Election officials would continue to be allowed to fill in some missing information on absentee ballot envelopes under emergency rules proposed Monday by the state’s election commission.

The bipartisan Wisconsin Elections Commission voted 4-2, with Republican appointees Dean Knudson and Robert Spindell opposed, to use existing guidance as the basis for emergency rules stipulating what errors clerks can fix on absentee ballot certificates, which are typically the envelopes containing the ballots. The commission’s vote follows a demand from the Legislature’s GOP-controlled rules committee for emergency rules on such envelope “curing,” as well as on the use of ballot drop boxes, by next Wednesday.
A small percentage of voters and witnesses made mistakes on their absentee ballot certificates in 2020. Here are some examples of the kinds of errors that were either allowed or corrected by the clerk in order to permit the ballot to be counted.

The commission voted Friday to keep in place guidance issued in 2016 allowing election officials to correct errors on absentee ballot certificates. On Monday, the commission voted to base the emergency rule on that same guidance after a previous motion requiring clerks to first contact a voter before making any corrections failed on a 3-3 split vote, with all Republican appointees in favor and all Democratic appointees opposed.

People are also reading...

1. Big snowstorm forecast to hit just south of southern Wisconsin at mid-week
2. Fact checking a strange new COVID lie: Athletes dying from vaccines
3. 5 questions about Wisconsin football’s likely hire of Bobby Engram as offensive coordinator
4. Hands on Wisconsin: Johnson’s ‘second opinion’ panel offers quack advice

Knudson, who introduced the failed motion, said he understands clerks might be able to fill in a missing ZIP code, for example, but they should make an effort to contact voters if the entire witness address is missing.

The nonpartisan Legislative Audit Bureau last year reviewed 14,710 absentee ballot certificates in 29 municipalities and found that 1,022 certificates (6.9%) were missing parts of witness addresses, 15 (0.1%) did not have any witness address at all, eight (less than 0.1%) did not have a witness signature, and three (less than 0.1%) did not have a voter signature.
"I don’t think it’s unreasonable to say, ‘You should contact that voter and get their involvement,’” Knudson said.

**Supreme Court: Ballot drop boxes allowed through Feb. 15 primary**

Mitchell Schmidt | Wisconsin State Journal

Democratic members of the commission pushed back against adding more hoops to the process.

“Every time we make it harder for people to vote, every time we punish them for small errors, we punish them for participating in government and we have to stop doing that,” commission chair Ann Jacobs said.

**Drop boxes**

The commission failed to agree last week on how to proceed with a similar demand by Republicans seeking emergency rules on ballot drop boxes amid litigation seeking to bar their use.

Sen. Steve Nass, who co-chairs the Legislature’s rules committee, criticized the commission for failing to adhere to the committee’s demands. Nass, R-Whitewater, urged the Legislature to sue the commission if emergency rules are not in place by committee’s Feb. 9 deadline.

Separate from the Legislature’s demand for emergency rules, the commission voted unanimously in December to begin the lengthy process to create permanent rules for drop boxes and for how to handle missing information on absentee ballot envelopes. Scope statements for potential rules could come before the commission on March 9.

The rules committee would have the option of rejecting the permanent rules.

**U.S. House committee subpoenas 2 Wisconsin fake electors in insurrection investigation**
The Wisconsin Supreme Court in a 4-3 ruling Friday decided to allow drop boxes in the Feb. 15 spring primary, while also agreeing to take up the legality of the boxes in future Wisconsin elections.

The high court’s decision stems from a request by the conservative Wisconsin Institute for Law and Liberty asking the court to address the matter after a state appeals court stayed a ruling by Waukesha County Circuit Judge Michael Bohren to bar the use of drop boxes. The Supreme Court’s decision allowing drop box use for the Feb. 15 primary was aimed at avoiding confusion among voters who have already requested absentee ballots.

A focal point of the case stems in part from guidance issued by the commission in early 2020 to allow election clerks to use their discretion when determining whether to use drop boxes. The boxes were widely used that year as an alternative for voters worried that the rising number of absentee ballots during the COVID-19 pandemic and potential delays in mail delivery could result in their ballots not making it to local clerks before Election Day.

The battle over the use of the free-standing, mailbox-like boxes has persisted since the 2020 election, due in part to baseless claims of election fraud by former President Donald Trump, who lost Wisconsin to President Joe Biden by about 21,000 votes.

State statutes do not address the use of ballot drop boxes, prompting allegations by Republicans that their use is illegal. Proponents of the boxes say local election officials should be able to offer them.

The 2020 election is over. Here’s what happened (and what didn’t)
The 2020 election was “the most secure in American history,” according to the Department of Homeland Security’s Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, which coordinates the nation’s election infrastructure.

While some voters risked going to prison by attempting to vote twice or in the name of a dead relative, as happens in any election, no evidence of widespread fraud has ever been produced in Wisconsin or elsewhere. Yet, many continue to question some of the practices clerks relied on to encourage eligible voters to cast ballots and make sure their votes were counted amid the first election in more than 100 years held during a pandemic.

The Wisconsin State Journal has covered every twist and turn of this debate in scores of stories. But here are a few that offered some broader context about what happened, and didn’t happen, in the election of 2020.

Want to steal an election in Wisconsin? It's harder than you think

Dec 13, 2020
In 'thousands of complaints' about Wisconsin election, few that could be substantiated

Chris Rickert | Wisconsin State Journal | Jan 28, 2021 |
No findings of fraud, but Wisconsin election audit questions some of the guidance clerks relied on in 2020

Mitchell Schmidt | Wisconsin State Journal | Oct 23, 2021 |
Tech-backed group spread money around Wisconsin in 2020 election, but Democratic areas benefited most

Chris Rickert | Wisconsin State Journal | Oct 25, 2021 |
Madison acted reasonably in not allowing access to ballots, Legislature's attorneys say
Chris Rickert | Wisconsin State Journal | Oct 28, 2021 |
Elections Commission rejects Racine County sheriff's claim of voting violations at nursing homes

AP, LEE ENTERPRISES | Oct 29, 2021 |
LRB: Laws did not preclude Madison from giving Audit Bureau direct access to ballots
Mitchell Schmidt | Wisconsin State Journal | Oct 29, 2021 |
Despite objections from conservatives, clerks in Trump country embraced ballot drop boxes, too

Chris Rickert | Wisconsin State Journal | Nov 4, 2021
Mistakes on last year's absentee ballot certificates were predictable, minor
Chris Rickert | Wisconsin State Journal | Nov 11, 2021 |
Conservative law firm's review of 2020 election: No 'big steal,' but plenty of problems
Chris Rickert | Wisconsin State Journal | Dec 8, 2021 |
Far too little vote fraud to tip election to Trump, AP finds
Dec 14, 2021
Wisconsin doesn't need a law to bar nonprofits election administration grants because it already has one.

