

FEBRUARY 15, 2022 | PUBLIC HEARING

Pennsylvania Senate State Government Committee

Senator David G. Argall, Chair
and Members of the Committee

Testimony of the Bipartisan Policy Center Elections Project

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Matthew Weil, and I am the Director of the Elections Project at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington, DC. I am here today with my colleague, Rachel Orey, who is a Senior Policy Analyst on my team.

I am also joined by Christopher Thomas, a fellow with BPC's Elections Project and former State Director of Elections in Michigan, and Brian Corley, Supervisor of Elections in Pasco County, Florida.

The Bipartisan Policy Center, BPC, was founded more than a decade ago by four former United States Senate Majority leaders – Senators Tom Daschle, Robert Dole, George Mitchell, and Howard Baker.

BPC's Elections Project believes that free and fair elections are critical to the health of democracy, and that voting is the most important expression of a citizen's democratic right.

The election officials testifying with us today are part of the BPC Task Force on Elections, a group of state and local election administrators working across the aisle to identify pragmatic, bipartisan policy improvements to election administration. The task force currently includes more than two dozen state and local election officials from more than a dozen states across the country, including Pennsylvania. Members of the Task Force represent both Republican and Democratic jurisdictions, but most importantly, they know what works in election administration because they live it daily.

Election officials' voices are often left out of policy, and the Task Force was created to give election officials a voice in the conversation. We are honored to be here today.

BACKGROUND

The process of updating the election code in Pennsylvania, as in most states, is arduous and challenging. The Senate Government Committee expressed a willingness to work across the aisle to improve and secure the voting experience for Pennsylvania voters.

There is an urgent need for this reform. To have a successful and trusted election in 2024, Pennsylvania must lay the groundwork for impactful election legislation as soon as possible.

In our analysis of the priorities for election reform in Pennsylvania, we have identified three principles that serve as a starting point for our policy recommendations: access, security, and resilience.

Good election policy advances access to the ballot and the security of the vote as coequal goals—not as competing incentives in a zero-sum game. Making that policy resilient to time and shifting political winds requires evidence-based decision-making and clear rules for how elections are run.

Each of these goals are critical to democracy, but they cannot be meaningfully achieved without bipartisan reform. One party should not overhaul election systems; despite examples of this occurring in states across the U.S., single party reform risks public trust in the democratic process. Accessible, secure, and resilient election policy transcends party affiliation, and we all benefit from a strong and functioning democracy.

This testimony draws on two primary sources. The first is a report of the BPC Task Force on Elections. Released in January of 2020, [Logical Election Policy](#) was endorsed unanimously by the task force and issues a series of recommendations covering all aspects of election administration policy from voter registration to casting and counting the vote.

Additionally, we draw on the findings of the Senate Special Committee on Election Integrity and Reform. After months of careful analysis and information gathering with election officials from within and outside of Pennsylvania, the Special Committee issued a [report](#) detailing legislative reforms to build a more accessible, secure, and resilient election system. The Committee's recommendations represent the needs of voters and election administrators alike and balance the priorities of both Democratic and Republican leaders.

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES TO IMPROVE PENNSYLVANIA ELECTIONS

In consultation with our nationwide network of election officials, including in Pennsylvania, BPC has identified several legislative priorities the Committee should explore, with which BPC offers its assistance, to

advance secure and accessible elections ahead of 2024. Those priorities include: pre-canvassing of mail ballots, enhancing the clarity and consistency of Pennsylvania election code, and increased election funding.

PRE-CANVASSING OF BALLOTS

All eyes were on Pennsylvania in the days that followed the 2020 presidential election. As election officials across the commonwealth rushed to count the swarm of mail ballots that resulted from unprecedented absentee voter turnout amidst a global pandemic, citizens across the county and from across the political spectrum waited anxiously for the state to be called.

BPC has long warned that the period between the close of polls and the reporting of unofficial results is precarious for public trust. Extended periods are ripe for the spread of mis and disinformation, as we saw in 2020 when former President Trump declared he won the state long before sufficient results were in. This long window was not only predictable, but also avoidable. To securely improve the timeliness of results reporting and reduce strain on election offices in the days after the election, the Committee should consider legislation which allows pre-canvassing of mail ballots.

In its inaugural report [Logical Election Policy](#), the BPC Task Force on Elections unanimously endorsed the recommendation that election administrators be permitted to process mail ballots beginning at least seven days before Election Day, but be prohibited from producing results.

