http://www.michigan.gov/documents/sos/Notice_To_Voters_209297_7.pdf (last accessed December 2013).
- 89 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 90 Minnesota Secretary of State Mark Ritchie, "Register to Vote: Register on Election Day," available at <http://www.sos.state.mn.us/index.aspx?page=1767> (last accessed December 2013).
- 91 Minnesota Secretary of State Mark Ritchie, "Register to Vote," available at <http://www.sos.state.mn.us/index.aspx?page=204> (last accessed December 2013).
- 92 Minnesota Secretary of State Mark Ritchie, "Election Administration," available at <http://www.sos.state.mn.us/index.aspx?page=587> (last accessed December 2013).
- 93 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Voter Identification Requirements," available at <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/voter-id.aspx> (last accessed December 2013).
- 94 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 95 Missouri Secretary of State Jason Kander, "Frequently Asked Questions," available at http://www.sos.mo.gov/elections/faqs.aspx#a1_2 (last accessed December 2013).
- 96 Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide: Missouri," July 31, 2012, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/student-voting-guide-missouri>.

- 97 Missouri Secretary of State Jason Kander, "Find Your Local Election Authority," available at <http://www.sos.mo.gov/elections/countyclerks.asp> (last accessed December 2013).
- 98 Missouri Secretary of State Jason Kander, "Acceptable IDs to Vote," available at <http://www.sos.mo.gov/elections/voterid/default.asp> (last accessed December 2013).
- 99 Krista Hostetler, "Nevada online voter registration complete," Channel 13 Action News, September 8, 2012, available at <http://www.jrn.com/ktnv/news/169050016.html>.
- 100 The Voting News, "Nevada: Bill would allow same day voter registration in Nevada," April 8, 2013, available at <http://thevotingnews.com/bill-would-allow-same-day-voter-registration-in-nevada-reno-gazette-journal/>.
- 101 Nevada Secretary of State Ross Miller, "Important Election Dates," available at <http://nv.sos.gov/index.aspx?page=91> (last accessed December 2013).
- 102 Ibid; see also Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide," November 19, 2012, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/student-voting-guide>.
- 103 24 NRS § 293.247; 20 NRS § 246.010.
- 104 Nevada Secretary of State Ross Miller, "Election Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)," available at <http://nv.sos.gov/index.aspx?page=255#472> (last accessed December 2013).
- 105 New Hampshire Secretary of State William M. Gardner, "Voter Registration: Frequently Asked Questions," available at <http://sos.nh.gov/VoterRegFAQ.aspx> (last accessed December 2013).
- 106 Ibid.
- 107 Ibid.
- 108 New Hampshire Secretary of State William M. Gardner, "New Hampshire Election Procedure Manual: 2010-2011" (2010), available at <http://sos.nh.gov/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=12408>.
- 109 N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. 654:12; Brennan Center for Justice, "Election 2012: Voting Laws Roundup," October 11, 2012, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/election-2012-voting-laws-roundup>; Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide: New Hampshire," July 31, 2012, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/student-voting-guide-new-hampshire>.
- 110 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 111 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 112 New Mexico Secretary of State, "Voter Registration Information," available at http://www.sos.state.nm.us/Voter_Information/Voter_Registration_Information.aspx (last accessed December 2013).
- 113 New Mexico Secretary of State, "Voter Information: County Clerk Information," available at http://www.sos.state.nm.us/Voter_Information/County_Clerk_Information.aspx (last accessed December 2013).
- 114 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Voter Identification Requirements."
- 115 Rokoff and Stokking, "Small Investments, High Yields."
- 116 Ibid.
- 117 Aaron Blake, "North Carolina governor signs extensive Voter ID law," *The Washington Post*, August 12, 2013, available at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2013/08/12/north-carolina-governor-signs-extensive-voter-id-law/>.
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Ian Millhiser, "GOP Official Resigns After Saying Purpose of Voter ID Is To Suppress Votes of Democrats, 'Lazy Blacks,'" ThinkProgress, October 25, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2013/10/25/2835101/gop-asks-party-official-resign-admits-voter-suppresses-democratic-votes/>.
- 120 Ibid.
- 121 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 122 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration." Note that this option was repealed with 2013 legislation.
- 123 North Carolina Voter Guide, "Voting Answers," available at <http://ncvoterguide.org/answers/> (last accessed December 2013).
- 124 "North Carolina State Board of Elections," available at <http://www.ncsbe.gov/> (last accessed December 2013).
- 125 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Voter Identification Requirements."
- 126 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 127 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 128 Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted, "Elections & Voting: Frequently Asked Questions about General Voting and Voter Registration," available at <http://www.sos.state.oh.us/sos/elections/Voters/FAQ/genFAQs.aspx> (last accessed December 2013).
- 129 Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted, "County Board Directory," available at <http://www.sos.state.oh.us/SOS/elections/electionofficials/boeDirectory.aspx> (last accessed December 2013).
- 130 Ibid.
- 131 Brennan Center for Justice, "Student Voting Guide: Ohio," March 31, 2012, available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/student-voting-guide-ohio>.
- 132 Igor Volsky, "Top Pennsylvania Republican Admits Voter ID Helped Suppress Obama Voters," ThinkProgress, July 17, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2013/07/17/2313571/top-pennsylvania-republican-admits-voter-id-helped-suppress-obama-voters/>.
- 133 Nicole Flatow, "Evidence Mounts of Misinformation on Pennsylvania Voter ID Requirement," ThinkProgress, November 6, 2012, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/11/06/1147211/evidence-mounts-of-misinformation-on-pennsylvania-voter-id-requirement/>.
- 134 Ibid.
- 135 Ibid.
- 136 Ibid.

- 137 Nicole Flatow, "Court Blocks Pennsylvania Voter ID Law, As Six Other States Revive Their Own," *ThinkProgress*, August 19, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2013/08/19/2487241/court-blocks-pennsylvania-voter-id-law-again-as-six-other-states-revive-their-own/>.
- 138 Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, "2012 Election Protection Report."
- 139 Ransom, "Study finds that majority of provisional ballots weren't necessary."
- 140 VotesPA, "How to Register," available at <http://www.votespa.com/portal/server.pt?mode=2&objID=1174117&open=514&parentid=1&parentname=ObjMgr> (last accessed December 2013).
- 141 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 142 Project Vote Smart, "Voter Registration: Pennsylvania," available at <http://votesmart.org/elections/voter-registration/PA#.UdHKz5ywXB8> (last accessed December 2013).
- 143 25 P.S. § 2641 (a); see also Pennsylvania Department of State, "Voting and Elections," available at http://www.dos.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/voting_and_elections/12363 (last accessed December 2013).
- 144 Linda Finarelli, "Governor signs voter ID bill into law," *Montgomery News*, March 16, 2012, available at http://www.montgomerynews.com/articles/2012/03/16/north_penn_life/news/doc4f635af0c40a5197444605.txt.
- 145 *Applewhite v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, Case No. 330 M.D.2012, Supplemental Determination on Application for Preliminary Injunction, October 2, 2012, available at http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/electionlaw/litigation/documents/Opinion_004.pdf.
- 146 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Voter Identification Requirements."
- 147 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Online Voter Registration."
- 148 National Conference of State Legislatures, "Same Day Voter Registration."
- 149 See Code of Virginia §§ 24.2-416 and § 24.2-101; Virginia Constitution Article II, Section I; Virginia State Board of Elections, "Virginia Voter Registration: Eligibility," available at <https://www.vote.virginia.gov/register/residential> (last accessed December 2013).
- 150 See Code of Virginia §§24.2-103(a); 24.2-103(b); and 24.2-106.
- 151 Virginia State Board of Elections, "Voter Identification," available at <http://www.sbe.virginia.gov/Files/Cast%20Your%20Ballot/VotingInPerson/VoterIdentificationChart.pdf> (last accessed December 2013); Laura Vozzella, "Justice Department upholds Va. voter ID law, governor says," *The Washington Post*, August 20, 2012, available at http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/virginia-politics/post/justice-department-upholds-virginia-voter-id-law/2012/08/20/76d609f6-eb2a-11e1-a80b-9f898562d010_blog.html.
- 152 In November 2012, Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker (R) called for the repeal of the state's same-day registration law. Thankfully, he reversed his position a month later. Amanda Terkel, "Scott Walker Won't End Same-Day Voter Registration in Wisconsin," *Huffington Post*, December 13, 2012, available at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/12/scott-walker-same-day-voter-registration_n_2285715.html.
- 153 *Ibid.*
- 154 24 NRS § 293.504; 293.240.
- 155 Wis. Stat. Ann. § 6.55 (West 2012); Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, "Proof of Residence for Voter Registration," available at http://gab.wi.gov/sites/default/files/publication/154/proof_of_residence_for_voter_registration_9_12_pdf_17758.pdf (last accessed December 2013).
- 156 Wis. Stat. Ann. § 6.28(1).
- 157 Wis. Stat. Ann. § 6.29.
- 158 Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, "Introduction to the G.A.B.," available at <http://gab.wi.gov/about/introduction> (last accessed December 2013).
- 159 *Ibid.*
- 160 Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, "Registration and Voting."
- 161 Chu, Field, and Posner, "Florida's Worst Election Offenders."
- 162 The Pew Charitable Trusts, "Solution or Problem? Provisional Ballots in 2004" (2005), available at <http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/ERIP10Apr05.pdf>.
- 163 The Pew Charitable Trusts, "Elections Performance Index."

Appendix A

Florida's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Average number of minutes after polls closed, 2012*	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Alachua	4	64.7% (14)	87.4% (8)	34 (17)	2.18% (3)	43.9% (13)	1.93% (5)	0.60% (2)
Bay	3	64.3% (12)	89.3% (14)	-	1.57% (6)	39.1% (16)	2.19% (1)	0.44% (7)
Brevard	27	69.1% (26)	91.2% (24)	63 (8)	0.64% (31)	53.2% (8)	0.21% (38)	0.25% (29)
Broward	35	68.6% (25)	102.6% (38)	25 (19)	0.87% (22)	61.4% (4)	1.30% (12)	0.36% (12)
Charlotte	22	65.0% (15)	87.6% (10)	0 (26)	0.28% (38)	49.3% (9)	1.01% (18)	0.15% (40)
Citrus	32	64.1% (11)	84.8% (5)	0 (26)	0.95% (21)	6.3% (40)	0.24% (36)	0.27% (27)
Clay	39	72.1% (37)	98.4% (37)	13 (23)	1.17% (16)	22.7% (36)	0.37% (33)	0.32% (22)
Collier	15	71.3% (36)	85.6% (6)	8 (25)	1.18% (15)	44.7% (12)	1.51% (8)	0.35% (15)
Columbia	1	53.5% (1)	69.6% (1)	-	0.53% (36)	38.8% (17)	1.98% (4)	0.28% (25)
Duval	5	66.7% (21)	89.6% (16)	35 (15)	4.32% (1)	34.6% (25)	1.29% (13)	0.49% (5)
Escambia	13	66.8% (22)	87.9% (12)	11 (24)	0.76% (26)	33.1% (26)	0.69% (26)	0.42% (9)
Flagler	37	71.0% (33)	97.2% (36)	-	1.04% (19)	28.2% (30)	0.60% (29)	0.35% (13)
Hernando	31	60.4% (5)	92.1% (27)	-	0.60% (32)	24.6% (34)	0.96% (19)	0.21% (32)
Highlands	7	57.3% (2)	82.4% (3)	-	1.80% (5)	36.2% (22)	0.73% (25)	0.33% (18)
Hillsborough	6	65.9% (18)	89.7% (17)	72 (7)	2.47% (2)	41.6% (14)	0.93% (21)	0.66% (1)
Indian River	26	69.5% (27)	90.1% (19)	18 (22)	1.38% (11)	22.5% (37)	0.77% (22)	0.32% (24)
Lake	33	68.1% (24)	90.1% (20)	20 (21)	0.43% (37)	39.8% (15)	1.12% (14)	0.27% (26)
Lee	9	60.6% (6)	87.9% (11)	115 (1)	1.07% (17)	38.2% (19)	1.02% (17)	0.19% (36)
Leon	25	70.9% (32)	90.4% (21)	41 (11)	1.56% (7)	38.0% (20)	0.11% (39)	0.35% (16)
Manatee	30	66.4% (20)	90.0% (18)	53 (9)	0.59% (33)	32.5% (28)	0.22% (37)	0.16% (39)
Marion	18	63.9% (10)	87.6% (9)	27 (18)	0.17% (40)	56.5% (7)	0.58% (30)	0.34% (17)
Martin	20	71.2% (35)	91.0% (22)	0 (26)	1.03% (20)	59.8% (5)	0.46% (31)	0.24% (30)
Miami-Dade	19	66.0% (19)	97.1% (35)	73 (6)	0.70% (30)	64.6% (2)	0.94% (20)	0.44% (6)
Monroe	11	71.0% (34)	92.7% (28)	-	0.70% (29)	16.7% (38)	1.46% (9)	0.52% (4)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Average number of minutes after polls closed, 2012*	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Nassau	29	73.7% (38)	92.9% (29)	0 (26)	1.42% (10)	27.7% (31)	0.76% (23)	0.33% (19)
Okaloosa	16	70.6% (31)	95.3% (32)	-	0.70% (28)	59.2% (6)	2.09% (2)	0.23% (31)
Orange	12	62.7% (9)	91.6% (25)	86 (3)	1.51% (8)	46.4% (10)	1.05% (16)	0.33% (21)
Osceola	23	65.1% (16)	96.7% (33)	37 (14)	1.25% (12)	62.4% (3)	1.64% (6)	0.38% (11)
Palm Beach	17	67.7% (23)	97.0% (34)	84 (4)	0.58% (35)	71.8% (1)	1.10% (15)	0.33% (20)
Pasco	36	62.1% (8)	89.4% (15)	41 (11)	0.76% (25)	8.5% (39)	0.67% (27)	0.20% (34)
Pinellas	24	65.6% (17)	88.6% (13)	40 (13)	0.86% (23)	34.7% (24)	0.26% (35)	0.32% (23)
Polk	14	59.4% (4)	83.3% (4)	35 (15)	1.20% (14)	44.8% (11)	0.45% (32)	0.26% (28)
Putnam	2	57.6% (3)	79.2% (2)	-	1.07% (18)	31.6% (29)	1.43% (11)	0.54% (3)
Santa Rosa	38	69.7% (28)	105.4% (39)	-	0.74% (27)	33.0% (27)	0.29% (34)	0.21% (33)
Sarasota	34	69.8% (29)	92.9% (30)	-	1.21% (13)	35.2% (23)	0.75% (24)	0.19% (35)
Seminole	28	69.8% (30)	91.6% (26)	25 (19)	1.90% (4)	22.8% (35)	2.05% (3)	0.18% (37)
St. Johns	40	83.6% (40)	110.1% (40)	0 (26)	0.85% (24)	37.5% (21)	1.52% (7)	0.16% (38)
St. Lucie	21	64.4% (13)	91.1% (23)	96 (2)	1.43% (9)	25.6% (33)	0.01% (40)	0.42% (8)
Sumter	10	77.0% (39)	93.5% (31)	46 (10)	0.23% (39)	26.3% (32)	0.60% (28)	0.38% (10)
Volusia	8	61.1% (7)	86.2% (7)	75 (5)	0.59% (34)	38.7% (18)	1.44% (10)	0.35% (14)

*Among counties in which waiting-time data were not available, this factor was omitted from the overall rankings. See the methodology section for more details.