_Wisconsin statutes 5.68 (1) and (2) state the following for the costs of elections: “The cost of acquisition of ballot boxes and voting booths, voting machines or electronic voting systems and regular maintenance thereof shall be borne by the municipalities in which the boxes, booths, machines or systems are used. (2) Except as otherwise expressly provided, all costs for ballots, supplies, notices and any other materials necessary in preparing or conducting any election shall be paid for by the county or municipality whose clerk or board of election commissioners is responsible for providing them.”_

_Wisconsin Statute 7.03 (b) Except as provided in par. (bm), any compensation owed shall be paid by the municipality in which the election is held, except that any compensation payable to a technician, messenger, tabulator, or member of the board of canvassers who is employed to perform services for the county shall be paid by the county and compensation payable to any messenger or tabulator who is employed to perform services for the state shall be paid by the commission.”_

I attached my Stone v. Barrett et. al complaint in which I stated Wisconsin statutes 5.68 (1) and (2) required the WI 5 cities to pay their election expenses, not CTCL. WEC has not informed me of a decision regarding my complaint.

Please ask your legislative counselor for an opinion of whether or not Wisconsin statutes 5.68 (1) and (2) and Wisconsin Statute 7.03 (b) required the WI 5 cities to pay for their own expenses.

I believe Wolfe incorrectly interpreted 5.06 (1) and used her interpretation to disallow my complaint. The statute says, "Whenever any elector of a jurisdiction or district served by an election official believes that a decision or action of the official or the failure of the official to act ...." Wolfe added the words local municipalities to her opinion of the statute and then said I did not live in any of the WI 5 municipalities; therefore, I was ineligible to file a complaint. However, I believe the legislative intent was to allow an elector to file a complaint in the jurisdiction or district in which the elector votes. Since the presidential election was a statewide race and my vote counted only in Wisconsin's total presidential vote, I should have been able to file my complaint against any Wisconsin election official involved in the 2020 presidential election. Please ask your legislative counsel for an opinion of 5.06 (1) to determine electors right to file a WEC complaint and ask for compliance review.
CHAPTER 5
ELECTIONS & GENERAL PROVISIONS; BALLOTS AND VOTING SYSTEMS

SUBCHAPTER I
GENERAL PROVISIONS

5.01 Scope. (1) CONSTRUCTION OF CHS. 5 TO 12. Except as otherwise provided, chs. 5 to 12 shall be construed to give effect to the will of the electors, if that can be ascertained from the proceedings, notwithstanding informalities or failure to fully comply with some of their provisions.

(2) GENERAL PROVISIONS OF ELECTION LAWS APPLY. The general provisions of chs. 5 to 12 apply to all elections.

(3) PLURALITY SHALL ELECT. (a) Except as provided in par. (b), in every election to choose any officer, each elector has one vote for each office unless clearly indicated otherwise. The person receiving the greatest number of legal votes for the office shall be declared elected, and the canvassers shall so determine and certify.

(b) In an election to fill a nonpartisan state office, if no names are certified to appear on the ballot, no person may be declared elected.

(4) THE VOTE. (a) If 2 or more candidates for the same office receive the greatest, but an equal number of votes, the winner shall be chosen by lot in the presence of the board of canvassers charged with the responsibility to determine the election, or in the case of an election for state or national office or metropolitan sewage commissioner, if the commissioner is elected under s. 200.09 (1) (am), in the presence of the chairperson of the board or the chairperson's designee.

(b) If, in a primary, 2 or more candidates receive an equal but not the greatest number of votes so that only one of those candidates with equal votes may advance to the final election, the choice shall similarly be made by drawing lots.

(c) The candidates may, if all those tied for the same office are present, draw for themselves. Upon refusal or absence of any of the candidates, the board of canvassers shall appoint a competent person to draw, and upon the results declare and certify the winner.

(d) If a question is submitted to the electors and an equal number of votes are cast for and against adoption, the question fails adoption.

(5) ELECTION OF GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. (a) In every general election to choose the governor and the lieutenant governor, each elector shall have a single vote applicable to both offices. The persons receiving the greatest number of legal votes cast jointly for them as governor and lieutenant governor shall be declared elected, and the canvassers shall so determine and certify.

(b) In case 2 or more slates have an equal and the highest number of votes for governor and lieutenant governor, the 2 houses of the legislature shall at the next annual session choose by joint ballot one of the slates so having an equal and the highest number of votes for governor and lieutenant governor.

History: 1979 c. 89; 1993 a. 464; 1985 a. 304; 1987 a. 27; 1999 a. 150 s. 672; 1999 a. 182.

The supreme court has consistently construed election statutes as being directory, in keeping with sub. (1) directive that election laws shall be construed to give effect to the will of the electors. Larson v. Kosmala, 62 Wis. 2d 209; 214 N.W.2d 425 (1974).

When 40% of registered voters were denied ballots in an election to remove a county seat, the election was set aside even though the outcome probably was not affected, McNally v. Tollander, 100 Wis. 2d 490; 302 N.W.2d 440 (1981).

Sub. (3) applies only after an election has been held and the will of the people manifested. City of Chippewa Falls v. Town Of Hallie, 231 Wis. 2d 85; 644 N.W.2d 300 (Ct. App. 1999), 99-0832.

Only substantial violations of the election law should operate to vacate an election. Carlson v. Domett County Board of Canvassers, 2001 WI App 20; 240 Wis. 2d 438, 623 N.W.2d 105, 00-1798.

Wisconsin Statutes Archive.
documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment, that is used to define ballots, to cast and count votes, to report or display election results, and to maintain and produce any audit trail information.

(b) The practices and associated documentation for any of the following purposes:

1. To identify equipment components and versions of such components.
2. To test the equipment during its development and maintenance.
3. To maintain records of equipment errors and defects.
4. To determine specific equipment changes to be made after the initial qualification of the equipment.
5. To make available any materials to an elector.

(25) "Word" means a town, village or city subdivision created for the convenience of the electors therein and to facilitate the division of such municipalities into election districts of substantially equal population numbers along common boundaries observing the community of interest of existing neighborhoods and other settlements.

History: 1971 c. 211; 1971 c. 304 ss. 2, 25 (2); 1973 c. 203, 334; 1975 c. 93; 1977 c. 107, 167, 394; 1977 c. 427 ss. 3 to 14; 1977 c. 448; 1978 c. 32, 89, 221; 1979 c. 260 ss. 1m, 73 to 75; 1979 c. 311; 1981 c. 4, 5; 1983 a. 464 ss. 5, 5e, 124en, 129en, 130en, 132en, 133en; 1985 a. 394 ss. 1m, 2, 325; 1987 a. 391 ss. 1 to 11; 686; 1989 c. 1m; 1991 a. 5; 1993 a. 140; 1995 a. 15a; 1995 a. 27a; 1995 a. 27; 1997 a. 25; 2001 a. 18; 2003 a. 24, 263; 2005 a. 177, 451; 2007 a. 1; 2009 a. 397.

5.05 Government accountability board; powers and duties. (1) GENERAL AUTHORITY. The government accountability board shall have the responsibility for the administration of chs. 5 to 12, other laws relating to elections and election campaigns, subch. III of ch. 13, and subch. III of ch. 19. Pursuant to such responsibility, the board may:

(b) In the discharge of its duties and after providing notice to any party who is the subject of an investigation, subpoena and bring before it any person and require the production of any papers, books, or other records relevant to an investigation. Notwithstanding s. 965.01 (4), the issuance of a subpoena requires action by the board at a meeting of the board. A circuit court may by order permit the inspection and copying of the accounts and the depositor's and loan records at any financial institution, as defined in s. 705.01 (3), doing business in the state to obtain evidence of any violation of ch. 11 upon showing by the board of probable cause to believe there is a violation and that such accounts and records may have a substantial relation to the violation. In the discharge of its duties, the board may cause the deposition of witnesses to be taken in the manner prescribed for taking depositions in civil actions in circuit court.