Pre-canvassing improves how the flow of mail ballots is managed. It also allows more time to conduct identity verification of mail voters, including the curing of ballot envelopes on which there are fixable errors. Earlier processing also allows election officials to report unofficial tallies of mail ballots more quickly on Election Day.

Some legislators have expressed concern that pre-canvassing exposes the election system to security vulnerabilities, or would lead to election results being leaked before Election Day. Thankfully, there are extensive protections that can be put in place to secure voting materials and election results during pre-canvassing.

BPC considers processing of mail ballots to include the following: verifying voter eligibility on the outer envelope, curing eligibility issues, sorting the ballots by precinct, opening the ballots, and preparing the ballots to go through tabulators. Generally speaking, there are two types of pre-canvassing relating to ballot tabulation: one in which ballots may be tabulated but results not be accessible until after voting has concluded, and one in which ballots may be prepared for tabulation but not be tabulated until the close of polls.

In both scenarios, election officials and voters get to reap the benefits of faster results reporting after the close of polls. In states that allow tabulation during pre-canvassing, computer algorithms restrict the sharing of vote counts prior to a certain date and time, thereby ensuring that even election officials conducting tabulation cannot see vote totals preemptively. Should Pennsylvania choose not to allow tabulation during pre-processing, simply allowing election officials to prepare mail ballots for tabulation (the most time- and resource-intensive part of mail ballot processing) would improve the efficiency and speed of final vote tabulation.

The Task Force has recommended that states permit election administrators to pre-canvass ballots for at least seven days before an election. BPC stands by this recommendation, but endorses the [recommendation](#) made by the Senate Special Committee on Election Integrity and Reform for the purposes of this testimony. BPC recommends that the Committee consider legislation which allows election officials at least three days of pre-canvassing. This move alone would drastically improve the administration of Pennsylvania elections by improving the flow of mail ballots, shortening the results reporting timeline, reducing strain on election offices, and strengthening the ballot curing process by giving election officials and voters more time to identify and address ballot eligibility issues.

ELECTION LAW CLARITY, CONSISTENCY, AND APPLICABILITY

Dating back to 1937, Pennsylvania's election code is sprawling, complicated, and often outdated. Without clarity from the state, counties are often left to their own interpretations of how crucial policies are to be implemented, such as how to conduct audits and what factors make a mail ballot ineligible to be counted. Not only can discrepancies between counties threaten the integrity of the election, but the lack of clarity in state code also sets the scene for extensive judicial intervention. Far too often, Pennsylvania's election procedures are determined by the courts—not the elected representatives of the state legislature. Bipartisan action from the Senate State Government Committee is needed to build a secure election system that voters trust.

The Committee should conduct a comprehensive analysis of Pennsylvania election code to identify outdated or contradictory requirements. As a starting point for reform, BPC has identified the following areas in need of clarification: if and when ballot curing may occur and how audits are conducted.

IF, WHEN, AND HOW BALLOT CURING MAY OCCUR

A combination of unclear statutes, last-minute guidance, and inconsistent implementation made ballot curing a point of contention in the aftermath of the 2020 election. On the night before the Election Day,

the Department of State issued guidance to county election officials advising them to identify the voters whose ballots have been rejected in the state's ballot tracking system. Ideally, that would mean that when pre-canvassing began on the following morning voters would be able to check if their ballot was rejected and, if rejected, submit a provisional ballot. The result was [far more convoluted](#). Some counties followed the Department's guidance, others had already begun curing ballot envelopes weeks before, and others offered no curing options at all. The resulting patchwork of curing options placed disproportionate and unfair burdens on some voters simply because of the county they resided in—some of whom did not receive the option to submit a valid ballot due to an innocent mistake on their original ballot envelope.

Because of Pennsylvania's balance of power between the state and county governments, election officials often are not required to follow guidance from the Department of State pertaining to elections. As such, the legislature must act to remediate the clear deficiencies in Pennsylvania's ballot curing provisions. The BPC Task Force on Elections [urges](#) all states to allow sufficient time for voters to cure eligibility deficiencies in mail ballots, even if this period extends beyond Election Day. To facilitate smoother ballot curing, the Task Force also recommends that election officials be encouraged to collect additional points of contact from voters throughout the registration and voting process.