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, and Advancement Project. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Georgia's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Appling	69	55.4% (62)	84.6% (58)	0.07% (72)	0.000% (33)	6.31% (53)
Baldwin	26	45.0% (11)	66.3% (4)	0.21% (33)	0.000% (33)	5.35% (88)
Banks	61	48.0% (27)	74.2% (17)	0.05% (85)	0.000% (33)	5.05% (93)
Barrow	72	54.8% (56)	85.9% (64)	0.06% (80)	0.000% (33)	6.24% (57)
Bartow	60	52.0% (45)	86.2% (67)	0.19% (36)	0.025% (15)	6.25% (55)
Ben Hill	24	46.7% (19)	74.6% (18)	0.08% (64)	0.000% (33)	7.22% (28)
Berrien	7	45.2% (12)	74.2% (16)	0.14% (44)	0.109% (4)	8.91% (5)
Bibb	83	57.7% (75)	86.6% (70)	0.12% (54)	0.000% (33)	5.64% (77)
Brantley	53	46.0% (15)	76.4% (23)	0.00% (103)	0.000% (33)	5.54% (78)
Brooks	8	55.1% (59)	83.7% (56)	2.33% (2)	0.000% (33)	6.54% (46)
Bryan	104	64.7% (96)	105.1% (106)	0.08% (65)	0.000% (33)	5.03% (94)
Bulloch	45	45.4% (13)	76.3% (22)	0.10% (56)	0.000% (33)	5.36% (86)
Burke	81	59.4% (83)	88.0% (75)	0.00% (103)	0.000% (33)	6.60% (42)
Butts	15	52.4% (48)	74.7% (19)	0.00% (103)	0.015% (25)	9.76% (2)
Camden	34	49.8% (34)	88.6% (82)	0.30% (21)	0.000% (33)	7.65% (15)
Carroll	49	53.2% (49)	84.3% (57)	0.32% (18)	0.020% (22)	6.25% (56)
Catoosa	67	50.8% (41)	87.3% (73)	0.07% (76)	0.000% (33)	6.26% (54)
Chatham	35	56.8% (70)	88.2% (79)	0.13% (49)	0.000% (33)	9.11% (4)
Chattooga	10	40.6% (5)	69.4% (6)	0.58% (6)	0.000% (33)	6.96% (35)
Cherokee	108	69.0% (106)	99.4% (99)	0.07% (73)	0.000% (33)	3.99% (110)
Clarke	38	46.7% (17)	77.8% (32)	0.15% (41)	0.000% (33)	6.11% (62)
Clayton	91	58.9% (81)	94.7% (95)	0.06% (81)	0.000% (33)	5.88% (69)
Cobb	13	69.2% (107)	101.9% (102)	0.39% (12)	0.424% (2)	6.18% (58)
Coffee	31	49.7% (33)	76.6% (25)	0.10% (58)	0.060% (7)	6.10% (63)
Colquitt	42	46.5% (16)	78.4% (35)	0.03% (98)	0.000% (33)	6.38% (50)
Columbia	107	69.8% (108)	105.7% (107)	0.05% (83)	0.000% (33)	4.93% (97)
Cook	40	50.8% (42)	77.8% (31)	0.00% (103)	0.000% (33)	7.16% (29)
Coweta	102	64.5% (95)	96.8% (98)	0.07% (75)	0.000% (33)	4.79% (100)
Crisp	18	43.5% (8)	70.5% (9)	0.00% (103)	0.000% (33)	6.97% (34)
Dade	44	47.5% (21)	85.4% (62)	0.53% (7)	0.000% (33)	5.47% (80)
Dawson	59	61.6% (88)	87.9% (74)	0.05% (82)	0.015% (24)	8.51% (7)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Decatur	27	52.2% (46)	82.2% (50)	0.36% (14)	0.033% (9)	7.14% (31)
DeKalb	100	67.2% (100)	102.7% (104)	0.25% (26)	0.001% (32)	5.80% (72)
Dodge	22	47.6% (23)	67.0% (5)	0.02% (100)	0.000% (33)	6.72% (41)
Dooly	1	38.8% (4)	56.7% (2)	0.44% (10)	0.093% (5)	8.51% (8)
Dougherty	68	54.9% (58)	88.3% (80)	0.39% (11)	0.029% (13)	5.21% (91)
Douglas	97	63.6% (90)	94.7% (94)	0.06% (77)	0.003% (31)	4.90% (98)
Effingham	88	57.5% (73)	92.3% (89)	0.07% (74)	0.000% (33)	5.90% (68)
Elbert	57	54.2% (52)	82.3% (52)	0.12% (51)	0.000% (33)	6.88% (36)
Emanuel	9	50.0% (35)	80.2% (43)	0.45% (8)	0.029% (12)	10.08% (1)
Fannin	70	53.6% (51)	86.1% (65)	0.09% (61)	0.000% (33)	6.15% (61)
Fayette	110	79.5% (110)	109.6% (111)	0.08% (67)	0.000% (33)	4.03% (109)
Floyd	11	48.0% (26)	77.9% (33)	0.82% (4)	0.000% (33)	7.36% (23)
Forsyth	109	76.8% (109)	107.1% (110)	0.12% (50)	0.010% (27)	4.23% (107)
Franklin	5	46.7% (18)	72.1% (11)	0.04% (89)	0.174% (3)	8.01% (11)
Fulton	30	63.7% (91)	105.9% (108)	2.22% (3)	0.039% (8)	5.39% (82)
Gilmer	66	53.5% (50)	83.3% (55)	0.09% (62)	0.000% (33)	6.50% (49)
Glynn	55	58.0% (77)	93.4% (93)	0.44% (9)	0.028% (14)	7.37% (21)
Gordon	28	46.8% (20)	79.3% (38)	0.28% (23)	0.000% (33)	6.76% (39)
Grady	76	55.2% (61)	87.3% (72)	0.04% (88)	0.021% (21)	6.03% (65)
Greene	86	68.2% (104)	89.6% (85)	0.31% (20)	0.000% (33)	6.53% (47)
Gwinnett	103	66.0% (99)	102.9% (105)	0.37% (13)	0.004% (30)	4.69% (101)
Habersham	51	48.5% (28)	74.0% (14)	0.32% (17)	0.000% (33)	4.63% (103)
Hall	84	57.2% (71)	87.0% (71)	0.25% (27)	0.022% (20)	4.64% (102)
Haralson	39	49.0% (30)	77.6% (27)	0.10% (57)	0.000% (33)	6.58% (43)
Harris	98	65.9% (98)	95.1% (96)	0.04% (90)	0.000% (33)	5.38% (84)
Hart	50	49.7% (32)	75.4% (21)	0.00% (103)	0.000% (33)	6.04% (64)
Henry	105	68.0% (102)	100.7% (101)	0.01% (102)	0.000% (33)	4.55% (105)
Houston	93	60.0% (84)	92.4% (90)	0.08% (66)	0.000% (33)	5.06% (92)
Jackson	79	56.1% (67)	82.3% (51)	0.14% (46)	0.000% (33)	5.37% (85)
Jefferson	48	59.4% (82)	88.2% (78)	0.35% (15)	0.033% (10)	7.36% (22)
Jones	90	58.5% (80)	82.6% (53)	0.07% (71)	0.000% (33)	4.58% (104)
Lamar	47	54.9% (57)	82.9% (54)	0.09% (63)	0.024% (17)	7.09% (32)
Laurens	37	55.9% (66)	78.6% (36)	0.03% (97)	0.000% (33)	7.98% (12)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Lee	106	68.2% (103)	102.1% (103)	0.03% (95)	0.000% (33)	4.37% (106)
Liberty	17	37.2% (1)	71.5% (10)	0.00% (103)	0.010% (26)	5.79% (73)
Lowndes	2	50.5% (40)	79.9% (41)	2.79% (1)	0.000% (33)	6.88% (37)
Lumpkin	12	48.8% (29)	73.9% (12)	0.28% (22)	0.000% (33)	8.63% (6)
Macon	21	45.5% (14)	69.6% (7)	0.00% (103)	0.000% (33)	7.33% (25)
Madison	52	54.3% (53)	80.0% (42)	0.14% (48)	0.000% (33)	6.81% (38)
Mcduffie	92	61.1% (86)	90.2% (86)	0.07% (70)	0.000% (33)	5.35% (87)
Mcintosh	78	58.2% (78)	81.8% (48)	0.27% (24)	0.000% (33)	5.33% (89)
Meriwether	64	55.2% (60)	85.1% (59)	0.05% (87)	0.000% (33)	7.25% (27)
Mitchell	36	47.8% (24)	73.9% (13)	0.05% (86)	0.023% (18)	5.73% (74)
Monroe	87	61.6% (89)	86.5% (69)	0.15% (42)	0.000% (33)	5.69% (75)
Morgan	96	68.7% (105)	92.7% (91)	0.12% (52)	0.000% (33)	5.39% (83)
Murray	32	42.1% (6)	74.1% (15)	0.00% (103)	0.000% (33)	6.01% (66)
Muscogee	41	51.9% (44)	88.3% (81)	0.31% (19)	0.000% (33)	7.56% (16)
Newton	101	64.2% (94)	95.8% (97)	0.03% (96)	0.000% (33)	4.94% (96)
Oconee	111	79.7% (111)	106.9% (109)	0.01% (101)	0.000% (33)	3.50% (111)
Oglethorpe	75	57.9% (76)	81.1% (46)	0.03% (94)	0.000% (33)	6.15% (60)
Paulding	95	60.9% (85)	90.9% (88)	0.14% (47)	0.005% (29)	4.10% (108)
Peach	85	57.3% (72)	85.3% (61)	0.16% (39)	0.000% (33)	4.95% (95)
Pickens	4	56.6% (69)	85.2% (60)	0.03% (92)	0.483% (1)	5.46% (81)
Pierce	62	51.7% (43)	80.3% (44)	0.03% (93)	0.000% (33)	6.33% (52)
Pike	89	63.9% (92)	90.4% (87)	0.21% (31)	0.023% (19)	5.49% (79)
Polk	16	47.9% (25)	77.7% (29)	0.34% (16)	0.000% (33)	8.30% (9)
Putnam	54	57.6% (74)	81.1% (47)	0.16% (40)	0.000% (33)	7.31% (26)
Rabun	80	61.2% (87)	88.0% (76)	0.06% (78)	0.000% (33)	6.75% (40)
Richmond	63	54.3% (54)	86.4% (68)	0.14% (45)	0.000% (33)	7.08% (33)
Rockdale	94	67.5% (101)	99.9% (100)	0.62% (5)	0.000% (33)	5.21% (90)
Screven	74	56.1% (68)	85.6% (63)	0.21% (30)	0.000% (33)	5.86% (70)
Spalding	73	54.5% (55)	86.2% (66)	0.14% (43)	0.000% (33)	5.93% (67)
Stephens	23	49.1% (31)	79.7% (40)	0.21% (34)	0.000% (33)	7.82% (13)
Sumter	25	50.3% (38)	76.5% (24)	0.21% (29)	0.000% (33)	7.48% (18)
Tattall	6	37.4% (2)	60.3% (3)	0.21% (32)	0.029% (11)	7.49% (17)
Telfair	3	38.2% (3)	55.3% (1)	0.07% (69)	0.060% (6)	9.24% (3)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Thomas	77	58.3% (79)	88.8% (83)	0.02% (99)	0.000% (33)	7.15% (30)
Tift	43	50.0% (36)	79.3% (37)	0.26% (25)	0.000% (33)	6.15% (59)
Toombs	19	50.3% (39)	78.1% (34)	0.19% (38)	0.024% (16)	8.04% (10)
Troup	71	55.4% (63)	88.1% (77)	0.07% (68)	0.008% (28)	6.50% (48)
Union	82	65.4% (97)	89.3% (84)	0.09% (60)	0.000% (33)	7.34% (24)
Upson	46	55.4% (64)	81.8% (49)	0.12% (53)	0.000% (33)	7.43% (19)
Walker	20	42.6% (7)	77.6% (28)	0.04% (91)	0.000% (33)	7.77% (14)
Walton	99	64.1% (93)	93.0% (92)	0.05% (84)	0.000% (33)	4.81% (99)
Ware	14	44.5% (10)	70.0% (8)	0.19% (37)	0.018% (23)	7.42% (20)
Washington	56	55.6% (65)	80.3% (45)	0.25% (28)	0.000% (33)	6.57% (44)
Wayne	33	47.5% (22)	74.9% (20)	0.06% (79)	0.000% (33)	6.56% (45)
White	58	50.2% (37)	76.8% (26)	0.09% (59)	0.000% (33)	5.66% (76)
Whitfield	29	44.1% (9)	77.8% (30)	0.20% (35)	0.000% (33)	6.33% (51)
Worth	65	52.3% (47)	79.4% (39)	0.11% (55)	0.000% (33)	5.80% (71)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, and the Office of the Georgia Secretary of State. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Indiana's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Adams	14	56.1% (52)	79.4% (2)	0.38% (12)	86.8% (33)	1.53% (42)	17.3% (32)
Allen	60	59.9% (64)	102.6% (66)	0.30% (17)	69.0% (48)	1.73% (36)	17.4% (30)
Bartholomew	45	55.7% (48)	97.3% (54)	0.07% (41)	88.2% (29)	1.39% (49)	17.6% (28)
Boone	75	71.2% (77)	108.3% (74)	0.13% (33)	84.6% (34)	0.91% (62)	16.0% (47)
Carroll	13	53.9% (38)	92.4% (39)	0.44% (7)	65.5% (50)	0.35% (73)	25.5% (3)
Cass	11	53.9% (37)	82.7% (8)	0.66% (3)	47.4% (57)	2.06% (27)	20.5% (8)
Clark	54	59.4% (62)	110.0% (76)	0.48% (5)	69.2% (47)	4.10% (8)	15.7% (51)
Clay	56	54.9% (45)	94.4% (45)	0.00% (61)	-	1.24% (53)	17.0% (36)
Clinton	8	44.3% (2)	89.7% (26)	0.18% (27)	100.0% (1)	2.03% (28)	17.7% (27)
Daviess	68	47.8% (7)	87.2% (17)	0.01% (59)	0.0% (60)	1.07% (58)	16.5% (44)
Dearborn	73	61.1% (67)	101.1% (64)	0.07% (47)	69.2% (46)	1.76% (32)	11.8% (76)
Decatur	21	55.8% (49)	83.3% (10)	0.04% (52)	100.0% (1)	0.86% (64)	18.3% (22)
DeKalb	38	54.2% (40)	95.0% (46)	0.07% (42)	88.9% (26)	3.98% (10)	14.8% (63)
Delaware	32	49.4% (11)	96.0% (50)	0.00% (61)	-	2.56% (20)	18.1% (23)
Dubois	74	62.8% (69)	98.5% (58)	0.00% (61)	-	1.07% (59)	13.8% (71)
Elkhart	28	52.5% (26)	95.7% (49)	0.41% (10)	78.3% (43)	1.42% (46)	16.8% (42)
Fayette	63	48.8% (9)	93.7% (42)	0.08% (39)	40.0% (59)	0.00% (75)	18.0% (25)
Floyd	51	64.8% (74)	102.1% (65)	0.24% (21)	89.2% (25)	2.26% (21)	19.0% (18)
Fountain	29	56.0% (50)	94.0% (43)	0.32% (14)	60.0% (51)	1.28% (52)	22.0% (5)