(c) Bring civil actions to require a forfeiture for any violation of chs. 5 to 12, subch. III of ch. 13, or subch. III of ch. 19 or a license revocation for any violation of subch. III of ch. 13 for which the offender is subject to a revocation. The board may compromise and settle any civil action or potential action brought or authorized to be brought by it in which, in the opinion of the board, constitutes a minor violation, a violation caused by excusable neglect, or which for other good cause shown, should not in the public interest be prosecuted under such chapter. Notwithstanding s. 778.06, a civil action or proposed civil action authorized under this paragraph may be settled for such sum as may be agreed upon by the parties. Any settlement made by the board shall be in such amount as to deprive the alleged violator of any benefit of his or her wrongdoing and may contain a pecuniary term to serve as a deterrent to future violations. In settling civil actions or proposed civil actions, the board shall treat comparable situations in a comparable manner and shall assure that any settlement bears a reasonable relationship to the severity of the offense or alleged offense. Except as otherwise provided in sub. (2m) (c) 15. and 16. and ss. 5.08, 5.091, and 19.59 (3), forfeiture and license revocation actions brought by the board shall be brought in the circuit court for the county where the defendant resides, or if the defendant is a nonresident of this state, in circuit court for the county wherein the violation is alleged to occur. For purposes of this paragraph, a person other than a natural person resides within a county if the person's principal place of operation is located within that county. Whenever the board enters into a settlement agreement with an individual who is accused of a civil violation of chs. 5 to 12, subch. III of ch. 13, or subch. III of ch. 19 or who is investigated by the board for a possible civil violation of one of those provisions, the board shall reduce the agreement to writing, together with a statement of the board's findings and reasons for entering into the agreement and shall retain the agreement and statement in its office for inspection.

(d) Sue for injunctive relief, a writ of mandamus or prohibition, or other such legal or equitable relief as may be appropriate to enforce any law regulating the conduct of elections or election campaigns or ensure its proper administration. No bond is required in such actions. Actions shall be brought in circuit court for the county where a violation occurs or may occur.

(e) Delegate to its legal counsel the authority to intervene in a civil action or proceeding under sub. (9), issue an order under s. 5.05, exempt a polling place from accessibility requirements under s. 5.25 (4) (a), exempt a municipality from the requirement to use voting machines or an electronic voting system under s. 5.40 (5m), approve an electronic data recording system for maintaining poll lists under s. 6.79, or authorize nonappointment of an individual who is nominated to serve as an election official under s. 7.30 (4) (e), subject to such limitations as the board deems appropriate.

(f) Promulgate rules under ch. 227 applicable to all jurisdictions for the purpose of interpreting or implementing the laws regulating the conduct of elections or election campaigns or ensuring their proper administration.

(2) ACTIONS BY THE BOARD. Any action by the board requires the affirmative vote of at least 4 members.

(1m) LEGAL COUNSEL. The board shall employ outside the classified service an individual to serve as legal counsel who shall perform legal and administrative functions for the board.

(2) AUDITING. In addition to the facial examination of reports and statements required under s. 11.21 (13), the board shall conduct an audit of reports and statements which are required to be filed with it to determine whether violations of ch. 11 have occurred. The board may examine records relating to matters required to be treated in such reports and statements. The board shall make official notice in the file of a candidate, committee, group or individual under ch. 11 of any error or other discrepancy which the board discovers and shall inform the person submitting the report or statement.

(2m) ENFORCEMENT. (a) The board shall investigate violations of laws administered by the board and may prosecute alleged civil violations of those laws, directly or through its agents under this subsection, pursuant to all statutes granting or assigning that authority or responsibility to the board. Prosecution of alleged criminal violations investigated by the board may be brought only as provided in par. (c) 11., 14., 15., and 16. and s. 798.05 (1).

(c) 2. a. Any person may file a complaint with the board alleging a violation of chs. 5 to 12, subch. III of ch. 13, or subch. III of ch. 19. If the board finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a complaint is frivolous, the board may order the complainant to forfeit not more than the greater of $500 or the expenses incurred by the division in investigating the complaint.

No complaint alleging a violation of s. 19.45 (13) may be filed during the period beginning 120 days before a general or spring election, or during the period commencing on the date of the order of a special election under s. 8.50, and ending on the date of that election, against a candidate who files a declaration of candidacy to have his or her name appear on the ballot at that election.

3. Any person to whom subch. III of ch. 13 or subch. III of ch. 19 may have application may request the board to make an inves-
14. If a special investigator or the administrator of the ethics and accountability division of the board, in the course of an investigation authorized by the board, discovers evidence of a potential violation of a law that is not administered by the board arising from or in relation to the official functions of the subject of the investigation or any matter that involves elections, ethics, or lobbying regulations, the special investigator or the administrator may present that evidence to the board. The board may therewith refer the matter to the appropriate district attorney specified in subd. 11.

15. Except as provided in subd. 17., if the board refers a matter to the district attorney specified in subd. 11. for prosecution of a potential violation under subd. 2. or 14. and the district attorney informs the board that he or she declines to prosecute any alleged civil or criminal violation related to any matter referred to the district attorney by the board, or the district attorney fails to commence a prosecution of any civil or criminal violation related to any matter referred to the district attorney by the board within 60 days of the date of the board's referral, the board may refer the matter to the district attorney for another prosecutorial unit that is contiguous to the prosecutorial unit of the district attorney to whom the matter was originally referred. If there is more than one such prosecutorial unit, the chairperson of the board shall determine the district attorney to whom the matter shall be referred by publicly drawing lots at a meeting of the board. The district attorney may then commence a civil or criminal prosecution relating to the matter.

16. Except as provided in subd. 17., if the board refers a matter to a district attorney under subd. 15. for prosecution of a potential violation under subd. 2. or 14. and the district attorney informs the board that he or she declines to prosecute any alleged civil or criminal violation related to any matter referred to the district attorney by the board, or the district attorney fails to commence a prosecution of any civil or criminal violation related to any matter referred to the district attorney by the board within 60 days of the date of the board's referral, the board may refer the matter to the attorney general. The attorney general may then commence a civil or criminal prosecution relating to the matter.

17. The board is not authorized to act under subd. 15. or 16. if a special prosecutor is appointed under s. 978.045 in lieu of the district attorney specified in subd. 11.

18. Whenever the board refers a matter to special counsel or to a district attorney or to the attorney general under this subsection, the special counsel, district attorney, or attorney general shall report to the board concerning any action taken regarding the matter. The report shall be transmitted no later than 40 days after the date of the referral. If the matter is not disposed of during that period, the special counsel, district attorney, or attorney general shall file a subsequent report at the end of each 30-day period following the filing of the initial report until final disposition of the matter.

