AUGUST 2021 – Unlike other states its size with an influence in national politics, Wisconsin could brag about the fact that its counts of undeliverable and “unknown” mail ballots never inundated the margin of victory for a statewide candidate—until the 2020 Election. Expanded vote-by-mail efforts create stress tests on a state’s voter registration list maintenance system and reveal if investments in ballot chains of custody were effective. When Wisconsin loses track of more ballots than the difference between winning and losing its Electoral College votes, that is a core system failure. These figures inform how policies and investments must be created to cut against this emerging trend—especially in the face of tightening elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Year</th>
<th>Undeliverable + Unknowns</th>
<th>Loser</th>
<th>L Votes</th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>W Votes</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>54,077</td>
<td>Romney</td>
<td>1,408,746</td>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>1,613,950</td>
<td>205,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>1,121,555</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1,259,162</td>
<td>137,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>12,984</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>1,382,210</td>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>1,409,467</td>
<td>27,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>14,125</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1,295,080</td>
<td>Evers</td>
<td>1,324,307</td>
<td>29,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>82,766</td>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>1,610,184</td>
<td>Biden</td>
<td>1,630,866</td>
<td>20,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2016 Election - WI**
-158,846 ballots sent
-1,846 undeliverable
-284 rejected
-11,138 “unknown”

**2016 Election - WI**
-1.4 million ballots sent
-6,458 undeliverable
-2,981 rejected
-76,308 “unknown”

**Just What Does ‘Unknown’ Mean in General and for Wisconsin?**
The U.S. Election Assistance Commission asks local officials how many ballots were not returned as voted, were undeliverable, or were otherwise “unable to be tracked.” The USPS Inspector General most recently reported that only 13 percent of mail ballots in the 2018 General Election used the official tracking system. This means there is a wide variety of things that can happen to a ballot in the “unknown” column. A ballot can be put in the wrong mailbox and land in an unfriendly neighbor’s trash. It can be thrown out with your unpaid bills. It can be left outside for the wind to carry the last mile (like seen in Nevada in 2020). Election officials simply do not know what happened. Unknown ballots are the greatest blind spot in the American electoral system. Up until 2020, Wisconsin had this problem relatively in-hand. If election results on their face continue to tighten while the “unknown” and undeliverable counts rise, the state will see an added layer of voter distrust like in California and Arizona with years of similar mail voting patterns.
PILF President J. Christian Adams

“We now know the cost of the rush to mail balloting – lost ballots. The federal data show the 2020 election had more mail ballots that were never counted than the margin of victory in the Presidential election in Wisconsin. This isn’t the way to run an election. Mail ballots invite error, disenfranchisement of voters, and puts the inept U.S. Post Office determining the outcome of elections.”
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The EAC data is not without its challenges. First, the EAC has a history making subtle edits to its data well after publication and without conspicuous editorial notes or changelogs. The version relied upon for this research brief, “2020_EAVS_for_Public_Release[1],” shows in its file metadata to have been created on August 16, 2021. Second, after publication, some voter registration jurisdictions have made changes to the EAC data by changing their responses to the federal survey that were hardly obvious to regular observers (see Judicial Watch v. Pennsylvania, No. 1:20-CV-708, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42496, at *13-15 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 8, 2021)). Finally, national totals reflected in this brief are subject to change with the EAC. As of publication, more than 680 jurisdictions have not responded to the survey question related to undeliverable ballots; 400 jurisdictions have not provided “status unknown,” data, and 120 did not provide ballot-rejection numbers. Over the past decade, Wisconsin’s more than 1,850 election jurisdictions have shown varying degrees of responsiveness to these optional federal surveys. The figures in this report could indeed be higher in reality, especially if a “zero” actually means silence from the responding office.