Franklin	78	62.8% (70)	108.9% (75)	0.00% (61)	-	1.74% (33)	9.8% (78)
Fulton	24	55.1% (47)	88.9% (21)	0.10% (38)	100.0% (1)	1.65% (39)	17.2% (33)
Gibson	52	59.5% (63)	92.8% (40)	0.07% (45)	100.0% (1)	1.41% (48)	14.9% (62)
Grant	27	47.5% (6)	91.5% (33)	0.12% (35)	81.8% (37)	2.16% (24)	15.7% (52)
Greene	4	53.5% (33)	83.2% (9)	0.00% (61)	-	2.97% (14)	25.6% (1)
Hamilton	77	77.0% (78)	112.6% (77)	0.03% (55)	80.6% (38)	2.07% (25)	17.1% (34)
Hancock	37	65.4% (75)	102.8% (69)	0.29% (19)	97.3% (16)	1.35% (50)	22.7% (4)
Harrison	71	60.7% (65)	102.7% (68)	0.00% (61)	-	2.06% (26)	14.2% (68)
Hendricks	66	66.6% (76)	100.4% (62)	0.13% (34)	95.6% (19)	1.35% (51)	16.9% (38)
Henry	5	51.0% (17)	80.6% (5)	0.01% (60)	100.0% (1)	4.18% (7)	21.1% (7)
Howard	61	58.9% (61)	99.3% (60)	0.00% (61)	-	1.88% (30)	18.4% (21)
Huntington	33	56.8% (55)	89.6% (25)	0.02% (58)	100.0% (1)	0.67% (69)	19.1% (16)
Jackson	55	56.4% (54)	97.5% (56)	0.04% (54)	80.0% (40)	2.76% (18)	16.0% (48)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Jasper	53	54.0% (39)	90.5% (31)	0.00% (61)	-	2.26% (22)	14.4% (66)
Jay	10	51.9% (20)	80.1% (4)	0.30% (16)	88.2% (29)	0.37% (71)	19.8% (13)
Jefferson	6	54.6% (42)	90.5% (30)	0.17% (28)	100.0% (1)	7.22% (4)	19.1% (15)
Jennings	3	51.5% (19)	88.9% (22)	0.37% (13)	80.0% (40)	9.03% (3)	17.1% (35)
Johnson	57	58.7% (60)	96.7% (52)	0.04% (53)	92.9% (20)	1.12% (56)	16.8% (40)
Knox	36	52.0% (21)	92.4% (38)	0.00% (61)	-	1.65% (40)	18.6% (20)
Kosciusko	30	55.0% (46)	89.0% (23)	0.26% (20)	90.9% (23)	1.73% (35)	15.1% (60)
Lagrange	2	39.4% (1)	65.8% (1)	0.19% (25)	100.0% (1)	6.36% (5)	16.8% (39)
Lake	25	58.2% (59)	96.3% (51)	0.43% (8)	87.3% (31)	2.83% (16)	17.0% (37)
Laporte	42	53.1% (30)	95.4% (48)	0.22% (22)	89.7% (24)	1.67% (38)	14.3% (67)
Lawrence	48	52.0% (23)	90.8% (32)	0.22% (23)	42.9% (58)	3.12% (13)	15.7% (53)
Madison	12	53.2% (31)	95.2% (47)	0.14% (32)	98.4% (15)	4.06% (9)	19.9% (11)
Marion	19	57.8% (58)	102.6% (67)	0.31% (15)	87.3% (32)	4.21% (6)	20.4% (9)
Marshall	44	54.8% (44)	89.2% (24)	0.02% (57)	66.7% (49)	2.61% (19)	16.8% (41)
Miami	16	46.2% (3)	81.1% (6)	0.05% (49)	60.0% (51)	1.68% (37)	19.9% (10)
Monroe	18	54.2% (41)	97.4% (55)	0.55% (4)	80.3% (39)	1.09% (57)	19.5% (14)
Montgomery	22	52.3% (25)	86.1% (13)	0.05% (51)	100.0% (1)	1.43% (45)	16.6% (43)
Morgan	76	56.3% (53)	93.5% (41)	0.00% (61)	0.0% (60)	0.71% (68)	15.1% (61)
Noble	35	50.7% (16)	90.3% (29)	0.07% (46)	88.9% (26)	1.81% (31)	15.3% (57)
Orange	65	53.6% (34)	104.6% (71)	0.00% (61)	-	2.81% (17)	15.2% (58)
Owen	43	50.3% (14)	90.1% (28)	0.11% (37)	83.3% (35)	0.00% (75)	15.6% (55)
Parke	39	48.9% (10)	91.7% (34)	0.48% (6)	60.0% (51)	0.84% (65)	14.1% (70)
Perry	62	53.1% (29)	86.3% (14)	0.00% (61)	-	0.99% (61)	12.2% (75)
Porter	69	60.8% (66)	94.4% (44)	0.00% (61)	-	0.50% (70)	15.6% (56)
Posey	70	63.5% (73)	97.2% (53)	0.16% (29)	60.0% (51)	0.80% (66)	16.3% (46)
Putnam	15	47.2% (4)	79.9% (3)	0.22% (24)	83.3% (35)	1.12% (55)	15.8% (50)
Randolph	40	53.1% (28)	88.6% (19)	0.15% (30)	100.0% (1)	0.00% (75)	14.2% (69)
Ripley	67	53.3% (32)	100.4% (63)	0.02% (56)	100.0% (1)	0.00% (75)	11.0% (77)
Rush	49	54.8% (43)	91.9% (36)	0.00% (61)	-	0.87% (63)	17.9% (26)
Scott	9	49.4% (12)	107.0% (73)	0.07% (43)	100.0% (1)	10.61% (1)	15.1% (59)
Shelby	46	52.2% (24)	85.1% (11)	0.07% (40)	80.0% (40)	0.78% (67)	13.7% (72)
Spencer	50	63.0% (71)	99.5% (61)	0.29% (18)	100.0% (1)	3.93% (11)	12.5% (74)
St. Joseph	58	57.8% (56)	106.2% (72)	0.11% (36)	96.0% (18)	1.89% (29)	15.8% (49)
Starke	34	51.0% (18)	98.8% (59)	0.38% (11)	88.9% (26)	1.42% (47)	14.7% (64)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Steuben	26	53.7% (35)	81.5% (7)	0.00% (61)	-	1.74% (34)	17.4% (31)
Sullivan	20	50.5% (15)	86.3% (15)	0.00% (61)	-	1.59% (41)	19.0% (17)
Tippecanoe	1	47.3% (5)	86.8% (16)	1.28% (1)	71.4% (45)	10.48% (2)	25.5% (2)
Vanderburgh	17	53.7% (36)	104.4% (70)	0.79% (2)	92.3% (22)	1.20% (54)	16.5% (45)
Vigo	7	48.8% (8)	92.1% (37)	0.43% (9)	96.5% (17)	2.87% (15)	17.5% (29)
Wabash	47	52.5% (27)	89.8% (27)	0.00% (61)	-	1.47% (44)	15.6% (54)
Warrick	72	57.8% (57)	115.7% (78)	0.00% (61)	-	3.73% (12)	14.5% (65)
Washington	41	52.0% (22)	91.9% (35)	0.15% (31)	92.9% (20)	1.50% (43)	13.5% (73)
Wayne	23	50.1% (13)	86.0% (12)	0.19% (26)	60.0% (51)	0.37% (72)	21.2% (6)
Wells	59	63.3% (72)	88.5% (18)	0.07% (44)	71.4% (44)	1.05% (60)	18.1% (24)
White	64	56.0% (51)	97.6% (57)	0.06% (48)	60.0% (51)	0.12% (74)	19.9% (12)
Whitley	31	61.1% (68)	88.7% (20)	0.05% (50)	100.0% (1)	2.20% (23)	18.7% (19)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Iowa's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Adair	70	67.6% (38)	97.2% (37)	0.04% (78)	0.0% (65)	0.82% (48)	5.52% (55)
Allamakee	64	66.7% (30)	97.9% (42)	0.10% (68)	25.0% (26)	0.10% (91)	6.31% (36)
Appanoose	16	63.3% (13)	96.4% (32)	0.71% (16)	0.0% (65)	0.99% (37)	9.11% (9)
Benton	52	73.3% (80)	98.0% (45)	0.17% (51)	43.8% (12)	1.10% (32)	6.01% (42)
Black Hawk	8	68.1% (47)	94.6% (23)	1.35% (4)	24.7% (27)	1.99% (11)	5.75% (46)
Boone	66	72.4% (78)	101.3% (72)	0.94% (11)	10.4% (53)	0.44% (73)	5.87% (44)
Bremer	45	72.3% (77)	101.0% (68)	0.89% (12)	14.5% (47)	0.69% (54)	7.57% (20)
Buchanan	41	69.3% (56)	96.7% (33)	0.06% (76)	50.0% (6)	1.52% (19)	4.14% (90)
Buena Vista	3	64.3% (14)	97.3% (38)	0.39% (37)	19.0% (35)	3.16% (3)	11.17% (5)
Butler	38	66.7% (31)	92.6% (15)	0.22% (46)	36.4% (18)	0.61% (61)	4.68% (79)
Calhoun	7	68.2% (50)	97.6% (39)	0.14% (56)	100.0% (1)	2.06% (10)	6.37% (32)
Carroll	61	69.0% (53)	98.8% (55)	0.15% (54)	40.0% (15)	0.90% (40)	4.20% (88)
Cass	59	67.7% (40)	100.8% (66)	0.00% (88)	-	0.51% (69)	8.69% (12)
Cedar	42	70.0% (64)	93.7% (19)	0.44% (32)	19.2% (34)	0.84% (45)	6.24% (38)
Cerro Gordo	11	70.0% (65)	98.3% (50)	1.20% (6)	20.0% (32)	3.09% (4)	4.20% (89)
Cherokee	74	68.6% (52)	98.0% (46)	0.15% (55)	16.7% (39)	0.36% (81)	5.12% (62)
Chickasaw	80	69.4% (58)	101.3% (71)	0.03% (84)	0.0% (65)	1.36% (25)	4.73% (76)
Clarke	87	67.7% (39)	98.8% (54)	0.04% (81)	0.0% (65)	0.16% (90)	4.92% (67)
Clay	82	68.0% (44)	103.2% (82)	0.45% (29)	13.6% (48)	0.25% (86)	4.32% (84)
Clayton	44	66.9% (34)	92.2% (12)	0.70% (18)	17.5% (37)	0.09% (92)	5.07% (64)
Clinton	50	67.5% (36)	95.3% (24)	0.11% (67)	42.9% (13)	0.47% (71)	4.85% (71)
Crawford	20	61.8% (6)	93.6% (18)	0.70% (17)	6.9% (59)	0.83% (46)	6.32% (35)
Dallas	92	87.5% (92)	118.3% (91)	0.79% (14)	33.1% (21)	0.85% (44)	4.76% (75)
Davis	40	62.3% (9)	88.9% (5)	0.08% (72)	0.0% (65)	0.77% (49)	4.81% (74)
Decatur	19	60.1% (2)	95.4% (26)	0.00% (88)	-	1.06% (34)	7.24% (25)
Delaware	79	71.3% (72)	98.1% (49)	0.12% (64)	28.6% (24)	0.27% (85)	4.70% (78)
Des Moines	25	66.9% (33)	97.9% (41)	0.12% (63)	15.4% (44)	2.65% (5)	6.05% (41)
Dickinson	78	75.6% (85)	102.8% (81)	0.00% (88)	-	1.01% (36)	8.76% (11)
Dubuque	69	72.9% (79)	98.4% (51)	0.60% (24)	15.1% (46)	0.88% (42)	4.36% (82)
Emmet	36	61.5% (5)	100.5% (64)	0.12% (65)	50.0% (6)	0.29% (83)	5.67% (49)
Fayette	17	64.7% (16)	82.0% (1)	0.31% (40)	21.1% (30)	0.60% (62)	5.55% (53)
Floyd	10	68.0% (43)	92.6% (14)	0.21% (48)	40.0% (15)	0.56% (65)	11.97% (3)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Franklin	1	67.8% (41)	95.4% (25)	0.47% (28)	100.0% (1)	2.09% (9)	9.33% (8)
Fremont	71	64.8% (18)	107.6% (89)	0.00% (88)	-	1.34% (26)	5.54% (54)
Greene	75	68.6% (51)	99.4% (59)	0.21% (49)	0.0% (65)	0.30% (82)	6.85% (27)
Grundy	73	74.1% (81)	100.0% (62)	0.43% (34)	5.0% (63)	1.78% (14)	4.23% (86)
Guthrie	81	71.2% (71)	99.4% (60)	0.14% (59)	0.0% (65)	0.98% (38)	5.17% (61)
Hamilton	32	68.2% (48)	96.7% (34)	0.09% (71)	75.0% (4)	0.42% (78)	5.81% (45)
Hancock	63	69.2% (55)	100.7% (65)	0.42% (36)	5.6% (61)	1.74% (15)	4.24% (85)
Hardin	43	67.5% (37)	95.6% (28)	0.64% (21)	26.7% (25)	0.24% (87)	5.66% (50)
Harrison	4	65.1% (21)	82.4% (2)	0.06% (77)	33.3% (19)	0.23% (88)	12.76% (2)
Henry	76	65.7% (24)	100.9% (67)	0.00% (88)	-	0.90% (41)	4.22% (87)
Howard	13	65.3% (22)	90.0% (7)	0.13% (60)	50.0% (6)	0.43% (76)	8.50% (14)
Humboldt	35	69.9% (63)	96.8% (35)	0.13% (61)	75.0% (4)	0.28% (84)	6.16% (39)
Iowa	77	72.2% (76)	102.0% (76)	0.69% (19)	18.4% (36)	0.42% (77)	4.84% (73)
Jackson	58	68.0% (45)	102.5% (80)	0.72% (15)	23.8% (28)	0.70% (53)	4.84% (72)
Jasper	62	69.1% (54)	97.7% (40)	0.22% (47)	20.8% (31)	0.93% (39)	5.01% (65)
Jefferson	65	69.5% (62)	106.9% (87)	0.03% (85)	0.0% (65)	1.88% (12)	8.55% (13)
Johnson	84	78.2% (90)	121.4% (92)	1.75% (2)	10.9% (51)	1.61% (16)	5.25% (59)
Jones	27	65.8% (25)	89.3% (6)	0.28% (43)	16.7% (39)	0.59% (64)	7.02% (26)
Keokuk	28	66.5% (28)	94.0% (21)	0.14% (57)	40.0% (15)	0.56% (66)	7.37% (21)
Kossuth	85	74.3% (82)	101.2% (69)	0.48% (26)	0.0% (65)	0.43% (75)	6.37% (34)
Lee	37	69.4% (60)	90.4% (8)	0.28% (44)	16.7% (39)	1.37% (23)	4.86% (69)
Linn	83	76.4% (87)	102.3% (78)	0.89% (13)	15.8% (43)	0.83% (47)	3.84% (92)
Louisa	34	62.6% (10)	97.2% (36)	0.03% (82)	0.0% (65)	2.54% (6)	4.40% (81)
Lucas	54	66.1% (26)	96.4% (31)	0.04% (79)	0.0% (65)	1.08% (33)	6.63% (29)
Lyon	91	79.1% (91)	104.0% (84)	0.30% (41)	7.7% (57)	0.43% (74)	6.49% (31)
Madison	88	75.8% (86)	107.5% (88)	0.44% (33)	42.9% (13)	0.38% (79)	4.97% (66)
Mahaska	31	65.6% (23)	98.0% (44)	0.60% (23)	30.0% (23)	1.14% (31)	4.92% (68)
Marion	55	71.8% (74)	101.4% (74)	0.44% (31)	15.4% (44)	0.86% (43)	8.18% (16)
Marshall	18	70.5% (68)	104.6% (85)	2.27% (1)	12.7% (49)	1.28% (27)	5.35% (58)
Mills	33	65.0% (19)	98.0% (48)	0.12% (66)	0.0% (65)	1.39% (21)	8.76% (10)
Mitchell	67	69.5% (61)	93.1% (17)	0.27% (45)	0.0% (65)	0.71% (51)	4.86% (70)