HOW AUDITS ARE CONDUCTED

Over the last two years, audits have transformed from a behind-the-scenes integrity measure to a flashpoint in the national debate. Any discrepancies between counties in how their audits are conducted could result in the spread of misinformation about and distrust of Pennsylvania's elections. Current state guidance on the conduct of audits is insufficient to ward off these threats, and additional clarity from the state is needed.

Election officials in the commonwealth have reported to BPC that rules about how audits should be conducted are unclear, specifically regarding whether selected ballots should be rescanned or hand counted. Audits must be consistently implemented to make definitive conclusions about the integrity of elections statewide.

To both bolster election security and shore up the reputation of Pennsylvania's elections, the Committee should explore ways to improve and make consistent the implementation of audits across the commonwealth.

Ballot curing and audits are two examples in a long list of policies and procedures that need clarification; the Senate Special Committee on Election Integrity and Reform detailed some of these additional areas in their [final report](#).

Election officials have made resoundingly clear that the one thing they need to do their jobs is clarity. Pennsylvania's election code is notably lacking when it comes to providing election officials the guidance they need to fully carry out their obligations. Reforming the commonwealth's election code should be a top priority of the Senate State Government Committee in the lead up to 2024.

I will now pass it to my colleague Rachel Orey, Senior Policy Analyst for BPC Elections, to discuss the need for strengthened election funding in Pennsylvania.

ELECTION FUNDING

Thank you, Matt. And thank you to the Committee for having us here today. Resource scarcity in election administration is a problem nationwide. Spending per voter varies dramatically by state and by county, and Pennsylvania is no exception.

With the recommendations that Pennsylvania pre-canvass mail ballots and clarify existing election law comes the need to bolster support for the implementation of and adherence to election policies.

As elections become increasingly complex with the expansion of new technologies and adoption of convenience voting methods, counties need additional resources to be able to run safe and secure elections for all Pennsylvanians.

Resources to hire more staff, purchase modern technology like ballot scanners, tabulators, and accessible voting machines, improve training and support for staff, and hire poll-workers are a few examples of how additional funds may be spent. Reliable and consistent funding could also improve voter outreach efforts, accessibility measures, and language access. Increasing demand for early and mail voting options also underscores the need for increased funding. Early and mail voting options require additional staffing, storage, supplies, and space, which many counties in Pennsylvania do not have enough resources to fund.

Pennsylvania's counties have vastly different needs: Philadelphia County, with 1.6 million people, has roughly 320 times more people than Cameron County, with a population under 5,000. Historically, states have vouched for a simple per-voter formula to determine how many resources counties should receive. This approach is insufficient to address the different needs of Pennsylvania's counties and rectify decades of underfunding.

In larger counties, it is untenable to hand-sort every ballot. Instead, modern technology allows for ballot sorting machines to organize and sort ballots. Ballot sorting machines have a high upfront cost but make a world of difference for larger counties. Investments in this kind of technology streamline ballot processing

by reducing the time it takes to process ballots, the number of staff involved, and the propensity for human error when otherwise processing hundreds of thousands of ballots by hand. Additionally, some ballot sorting machines can discern whether or not a ballot has a secrecy envelope before it is even opened; if lacking a secrecy envelope is considered grounds for ballot dismissal, identifying the missing envelope early gives election officials more time to notify the voter of the mistake and ensure the voter is still able to cast their vote.

By contrast, smaller counties with only a few thousand voters may not need to invest in extensive machinery to process ballots. However, they still need sufficient resources to bring on staff to verify and tabulate mail ballots and run in-person voting. Smaller counties might have higher per-voter costs in staff, costs which tend to remain more stable over time. In contrast, larger counties might need to allocate more of their budget towards new technology with high upfront cost that result in savings down the road. As such, the Committee should work with county election officials to explore a more nuanced funding system that looks beyond per-voter costs and towards the full life cycle of election infrastructure investments.

Recently, the Pennsylvania House of Representatives passed [House Bill 2044](#) and referred it to this committee. The bill would ban county election officials from accepting third party election grants from private entities. BPC agrees with the premise of this bill that elections are a wholly governmental function and should be funded accordingly. However, we cannot ignore the vital resource gap filled by private funding in 2020; if Pennsylvania does away with third party support, it must be prepared to step in and fully fund the state's election system.

