



VIA EMAIL

July 24, 2025

C/O: Bureau of Elections
The Hon. Al Schmidt
Pennsylvania Secretary of State
401 North Street, Rm 210
Harrisburg, PA 17120
Email: ra-voterreg@pa.gov | RA-Elections@pa.gov

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

Dear Secretary Schmidt:

I am writing with the goal of scheduling a meeting to discuss our recent, sampled review of Pennsylvania'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 at a mutually convenient time.

Interstate Duplicate Registrants

The Foundation highlights **19,489** Pennsylvania registrants holding matched voter registration files in second states as of Summer 2025. The study only compared Pennsylvania's roll to California, Florida, Maine, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, and Ohio. Most findings matched **Florida** and **New York**'s voter rolls, respectively.

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 Pennsylvania today. The method utilizes the secondary or mailing address data kept by Pennsylvania 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 lead to addresses in Pennsylvania. A registrant is flagged if names and birthdates perfectly match.

Interstate Duplicate Counts	
PA - Florida	9,967
PA - New York	5,722
PA - California	2,427
PA - New Jersey	925
PA - North Carolina	304
PA - Ohio	129
PA - Maine	15

Same-Address Duplicate Registrants

The Foundation highlights **3,170 instances of duplicated registrants** where variations in name spelling or nicknames have generated duplications at same residential addresses. The Foundation studies same-address duplicates using the following common patterns of duplication, assuming perfectly matched DOBs:

- Perfect matches potentially due to missing Social Security data (John Doe vs. John Doe);
- Hyphenated/married name confusion (Jane Doe vs. Jane Doe-Surname);
- Typographical errors in last name fields (John Smith vs. John Smiht); and,
- Typographical errors in first name fields (John Smith vs. Jon Smith).

According to data review conversations in other states, missing or transposed Social Security numbers can stifle standard de-duplication procedures.

Inter-County Duplicates

The Foundation also highlights a **sample of 79 inter-county duplicates**. These follow the same research methodology as the interstate study, yet the data analytics are turned inward to only focus on the Pennsylvania voter roll. The fact these findings exist within a statewide voter registration database is more important than the current volume. Within the sample of 79, we see:

- 58 pairs are active/active status;
- 20 pairs are active/inactive status; and,
- 1 pair is inactive/inactive.

We hope to explore the factors driving this type of finding with your office very soon.

Placeholder/Fictitious Dates of Birth

Lastly, the Foundation's latest count shows at least **321 registrants** in Pennsylvania are flagged for having placeholder or false dates of birth in the public record. The most common placeholder format in the roll is "1800-01-01."

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. 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 and successfully backfilled the missing birthdates with full Social Security number validation to ensure quality control. Later, the Foundation sampled another 10 records showing implausibly old dates of birth, despite recent voting histories. As an example, a registrant

showing to be born “7/15/1905” in Philadelphia is still alive and well, because their real birthdate is July 15, 1951. The Foundation does not have a full accounting of all incorrect dates of birth within the active voter roll. The Foundation would be pleased to advise the Commonwealth further on its methodology and experiences using credit bureau and other federal resources to complete or correct these records.

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