Monona	21	66.6% (29)	98.5% (53)	0.06% (75)	50.0% (6)	1.55% (17)	6.85% (28)
Monroe	29	64.4% (15)	88.6% (4)	0.14% (58)	0.0% (65)	0.64% (56)	7.61% (19)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Montgomery	47	62.1% (8)	98.5% (52)	0.09% (70)	0.0% (65)	0.62% (59)	7.29% (23)
Muscatine	51	66.5% (27)	102.4% (79)	1.17% (7)	8.7% (56)	0.67% (55)	4.34% (83)
O'Brien	60	68.2% (49)	98.0% (47)	0.02% (87)	0.0% (65)	1.24% (28)	7.25% (24)
Page	5	57.7% (1)	92.1% (11)	0.68% (20)	3.3% (64)	2.49% (7)	5.46% (56)
Palo Alto	30	67.2% (35)	95.6% (29)	0.47% (27)	16.7% (39)	0.71% (50)	8.00% (17)
Plymouth	90	71.3% (73)	101.5% (75)	0.04% (80)	0.0% (65)	0.61% (60)	4.71% (77)
Pocahontas	26	70.7% (69)	100.3% (63)	0.16% (53)	0.0% (65)	3.88% (1)	6.52% (30)
Polk	72	76.9% (88)	98.8% (56)	0.13% (62)	49.7% (10)	0.62% (58)	5.65% (51)
Pottawattamie	6	61.9% (7)	93.9% (20)	1.34% (5)	5.3% (62)	1.15% (30)	7.98% (18)
Poweshiek	57	68.1% (46)	103.4% (83)	1.16% (8)	10.9% (51)	0.37% (80)	5.43% (57)
Sac	24	66.7% (32)	99.2% (58)	0.08% (73)	0.0% (65)	1.47% (20)	11.42% (4)
Scott	49	75.0% (84)	108.4% (90)	0.10% (69)	31.1% (22)	3.56% (2)	5.69% (48)
Shelby	14	70.4% (67)	101.2% (70)	0.03% (83)	100.0% (1)	0.70% (52)	9.72% (7)
Sioux	39	74.9% (83)	91.7% (9)	0.43% (35)	10.2% (54)	1.87% (13)	5.92% (43)
Story	48	69.3% (57)	105.8% (86)	1.11% (9)	17.1% (38)	1.15% (29)	5.18% (60)
Tama	46	70.1% (66)	97.9% (43)	0.34% (39)	47.6% (11)	0.21% (89)	6.31% (37)
Union	2	63.1% (11)	88.5% (3)	0.58% (25)	11.8% (50)	0.46% (72)	15.46% (1)
Van Buren	23	61.3% (4)	92.1% (10)	0.08% (74)	0.0% (65)	2.25% (8)	4.42% (80)
Wapello	15	60.1% (3)	93.0% (16)	0.37% (38)	21.2% (29)	1.39% (22)	5.62% (52)
Warren	86	77.4% (89)	102.1% (77)	0.44% (30)	19.7% (33)	0.60% (63)	5.69% (47)
Washington	22	69.4% (59)	94.0% (22)	0.62% (22)	0.0% (65)	0.64% (57)	10.83% (6)
Webster	12	63.3% (12)	92.3% (13)	0.98% (10)	6.6% (60)	0.55% (67)	8.26% (15)
Winnebago	68	71.1% (70)	99.1% (57)	0.30% (42)	7.7% (57)	0.55% (68)	7.34% (22)
Winneshiek	56	67.9% (42)	95.9% (30)	0.17% (50)	33.3% (19)	0.48% (70)	5.08% (63)
Woodbury	9	64.8% (17)	95.6% (27)	1.51% (3)	9.0% (55)	1.37% (24)	6.13% (40)
Worth	89	72.1% (75)	101.4% (73)	0.16% (52)	0.0% (65)	1.03% (35)	4.01% (91)
Wright	53	65.0% (20)	100.0% (61)	0.03% (86)	0.0% (65)	1.54% (18)	6.37% (33)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Michigan's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Allegan	35	67.0% (39)	100.1% (29)	0.02% (39)	33.3% (21)	0.96% (5)	2.93% (46)
Alpena	6	60.6% (20)	101.1% (34)	0.04% (26)	100.0% (1)	0.64% (22)	5.47% (2)
Barry	48	64.9% (30)	98.9% (21)	0.04% (28)	0.0% (39)	0.41% (43)	2.67% (50)
Bay	16	65.1% (33)	96.9% (17)	0.01% (44)	75.0% (6)	0.47% (38)	5.04% (6)
Berrien	28	63.8% (28)	109.4% (49)	0.03% (36)	33.3% (21)	0.79% (12)	4.56% (9)
Branch	24	51.0% (4)	93.9% (11)	0.04% (27)	0.0% (39)	0.59% (27)	3.93% (20)
Calhoun	10	58.7% (15)	100.5% (31)	0.04% (23)	94.7% (3)	0.65% (21)	4.06% (18)
Cass	19	57.8% (14)	100.1% (27)	0.12% (6)	23.8% (30)	0.41% (42)	4.29% (13)
Chippewa	11	51.4% (5)	79.4% (2)	0.02% (41)	0.0% (39)	0.40% (44)	4.86% (7)
Clare	9	55.9% (10)	96.2% (14)	0.09% (9)	11.1% (36)	0.82% (8)	4.36% (11)
Clinton	44	71.7% (46)	100.2% (30)	0.08% (13)	36.0% (19)	0.44% (40)	2.95% (45)
Delta	18	64.9% (32)	99.9% (25)	0.05% (21)	85.7% (4)	0.68% (19)	3.41% (31)
Eaton	36	68.5% (42)	100.0% (26)	0.10% (7)	25.6% (29)	0.39% (46)	4.03% (19)
Emmet	45	71.2% (44)	107.6% (47)	0.02% (42)	50.0% (8)	0.73% (17)	3.27% (35)
Genesee	38	64.4% (29)	106.2% (45)	0.03% (33)	40.0% (17)	0.36% (47)	4.42% (10)
Grand Traverse	42	72.5% (48)	104.3% (42)	0.03% (30)	0.0% (39)	0.40% (45)	5.37% (3)
Gratiot	1	49.4% (2)	80.2% (3)	0.21% (1)	28.6% (26)	0.82% (6)	3.46% (30)
Hillsdale	29	54.6% (9)	95.1% (12)	0.04% (25)	0.0% (39)	0.66% (20)	3.17% (41)
Houghton	3	56.0% (11)	87.7% (5)	0.08% (14)	10.0% (37)	1.11% (2)	4.34% (12)
Huron	30	60.1% (17)	96.7% (16)	0.02% (40)	0.0% (39)	0.77% (15)	3.75% (23)
Ingham	7	61.9% (26)	95.6% (13)	0.09% (11)	46.1% (13)	0.81% (9)	5.12% (5)
Ionia	2	54.5% (8)	88.2% (6)	0.21% (2)	50.0% (8)	0.48% (37)	3.49% (29)
Isabella	4	43.6% (1)	76.8% (1)	0.04% (24)	37.5% (18)	0.77% (13)	2.68% (49)
Jackson	25	57.5% (13)	93.3% (10)	0.03% (35)	43.8% (14)	0.44% (41)	3.63% (28)
Kalamazoo	26	66.7% (38)	104.4% (43)	0.07% (16)	13.2% (35)	0.50% (35)	5.64% (1)
Kent	40	70.4% (43)	103.9% (40)	0.06% (17)	34.5% (20)	0.50% (34)	3.67% (24)
Lapeer	47	66.1% (35)	100.1% (28)	0.00% (47)	-	0.44% (39)	3.08% (42)
Lenawee	32	59.8% (16)	96.5% (15)	0.03% (38)	33.3% (21)	0.62% (23)	2.99% (43)
Livingston	49	75.1% (49)	103.9% (41)	0.03% (34)	9.5% (38)	0.60% (25)	3.24% (37)
Macomb	39	66.5% (36)	100.6% (32)	0.06% (18)	23.2% (31)	0.51% (33)	3.64% (27)
Marquette	20	60.2% (19)	91.7% (9)	0.00% (47)	-	0.52% (32)	4.61% (8)
Mason	14	66.6% (37)	101.9% (38)	0.03% (37)	100.0% (1)	0.81% (10)	4.17% (14)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Mecosta	13	50.6% (3)	81.6% (4)	0.05% (19)	50.0% (8)	0.33% (50)	3.29% (34)
Midland	27	68.2% (41)	106.4% (46)	0.00% (47)	-	1.46% (1)	2.98% (44)
Monroe	23	64.9% (31)	100.9% (33)	0.00% (45)	50.0% (8)	0.61% (24)	5.32% (4)
Montcalm	15	54.4% (7)	88.8% (7)	0.01% (43)	50.0% (8)	0.52% (31)	3.92% (21)
Muskegon	41	60.2% (18)	101.6% (36)	0.03% (32)	27.8% (28)	0.34% (49)	3.23% (38)
Newaygo	22	60.8% (21)	99.9% (24)	0.03% (29)	33.3% (21)	1.08% (4)	3.19% (40)
Oakland	46	76.1% (50)	108.7% (48)	0.03% (31)	22.5% (32)	0.55% (30)	4.12% (16)
Ottawa	33	71.3% (45)	99.2% (22)	0.08% (15)	42.1% (15)	0.81% (11)	2.91% (47)
Saginaw	43	67.2% (40)	102.1% (39)	0.04% (22)	14.7% (34)	0.59% (28)	3.36% (33)
Sanilac	8	56.5% (12)	90.6% (8)	0.09% (12)	30.8% (25)	0.68% (18)	4.14% (15)
Shiawassee	50	65.7% (34)	98.7% (20)	0.00% (47)	-	0.35% (48)	2.82% (48)
St. Clair	37	61.0% (23)	99.5% (23)	0.00% (46)	0.0% (39)	0.75% (16)	3.66% (26)
St. Joseph	17	53.0% (6)	98.6% (19)	0.12% (5)	17.4% (33)	0.56% (29)	3.25% (36)
Tuscola	31	61.7% (25)	98.0% (18)	0.05% (20)	0.0% (39)	0.60% (26)	4.09% (17)
Van Buren	34	61.0% (22)	101.6% (37)	0.10% (8)	28.0% (27)	0.49% (36)	3.19% (39)
Washtenaw	21	71.8% (47)	110.4% (50)	0.16% (4)	40.7% (16)	1.09% (3)	3.36% (32)
Wayne	5	62.9% (27)	105.7% (44)	0.20% (3)	84.7% (5)	0.82% (7)	3.67% (25)
Wexford	12	61.1% (24)	101.1% (35)	0.09% (10)	72.7% (7)	0.77% (14)	3.78% (22)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Minnesota's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Aitkin	7	69.2% (21)	79.6% (7)	3.20% (21)	7.85% (12)
Anoka	51	80.0% (51)	91.2% (51)	3.37% (18)	4.71% (55)
Becker	4	67.5% (12)	81.3% (21)	4.43% (10)	7.58% (13)
Beltrami	32	68.0% (14)	83.6% (28)	0.77% (54)	7.46% (15)
Benton	29	69.2% (20)	81.1% (18)	2.68% (30)	5.66% (41)
Blue Earth	23	68.7% (19)	83.7% (29)	3.36% (19)	7.05% (17)
Brown	33	70.3% (29)	80.8% (15)	0.97% (52)	7.01% (20)
Carlton	41	69.5% (25)	80.4% (12)	0.69% (55)	5.48% (46)
Carver	55	87.2% (57)	97.8% (57)	4.58% (8)	4.62% (57)
Cass	17	72.7% (36)	86.6% (43)	6.35% (1)	6.21% (32)
Chisago	50	75.8% (47)	86.6% (44)	1.86% (42)	5.76% (40)
Clay	9	66.0% (8)	81.7% (24)	3.59% (17)	6.97% (22)
Crow Wing	36	73.9% (42)	85.9% (40)	3.81% (14)	6.18% (33)
Dakota	53	83.5% (53)	95.2% (54)	3.11% (24)	5.23% (51)
Dodge	38	74.4% (43)	86.5% (42)	4.80% (7)	5.04% (52)
Douglas	46	75.2% (46)	87.9% (47)	1.59% (44)	7.04% (18)
Faribault	5	68.6% (17)	80.9% (16)	3.80% (15)	8.38% (8)
Fillmore	11	69.6% (26)	83.2% (27)	3.17% (22)	8.76% (5)
Freeborn	22	70.3% (28)	80.8% (14)	2.08% (38)	8.09% (10)
Goodhue	48	75.1% (45)	86.3% (41)	1.94% (41)	5.86% (38)
Hennepin	40	84.3% (54)	94.2% (53)	2.88% (27)	11.52% (2)
Houston	39	72.2% (35)	86.8% (45)	2.85% (29)	6.51% (26)
Hubbard	42	73.5% (41)	85.7% (39)	2.00% (39)	6.67% (24)
Isanti	28	73.3% (40)	84.7% (36)	5.35% (3)	5.26% (50)
Itasca	24	68.7% (18)	80.6% (13)	2.87% (28)	6.35% (29)
Kanabec	35	66.3% (9)	79.2% (6)	0.79% (53)	5.49% (45)
Kandiyohi	14	69.7% (27)	81.2% (20)	2.24% (34)	8.54% (6)
Le Sueur	37	73.2% (39)	85.3% (38)	4.23% (12)	5.29% (48)
Lyon	27	66.7% (10)	80.2% (11)	2.15% (36)	6.23% (31)
Martin	19	69.3% (23)	81.7% (23)	0.58% (57)	10.19% (3)
McLeod	26	69.3% (22)	81.1% (19)	1.55% (45)	7.97% (11)
Meeker	31	71.7% (32)	83.1% (26)	2.91% (26)	6.58% (25)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Mille Lacs	30	68.1% (15)	81.4% (22)	1.98% (40)	6.16% (34)
Morrison	34	67.8% (13)	79.9% (9)	0.68% (56)	6.32% (30)
Mower	21	68.4% (16)	80.1% (10)	2.15% (37)	7.41% (16)
Nicollet	49	74.5% (44)	88.4% (48)	2.65% (31)	5.31% (47)
Nobles	3	63.0% (3)	74.7% (2)	1.15% (51)	8.53% (7)
Olmsted	52	78.0% (49)	90.4% (50)	1.53% (46)	5.91% (37)
Otter Tail	44	72.1% (34)	84.4% (35)	1.17% (50)	6.07% (35)
Pine	2	61.6% (1)	72.3% (1)	4.27% (11)	7.49% (14)
Polk	1	62.7% (2)	74.9% (3)	5.00% (4)	8.09% (9)
Ramsey	8	78.6% (50)	88.9% (49)	3.92% (13)	12.36% (1)
Redwood	16	66.0% (7)	84.2% (32)	3.34% (20)	6.98% (21)
Renville	20	65.1% (5)	78.2% (5)	1.23% (49)	7.03% (19)
Rice	18	70.7% (31)	84.9% (37)	4.95% (5)	6.71% (23)
Roseau	10	64.8% (4)	79.7% (8)	3.17% (23)	6.48% (27)
Scott	56	84.3% (55)	96.0% (55)	2.53% (32)	4.64% (56)
Sherburne	45	76.5% (48)	87.5% (46)	3.09% (25)	5.84% (39)
St. Louis	25	73.2% (38)	84.3% (34)	2.38% (33)	9.24% (4)
Stearns	13	70.7% (30)	84.0% (31)	6.20% (2)	5.59% (43)
Steele	47	73.1% (37)	84.2% (33)	1.26% (48)	5.52% (44)
Todd	6	65.5% (6)	77.8% (4)	3.62% (16)	6.41% (28)
Wabasha	43	71.8% (33)	83.8% (30)	1.42% (47)	5.64% (42)
Waseca	15	69.4% (24)	81.0% (17)	4.91% (6)	5.28% (49)
Washington	57	85.2% (56)	96.7% (56)	2.18% (35)	4.94% (53)
Winona	12	67.1% (11)	82.1% (25)	4.52% (9)	6.02% (36)
Wright	54	80.3% (52)	93.0% (52)	1.85% (43)	4.71% (54)

