



The Truth about Voter Fraud

No Need for Voter ID

- 1. Voter fraud is rare.** The specific type of voter fraud addressed by voter ID, in person voter impersonation, is even rarer. Two studies on voter fraud in Washington and Ohio in 2004 revealed a voter fraud rate of 0.0009% and 0.00004%.¹ A study examining election fraud cases since 2000 shows that the threat of in-person voter impersonation on Election Day is infinitesimal – only 10 cases since 2000. That is 1 case for every 15 million voters.²
- 2. In-Person Voter Impersonation is not a threat to the integrity of our election.** Former Secretary of State Colin Powell made a poignant statement on voter fraud – “How can it be widespread *and* undetected?” In short, it cannot. Voter fraud is not a widespread problem and does not pose a threat to our democratic system. Secretary of State John Gale agrees, stating on numerous occasions that voter fraud does not exist in Nebraska.³
- 3. Voter ID will not prevent voter fraud.** Out of 1 billion votes cast from 2000 – 2014, 31 incidents of voter fraud were identified – more than 1/2 of those 31 incidents would not have been prevented by voter ID law.⁴ Requiring a photo ID be shown before an eligible voter may cast a ballot does not protect the integrity of our elections.
- 4. A voter ID law will not ensure integrity in our democratic process.** It is estimated that voter ID laws have the potential to prevent 10% of voters from being able to cast a ballot.⁵ In her testimony before the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee in 2015, ASUN President Erin Cooper said it best “How can it protect our right to vote if we won’t be able to vote at all?”
- 5. Potential voter fraud is better prevented by other methods that do not disenfranchise voters.** Inaccurate poll books, clerical errors, deceased individuals and felony convictions can be solved by investments in training and technology to reduce the human error associated with facilitating an election.⁶

¹ Brennan Center for Justice, “The Truth about ‘Voter Fraud’”, September 2006.

² NBC News “New database of US voter fraud finds no evidence that photo ID laws are needed”, August 11, 2012. <http://investigations.nbcnews.com/news/2012/08/11/13236464-new-database-of-us-voter-fraud-finds-no-evidence-that-photo-id-laws-are-needed>.

³ Secretary Gale testified there is no voter fraud in Nebraska in 2013 before the Government Committee on LB 318 and submitted testimony stating the same in 2015 on LB 111. Every four years Nebraska’s voter turnout surges in a presidential elections and to date no evidence exists that an individual arrived at the polls to find that another has voted in their place. In fact of the 31 incidents noted by Professor Levitt, only 7 were individuals reporting someone else voting before them. That’s 7 out of over 1 billion ballots cast.

⁴ Washington Post “Wonkblog”, “*A comprehensive investigation of voter impersonation finds 31 credible incidents out of one billion ballots cast*”, Justin Levitt, August 6, 2014. Of the 31 incidents recorded by Justin, Professor of Law at Loyola University, out of the more than 1 billion cast in primary, general and municipal elections, only 9 (29%) could have been prevented by a voter ID law. Seven of those incidents recorded were situations where individuals arrived to the polls to discover they have been marked as already voting. Eight incidents were individuals that were reported for voting as someone else – only two were situations where the individual they were impersonating was a stranger, the remaining six instances involved family members voting for another family member – a situation where obtaining the required identification documents would be easy. (APPENDIX K)

⁵ Brennan Center for Justice, “The Truth about ‘Voter Fraud’”, September 2006. According to the Election Assistance Commission in 2012, 24% of provisional ballots cast were rejected, over 13,000 because the individual failed to produce the required ID.

⁶ Incidents listed by Professor Levitt, 12 of 31 incidents, included those where a vote cast matched the names of an individual listed to be dead. However, it was not clear whether the two were the same individual and the accuracy of the death reports were questioned. In Florida past attempts to “purge” names of those with felony convictions became notorious when the matching process utilized was ineffective in its purpose and instead captured eligible voters with similar names. Statistically, for reasonably common names like Tom Johnson or John Miller it is likely that at least two people in the same state share a name and a birthdate. Investments in updating our process and technology is better poised to prevent possible fraud in our election system, not voter ID.