(d) 1. No individual who serves as the legal counsel to the board or as a division administrator for the board may have been a lobbyist, as defined in s. 13.62 (11). No such individual may have served in a partisan state or local office.

2. No employee of the board, while so employed, may become a candidate, as defined in s. 11.01 (1), for a state or partisan local office. No individual who is retained by the board to serve as a special investigator or as special counsel may, while so retained become a candidate, as defined in s. 11.01 (1), for any state or local office. A filing officer shall decline to accept nomination papers or a declaration of candidacy from any individual who does not qualify to become a candidate under this paragraph.

(e) No individual who serves as an employee of the board and no individual who is retained by the board to serve as a special investigator or a special counsel may, while so employed or retained, make a contribution, as defined in s. 11.01 (6), to a candidate for state or local office. No individual who serves as an employee of the board and no individual who is retained by the board to serve as a special investigator or as special counsel, for 12 months prior to becoming so employed or retained, may have made a contribution, as defined in s. 11.01 (6), to a candidate for a partisan state or local office.

(f) Pursuant to any investigation authorized under par. (c), the board has the power:

1. To require any person to submit in writing such reports and answers to questions relevant to the proceedings as the board may prescribe, such submission to be made within such period and under oath or otherwise as the board may determine.

2. To order testimony to be taken by deposition before any individual who is designated by the board and has the power to administer oaths, and, in such instances, to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized by sub. (1) (b).

3. To pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances by the courts of this state.

4. To request and obtain from the department of revenue copies of state income or franchise tax returns and access to other appropriate information under s. 71.78 (4) regarding all persons who are the subject of such investigation.

(g) 1. Except as provided in subd. 2., no action may be taken on any complaint that is filed later than 3 years after a violation of subch. III of ch. 13 or subch. III of ch. 19 is alleged to have occurred.

2. The period of limitation under subd. 1. is tolled for a complaint alleging a violation of s. 19.45 (13) or 19.59 (1) (b) for the period during which such a complaint may not be filed under par. (c) 2. b. or s. 19.59 (8) (cm).

(h) If the defendant in an action for a civil violation of chs. 5 to 12, subch. III of ch. 13, or subch. III of ch. 19 is a district attorney or a circuit judge or a candidate for either such office, the action shall be brought by the board. If the defendant in an action for a civil violation of chs. 5 to 12, subch. III of ch. 13, or subch. III of ch. 19 is the attorney general or a candidate for that office, the board may appoint special counsel to bring suit on behalf of the state.

(i) If the defendant in an action for a criminal violation of chs. 5 to 12, subch. III of ch. 13, or subch. III of ch. 19 is a district attorney or a circuit judge or a candidate for either such office, the action shall be brought by the attorney general. If the defendant in an action for a criminal violation of chs. 5 to 12, subch. III of ch. 13, or subch. III of ch. 19 is the attorney general or a candidate for that office, the board may appoint a special prosecutor to conduct the prosecution on behalf of the state.

(j) Any special counsel or prosecutor who is appointed under par. (h) or (i) shall be independent of the attorney general and need not be a state employee at the time of his or her appointment.

(2s) ETHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY DIVISION. The ethics and accountability division has the responsibility for administration of ch. 11, subch. III of ch. 13, and subch. III of ch. 19.

(2w) ELECTIONS DIVISION. The elections division has the responsibility for the administration of chs. 5 to 10 and 12.

(3g) CHIEF ELECTION OFFICER. The board shall designate an employee of the board to serve as the chief election officer of this state.

(4) EMPLOYEES. All employees of the board shall be nonpartisan.

(5e) BIEINNIAL REPORT. The board shall include in its biennial report under s. 15.04 (1) (d) the names and duties of all individuals employed by the board and a summary of its determinations and advisory opinions issued under sub. (6a). Except as authorized or required under sub. (5e) (f) 2., the board shall make sufficient alterations in the summaries to prevent disclosing the identities of individuals or organizations involved in the decisions or opinions. The board may also include in its biennial report any information compiled under s. 11.21 (7). The board shall make such further
the requirements of P.L. 107–252 to enable participation by this state in federal financial assistance programs authorized under that law. The board shall adopt the plan and any modifications only after publishing a class I notice under ch. 98S or posting on the Internet a statement describing the proposed plan or modification and receiving public comment thereon. After approval of the proposed plan or any modification of the plan by the board, the board shall submit the proposed plan or modification to the joint committee on finance for the approval of the committee. The board may adopt the proposed plan or modification only if the committee approves the proposed plan or modification.

(11) AID TO COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES. From the appropriations under s. 20.511 (1) (t) and (x), the board may provide financial assistance to eligible counties and municipalities for election administration costs in accordance with the plan adopted under sub. (10). As a condition precedent to receipt of assistance under this subsection, the board shall enter into an agreement with the county or municipality receiving the assistance specifying the intended use of the assistance and shall ensure compliance with the terms of the agreement. Each agreement shall provide that if the federal government objects to the use of any assistance monies provided to the county or municipality under the agreement, the county or municipality shall repay the amount of the assistance provided to the board.

(12) VOTER EDUCATION. The board may conduct or prescribe requirements for educational programs to inform electors about voting procedures, voting rights, and voting technology. The board shall conduct an educational program for the purpose of educating electors who cast paper ballots, ballots that are counted at a central counting location, and absentee ballots of the effect of casting excess votes for a single office.

(13) TOLL-FREE ELECTION INFORMATION EXCHANGE. (a) The board shall maintain one or more toll-free telephone lines for electors to report possible voting fraud and voting rights violations, to obtain general election information and, to access information concerning their registration status, current polling place locations, and other information relevant to voting in elections. (b) The board may maintain a free access system under which an elector who votes under s. 6.56 or 6.57 may ascertain current information concerning whether the elector’s vote has been counted, and, if the vote will not be counted, the reason that it will not be counted.

(14) INFORMATION FROM COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL CLERKS. The board may request information from county and municipal clerks relating to election administration, performance of electronic voting systems and voting machines, and use of paper ballots in elections.

(15) REGISTRATION LIST. The board is responsible for the design and maintenance of the official registration list under s. 6.36. The board shall require all municipalities to use the list in every election and may require any municipality to adhere to procedures established by the board for proper maintenance of the list.


Cross-reference: See also GAB, Wis. admin. code.

Notice to the district attorney, attorney general, or governor is not a prerequisite to a civil forfeiture under sub. (1) (c); notice pursuant to sub. (3) is required only as specified by s. 119.61 (4) or (16) (2). State Elections Board v. Hales, 149 Wis. 2d 306, 406 N.W.2d 574 (Ct. App. 1989).

A party being investigated by the board is not entitled under sub. (1) (b) to attend and participate in all depositions conducted by the board. Notice to the party being investigated under sub. (1) (b) is limited to the board’s exercise of its subpoena power and does not relate in any way to the conduct of depositions the board may wish to take. State ex rel. Black v. Circuit Court for Dane County, 2000 WI App 72, 234 Wis. 2d 315, 611 N.W.2d 213, 611 N.W.2d 220.