PREPARING FOR 2024

All Americans must feel confident that the voting process is fair, accessible, and secure. As members of the Senate State Government Committee, you can create true, bipartisan election reform by prioritizing pre-canvassing of ballots, clarifying election law through consistent and applicable standards for mail voting audits, and increasing election funding.

Timeliness is of the utmost importance. For election reform to be impactful, it should be implemented far enough before an election that election officials have time to implement changes to the voting process. The Special Committee noted this in their [final report](#), stating that “the department must issue guidance as far in advance as possible to avoid the confusion of having to implement new practices immediately prior to an election.”

The Bipartisan Policy Center's April 2021 report, [Improving the Voting Experience](#), recommends that states should implement policy and administrative changes to elections no later than 90-days before an election, and ideally more than six months before. This recommendation was endorsed unanimously by our bipartisan task force of election officials.

The next nine months provide ample time to prioritize reforms such as pre-canvassing of ballots and election funding, both reforms that would drastically improve the performance of the 2022 midterm elections. The Committee should also start laying the groundwork now for a more comprehensive assessment and reform of Pennsylvania's election code in the 2023 legislative session. The Bipartisan Policy Center stands at the ready to assist the Committee in convening stakeholders from across the aisle to meaningfully improve the voting experience.

Thank you for allowing us to speak to you today. I will now turn it over Christopher Thomas, a fellow of the Elections project at BPC and former State Director of Elections in Michigan. He will be followed by Brian Corley, Supervisor of Elections in Pasco County, Florida.

Sincerely,



MATT WEIL

Director, Elections Project
Bipartisan Policy Center



RACHEL OREY

Senior Policy Analyst, Elections Project
Bipartisan Policy Center

Testimony of Christopher Thomas, Fellow at the Bipartisan Policy Center before the Pennsylvania Senate State Government Committee on February 15, 2022 at 1 p.m.

Good afternoon to the Chair and members of the State Government Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on election administration issues.

As noted, I served as Michigan's state election director for 36 years during my 40-year tenure with Michigan Department of State. I worked for a Democratic Secretary of State for 17 years and three Republican Secretaries of State for 23 years.

In addition, during the 2020 November general election, I served as a senior advisor to Janice Winfrey, Detroit City Clerk. In that capacity I was part of the management team at the TCF Center processing and tabulating more than 174,000 absent voter ballots.

Michigan and Pennsylvania shared fortuitous pre-pandemic enactments of no-excuse mail voting for all electors. Ours was by voter initiated constitutional amendment; yours by well crafted legislation. Public Acts 77 and 22 have all the necessary components for secure and accessible elections, which was demonstrated in 2020. However, like all new, major enactments the first series of elections reveal the need for necessary adjustments. The pandemic canceled any plans for easing into these new provisions by providing the ultimate stress test of the abilities of state and county election officials and voters to manage the voting changes.

Binding election law instruction: Michigan has 1,600 county, city and township election officials conducting elections. A primary role of the secretary of State is to ensure uniformity in the conduct of election. Without state source to issue legally enforceable instructions, uniformity would suffer as various communities set their own rules. PA places authority in the county election boards to establish rules and regulations. Unfortunately, the courts end up making the hard calls. Rulemaking by the Secretary of State would provide an avenue for input from county election officials and the public. Also, in the midst of an election, a state process for addressing legal issues, in consultation with county officials, would benefit clarity, uniformity and judicial economy.

Signature verification: This is essential to both the acceptance and rejection of ballots. Pennsylvania has "belts and suspenders" by also requiring driver license numbers or last four digits of social security numbers. The challenge is how to apply both verifications. There are issues with both forms of verification, such as signature changing over time or verification numbers have transposed digits. This challenge call for laws that set the standard of review and then uniform guidance on how to perform the verifications. In Michigan, a ballot may be rejected if the signature does not sufficiently agree with signature on record. The standard does not impose an exact match, taking into account some variation in signatures. Out of 3.3 million mail ballots cast in November 2020, only 1,386 were rejected based on signature comparison. With the annual request for mail ballots, PA election officials have time to closely review

signatures, and those accepted should become another retained, valid signature for comparison purposes. Finally, Michigan's registration file contains the driver license or state ID signatures for most voters.

Curing via email and text: As election day approaches the viability of contacting voters by first class mail quickly diminishes, making curing opportunities empty gestures. Many voters are reluctant to disclose their email addresses and phone numbers that will then be publicly available for political and commercial purposes. These communication avenues should be exempt from disclosure under public records law.

