



VIA EMAIL

August 4, 2025

ATTN: Sam Hayes, Executive Director
North Carolina State Board of Elections
P.O. Box 27255
Raleigh, NC 27611-7255
Email: sam.hayes@ncsbe.gov | elections.sboe@ncsbe.gov

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

Dear Mr. Hayes:

I am writing with the goal of scheduling a meeting to discuss our recent, sampled review of North Carolina's voter registration and voting data. Given the State Board's recently announced Registration Repair¹ initiative, our data should prove helpful in backfilling missing data. 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 **29,414** North Carolina registrants holding matched voter registration files in second states as of Summer 2025. The study only compared North Carolina's roll to California, Florida, Maine, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

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 North Carolina today. The method utilizes the secondary or mailing address data kept by North Carolina 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 North Carolina. A registrant is flagged if names and birthdates perfectly match.

Interstate Duplicate Counts	
NC – Florida	17,817
NC – New York	6,247
NC – California	4,383
NC – New Jersey	382
NC – Pennsylvania	304
NC – Ohio	239
NC – Maine	42

¹ <https://www.ncsbe.gov/registrationrepair>

Same-Address Duplicate Registrants

The Foundation highlights **12,700+ instances of duplicated and triplicated 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).

The Foundation has provided these kinds of studies in the past to North Carolina counties. During data review conversations, local officials typically assumed a duplicate was due to missing SSN, especially if the application was handled by a third party/grassroots canvasser. Within the 12,700-plus, the majority of matched sets are of the “perfect match” variety, meaning backfilled SSNs should be very helpful in merging records.

Inter-County Duplicates

The Foundation also highlights a **sample of 230 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 North Carolina voter roll. The fact these findings exist within a statewide voter registration database is more important than the current volume. Within the sample of 230, we see 141 pairs are active/active and 89 pairs are active/inactive status.

Placeholder/Fictitious Dates of Birth

Lastly, the Foundation’s latest count shows at least **613 registrants** in North Carolina are flagged for having placeholder or potentially false dates of birth in the public record.

As you 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 who were credited for voting in the November 2024 Presidential Election and successfully backfilled the missing birthdates with full Social Security number validation to ensure quality control. Given their recent vote credits, your offices would be justified in wanting to know why correct dates were not captured during polling place check-ins in the past year.

The Foundation would be pleased to advise North Carolina 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