Unless otherwise stated in a specific statute, criminal and civil forfeiture provisions of the election, lobby, and ethics laws can be enforced by a district attorney independent of the board. A referral following an investigation by the board is not required. A district attorney may request prosecutorial or investigative assistance from the attorney general in connection with any duty of the district attorney under those laws. If there has been a referral to the district attorney by the board under sub. (2m) (c) 1., 14., or 15., the district attorney must retain ultimate supervisory authority over the matter referred unless a special prosecutor has been appointed in lieu of the district attorney. OAG 10–08.

The board and district attorneys possess joint and co-equal authority to investigate possible violations of the election, lobby, or ethics laws and to prosecute civil forfeitures under those laws. Unless otherwise stated in a specific statutory provision, the district attorneys possess the authority to prosecute criminal proceedings under those laws. The board has no authority to authorize a district attorney to prosecute criminal proceedings under those laws except as stated in sub. (2m) (j). OAG 10–08.

For the attorney general to prosecute violations of the election, lobby, and ethics laws there must be a specific statute authorizing the attorney general to independently initiate the prosecution of civil and criminal actions involving violations of those laws unless there is a referral to the attorney general by the board under sub. (2m) (c) 16. or unless the attorney general is an assistant attorney general has been appointed as special prosecutor to serve in lieu of the district attorney. OAG 10–08.

5.052 Government accountability candidate committee. (1) The government accountability candidate committee shall meet whenever a vacancy occurs in the membership of the board that requires a nomination to be submitted to the governor under s. 15.60 (2).

(2) No person may be nominated by the committee unless the person receives the unanimous approval of the committee.

(3) Except as provided in sub. (4), the committee shall submit at least the following number of nominations:

(a) To fill one vacancy, 2 nominations.
(b) To fill 2 vacancies, 3 nominations.
(c) To fill 3 vacancies, 5 nominations.
(d) To fill 4 vacancies, 6 nominations.
(e) To fill 5 vacancies, 7 nominations.

(4) If a nominee dies or withdraws, or if a nomination of the governor is withdrawn by the governor or rejected by the senate, the committee shall submit an additional nominee to the governor.

History: 2007 a. 1.

5.054 Duties of the legal counsel. The board’s legal counsel shall:

(1) Whenever a vacancy occurs on the board, call a meeting of the government accountability candidate committee.

(2) Assist the government accountability candidate committee in the performance of its functions.

History: 2007 a. 1.

5.055 Election assistance commission standards board. The administrator of the elections division of the board shall, in consultation with the board, appoint an individual to represent this state as a member of the federal election assistance commission standards board. The administrator shall also conduct and supervise a process for the selection of an election official by county and municipal clerks and boards of election commissioners to represent local election officials of this state as a member of the federal election assistance commission standards board. The administrator shall ensure that the members of the federal election assistance commission standards board representing this state shall at no time be members of the same political party. Upon appointment or election of any new member of the federal election assistance commission standards board representing this state, the administrator shall transmit a notice of that member’s appointment or election to the officer or agency designated by federal law.


5.056 Matching program with secretary of transportation. The administrator of the elections division of the board shall enter into the agreement with the secretary of transportation specified under s. 85.61 (1) (b) to match personally identifiable information on the official registration list maintained by the board under s. 6.36 (1) with personally identifiable information maintained by the department of transportation.


5.06 Compliance review; appeal. (1) Whenever any elector of a jurisdiction or district served by an election official believes that a decision or action of the official or the failure of the official to act with respect to any matter concerning nominations,
petition with the attorney general, who may then commence the action.

5.081 Petition for enforcement of voting rights. The attorney general shall accept a verified petition from any person alleging failure to comply with section 2 of the federal voting rights act, 42 USC 1973 (a) and (b). The attorney general may commence an action or proceeding in any court of competent jurisdiction on behalf of any elector of this state whose rights under 42 USC 1973 (a) and (b) are violated.
History: 1985 a. 312.

5.09 Certification of documents. Whenever the board is authorized or required to make a certification of any document in the custody of the board, and the authority to make the certification is lawfully delegated to the board's legal counsel, the legal counsel may, personally or through an employee authorized by the legal counsel, affix his or her signature by means of a stamp, machine impression, reproduction print or similar process. This section does not apply to certificates of election.

5.10 Presidential electors. Although the names of the electors do not appear on the ballot and no reference is made to them, a vote for the president and vice president named on the ballot is a vote for the electors of the candidates for whom an elector's vote is cast. Under chs. 5 to 12, all references to the presidential election, the casting of votes and the canvassing of votes for president, or for president and vice president, mean votes for them through their pledged presidential electors.
History: 1973 c. 334 s. 2; Stats. 1973 s. 5.10; 1977 c. 26; 1979 c. 89, 311.

5.15 Division of municipalities into wards. (1) (a) 1. Every city, village, and town in this state shall by its common council or village or town board, respectively, be divided into wards as provided in this section, except as authorized in sub. (2). The boundaries of the wards established under this section, and the number assigned to each ward, are intended to be as permanent as possible, and to the end each ward shall when created contain a population at a convenient point within the applicable population range under sub. (2) (b), with due consideration for the known trends of population increase or decrease within that part of the municipality in which the ward is located.
2. Once established, the boundaries of each ward shall remain unchanged until a further decennial federal census of population indicates that the population of a ward is then above or below the applicable population range or until the ward boundaries are required to be changed to permit creation of supervisory or aldermanic districts of substantially equal population or to enhance the participation of members of a racial or language minority group in the political process and their ability to elect representatives of their choice.
3. If the population of a ward has increased above the maximum of its population range or if the population of a ward must be decreased for a reason specified in subd. 2, the ward shall be divided into 2 or more wards in compliance with sub. (2) (b). If the population of a ward has decreased below the minimum of its population range or if the population of a ward must be increased for a reason specified in subd. 2, the ward shall, if possible, be combined with an adjoining ward, or the underpopulated ward and one adjoining ward shall be combined and together subdivided into 2 or more wards in compliance with sub. (2).
(b) Except as authorized in sub. (2) (a), within 60 days after the receipt of a tentative supervisory district plan and written statement, if any, from the county board of each county in which a municipality is located, the governing body of the municipality shall adjust its wards according to the schedule shown in sub. (2). All territory contained within the municipality, and only the territory so contained, on August 1 following the year of the federal decennial census shall be contained within a ward. Except as authorized in sub. (2), each ward shall consist of whole blocks. To suit the convenience of the voters residing therein each ward shall, as far as practicable, be kept compact and observe the community of interest of existing neighborhoods and other settlements. All territory within a ward shall be contiguous, except for islands as defined in sub. (2) (f) 3. Enactment or adoption of a division ordinance or resolution requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the governing body.
(c) The wards established by municipal governing bodies under this section on the basis of the published results of each federal decennial census of population shall govern the adjustment of supervisory districts under s. 59.10 (2) (a) and (b) and of aldermanic districts under s. 62.08 (1) for the purpose of local elections beginning on January 1 of the 2nd year commencing after the year of the census until revised under this section on the basis of the results of the next decennial census of population unless adjusted under sub. (2) (f) 4., (6) (a) or (7), or unless adjusted, as a matter of statewide concern, in the enactment of legislative districts under article IV, section 3, of the constitution on the basis of the most recent decennial census of population.
(d) Every ward shall be wholly contained within a single county.

