PUBLIC INTEREST LEGAL FOUNDATION

October 30, 2026

ATTN: Elections
The Hon. Frank LaRose
Ohio Secretary of State
180 Civic Center Dr.
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Email: elections@ohiosos.gov

RE: Interstate, In-State Duplicate Registrations to Resolve

Dear Secretary LaRose:

I am writing on behalf of the Public Interest Legal Foundation to share findings from our review of Ohio's voter registration data. We appreciate the work your office does to maintain accurate voter rolls, and we hope this information will be useful to those efforts.

Apparent Interstate Duplicate Registrations

As the Foundation has done in the past, we offer a review of what appears to be interstate duplicate voter registrations between Ohio and a collection of second states that, depending on their individual facts, may require more immediate attention than others ahead of this November election. These findings should not be construed to mean Ohio is violating the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 or the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

The October 24 edition of the Ohio voter file was compared against similarly dated voter rolls from **California, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, North Carolina, New York, and Pennsylvania**. This effort produced **11,085 apparent interstate duplications** in a variety of Active-Active and Active-Inactive status matches.

State	Pairs*	OH Active	OH Inact.	Act-Act	A-A %
Florida	8,431	7,546	883	1,528	18%
New York	1,651	1,491	160	192	12%
Michigan	463	324	139	273	59%
North Carolina	239	166	73	124	52%
California**	185	152	33	152	82%
Pennsylvania	109	67	42	50	46%
Iowa	7	6	1	5	71%

*Mathematic inconsistencies between table and underlying data due to interstate matches connecting to duplicated registrants in Ohio or a second state.

**Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange Counties, only.

Since most of the matches from Michigan, North Carolina, California, and Iowa hold Active-Active statuses, the Foundation raises these as a higher priority, **given their ability to cast ballots in both jurisdictions unimpeded**. Inactive Ohio registrants in the finding are offered to assist with voter list maintenance operations in 2027 and beyond.

Apparent interstate duplicates are matched based on reciprocal references between the Ohio voter roll's mailing address fields to identical name registrants in a second state's residential address fields, and vice versa. After reciprocal addresses are connected, full names and date of birth information must follow precision matching rules.

Apparent Same-Address Duplicate Registrations

Our review identified **424 pairs** of records that appear potentially duplicative. Each pair has matching first and last names, with corresponding middle-name and suffix fields where present, and a matching residential address after accounting for formatting differences such as spacing and apartment designations.

The Foundation studies same-address duplicates using the following common patterns of duplication, assuming matched year/date of birth:

- 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);
- Typographical errors in first name fields (John Smith vs. Jon Smith); and,
- Nickname, diminutive variations (William vs. Bill, Rebecca vs. Becky).

We would appreciate your review of these pairs using the underlying registration records and other reliable information available to your office. Where a duplicate is confirmed, we ask that your office make appropriate corrections consistent with applicable law and protections for eligible voters.

These findings relate to the Help America Vote Act's requirement that duplicate names be eliminated from the statewide computerized list, while ensuring that registered voters remain on the list and that only voters who are not registered or eligible are removed. 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(2)(B). We are sharing the records to assist your office with that work.

We would welcome any clarification your office can provide and an update on the results when available. Thank you for your time and for considering this information. We look forward to working with your office.

Should you need to contact the Foundation regarding this matter, please contact me at lchurchwell@publicinterestlegal.org. Thank you for your service on this matter.

Sincerely,



Logan Churchwell
Research Director
Public Interest Legal Foundation