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Missouri's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Adair	11	51.2% (10)	79.0% (5)	0.19% (14)	62.5% (55)	0.71% (56)	18.44% (8)
Andrew	62	70.2% (71)	95.8% (66)	0.04% (48)	100.0% (1)	1.54% (34)	4.36% (79)
Audrain	50	52.9% (17)	88.2% (30)	0.04% (45)	75.0% (35)	0.40% (63)	5.82% (76)
Barry	20	54.3% (20)	80.5% (11)	0.00% (62)		1.57% (32)	10.86% (23)
Bates	64	62.0% (51)	94.1% (58)	0.00% (62)		2.08% (21)	6.50% (69)
Benton	34	59.6% (40)	89.3% (39)	0.06% (36)	100.0% (1)	0.15% (74)	10.92% (22)
Boone	14	66.4% (63)	101.8% (72)	0.64% (2)	73.5% (41)	1.47% (35)	20.13% (5)
Buchanan	49	57.3% (31)	82.8% (18)	0.00% (62)		0.00% (75)	7.55% (56)
Butler	19	57.4% (32)	92.9% (55)	0.00% (62)		1.68% (28)	22.43% (3)
Callaway	27	60.0% (42)	84.1% (22)	0.07% (34)	66.7% (47)	1.56% (33)	18.81% (7)
Camden	57	66.9% (65)	88.6% (35)	0.05% (44)	77.8% (30)	0.76% (55)	11.11% (20)
Cape Girardeau	36	62.8% (56)	91.9% (45)	0.27% (11)	67.0% (46)	3.25% (11)	9.42% (31)
Cass*				0.01% (60)	100.0% (1)	1.63% (31)	5.29% (78)
Cedar	48	63.4% (58)	79.7% (7)	0.05% (41)	66.7% (47)	0.57% (61)	11.04% (21)
Christian	73	76.7% (74)	99.6% (70)	0.08% (27)	77.4% (32)	1.39% (38)	7.72% (52)
Clay*				0.46% (5)	75.1% (34)	1.83% (25)	7.80% (49)
Clinton	71	69.5% (69)	92.8% (52)	0.05% (40)	60.0% (57)	1.42% (37)	6.14% (71)
Cole	59	66.4% (64)	94.5% (60)	0.11% (18)	89.5% (19)	0.25% (68)	7.56% (55)
Cooper	39	55.8% (24)	84.1% (21)	0.00% (62)		1.20% (44)	7.60% (54)
Crawford	9	52.4% (13)	87.2% (25)	0.01% (57)	100.0% (1)	2.48% (16)	17.83% (9)
Dallas	37	58.4% (35)	88.5% (34)	0.08% (30)	100.0% (1)	0.29% (67)	6.02% (74)
DeKalb	1	42.0% (2)	64.0% (2)	0.00% (62)		11.42% (1)	5.67% (77)
Dent	30	56.5% (27)	81.6% (14)	0.01% (55)	100.0% (1)	0.00% (75)	6.70% (66)
Douglas	72	63.3% (57)	97.1% (68)	0.03% (49)	50.0% (61)	1.10% (47)	9.00% (34)
Dunklin	18	49.3% (7)	81.9% (15)	0.06% (35)	71.4% (42)	0.00% (75)	16.73% (10)
Franklin	68	62.6% (55)	92.4% (50)	0.08% (25)	62.2% (56)	1.25% (43)	7.72% (51)
Gasconade	65	60.7% (47)	90.3% (41)	0.00% (62)		0.88% (52)	6.07% (73)
Greene	26	60.3% (44)	93.3% (56)	0.38% (9)	69.1% (45)	2.55% (14)	10.48% (26)
Henry	47	65.2% (61)	92.1% (47)	0.08% (29)	87.5% (20)	1.31% (41)	10.31% (28)
Howell	32	56.0% (25)	90.3% (40)	0.15% (17)	77.3% (33)	1.89% (24)	10.18% (29)
Jackson*				0.38% (8)	84.9% (23)	2.69% (12)	16.08% (12)
Jasper	55	55.0% (22)	94.6% (61)	0.06% (39)	79.2% (28)	0.19% (72)	8.40% (39)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Jefferson	53	67.2% (66)	92.1% (46)	0.00% (61)	100.0% (1)	1.30% (42)	7.24% (58)
Johnson	15	53.3% (18)	83.2% (19)	0.26% (13)	80.0% (27)	0.38% (65)	10.62% (25)
Kansas City*				0.72% (1)	69.9% (44)	2.53% (15)	12.84% (15)
Laclede	46	58.6% (36)	88.3% (31)	0.08% (24)	83.3% (25)	0.61% (60)	6.11% (72)
Lafayette	74	69.6% (70)	96.5% (67)	0.07% (32)	63.6% (53)	0.22% (71)	6.94% (63)
Lawrence	44	57.5% (33)	87.2% (26)	0.06% (37)	77.8% (30)	1.04% (48)	7.84% (48)
Lincoln	67	61.9% (49)	95.0% (62)	0.05% (42)	70.0% (43)	1.72% (26)	6.76% (64)
Livingston	35	52.5% (15)	82.5% (16)	0.00% (62)		0.39% (64)	8.37% (41)
Macon	31	61.9% (50)	91.2% (43)	0.06% (38)	100.0% (1)	0.70% (57)	13.73% (14)
Marion	52	56.8% (29)	89.2% (38)	0.11% (21)	75.0% (35)	0.00% (75)	7.22% (59)
Mcdonald	12	51.1% (9)	84.5% (23)	0.00% (62)		0.24% (69)	20.47% (4)
Miller	70	65.4% (62)	95.7% (64)	0.00% (62)		1.67% (29)	6.74% (65)
Mississippi	5	47.1% (4)	80.1% (9)	0.17% (16)	75.0% (35)	3.85% (8)	12.52% (18)
Moniteau	10	56.5% (28)	82.5% (17)	0.07% (33)	100.0% (1)	3.61% (10)	7.21% (60)
Morgan	22	60.6% (46)	80.0% (8)	0.01% (56)	100.0% (1)	0.99% (51)	9.01% (33)
New Madrid	3	51.9% (12)	92.7% (51)	0.03% (51)	100.0% (1)	0.85% (54)	43.04% (1)
Newton	63	60.5% (45)	95.7% (65)	0.02% (54)	75.0% (35)	1.18% (45)	8.04% (46)
Nodaway	16	49.0% (6)	73.8% (3)	0.00% (62)		0.00% (75)	8.87% (36)
Osage	43	67.4% (67)	92.3% (48)	0.09% (22)	66.7% (47)	5.81% (5)	8.17% (44)
Pemiscot	4	52.8% (16)	91.3% (44)	0.34% (10)	90.9% (18)	2.61% (13)	18.94% (6)
Perry	51	57.6% (34)	89.0% (36)	0.04% (46)	66.7% (47)	1.03% (49)	10.74% (24)
Pettis	66	59.4% (39)	89.1% (37)	0.05% (43)	57.1% (59)	0.18% (73)	10.45% (27)
Phelps	54	59.8% (41)	83.9% (20)	0.03% (52)	60.0% (57)	1.71% (27)	8.26% (42)
Pike	21	52.5% (14)	80.5% (10)	0.00% (62)		1.95% (23)	7.77% (50)
Platte*				0.08% (28)	84.8% (24)	0.86% (53)	8.51% (38)
Polk	33	57.2% (30)	86.5% (24)	0.01% (59)	100.0% (1)	0.55% (62)	8.14% (45)
Pulaski	2	36.8% (1)	59.6% (1)	0.01% (58)	100.0% (1)	2.18% (19)	15.39% (13)
Randolph	7	51.7% (11)	80.7% (12)	0.11% (20)	100.0% (1)	3.62% (9)	9.10% (32)
Ray	40	65.1% (60)	102.1% (73)	0.41% (6)	51.2% (60)	0.99% (50)	23.56% (2)
Ripley	24	50.1% (8)	87.8% (28)	0.00% (62)		2.28% (17)	8.95% (35)
Saline	38	54.2% (19)	92.9% (54)	0.08% (26)	85.7% (22)	1.17% (46)	7.64% (53)
Scott	61	58.9% (37)	93.6% (57)	0.00% (62)		0.61% (59)	8.39% (40)
St. Charles	45	74.9% (73)	99.3% (69)	0.17% (15)	74.8% (40)	7.09% (2)	8.21% (43)
St. Francois	13	45.4% (3)	78.4% (4)	0.03% (50)	83.3% (25)	1.44% (36)	7.43% (57)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
St. Louis	69	72.7% (72)	104.2% (74)	0.47% (4)	66.0% (52)	1.65% (30)	6.63% (67)
St. Louis City	17	61.4% (48)	100.2% (71)	0.41% (7)	63.6% (54)	4.46% (7)	16.58% (11)
Ste. Genevieve	42	62.2% (52)	92.9% (53)	0.04% (47)	100.0% (1)	2.02% (22)	5.83% (75)
Stoddard	23	56.5% (26)	88.4% (32)	0.00% (62)		4.55% (6)	7.87% (47)
Stone	25	62.3% (53)	90.7% (42)	0.27% (12)	87.2% (21)	1.34% (40)	11.73% (19)
Taney	6	63.9% (59)	92.4% (49)	0.55% (3)	79.2% (28)	5.83% (3)	12.58% (17)
Texas	29	55.2% (23)	81.0% (13)	0.00% (62)		2.28% (18)	6.53% (68)
Vernon	58	62.6% (54)	87.3% (27)	0.07% (31)	66.7% (47)	0.30% (66)	9.90% (30)
Warren	28	67.4% (68)	94.5% (59)	0.03% (53)	100.0% (1)	5.81% (4)	7.13% (61)
Washington	8	47.1% (5)	79.3% (6)	0.09% (23)	100.0% (1)	0.69% (58)	12.80% (16)
Wayne	41	55.0% (21)	88.0% (29)	0.00% (62)		1.34% (39)	8.56% (37)
Webster	56	60.2% (43)	88.4% (33)	0.11% (19)	75.0% (35)	0.22% (70)	6.96% (62)
Wright	60	58.9% (38)	95.1% (63)	0.00% (62)		2.13% (20)	6.14% (70)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