2. (a) Except as required by par. (d), no city electing its common council at large in which the total population is less than 1,000, and no village or town in which the total population is less than 1,000 is required to be divided into wards under this section, but any such city, village or town may divide itself into wards if the creation of wards facilitates the administration of elections. No village or town located in a county having only one town is required to be divided into wards under this section.
(b) 1. In any city in which the population is at least 150,000, each ward shall contain not less than 1,000 nor more than 4,000 inhabitants.
2. In any city in which the population is at least 39,000 but less than 150,000, each ward shall contain not less than 800 nor more than 3,200 inhabitants.
3. In any city, village or town in which the population is at least 10,000 but less than 39,000, each ward shall contain not less than 600 nor more than 2,100 inhabitants.
4. In any city, village or town in which the population is less than 16,000, each ward shall contain not less than 300 nor more than 1,000 inhabitants.
(c) Every city electing the members of its common council from aldermanic districts shall assemble the blocks wholly or partially contained within the city into wards that will enable the creation of aldermanic districts that are substantially equal in population.

2. (a) Except as required by par. (d), no city electing its common council at large in which the total population is less than 1,000, and no village or town in which the total population is less than 1,000 is required to be divided into wards under this section, but any such city, village or town may divide itself into wards if the creation of wards facilitates the administration of elections. No village or town located in a county having only one town is required to be divided into wards under this section.
(b) 1. In any city in which the population is at least 150,000, each ward shall contain not less than 1,000 nor more than 4,000 inhabitants.
2. In any city in which the population is at least 39,000 but less than 150,000, each ward shall contain not less than 800 nor more than 3,200 inhabitants.
3. In any city, village or town in which the population is at least 10,000 but less than 39,000, each ward shall contain not less than 600 nor more than 2,100 inhabitants.
4. In any city, village or town in which the population is less than 16,000, each ward shall contain not less than 300 nor more than 1,000 inhabitants.
(c) Every city electing the members of its common council from aldermanic districts shall assemble the blocks wholly or partially contained within the city into wards that will enable the creation of aldermanic districts that are substantially equal in population.

Any division of blocks under this section shall be based on the best evidence available. In this paragraph, "best evidence" includes, but is not limited to, the population of the block and other information received from the U.S. bureau of the census and such data as number of housing units, utility connections and vehicle registrations or a special census conducted locally. For each ward so established, the population estimate shall be correlated with the results of the most recent federal decennial census, so that the total population reported for all wards in the municipality agrees with the census results.
(d) Every municipality shall make a good faith effort to accommodate the tentative plan submitted by the county or counties in which it is located under s. 59.10 (2) (a) or (3) (b) 1., and shall
(b) In any jurisdiction that is subject to the requirement under 42 USC 1973aa-1a to provide voting materials in any language other than English, the board shall ensure that the voting system used at each polling place in that jurisdiction is in compliance with 42 USC 1973aa-1a.

d) No later than June 30 of each odd-numbered year, the board shall submit a report on impediments to voting faced by elderly and handicapped individuals to the appropriate standing committees of the legislature under s. 13.172 (3). In preparing its report under this paragraph, the board shall consult with appropriate advocacy groups representing the elderly and handicapped populations.

(5) (a) Except as authorized in par. (b), all electors within a ward shall vote at the same polling place.

(b) The municipal clerk or board of election commissioners of a municipality in which an elderly or handicapped elector resides may reassign the elector to a polling place within the municipality other than the polling place serving the elector’s residence in order to permit the elector to utilize a polling place that is accessible to elderly or handicapped individuals.

(c) The electors of more than one ward in the same municipality may vote at a single polling place.


5.35 Polling place requirements. (1) NATIONAL FLAG. On election days, every polling place shall properly display the national flag during all hours the polls are open.

(2) VOTING BOOTHS. There shall be one voting booth for every 200 electors who voted at the last general election. The booths shall have a surface on which to write or work and be sufficiently enclosed to assure privacy for the elector and anyone lawfully assisting the elector while marking the elector’s ballot.

(3) BALLOT BOXES. Where the voting procedure makes it necessary, there shall be a separate ballot box for each form of ballot at each polling place. There shall be a suitable lock and key for each, and an opening no larger than is sufficient to receive a single ballot or a single folded ballot. The box is used for deposit of paper ballots. If the electors of more than one ward use the same polling place, there shall be separate ballot boxes provided for the electors of each ward unless combined ballot boxes are authorized in accordance with s. 5.15 (6) (b).

(4) LAYOUT; ORGANIZATION. All voting booths and machines shall be placed apart from other activities in the polling place, with their exteriors in full view of the election officials. Only the proper election officials, persons observing the proceedings under s. 7.41, persons assisting voters under s. 6.82 (2) and electors receiving, preparing or depositing their ballots or casting their votes on the machines are permitted in the voting area. Except where assistance is authorized, only one elector at a time is permitted in a voting booth or machine.

(5) ACTIVITIES RESTRICTED. No polling place may be situated so as to interfere with or distract election officials from carrying out their duties. The municipal clerk and election inspectors shall prevent interference with and distraction of electors at polling places.

(6) POSTING REQUIREMENTS. (a) At each polling place in the state, the municipal clerk or board of election commissioners shall post the following materials, positioned so that they may be readily observed by electors entering the polling place or waiting in line to vote:

1. The relevant portions of the voting instructions in the type B notice for the election as specified in s. 10.02 (3) and, for each referendum on the ballot, the text of the type C notice specified in s. 10.01 (2) (c).

2. A copy of the election fraud laws provided in s. 12.13 (1) and (3) (Intro.), (d), (f), (g), (h), (l), (o), (q), (r), (u), (v) and (x), together with the applicable penalties provided in s. 12.60 (1).

2m. General information prescribed by the board on federal laws relating to election fraud and misrepresentation in federal elections.

3. Two sample ballots prepared under s. 5.66 (2).

4. The date of the election and the hours during which the polling place is open.

4a. Instructions prescribed by the board for electors for whom proof of residence under s. 6.34 is required under s. 6.55 (2).

4b. General information prescribed by the board concerning voting rights under applicable state and federal laws, including the method of redress for any alleged violations of those rights.

5. Any other voting information directed to be posted by the board.

(b) At each polling place in the state where a consolidated ballot under s. 6.655 is used or an electronic voting system is utilized at a partisan primary election incorporating a ballot upon which electors may mark votes for candidates of more than one recognized political party or for candidates of a recognized political party and independent candidates, the municipal clerk or board of election commissioners shall prominently post a sign in the form prescribed by the board warning electors in substance that on any ballot with votes cast for candidates of more than one recognized political party or any ballot with votes cast for candidates of a recognized political party and independent candidates, no votes cast for any candidates for partisan office will be counted unless a preference for a party or for the independent candidates is made. If the elector designates a preference, only votes cast for candidates of that preference will be counted.

(c) At each polling place located in a municipality that is served by more than one polling place for an election, the municipal clerk or board of election commissioners shall prominently post a map of the geographic area served by the polling place for that election. The posting shall clearly show the boundaries of the ward or wards served by the polling place for that election.