Pre-canvassing before election day: From the testimony on record, this topic wins the popularity contest. The Michigan legislature on October 6th before the November 2020 election provided election officials with 10 hours of pre-processing on Monday prior to the election. The ballots could be checked into the poll book, the return envelopes opened, and the ballot number printed on the ballot stub verified against the ballot number in the poll book. That was it. Signatures are verified by municipal clerk staff as they received; this is not done on election day. As the Bipartisan Policy Center Task Force recommends, seven days are desired, but if three days are what is offered, election officials should take it. More important is what is done during the pre-canvassing. For security and efficiency, ballots should be scanned and then secured. Merely opening ballots and unfolding them is neither efficient nor the more secure process.

Naked ballots: Ballots returned without a secrecy envelope or sleeve are counted in Michigan. Voters should not be penalized for this error as it is not evidence of fraud. If managed properly, the ballot will not reveal votes connected to a particular voter as it is inserted into a secrecy sleeve by an election worker.

Mandatory training: The franchise is dependent on the execution of laws and procedures designed to enhance and protect it. The Secretary of the Commonwealth should be authorized by law to require certification of all new county election officials and promulgated training curriculums for county election staff and poll workers. County Boards of Election will conduct the training as they currently do but with the state curriculum as part of the training.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before this committee.

Testimony of Brian Corley, MPA

Supervisor of Elections, Pasco County, Florida

Pennsylvania State Senate

State Government Committee

February 15, 2022, 1:00 P.M.

Pennsylvania State Capitol

It is an honor to be with you today to share some perspective on Florida’s election model. I’d like to begin with a brief overview of how Florida elections are structured with a focus on how we balance the three-legged stool of voter turnout—Election Day, In-Person Early Voting and Vote-By-Mail (aka Absentee Voting)—followed by voter verification and list maintenance best practices.

Florida’s Supervisors of Elections, much like our counterparts in Pennsylvania and nationwide, are comprised of consummate professionals with different genders, races, and political affiliations who are focused on serving voters and running stellar elections. We are professionally non-partisan and politically agnostic. In my opinion, it’s inappropriate when “politics” in essence hijacks election administration. Voters are the most important stakeholder in elections administration and expect and deserve better.

Learning from the 2000 General Election

It’s no secret that Florida had been dubbed a “laughingstock” stemming from the 2000 election. While some of the criticism was warranted, it did motivate Florida’s election administrators to work with the legislature to amend laws to vastly improve upon the processes and procedures that comprise administering elections in the nation’s third largest state.

For the past two decades, Florida voters have had a choice of one of three ways to cast their ballot: early in-person, by mail, or on election day. In the 2016 general election, the distribution of those methods was roughly equal in proportion. In 2020, Florida joined many states in increasing its share of voters who cast their ballot by mail, which is mainly attributable to the pandemic. Of the more than 11 million ballots cast in Florida’s 2020 general election, 39% voted early, 44% voted by mail, and 18% voted on election day.

While there has been a sizeable shift away from election day voting at the neighborhood polling place, we have many older voters in Florida who still prefer in-person election day voting. That’s not a problem. In fact, Florida’s myriad of options to cast a ballot assists with not having to add additional precincts because although a precinct may have a higher number of registered voters, we know a percentage of those voters will choose mail or in-person early voting.

Early Voting

Early voting in Florida is required in federal and state elections for a minimum of eight consecutive days, up to a maximum of 14 consecutive days, for a minimum of eight hours and up to a maximum of 12 hours each day. Early voting is required to be held in the office of the supervisor of elections and may be held at additional locations that meet certain criteria. Within those parameters, supervisors of elections have the discretion to choose the number of days, hours, and locations that best accommodate their voters. Florida’s Supervisors of Elections lobbied for flexibility with early

voting duration and locations with a “one size doesn’t fit all” approach. Early voters can choose any site in their county, and votes are cast on paper ballots that are tabulated by optical scanners at each early voting site. By law, early voting results must be reported no later than 30 minutes after polls close on election day. On election day, voters who have not already cast a ballot may do so between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. at their assigned polling location. Like early voting, voters mark paper ballots and tabulate them on optical scanners at each precinct.