* Kansas City is its own election jurisdiction, but the Census Bureau does not provide CVAP data for the city on its own. Instead, it distributes Kansas City's CVAP data into the four counties that encompass it. As a result, the population data and election administration data for Kansas City and its four counties do not match. We made the following changes to our analysis for Missouri to account for this. First, we removed the two factors that the discrepancy affects—voter turnout rate and voter registration rate—for the counties that were affected: Cass, Clay, Jackson, Platte, and Kansas City. Second, because these five jurisdictions were missing data for two factors, we removed them from the overall rankings for the state. However, we decided to include the rates and rankings for the other four factors, so those jurisdictions can see how they perform on election administration where trustworthy data is available.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

North Carolina's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Alamance	51	63.9% (43)	90.7% (30)	2.8% (37)	63.3% (27)	0.00% (66)	8.91% (61)
Alexander	35	62.9% (36)	88.2% (21)	2.2% (46)	69.0% (10)	0.00% (66)	10.15% (29)
Anson	14	55.9% (8)	85.8% (11)	7.6% (4)	54.1% (50)	0.00% (66)	10.71% (21)
Ashe	26	61.4% (32)	90.9% (31)	1.1% (72)	35.1% (75)	0.15% (60)	17.56% (2)
Beaufort	61	67.4% (57)	94.0% (43)	1.3% (71)	45.1% (62)	0.92% (38)	10.41% (25)
Bladen	25	63.7% (42)	91.4% (33)	2.4% (45)	80.9% (4)	0.87% (41)	8.99% (56)
Brunswick	56	69.9% (65)	100.4% (64)	2.9% (36)	65.6% (18)	0.76% (45)	9.70% (39)
Buncombe	58	71.7% (71)	104.5% (70)	2.8% (38)	57.9% (40)	1.22% (27)	10.68% (22)
Burke	49	54.9% (7)	87.0% (17)	0.6% (77)	35.9% (73)	1.16% (28)	9.08% (52)
Cabarrus	54	70.6% (68)	100.3% (63)	3.6% (25)	55.5% (43)	1.27% (25)	10.20% (28)
Caldwell	69	56.6% (10)	87.3% (19)	1.9% (57)	0.5% (79)	0.69% (49)	8.99% (55)
Carteret	65	68.9% (62)	98.4% (58)	3.2% (30)	55.0% (47)	0.06% (64)	9.60% (44)
Caswell	22	60.5% (24)	86.6% (13)	1.5% (64)	81.5% (3)	0.85% (42)	8.29% (68)
Catawba	41	63.4% (40)	94.5% (45)	1.3% (70)	55.2% (44)	0.87% (39)	12.29% (11)
Chatham	71	80.3% (76)	105.1% (71)	2.5% (41)	58.0% (39)	1.53% (19)	9.59% (45)
Cherokee	78	59.9% (20)	101.6% (67)	0.5% (79)	43.3% (64)	0.00% (66)	6.78% (79)
Cleveland	29	59.2% (19)	86.7% (14)	5.1% (15)	39.5% (70)	0.87% (40)	9.04% (53)
Columbus	68	57.7% (16)	89.6% (25)	1.4% (67)	35.4% (74)	0.00% (66)	7.82% (76)
Craven	39	61.5% (33)	95.4% (49)	3.9% (23)	56.6% (42)	0.25% (59)	10.63% (23)
Cumberland	10	57.4% (15)	96.8% (52)	5.7% (9)	64.5% (22)	2.33% (9)	10.10% (30)
Currituck	74	64.4% (45)	100.8% (66)	1.9% (59)	41.7% (67)	0.00% (66)	8.45% (66)
Dare	76	70.0% (66)	109.0% (75)	2.1% (51)	54.5% (49)	0.00% (66)	8.87% (62)
Davidson	36	60.9% (28)	89.3% (24)	1.5% (66)	59.0% (35)	1.03% (35)	9.61% (43)
Davie	66	69.3% (63)	93.9% (42)	2.4% (44)	55.1% (45)	0.41% (54)	8.14% (71)
Duplin	11	54.8% (6)	79.6% (2)	3.8% (24)	54.9% (48)	2.29% (10)	8.07% (73)
Durham	60	82.5% (78)	119.3% (79)	6.5% (7)	42.7% (65)	3.40% (3)	10.94% (19)
Edgecombe	40	66.0% (55)	96.9% (54)	2.1% (52)	67.2% (15)	0.59% (50)	11.80% (14)
Forsyth	73	72.4% (72)	101.9% (68)	1.8% (61)	53.2% (52)	0.79% (44)	9.25% (49)
Franklin	38	66.4% (56)	93.6% (41)	3.0% (32)	58.5% (37)	1.34% (24)	9.99% (31)
Gaston	31	60.8% (27)	91.0% (32)	2.9% (34)	51.4% (53)	1.07% (33)	10.40% (26)
Granville	4	60.7% (26)	84.5% (6)	4.8% (17)	78.4% (6)	1.98% (12)	9.93% (34)
Guilford	53	74.2% (73)	105.2% (72)	1.1% (73)	59.2% (34)	1.42% (21)	14.52% (4)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Halifax	5	63.2% (39)	91.9% (34)	5.4% (11)	50.8% (54)	3.52% (2)	12.00% (13)
Harnett	8	57.0% (12)	89.8% (26)	7.1% (5)	66.3% (16)	0.75% (46)	11.11% (16)
Haywood	45	61.1% (30)	92.9% (39)	0.9% (75)	64.0% (24)	1.10% (30)	8.97% (57)
Henderson	67	67.4% (58)	100.7% (65)	0.6% (78)	68.5% (13)	0.03% (65)	9.86% (37)
Hertford	1	61.1% (31)	85.1% (8)	3.1% (31)	75.5% (7)	3.91% (1)	13.65% (6)
Hoke	23	56.8% (11)	98.8% (60)	6.2% (8)	65.1% (20)	0.00% (66)	9.93% (33)
Iredell	70	68.0% (60)	97.9% (56)	1.3% (68)	58.5% (36)	0.00% (66)	8.80% (63)
Jackson	17	54.3% (5)	90.7% (29)	1.5% (63)	65.1% (19)	0.82% (43)	12.81% (8)
Johnston	42	70.2% (67)	98.3% (57)	4.0% (22)	73.0% (9)	0.00% (66)	11.75% (15)
Lee	52	65.3% (49)	93.6% (40)	5.3% (13)	21.3% (77)	1.67% (14)	9.62% (42)
Lenoir	27	65.8% (53)	92.8% (38)	5.2% (14)	60.7% (30)	1.10% (29)	9.12% (51)
Lincoln	63	65.8% (52)	94.6% (46)	1.5% (65)	64.8% (21)	0.00% (66)	8.50% (65)
Macon	64	65.5% (50)	96.7% (51)	1.0% (74)	60.3% (32)	0.10% (63)	9.66% (40)
Martin	62	68.7% (61)	97.3% (55)	2.2% (47)	42.1% (66)	0.37% (57)	12.23% (12)
Mcdowell	30	53.6% (4)	84.8% (7)	1.7% (62)	57.6% (41)	0.38% (56)	8.60% (64)
Mecklenburg	79	75.5% (75)	113.3% (77)	1.8% (60)	49.8% (56)	1.26% (26)	8.13% (72)
Montgomery	20	58.7% (18)	86.5% (12)	1.9% (58)	79.2% (5)	0.46% (52)	9.03% (54)
Moore	72	71.3% (70)	98.5% (59)	2.5% (40)	44.5% (63)	0.74% (47)	8.93% (59)
Nash	15	70.7% (69)	98.8% (61)	3.3% (28)	82.2% (2)	1.74% (13)	14.38% (5)
New Hanover	28	67.7% (59)	103.5% (69)	4.3% (19)	62.2% (29)	1.34% (23)	12.37% (10)
Northampton	33	63.1% (38)	90.4% (28)	1.9% (55)	67.4% (14)	1.06% (34)	9.29% (48)
Onslow	9	41.2% (1)	77.9% (1)	5.5% (10)	34.3% (76)	0.26% (58)	9.87% (36)
Orange	59	81.6% (77)	119.0% (78)	1.9% (54)	64.1% (23)	1.65% (15)	16.21% (3)
Pasquotank	6	59.9% (21)	96.8% (53)	5.4% (12)	55.0% (46)	2.83% (5)	12.99% (7)
Pender	2	65.0% (47)	94.8% (48)	10.1% (2)	46.6% (58)	2.83% (6)	12.73% (9)
Person	46	65.6% (51)	90.2% (27)	2.0% (53)	66.1% (17)	1.10% (31)	7.79% (78)
Pitt	12	64.2% (44)	94.7% (47)	10.3% (1)	36.7% (72)	2.09% (11)	11.05% (18)
Randolph	55	61.7% (34)	92.1% (35)	0.7% (76)	60.6% (31)	1.00% (36)	7.80% (77)
Richmond	19	58.6% (17)	92.6% (37)	4.8% (16)	41.5% (68)	2.34% (8)	9.42% (47)
Robeson	13	47.6% (2)	82.6% (4)	9.2% (3)	39.5% (71)	0.00% (66)	8.18% (70)
Rockingham	43	60.3% (22)	87.1% (18)	3.3% (29)	54.1% (51)	0.44% (53)	8.31% (67)
Rowan	37	63.1% (37)	94.5% (44)	2.4% (42)	69.0% (11)	0.40% (55)	10.61% (24)
Rutherford	18	57.0% (13)	85.7% (10)	3.5% (26)	45.2% (61)	1.58% (18)	9.94% (32)
Sampson	44	61.7% (35)	88.7% (22)	2.1% (50)	63.8% (25)	0.14% (61)	9.49% (46)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Scotland	3	53.6% (3)	87.0% (16)	6.7% (6)	75.4% (8)	0.55% (51)	11.10% (17)
Stanly	32	63.6% (41)	88.9% (23)	4.7% (18)	46.3% (59)	1.50% (20)	8.27% (69)
Stokes	48	60.5% (23)	85.6% (9)	1.9% (56)	50.0% (55)	0.00% (66)	9.72% (38)
Surry	34	56.3% (9)	84.3% (5)	3.3% (27)	40.3% (69)	0.71% (48)	8.93% (60)
Transylvania	47	64.4% (46)	92.2% (36)	4.3% (20)	19.9% (78)	1.64% (16)	10.84% (20)
Union	77	74.3% (74)	106.3% (74)	2.4% (43)	45.4% (60)	1.10% (32)	7.86% (75)
Vance	21	65.3% (48)	95.8% (50)	2.6% (39)	68.8% (12)	2.38% (7)	9.64% (41)
Wake	75	83.4% (79)	111.9% (76)	2.2% (48)	60.0% (33)	1.36% (22)	9.90% (35)
Watauga	16	65.9% (54)	105.9% (73)	2.9% (33)	84.4% (1)	0.00% (66)	18.63% (1)
Wayne	7	60.7% (25)	88.0% (20)	4.1% (21)	63.6% (26)	3.04% (4)	10.20% (27)
Wilkes	24	57.1% (14)	82.2% (3)	2.2% (49)	58.2% (38)	0.94% (37)	8.03% (74)
Wilson	50	69.6% (64)	99.3% (62)	2.9% (35)	62.7% (28)	1.64% (17)	9.13% (50)
Yadkin	57	61.0% (29)	87.0% (15)	1.3% (69)	48.6% (57)	0.12% (62)	8.95% (58)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Ohio's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Allen	1	60.9% (27)	86.9% (19)	5.82% (13)	17.7% (10)	2.13% (1)	19.5% (6)
Ashland	59	61.4% (29)	91.5% (36)	3.83% (52)	10.1% (61)	0.49% (61)	-
Ashtabula	34	57.0% (13)	84.3% (13)	4.37% (41)	9.5% (64)	0.81% (39)	10.4% (39)
Athens	3	53.6% (5)	91.5% (37)	9.82% (1)	11.4% (53)	0.78% (41)	23.6% (2)
Auglaize	45	69.2% (62)	92.0% (41)	3.69% (57)	15.5% (24)	0.94% (30)	12.3% (23)
Belmont	46	57.3% (15)	88.3% (26)	4.38% (40)	14.0% (33)	0.62% (50)	2.4% (66)
Brown	19	58.7% (21)	85.4% (15)	3.61% (60)	19.0% (7)	0.56% (54)	13.4% (18)
Butler	21	64.7% (45)	90.7% (34)	5.97% (10)	17.2% (16)	1.21% (16)	7.3% (50)
Champaign	53	62.7% (35)	92.5% (46)	4.02% (46)	8.8% (67)	1.09% (20)	-
Clark	14	62.6% (34)	87.7% (22)	5.64% (15)	19.3% (4)	1.05% (22)	10.6% (36)
Clermont	26	67.6% (54)	92.6% (47)	5.05% (24)	17.3% (15)	0.91% (32)	13.9% (16)
Clinton	8	58.0% (18)	84.1% (12)	5.07% (23)	12.4% (45)	2.12% (2)	11.3% (30)
Columbiana	18	55.8% (11)	79.7% (7)	2.97% (68)	16.8% (18)	0.42% (62)	14.6% (12)
Coshocton	55	57.2% (14)	80.2% (8)	1.89% (71)	11.5% (51)	0.42% (63)	6.6% (56)
Crawford	31	59.1% (22)	87.6% (21)	5.07% (22)	10.5% (58)	0.84% (38)	10.9% (33)
Cuyahoga	9	68.0% (55)	97.0% (61)	9.13% (3)	15.3% (25)	1.23% (15)	17.9% (7)
Darke	50	64.9% (46)	92.4% (45)	3.50% (62)	13.7% (35)	1.28% (13)	5.5% (59)
Defiance	28	63.1% (37)	88.1% (23)	5.28% (18)	14.9% (27)	0.68% (48)	11.1% (32)
Delaware	72	84.4% (72)	106.8% (71)	4.52% (35)	14.5% (28)	1.50% (9)	1.1% (68)
Erie	63	67.2% (53)	90.9% (35)	4.65% (32)	5.4% (70)	0.71% (47)	10.4% (38)
Fairfield	64	68.8% (61)	100.8% (68)	5.08% (21)	13.7% (36)	1.02% (25)	1.8% (67)
Franklin	15	70.0% (63)	98.6% (65)	9.60% (2)	20.4% (3)	0.71% (46)	11.9% (27)
Fulton	40	68.6% (60)	93.5% (51)	3.87% (50)	17.7% (11)	0.73% (45)	14.8% (11)
Geauga	66	75.9% (71)	97.9% (62)	2.38% (70)	13.2% (39)	0.92% (31)	13.1% (20)
Greene	60	68.4% (58)	101.0% (69)	4.58% (34)	14.0% (30)	0.90% (33)	6.6% (57)
Guernsey	37	56.2% (12)	81.3% (9)	3.63% (59)	10.5% (59)	0.41% (64)	11.7% (29)
Hamilton	7	71.4% (66)	95.5% (58)	6.32% (7)	24.6% (1)	1.74% (5)	14.4% (14)
Hancock	68	64.5% (44)	98.0% (63)	3.19% (67)	4.7% (72)	0.62% (51)	11.8% (28)
Hardin	4	51.4% (3)	75.4% (3)	3.80% (53)	16.5% (22)	0.29% (68)	24.2% (1)
Highland	52	55.7% (10)	88.5% (28)	4.99% (25)	10.9% (57)	0.04% (72)	7.0% (52)
Holmes	13	43.6% (1)	67.3% (1)	2.62% (69)	12.7% (41)	0.57% (52)	6.7% (55)
Huron	42	58.0% (19)	85.8% (17)	3.80% (54)	11.0% (56)	0.90% (35)	6.9% (53)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Jackson	57	54.5% (8)	96.5% (60)	5.85% (12)	9.8% (63)	0.34% (67)	3.9% (64)
Jefferson	47	60.8% (26)	89.9% (30)	3.49% (63)	11.7% (49)	0.54% (57)	12.5% (22)
Knox	61	63.6% (39)	93.7% (52)	4.61% (33)	12.9% (40)	0.22% (71)	6.5% (58)
Lake	35	68.5% (59)	88.2% (24)	4.21% (43)	11.4% (52)	0.50% (60)	23.2% (3)
Lawrence	33	55.2% (9)	104.1% (70)	3.96% (48)	19.3% (5)	1.49% (10)	3.6% (65)
Licking	43	66.8% (51)	91.6% (38)	4.48% (37)	16.6% (21)	0.73% (44)	9.7% (43)
Logan	25	63.0% (36)	89.7% (29)	5.09% (20)	16.7% (19)	0.90% (34)	10.6% (34)
Lorain	17	64.1% (42)	94.4% (54)	5.98% (9)	16.4% (23)	0.99% (27)	16.2% (8)
Lucas	11	64.3% (43)	94.2% (53)	7.42% (4)	17.6% (12)	1.20% (17)	13.8% (17)
Madison	6	53.9% (6)	72.8% (2)	4.92% (28)	14.0% (31)	0.95% (29)	13.2% (19)
Mahoning	32	66.5% (50)	92.1% (43)	4.45% (39)	14.0% (32)	1.03% (24)	14.9% (10)
Marion	16	54.0% (7)	82.6% (10)	5.25% (19)	11.6% (50)	1.48% (11)	5.3% (60)
Medina	65	72.4% (67)	99.5% (67)	3.98% (47)	17.3% (14)	0.51% (59)	7.1% (51)
Mercer	69	72.6% (68)	98.2% (64)	3.93% (49)	10.0% (62)	0.56% (55)	7.6% (48)
Miami	12	68.0% (56)	92.1% (44)	5.67% (14)	18.7% (8)	0.87% (36)	20.9% (5)
Montgomery	20	66.2% (48)	94.8% (57)	6.45% (6)	11.9% (48)	1.57% (7)	12.8% (21)
Morrow	30	63.5% (38)	96.3% (59)	3.72% (56)	16.8% (17)	1.04% (23)	15.0% (9)
Muskingum	24	58.0% (20)	83.3% (11)	5.63% (16)	10.4% (60)	0.80% (40)	10.3% (40)
Ottawa	54	70.1% (64)	94.5% (55)	3.46% (64)	13.4% (38)	1.15% (18)	10.6% (35)
Perry	62	57.4% (16)	92.0% (42)	3.33% (66)	12.5% (43)	0.23% (70)	4.9% (61)
Pickaway	10	57.8% (17)	79.0% (6)	4.49% (36)	16.7% (20)	1.23% (14)	11.3% (31)
Portage	23	61.6% (30)	86.8% (18)	4.47% (38)	12.4% (44)	1.14% (19)	14.4% (13)
Preble	58	64.0% (41)	90.4% (33)	3.87% (51)	12.6% (42)	0.57% (53)	6.8% (54)
Putnam	70	74.1% (69)	94.8% (56)	1.74% (72)	4.7% (71)	1.50% (8)	8.9% (46)
Richland	56	60.5% (25)	92.8% (49)	4.93% (27)	7.0% (68)	0.78% (42)	9.0% (45)
Ross	5	50.8% (2)	77.9% (4)	6.13% (8)	9.3% (65)	2.04% (3)	4.7% (62)
Sandusky	51	65.3% (47)	91.7% (39)	4.07% (45)	12.1% (46)	1.00% (26)	7.5% (49)
Scioto	2	52.7% (4)	78.4% (5)	5.88% (11)	17.7% (9)	0.77% (43)	21.5% (4)
Seneca	44	59.5% (23)	84.4% (14)	3.67% (58)	12.0% (47)	0.38% (65)	12.0% (26)
Shelby	49	68.1% (57)	88.4% (27)	4.75% (31)	13.6% (37)	0.52% (58)	10.0% (42)
Stark	29	64.0% (40)	90.4% (32)	4.83% (30)	15.3% (26)	0.85% (37)	12.2% (25)
Summit	22	66.3% (49)	90.0% (31)	4.94% (26)	19.0% (6)	0.96% (28)	12.2% (24)
Trumbull	41	62.4% (33)	92.8% (48)	4.89% (29)	14.2% (29)	0.35% (66)	14.4% (15)
Tuscarawas	38	60.1% (24)	85.6% (16)	7.00% (5)	6.2% (69)	0.64% (49)	8.6% (47)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Union	48	70.2% (65)	93.0% (50)	4.14% (44)	13.8% (34)	1.08% (21)	10.5% (37)
Warren	71	75.6% (70)	99.0% (66)	4.37% (42)	17.4% (13)	0.23% (69)	0.1% (70)
Washington	27	61.7% (31)	88.2% (25)	3.79% (55)	11.0% (55)	1.62% (6)	10.1% (41)
Wayne	67	61.0% (28)	91.9% (40)	3.53% (61)	9.3% (66)	0.55% (56)	0.9% (69)