5.36 Notice of voting by individuals with disabilities. Any individual with a disability may notify a municipal clerk that he or she intends to vote at a polling place on election day and may request that a specific type of accommodation be provided that will facilitate his or her voting.

History: 2003 a. 265.

5.37 Voting machine requirements. (1) Voting machines shall give every elector a reasonable opportunity to vote for any person for any office and on any proposition the elector is entitled to vote on, assure privacy to the elector so no one will know how the elector is voting or has voted, preclude the electors from voting for persons or propositions upon which they are not entitled to vote and from voting more than once for the same office or on the same proposition. Voting machines shall be constructed to lock so they cannot be manipulated, tampered with, or show the number of votes registered for any candidate or proposition while voting is in progress. The machines shall provide a method for electors to vote a straight party ticket, shall permit voting a split ticket and shall record each vote cast.

(2) When 2 or more wards or aldermanic districts are joined to use a voting machine, under s. 5.15 (6) (b), the machine shall be constructed to allow the electors to vote for all nominated candidates and issues for their aldermanic district or ward, but for no other.

(3) For presidential electors one device shall be provided to vote for all of one party's electoral candidates at the same time. The device shall be opposite or adjacent to the names of the party's candidates for president and vice president.

(4) Voting machines may be used at primary elections when they comply with subs. (1) and (2) and the following provisions: All candidates' names entitled to appear on the ballots at the pr-
pality may be omitted in printing and stamped or written on the ballots at any location which is clearly visible at the option of the county clerk. Printed information and initials shall appear on the back and outside of the ballot.


5.56 **Multiple columns and rows.** Whenever the number of candidates for any office requires the use of more than one row or column on a voting machine or whenever the official or agency having the responsibility to determine ballot positions determines that the number of candidates for an office requires the use of more than one column on a ballot, the official or agency having such responsibility shall require that the rows or columns be rotated in such a manner that all rows are positioned on top, or all columns are positioned to the left, in an equal number of wards or election districts. If the number of wards and election districts in which voting for an office is conducted is not equally divisible, the position of the rows or columns in the remaining wards or election districts shall be determined by the official or agency by the drawing of lots. The number of columns or rows shall be determined at the same time that the positions of the candidates’ names are determined for each primary and election.

**History:** 1981 c. 377 s. 5.

5.58 **Spring primary ballots.** (1a) **Generally.** At spring primary elections the ballots under subs. (1b) to (2r), when necessary, shall be provided for each ward, except as authorized in s. 5.655. Except as provided under sub. (2r), only nonpartisan candidates nominated for office by nomination papers shall have their names placed on the official spring primary ballot under the proper office designation, but the ballots shall allow room for write-in candidates.

(1b) **Municipal county supervisor ballots.** (am) There shall be separate ballots for municipal and county primaries, except as authorized in s. 5.655.

(bm) For all cities the official spring primary ballot shall be arranged by the municipal clerk, using the same method as that used by the board under s. 5.60 (1) (b).

(cm) Towns and villages holding a primary under s. 8.05 shall arrange the ballot in accordance with the form prescribed by the board under s. 7.08 (1) (a), which shall be the same form as provided in s. 5.60 (5) and (6), insofar as possible.

(1c) **Municipal judge.** There shall be a separate ballot for municipal judges if they are elected under s. 755.01 (4), except as authorized in s. 5.655. Arrangement of the names on the ballot shall be determined by the county clerk or the executive director of the county board of election commissioners of the county having the largest portion of the population in the jurisdiction served by the judge.

(1g) **School district.** (a) There shall be a separate ballot for school district officers when so required, except as authorized in s. 5.655.

(b) In 1st class cities, the names of the candidates for the seat of the member elected at-large to the board of school directors shall be placed on the official city primary ballot and, except as authorized in s. 5.655, there shall be a separate ballot giving the names of the candidates for any seat to be filled on the board of school directors from any election district. All names of candidates for the at-large seat shall be placed in one or more separate columns or rows on the ballot.

(c) The arrangement of candidates for school board seats shall be determined by the school district clerk or the executive director of the city board of election commissioners by the drawing of lots not later than the 2nd Tuesday in January, or the next day if the first Tuesday is a holiday. The method of determining arrangement shall be the same as provided in s. 5.60 (1) (b). Sufficient space shall be provided on the ballot for write-in candidates.

(1r) **Town sanitary district commission.** There shall be a separate ballot for members of the town sanitary district commission if commissioners are elected under s. 50.74 and the boundaries of the district are not coterminal with one or more towns, except as authorized in s. 5.655. Candidates for different seats shall be listed in separate columns or rows if more than one seat is contested in any election. Arrangement of the names on the ballot shall be determined by the town clerk of the town whose board of supervisors directs the election, in the same manner as provided in s. 5.60 (1) (b).

(2) **State superintendent of public instruction, judiciary, county executive, and county supervisors.** There shall be one separate ballot for state superintendent, judicial officers, county executive under s. 59.17 and county supervisor, except as authorized in s. 5.655. In counties having a population of 500,000 or more, the ballot also shall include those offices under s. 8.11 (2) (2m). The arrangement of the names of candidates for state superintendent, justice, court of appeals judge and circuit court judge shall be determined by the board in the manner specified in s. 5.60 (1) (b). Arrangement of the names of candidates for county executive and county supervisor shall be determined by the county clerk or by the executive director of the county board of election commissioners in the manner specified in s. 5.60 (1) (b).

(2m) **Metropolitan sewerage commission.** Except as authorized in s. 5.655, there shall be a separate ballot for members of the metropolitan sewerage commission if commissioners are elected under s. 200.09 (11) (am), with candidates for different seats listed in separate columns or rows if more than one seat is contested at any election. Arrangement of the names on the ballot shall be determined by the board.

(2r) **Ballots for presidential vote.** (am) Except as authorized in s. 5.655, there shall be a separate ballot for each recognized political party filing a certification under s. 8.12 (1), listing the names of all potential candidates of that party determined under s. 8.12 and affording, in addition, an opportunity to the voter to nominate another potential candidate by write-in vote or to vote for an uninstructed delegation to the party convention. The order of presidential candidates on the ballot shall be determined by lot by or under the supervision of the board. Each voter shall be given the ballots of all the parties participating in the presidential preference vote, but may vote on one ballot only.

(bm) Except as authorized in s. 5.655, a separate ballot shall be provided for use in each voting district.

(c) The official ballots for the presidential preference vote shall be securely fastened together at the bottom. The party receiving the greatest number of votes for governor at the preceding election shall have its ticket placed on top and the remaining party ballots shall follow in the same manner. A facsimile ballot notice shall be published as provided in s. 10.02.