Mail Voting

No-excuse vote-by-mail has been an option for all voters in Florida since 2001. Under current law, voters can make a single request to vote by mail for all elections through the next general election. For example, a voter could make a request today for all ballots through the 2022 general election. Requests can be made in writing, electronically, or by phone and include their Driver’s License state ID card number, or the last four digits of their social security number. The request must be received no later than 10 days before the election. Vote-by-mail ballots are not forwardable; if a voter wants it sent to an alternate address, that request must be made in writing. Many offices offer an ability for voters to track their mail ballots like an Amazon package, providing peace of mind to know when the elections office has received their ballot.

Ballot Delivery Methods and UOCAVA Voters

Ballots for military and overseas (UOCAVA) voters are sent no later than 45 prior to election day, and ballots for all other requesters must be sent between the 40th and 33rd day before the election. UOCAVA voters can receive their balloting materials electronically but must return them by mail or hand delivery. However, overseas voters have the option of returning their ballot by fax no later than 7pm on Election Day or by mail no after than 10 days after Election Day.

Vote-by-mail ballots must be received in the supervisor of elections office no later than 7 p.m. on election day, with the exception of overseas voters whose ballots can be accepted up to 10 days after election day if postmarked or signed by election day. Voters can return their ballot by mail, or by hand delivery to the election office, an early voting site, or an authorized drop box. Drop boxes were utilized statewide for the first time in 2020.

Signature Verification

Each vote-by-mail ballot is verified upon receipt by the supervisor of elections. Signatures on the ballot envelope are compared against the voter signature on file. Missing signatures or mismatched signatures are flagged, and the voter has an opportunity to cure their ballot for up to two days after the election. This cure process was brought to the legislature by election officials and was utilized by voters with great success in the 2020 general election. Each county canvassing board is comprised of a County Judge, a County Commissioner, and the Supervisor of Elections and each receives training in signature verification coordinated by the Florida Secretary of State’s office. Beginning 60 days before the primary election until 15 days after the general election, we are required to report vote-by-mail activity to the state each day, and that information is made available only to candidates, political parties, and political committees.

Results Reporting

Once received and verified, vote-by-mail ballots are held until canvassing begins. Under Florida law, vote-by-mail ballots can begin being canvassed as early as the completion of the statutorily

required public test of our voting equipment. This pre-election day processing was first authorized in Florida in 2001 at four days prior to election day. Results may not be released until after the polls close, subject to a third-degree felony. Like early voting, the results of any vote-by-mail ballots that have been tabulated must be released no later than 30 minutes after polls close. As a result, in the 2020 general election the results of more than 75% of the total votes cast were published by 7:30 PM on election night.

Mail Voting Best Practices

Based on my experience as Supervisor of Elections for Pasco County, I have outlined some general thoughts on what I believe are the most important design aspects of administering a successful vote-by-mail operation:

- Proper planning (supplies, equipment, people, space) is critical
- Spend time and effort on the design of materials (envelopes, instructions, etc.)
- Allow pre-election day processing of mail ballots to reduce post-election volume
- Drop boxes are popular with voters and a secure method of ballot return
- Build transparency into all aspects of vote-by-mail operations
- Tracking of ballots is a benefit to both election officials and voters
- Offer voters the opportunity to cure signature deficiencies
- Ensure the process is secure and auditable from beginning to end

List Maintenance

With regards to list maintenance best practices, Florida, along with our counterparts in other states, dutifully follow federal and state law. Along with state law, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA) and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) provide clear and unambiguous directives for election administrators to follow.

While the above referenced statutes are required, there is a program that both Florida and Pennsylvania have joined and, in doing so, are ensuring access to voter registration and shoring up the integrity and accuracy of our voter rolls. That program being the Electronic Registration Information Center, or ERIC. This non-profit membership comprised of 31 states has proven successful in cleaning up the voter rolls while reaching out to millions who are eligible but unregistered (EBU).

To highlight ERIC's impact in Florida, consider this. Since Florida officially started sharing data with ERIC in September of 2020, ERIC has helped Florida identify:

- Over 14,000 dead people still on FL's voter lists.
- Over 3.1 million Floridians who had moved within the state to another address.
- Over 700,000 registered voters in FL who had moved to another state, who could then be flagged for removal.

In closing, it is my belief that a "one size does not fit all" approach to local election administration allows us to be successful in providing a responsive, transparent, and professional approach to conducting elections that inspires trust and confidence in the accuracy and efficiency of our elections.

Thank you again for the opportunity to offer testimony today. I wish you all the best in your efforts.