Williams	39	62.4% (32)	87.0% (20)	3.41% (65)	11.0% (54)	1.33% (12)	9.7% (44)
Wood	36	66.9% (52)	112.3% (72)	5.54% (17)	21.3% (2)	1.84% (4)	4.2% (63)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Pennsylvania's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Adams	14	56.3% (23)	78.2% (13)	0.65% (14)	73.4% (11)	0.00% (31)	10.4% (22)
Allegheny	45	65.2% (43)	92.2% (41)	0.64% (15)	51.1% (34)	0.00% (31)	7.9% (36)
Armstrong	21	54.9% (19)	74.5% (8)	0.10% (39)	53.3% (31)	0.92% (12)	10.8% (18)
Beaver	40	60.2% (38)	80.7% (20)	0.26% (30)	47.0% (39)	0.16% (23)	10.0% (25)
Bedford	12	56.8% (24)	83.0% (28)	1.44% (2)	48.5% (38)	0.32% (20)	14.0% (12)
Berks	18	57.5% (29)	81.8% (22)	1.05% (3)	56.5% (29)	0.72% (15)	10.7% (21)
Blair	28	51.5% (12)	86.1% (34)	0.20% (35)	82.5% (4)	0.00% (31)	6.2% (45)
Bradford	27	49.8% (6)	82.9% (26)	0.72% (8)	51.6% (33)	1.00% (11)	6.6% (42)
Bucks	47	69.8% (44)	94.7% (43)	0.15% (36)	67.3% (19)	0.00% (31)	9.5% (28)
Butler	44	64.3% (42)	87.7% (36)	0.25% (33)	60.7% (26)	0.73% (14)	8.2% (35)
Cambria	10	53.3% (18)	75.8% (9)	0.06% (43)	71.4% (15)	0.00% (31)	13.1% (14)
Carbon	20	51.0% (10)	77.1% (12)	0.00% (46)	-	0.07% (26)	10.4% (23)
Centre	39	57.1% (28)	89.1% (40)	0.54% (17)	52.5% (32)	0.28% (21)	9.1% (30)
Chester	46	72.1% (47)	94.3% (42)	0.36% (24)	62.4% (23)	0.08% (25)	10.8% (19)
Clearfield	25	50.2% (8)	79.7% (17)	0.04% (45)	72.7% (12)	0.00% (31)	7.4% (39)
Columbia	2	48.2% (4)	73.0% (5)	0.74% (7)	79.2% (9)	0.33% (19)	20.2% (2)
Crawford	5	52.4% (16)	76.9% (11)	0.47% (22)	71.5% (14)	0.05% (28)	19.9% (3)
Cumberland	23	62.1% (39)	81.9% (23)	0.66% (12)	74.9% (10)	1.51% (5)	7.8% (37)
Dauphin	24	63.1% (40)	88.4% (37)	0.75% (6)	61.7% (24)	0.00% (31)	18.5% (4)
Delaware	43	70.6% (45)	98.0% (45)	0.68% (9)	67.2% (20)	2.49% (3)	10.7% (20)
Erie	30	56.9% (26)	84.2% (31)	0.52% (20)	49.3% (37)	0.22% (22)	14.0% (10)
Fayette	16	45.2% (2)	73.5% (7)	0.50% (21)	42.3% (41)	0.64% (16)	6.8% (41)
Franklin	17	57.5% (30)	79.8% (18)	0.30% (25)	88.8% (1)	0.07% (27)	8.6% (33)
Huntingdon	6	48.4% (5)	79.4% (16)	0.27% (29)	82.2% (6)	0.00% (31)	14.0% (11)
Indiana	9	51.2% (11)	80.5% (19)	0.54% (18)	81.0% (8)	0.00% (31)	8.7% (32)
Lackawanna	38	59.5% (37)	88.5% (38)	0.66% (13)	58.3% (28)	0.00% (31)	8.9% (31)
Lancaster	19	59.4% (36)	81.1% (21)	0.99% (4)	50.8% (36)	1.57% (4)	10.9% (17)
Lawrence	26	55.2% (21)	84.1% (30)	0.10% (41)	83.3% (3)	0.37% (18)	8.5% (34)
Lebanon	36	56.8% (25)	79.3% (15)	0.04% (44)	36.4% (43)	0.04% (29)	13.8% (13)
Lehigh	41	59.3% (35)	85.9% (33)	0.77% (5)	42.5% (40)	0.00% (31)	10.0% (26)
Luzerne	13	49.9% (7)	78.6% (14)	0.28% (27)	85.8% (2)	0.00% (31)	6.2% (43)
Lycoming	4	52.4% (17)	71.7% (2)	0.25% (32)	82.3% (5)	1.08% (10)	14.4% (9)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Mercer	11	57.0% (27)	82.9% (27)	0.07% (42)	81.3% (7)	0.12% (24)	16.4% (7)
Mifflin	3	46.1% (3)	68.6% (1)	0.28% (28)	63.6% (22)	0.74% (13)	15.0% (8)
Monroe	32	52.0% (13)	82.6% (25)	0.00% (46)	-	1.49% (6)	6.2% (44)
Montgomery	34	71.4% (46)	95.5% (44)	0.22% (34)	69.7% (17)	2.76% (2)	16.8% (6)
Northampton	37	59.2% (34)	88.7% (39)	0.67% (10)	63.9% (21)	0.02% (30)	7.3% (40)
Northumberland	35	44.8% (1)	72.6% (4)	0.25% (31)	12.7% (45)	0.00% (31)	7.7% (38)
Philadelphia	29	64.3% (41)	101.2% (47)	4.06% (1)	27.3% (44)	0.00% (31)	10.3% (24)
Pike	1	55.5% (22)	99.4% (46)	0.67% (11)	41.3% (42)	10.94% (1)	23.6% (1)
Schuylkill	15	50.4% (9)	72.2% (3)	0.10% (40)	50.9% (35)	0.40% (17)	11.1% (16)
Somerset	31	55.1% (20)	83.0% (29)	0.14% (37)	72.7% (12)	1.43% (7)	5.6% (47)
Venango	7	52.4% (15)	73.5% (6)	0.58% (16)	69.1% (18)	0.00% (31)	12.8% (15)
Washington	22	58.1% (31)	84.9% (32)	0.29% (26)	58.7% (27)	0.00% (31)	17.9% (5)
Wayne	8	52.3% (14)	76.0% (10)	0.52% (19)	70.8% (16)	0.00% (31)	9.7% (27)
Westmoreland	33	58.9% (32)	82.1% (24)	0.12% (38)	61.4% (25)	1.11% (9)	9.1% (29)
York	42	59.1% (33)	87.2% (35)	0.44% (23)	55.0% (30)	1.35% (8)	5.7% (46)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Virginia's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Accomack	76	64.8% (54)	95.0% (75)	0.05% (89)	71.4% (26)	0.0% (48)	6.92% (92)
Albemarle	58	75.6% (86)	103.7% (94)	0.25% (34)	32.5% (76)	3.1% (4)	9.31% (38)
Alexandria City	28	78.9% (94)	114.5% (99)	1.00% (3)	78.4% (13)	0.0% (48)	16.18% (3)
Alleghany	81	60.0% (31)	84.1% (26)	0.01% (98)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	8.33% (62)
Amherst	43	61.6% (40)	80.9% (14)	0.24% (37)	62.9% (44)	0.1% (45)	7.75% (77)
Appomattox	96	70.6% (76)	93.2% (67)	0.08% (79)	16.7% (83)	0.0% (48)	7.01% (90)
Arlington	48	81.7% (99)	116.1% (100)	0.67% (8)	77.7% (15)	0.2% (43)	15.12% (7)
Augusta	11	61.4% (39)	80.2% (11)	0.15% (57)	74.0% (22)	2.7% (6)	7.32% (86)
Bedford	87	71.8% (78)	94.3% (73)	0.07% (83)	47.8% (65)	0.0% (48)	8.76% (57)
Botetourt	90	72.1% (80)	92.9% (65)	0.09% (73)	26.7% (79)	0.0% (48)	9.30% (39)
Bristol City	41	53.5% (12)	89.1% (48)	0.22% (40)	40.0% (71)	0.0% (48)	10.48% (28)
Brunswick	42	58.1% (25)	79.9% (10)	0.16% (49)	58.3% (51)	0.0% (48)	8.04% (69)
Buchanan	56	50.2% (6)	84.7% (29)	0.04% (90)	25.0% (81)	0.5% (33)	6.95% (91)
Buckingham	35	53.4% (11)	72.4% (4)	0.11% (69)	62.5% (46)	0.0% (48)	6.83% (93)
Campbell	54	63.6% (49)	86.3% (36)	0.10% (71)	50.0% (61)	0.3% (39)	9.11% (45)
Caroline	44	65.6% (62)	89.7% (52)	0.47% (19)	62.7% (45)	0.0% (48)	9.18% (42)
Carroll	15	55.5% (16)	80.5% (12)	0.18% (44)	45.5% (67)	2.4% (9)	7.18% (88)
Charlottesville City	24	66.1% (66)	100.1% (88)	0.54% (13)	71.3% (28)	0.0% (48)	14.48% (8)
Chesapeake City	47	69.8% (74)	96.9% (81)	0.41% (23)	64.2% (41)	1.1% (22)	9.36% (37)
Chesterfield	101	78.8% (93)	102.9% (93)	0.18% (46)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	8.03% (70)
Clarke	79	73.1% (82)	96.2% (77)	0.09% (76)	50.0% (61)	0.3% (40)	9.50% (33)
Colonial Heights City	83	65.2% (60)	93.0% (66)	0.01% (99)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	11.97% (17)
Culpeper	61	65.1% (59)	92.6% (63)	0.32% (32)	66.7% (35)	0.0% (48)	7.66% (80)
Danville City	20	63.5% (47)	88.6% (46)	0.23% (38)	77.3% (18)	1.2% (19)	10.56% (26)
Dickenson	38	56.6% (19)	91.3% (61)	0.06% (85)	75.0% (19)	1.8% (14)	6.44% (97)
Dinwiddie	92	65.0% (57)	88.7% (47)	0.02% (97)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	8.84% (52)
Fairfax	77	80.0% (97)	111.0% (98)	0.50% (16)	52.7% (59)	0.8% (27)	9.27% (40)
Fairfax City	12	75.6% (85)	101.6% (91)	0.72% (4)	63.4% (43)	1.0% (24)	16.85% (2)
Fauquier	70	76.8% (88)	101.5% (90)	0.12% (68)	50.0% (61)	2.2% (12)	8.97% (50)
Floyd	67	66.1% (65)	89.4% (50)	0.11% (70)	75.0% (19)	0.0% (48)	7.84% (75)
Fluvanna	39	66.8% (68)	89.8% (53)	0.33% (30)	70.3% (30)	0.8% (28)	9.12% (44)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Franklin	49	62.2% (41)	82.9% (20)	0.03% (95)	42.9% (69)	1.1% (21)	7.27% (87)
Frederick	69	66.1% (64)	93.8% (70)	0.09% (75)	40.0% (71)	1.0% (25)	9.03% (48)
Fredericksburg City	4	63.9% (50)	90.7% (58)	1.37% (1)	83.5% (10)	0.0% (48)	15.77% (4)
Giles	51	60.2% (33)	86.2% (35)	0.12% (66)	55.6% (55)	0.0% (48)	8.48% (60)
Gloucester	95	69.0% (72)	92.8% (64)	0.08% (80)	7.1% (85)	0.0% (48)	8.06% (67)
Goochland	99	79.1% (95)	94.7% (74)	0.13% (64)	26.7% (79)	0.0% (48)	7.38% (84)
Grayson	75	57.7% (24)	84.5% (28)	0.03% (94)	0.0% (86)	0.2% (42)	8.82% (54)
Greene	73	68.5% (70)	93.5% (68)	0.16% (50)	38.5% (73)	0.6% (32)	9.01% (49)
Halifax	21	62.6% (44)	86.0% (32)	0.15% (58)	62.5% (46)	3.0% (5)	6.16% (100)
Hampton City	33	64.6% (53)	93.9% (71)	0.64% (9)	82.0% (12)	0.0% (48)	9.13% (43)
Hanover	72	81.0% (98)	98.0% (84)	0.16% (52)	64.4% (40)	1.9% (13)	8.00% (71)
Harrisonburg City	2	43.1% (2)	67.4% (2)	0.56% (11)	92.5% (5)	1.2% (20)	12.68% (13)
Henrico	74	77.1% (90)	99.5% (87)	0.62% (10)	44.5% (68)	0.0% (48)	8.80% (55)
Henry	64	60.3% (34)	86.4% (37)	0.08% (77)	52.6% (60)	0.0% (48)	7.90% (74)
Hopewell City	7	58.9% (27)	87.1% (40)	0.67% (6)	94.8% (2)	0.0% (48)	14.07% (10)
Isle Of Wight	85	78.5% (92)	101.9% (92)	0.20% (42)	71.1% (29)	0.4% (38)	8.26% (63)
James City	97	83.9% (100)	108.0% (95)	0.23% (39)	53.1% (57)	0.0% (48)	9.19% (41)
King George	53	68.4% (69)	91.3% (60)	0.16% (55)	87.5% (8)	0.1% (44)	8.42% (61)
King William	65	77.5% (91)	96.4% (78)	0.45% (20)	94.7% (3)	0.0% (48)	7.74% (79)
Lee	59	48.5% (5)	82.6% (17)	0.03% (92)	33.3% (74)	0.0% (48)	6.54% (95)
Loudoun	100	88.7% (101)	116.2% (101)	0.33% (29)	56.6% (53)	0.2% (41)	8.23% (64)
Louisa	63	66.4% (67)	87.9% (44)	0.15% (59)	40.9% (70)	0.9% (26)	8.18% (65)
Lynchburg City	10	63.5% (48)	94.2% (72)	0.21% (41)	71.4% (26)	3.4% (2)	10.53% (27)
Manassas City	98	76.2% (87)	110.4% (97)	0.17% (47)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	12.98% (12)
Martinsville City	14	59.5% (29)	86.7% (38)	0.18% (45)	100.0% (1)	0.0% (48)	12.07% (16)
Mecklenburg	13	60.8% (36)	86.2% (34)	0.67% (7)	94.6% (4)	0.0% (48)	7.94% (72)
Montgomery	66	56.1% (17)	84.1% (25)	0.08% (78)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	11.00% (20)
Nelson	68	69.5% (73)	92.1% (62)	0.16% (53)	75.0% (19)	0.0% (48)	8.56% (59)
New Kent	93	79.2% (96)	96.8% (80)	0.04% (91)	25.0% (81)	1.6% (15)	7.93% (73)
Newport News City	37	61.1% (37)	93.6% (69)	0.42% (21)	65.1% (38)	0.0% (46)	10.68% (23)
Norfolk City	1	48.2% (4)	71.7% (3)	1.32% (2)	84.9% (9)	2.5% (8)	14.38% (9)
Nottoway	62	56.8% (21)	77.1% (7)	0.16% (54)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	8.83% (53)
Orange	25	66.1% (63)	91.0% (59)	0.17% (48)	64.0% (42)	2.4% (10)	9.45% (36)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Page	57	55.3% (15)	83.5% (22)	0.14% (61)	46.2% (66)	0.0% (48)	6.52% (96)
Patrick	29	58.3% (26)	82.8% (19)	0.09% (74)	57.1% (52)	2.3% (11)	6.30% (99)
Petersburg City	19	65.3% (61)	90.6% (57)	0.53% (14)	90.0% (6)	0.0% (48)	10.81% (22)
Pittsylvania	80	64.9% (55)	87.8% (42)	0.06% (86)	33.3% (74)	0.0% (48)	7.12% (89)
Portsmouth City	34	65.1% (58)	90.6% (56)	0.47% (18)	77.6% (16)	0.0% (48)	10.25% (30)
Powhatan	89	72.2% (81)	88.2% (45)	0.15% (56)	27.3% (78)	0.0% (48)	7.56% (81)
Prince Edward	6	51.5% (8)	76.1% (6)	0.00% (101)	-	2.7% (7)	10.57% (24)
Prince George	71	60.1% (32)	82.6% (18)	0.09% (72)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	10.06% (31)
Prince William	84	76.9% (89)	108.2% (96)	0.39% (24)	68.0% (33)	0.0% (48)	9.10% (47)
Pulaski	16	53.1% (10)	78.4% (9)	0.19% (43)	69.2% (31)	0.5% (34)	8.91% (51)
Radford City	3	39.9% (1)	61.4% (1)	0.12% (65)	0.0% (86)	3.4% (3)	15.38% (5)
Richmond City	8	64.6% (52)	86.8% (39)	0.68% (5)	77.5% (17)	0.0% (47)	13.99% (11)
Roanoke	88	74.1% (84)	98.8% (85)	0.13% (63)	32.2% (77)	0.0% (48)	10.89% (21)
Roanoke City	22	57.2% (23)	90.6% (55)	0.38% (26)	61.0% (49)	0.0% (48)	11.96% (18)
Rockbridge	32	60.3% (35)	81.6% (15)	0.03% (93)	66.7% (35)	1.3% (18)	8.73% (58)
Rockingham	50	63.2% (46)	83.8% (24)	0.13% (62)	53.7% (56)	0.5% (35)	7.51% (83)
Russell	82	54.0% (13)	85.7% (31)	0.07% (81)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	6.30% (98)
Salem City	18	65.0% (56)	90.2% (54)	0.33% (28)	59.5% (50)	1.1% (23)	12.64% (14)
Scott	86	54.5% (14)	87.5% (41)	0.06% (84)	16.7% (83)	0.0% (48)	5.03% (101)
Shenandoah	9	62.4% (43)	87.8% (43)	0.32% (31)	69.0% (32)	3.5% (1)	8.08% (66)
Smyth	26	51.2% (7)	78.4% (8)	0.05% (88)	83.3% (11)	0.0% (48)	7.81% (76)
Southampton	91	64.1% (51)	86.0% (33)	0.01% (100)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	8.05% (68)
Spotsylvania	94	70.0% (75)	97.9% (83)	0.25% (36)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	9.49% (35)
Stafford	46	71.6% (77)	97.4% (82)	0.56% (12)	64.5% (39)	0.5% (36)	10.44% (29)
Staunton City	27	59.7% (30)	83.6% (23)	0.33% (27)	50.0% (61)	0.0% (48)	11.86% (19)
Suffolk City	55	71.9% (79)	96.6% (79)	0.42% (22)	72.3% (25)	0.0% (48)	9.49% (34)
Tazewell	31	52.5% (9)	81.7% (16)	0.06% (87)	90.0% (6)	0.0% (48)	7.75% (78)
Virginia Beach City	36	62.3% (42)	95.6% (76)	0.50% (17)	73.8% (23)	0.7% (31)	8.79% (56)
Warren	40	61.2% (38)	89.7% (51)	0.14% (60)	72.7% (24)	0.7% (30)	9.11% (46)
Washington	60	59.3% (28)	84.3% (27)	0.07% (82)	56.3% (54)	0.0% (48)	7.53% (82)
Waynesboro City	17	56.2% (18)	80.7% (13)	0.16% (51)	61.5% (48)	0.0% (48)	12.33% (15)
Westmoreland	30	63.1% (45)	89.1% (49)	0.25% (35)	77.8% (14)	0.8% (29)	10.04% (32)
Williamsburg City	52	68.5% (71)	99.5% (86)	0.53% (15)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	15.36% (6)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots cast, 2012	Rate of provisional ballots rejected, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Winchester City	5	57.0% (22)	85.4% (30)	0.29% (33)	65.4% (37)	1.5% (17)	19.89% (1)
Wise	23	46.7% (3)	74.6% (5)	0.12% (67)	52.9% (58)	0.5% (37)	6.67% (94)
Wythe	78	56.7% (20)	83.1% (21)	0.02% (96)	0.0% (86)	0.0% (48)	7.35% (85)
York	45	73.4% (83)	100.7% (89)	0.38% (25)	67.5% (34)	1.5% (16)	10.56% (25)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

