



VIA EMAIL

July 16, 2025

C/O: Elections
The Hon. Tahesha Way
New Jersey Lt. Governor, Secretary of State
PO Box 300
Trenton, NJ 08625
Email: nj.elections@sos.nj.gov

RE: Introduction of Voter Registration Data Findings, Request for Meeting

Dear Lt. Governor Way:

I am writing with the goal of scheduling a meeting to discuss our recent, sampled review of New Jersey's voter registration and voting data. In recent months, the Foundation studied the state's full voter roll to explore opportunities for list maintenance. Below are summaries of findings with general explanations on methodologies. These findings are not intended to be exhaustive. We would very much like to provide detailed data and answer any questions you may have in your offices at a mutually convenient time.

Interstate Duplicate Registrants

The Foundation highlights **14,059** New Jersey registrants holding matched voter registration files in second states as of Spring 2025. The study only compared New Jersey's roll to Florida, Maine, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The overwhelming majority matched **Florida** and **New York's** voter rolls, respectively.

Interstate Duplicate Counts	
NJ - Florida	6,972
NJ – New York	5,725
NJ - Pennsylvania	925
NJ – North Carolina	381
NJ – Ohio	41
NJ – Maine	15

The Foundation's relational database was designed to house voter registration rolls from every state to run comparative analytics. Like the ERIC system, the Foundation can detect apparent interstate duplicate registrations using several methodologies but only focuses on one in New Jersey today. The method utilizes the secondary or mailing address data kept by New Jersey to follow the local registrant to that second state address to check if there is a matching registration. This process is then reversed by checking other states' mailing address data which leads to addresses in New Jersey. A registrant is flagged if names and birthdates perfectly match.

Placeholder/Fictitious Dates of Birth

The Foundation's latest count shows **15,655 registrants** in New Jersey are flagged for having no dates of birth in the public record. Within the finding, 85 percent are on active status. Essex County far exceeds others in carrying the most records with placeholder data. The most common placeholder format in the roll is "1800-01-01."

Top 5 Counties – Placeholder DOBs	
Essex	5,166
Passaic	2,108
Middlesex	1,928
Union	1,640
Morris	1,008

As you likely know, holding fictitious dates of birth risks complicating future voter registration list maintenance efforts when you cannot match these dates to resources like the Social Security Death Index (SSDI) and others. In the near term, placeholders can also aid in generating duplicated voter registrations, as described in a later segment of this letter. The Foundation is pleased to report on an effective solution to replace these placeholders with accurate data.

While reviewing placeholder records, the Foundation took a random sample of 10 active registrants across the full finding to attempt a backfill of the missing data. The Foundation triangulated the New Jersey voter roll, Social Security records, and Experian reports to arrive at final conclusions. The random sample consisted of four registered Democrats, four Republicans, and two without party affiliations. Core conclusions were:

- All 10 actual dates of birth were found within minutes;
- 7 of the 10 records were otherwise accurate once the placeholders were replaced with genuine dates;
- 2 registrants were each recorded as deceased by Social Security more than 20 years ago; and,
- 1 registrant, although still alive, apparently moved to St. Lucie County, Florida, and established a second voter registration there in 2017.

The Foundation would be pleased to advise the State further on its methodology and experiences using credit bureau and other federal resources.

Same-Address Duplicate Registrants

The Foundation highlights **2,507 instances of duplicated registrants** where variations in name spelling or nicknames have generated duplications at same residential addresses. As an example, "William" versus "Willie" at precisely the same address with matching date of birth information were flagged.

New Jersey's same-address duplication problem has improved since the Foundation last reviewed the voter roll and is down from more than 8,200 in 2022.¹ It appears the bulk of these duplicates are driven by placeholder/fictious dates of birth confusing any process to de-duplicate the rolls. As of this letter, 65 percent of the apparent duplicates contain placeholder dates of birth. It stands to reason that if New Jersey addresses its placeholder data problem, it will substantially aid in the de-duplication process as well.

Request for Meeting

PILF representatives would like to discuss these findings further at a mutually convenient time in your offices. Please contact me to arrange for the secure transmission of the findings and discuss scheduling. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,



Logan Churchwell
Research Director
Public Interest Legal Foundation

CC: The Hon. Harmeet K. Dhillon
U.S. Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division
Maureen Riordan, Acting Voting Section Chief
U.S. Department of Justice
4 Constitution Square, Room 8.923
150 M Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20530
voting.section@usdoj.gov

¹ PILF; NJ: Tens of Thousands of Voter Registrations are Duplicated, Missing Critical Information (June 2022), <https://publicinterestlegal.org/reports/new-jersey-tens-of-thousands-of-voter-registrations-are-duplicated-missing-critical-information/>