Wisconsin's election administration rankings

County rankings for each factor in parentheses, 1 = worst-performing county

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Adams	3	60.0% (5)	76.0% (4)	0.78% (14)	12.12% (14)
Barron	27	64.7% (14)	83.7% (18)	0.38% (36)	8.95% (31)
Brown	49	73.3% (42)	94.0% (45)	0.17% (49)	7.24% (46)
Calumet	48	76.2% (48)	92.9% (42)	0.45% (30)	4.45% (55)
Chippewa	31	66.0% (17)	86.3% (23)	0.12% (53)	10.63% (23)
Clark	7	57.6% (3)	75.9% (3)	0.69% (19)	8.11% (42)
Columbia	38	71.2% (33)	89.6% (30)	0.50% (27)	6.13% (51)
Dane	25	85.6% (54)	125.5% (55)	1.31% (3)	45.96% (1)
Dodge	32	65.4% (16)	81.6% (12)	0.15% (50)	5.63% (53)
Door	19	78.6% (50)	94.0% (44)	0.69% (21)	29.08% (2)
Douglas	26	60.7% (6)	89.9% (33)	0.61% (22)	6.13% (52)
Dunn	1	64.4% (13)	82.2% (14)	1.21% (5)	22.00% (4)
Eau Claire	24	72.4% (38)	88.5% (26)	0.36% (38)	21.65% (5)
Fond Du Lac	28	70.3% (29)	83.9% (19)	0.54% (23)	10.79% (22)
Grant	11	61.3% (8)	81.5% (11)	0.71% (18)	10.61% (24)
Green	47	72.3% (37)	90.6% (38)	0.14% (52)	5.29% (54)
Green Lake	9	67.0% (19)	82.8% (15)	0.78% (13)	18.89% (7)
Iowa	37	71.4% (34)	88.6% (27)	0.53% (24)	6.70% (48)
Jackson	16	60.0% (4)	78.7% (6)	0.50% (26)	8.16% (41)
Jefferson	45	72.7% (39)	94.6% (46)	0.19% (48)	8.74% (34)
Juneau	2	57.4% (2)	74.7% (2)	0.52% (25)	14.12% (12)
Kenosha	34	69.4% (27)	90.3% (36)	0.29% (42)	11.00% (21)
Kewaunee	21	71.6% (36)	87.6% (24)	1.10% (7)	8.97% (30)
La Crosse	52	73.0% (40)	97.8% (52)	0.15% (51)	9.73% (27)
Langlade	8	67.7% (23)	81.6% (13)	1.25% (4)	12.12% (15)
Lincoln	23	67.6% (21)	84.5% (20)	0.76% (15)	8.34% (36)
Manitowoc	41	69.3% (25)	88.5% (25)	0.11% (55)	8.18% (40)
Marathon	35	71.4% (35)	91.3% (39)	0.40% (34)	11.80% (16)
Marinette	4	55.7% (1)	74.6% (1)	0.42% (32)	12.51% (13)
Milwaukee	46	74.8% (47)	97.4% (51)	0.26% (45)	11.47% (17)
Monroe	10	61.2% (7)	80.2% (8)	0.42% (31)	14.95% (11)
Oconto	22	69.3% (26)	84.9% (22)	0.90% (11)	8.28% (38)
Oneida	33	74.4% (43)	92.8% (41)	0.50% (28)	16.57% (8)

County	Overall state rank	Voter turnout rate	Voter registration rate, 2012	Absentee ballot rejection rate, 2012	Voter removal rate, 2012
Outagamie	42	74.6% (45)	93.7% (43)	0.33% (41)	10.50% (25)
Ozaukee	54	86.3% (55)	106.1% (53)	0.49% (29)	20.32% (6)
Pierce	12	67.2% (20)	84.7% (21)	0.42% (33)	24.27% (3)
Polk	18	67.7% (22)	89.0% (29)	1.08% (8)	8.84% (32)
Portage	39	73.1% (41)	95.9% (48)	0.69% (20)	8.43% (35)
Racine	36	74.7% (46)	89.7% (32)	0.27% (43)	15.87% (9)
Rock	43	70.3% (30)	92.1% (40)	0.21% (47)	7.23% (47)
Sauk	29	70.7% (32)	88.9% (28)	0.72% (17)	9.29% (28)
Shawano	13	63.7% (11)	81.3% (10)	0.75% (16)	11.43% (18)
Sheboygan	44	74.4% (44)	90.3% (35)	0.37% (37)	6.63% (49)
St. Croix	51	77.0% (49)	97.4% (50)	0.39% (35)	9.12% (29)
Taylor	6	62.0% (9)	78.2% (5)	1.05% (9)	8.20% (39)
Trempealeau	17	64.1% (12)	83.3% (17)	0.79% (12)	7.96% (43)
Vernon	15	66.5% (18)	83.1% (16)	1.04% (10)	8.77% (33)
Vilas	53	78.7% (51)	97.0% (49)	0.36% (39)	9.87% (26)
Walworth	30	70.3% (31)	90.6% (37)	0.27% (44)	15.80% (10)
Washington	55	81.0% (52)	95.2% (47)	0.11% (54)	11.16% (20)
Waukesha	50	84.1% (53)	108.1% (54)	1.33% (2)	7.30% (45)
Waupaca	20	65.0% (15)	81.2% (9)	0.35% (40)	11.41% (19)
Waushara	5	62.3% (10)	79.7% (7)	1.19% (6)	7.89% (44)
Winnebago	40	70.0% (28)	89.7% (31)	0.23% (46)	8.29% (37)
Wood	14	68.5% (24)	90.1% (34)	1.66% (1)	6.31% (50)

Note: Due to the fact that U.S. Census Bureau figures for citizen voting-age population, or CVAP, are estimates with a margin of error and the most up-to-date CVAP estimates are from 2011, not 2012, some registration rates appear as more than 100 percent. See the methodology section for more details.

Source: Center for American Progress Action Fund analysis based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Election Assistance Commission. See the methodology and endnotes for more details.

The Center for American Progress Action Fund transforms progressive ideas into policy through rapid response communications, legislative action, grassroots organizing and advocacy, and partnerships with other progressive leaders throughout the country and the world. The Action Fund is also the home of the Progress Report and ThinkProgress.

Center for American Progress Action Fund