(3) **Names on spring ballot.** Only 2 candidates for state superintendent, for any judicial office, for any elected seat on a metropolitan sewerage commission or town sanitary district commission, in counties having a population of 500,000 or more only 2 candidates for member of the board of supervisors within each district, in counties having a population of less than 500,000 only 2 candidates for each member of the county board of supervisors from each district or numbered seat or only 4 candidates for each 2 members of the county board of supervisors from each district whenever 2 supervisors are elected to unnumbered seats from the same district, in 1st class cities only 2 candidates for any at-large seat and only 2 candidates from any election district to be elected to the board of school directors, in school districts elected school board members to numbered seats, or pursuant to an apportionment plan or district representation plan, only 2 school board candidates for each numbered seat or within each district, and twice as many candidates as are to be elected members of other school boards or other elective officers receiving the highest number of votes at the primary shall be nominees for the office at the spring election. Only their names shall appear on the official spring ballot.

bottom. The party ballot of the party receiving the most votes for president or governor at the last general election shall be on top with the other parties arranged in descending order based on their vote for president or governor at the last general election. The ballots of parties qualifying under sub. (2) shall be placed after the parties qualifying under par. (b), in the same order in which the parties filed petitions with the board. Any ballot required under par. (b) 2. shall be placed next in order. The ballot listing the independent candidates shall be placed at the bottom. At polling places where voting machines are used, each party and the independent candidates shall be represented in one or more separate columns or rows on the ballot. At polling places where an electronic voting system is used other than an electronic voting machine, each party and the independent candidates may be represented in separate columns or rows on the ballot.

(b) 1. Except as provided in subd. 2. and s. 5.64 (1) (e) 2., every recognized political party listed on the official ballot at the last gubernatorial election whose candidate for any statewide office received at least 1% of the total votes cast for that office and, if the last general election was also a presidential election, every recognized political party listed on the ballot at that election whose candidate for any statewide office received at least 1% of the total votes cast for that office shall have a separate primary ballot or one or more separate columns or rows on the primary ballot as prescribed in par. (a) and a separate column on the general election ballot in every ward and election district. An organization which was listed as "independent" at the last general election and whose candidate meets the same qualification shall receive the same ballot status upon petition of the chairperson and secretary of the organization to the board requesting such status and specifying their party name, which may not duplicate the name of an existing party. A petition under this subdivision may be filed no later than 5 p.m. on June 11 in the year of each general election.

2. Subdivision 1. applies to a party within any assembly district or county at any September primary election only if at least one candidate of the party for any national, state or county office qualifies to have his or her name appear on the ballot under the name of that party within that assembly district or county. The county clerk or county board of election commissioners shall provide a combined separate ballot or one or more separate columns or rows on the ballot that will permit an elector to cast a vote for any independent candidates for any statewide office that party qualifies to be represented on a separate primary ballot or in one or more separate columns or rows under par. (a) but does not qualify under this paragraph. The ballot shall include the name of each party qualifying for a separate ballot or one or more separate columns or rows on the ballot under each office, with the names of the candidates for each such party appearing in the same order in which the ballots of the parties would appear under par. (a).

2. (a) Except as provided in par. (b) and s. 5.64 (1) (e) 2., any political organization may be represented on a separate primary ballot or in one or more separate columns or rows on the primary ballot as prescribed in sub. (1) (a) and in a separate column on the general election ballot in every ward and election district. To qualify for a separate ballot under this paragraph, the political organization shall, not later than 5 p.m. on June 1 in the year of the September primary, file with the board a petition requesting separate ballot status. The petition shall be signed by at least 10,000 electors, including at least 1,000 electors residing in each of at least 3 separate congressional districts. The petition shall conform to the requirements of s. 8.40. No signature obtained before January 1 in the year of filing is valid. When the candidates of a political organization filing a valid petition fulfill the requirements prescribed by law, they shall appear on a separate ballot or one or more separate columns or rows on the ballot for the period ending with the following general election.

(b) Paragraph (a) applies to a party within any assembly district or county at any September primary election only if at least one candidate of the party for any national, state or county office qualifies to have his or her name appear on the ballot under the name of that party within that assembly district or county. The county clerk or county board of election commissioners shall provide a combined separate ballot or one or more separate columns or rows on the ballot that will permit an elector to cast a vote for the name of any such party for any national, state and county office whenever that party qualifies to be represented on a separate primary ballot or in one or more separate columns or rows under par. (a) but does not qualify under this paragraph. The ballot shall include the name of each party qualifying for a separate ballot or one or more separate columns or rows on the ballot under each office, with the names of the candidates for each such party appearing in the same order in which the ballots of the parties would appear under sub. (1) (a).

3. The board shall designate the official primary ballot arrangement for statewide offices and district attorney within each prosecutorial district by using the same procedure as provided in s. 5.60 (1) (b). On each ballot and on each separate column or row on the ballot, the candidates for office shall be listed together with the offices which they seek in the following order whenever these offices appear on the September primary ballot: governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general, secretary of state, state treasurer, U.S. senator, U.S. representative in congress, state senator, representative to the assembly, district attorney and the county offices. Below the names of the independent candidates shall appear the party or principle of the candidates, if any, in 5 words or less, as shown on their nomination papers.

4. (a) The county clerk or county board of election commissioners shall designate the official primary ballot arrangement for all candidates filing nomination papers in that office.

(b) The county board of election commissioners in counties having a population of more than 500,000 shall prepare the official primary ballot. The commissioners shall arrange the names of all candidates for each office whose nomination papers are filed at the county level, using the same method as that used by the government accountability board under s. 5.60 (1) (b).

5. At the September primary, an elector may vote for the candidates of only one party, or the elector may vote for any of the independent candidates for state office listed; but the elector may not vote for more than one candidate for a single office. A space shall be provided on the ballot for an elector to write in the name of his or her choice as a party candidate for any office, including a party candidate of a party whose name appears on the ballot, column or row designated for independent candidates, as provided in sub. (1) (b) or (2) (b), but no space shall be provided to write in the names of independent candidates.


The filing of a proper petition by the requisite number of electors in a senate, assembly, or congressional district will qualify the political organization referred to in the petition as a party entitled to a separate ballot within the specific district only for all the state, congressional, legislative, and county offices for which an elector of that district may vote. The petition may be circulated commencing after any November general election and ending on the June 1 immediately prior to the next succeeding September primary. 61 Att'y. Gen. 41.

5.64 General election ballots. At general elections all of the following ballots, when necessary, shall be provided for each ward and precinct.

1. Official ballot. (a) Except as authorized in s. 5.655, there shall be a separate ballot giving the names of all candidates for president and vice president and for statewide, congressional, legislative, and county offices in the same form as prescribed by the board under s. 7.08 (1) (a).
shall include a separate column or row for any office, referendum or party for which a separate ballot is required by law and the ballot shall be distributed only to electors who are eligible to vote for all of the offices and referenda appearing on the ballot.

(2) Whenever a municipality employing paper ballots is required to utilize separate ballots for certain offices, referenda or parties at an election, the municipality may, with the approval of the county clerk or board of election commissioners of each county in which there is located any portion of the municipality where one or more electors reside, substitute a single consolidated paper ballot for a ballot that is designed to be utilized with an electronic voting system, if the ballot contains all of the applicable information required to be provided for paper ballots at that election.

(3) The board shall prescribe notices and instructions to be given to electors who use a ballot that is authorized under sub. (2) in lieu of any notices and instructions that are applicable only to municipalities employing separate paper ballots.

History: 1999 a. 102.

5.66 Number of ballots. (1) For local elections, where necessary, municipal clerks shall have sufficient ballots printed or otherwise prepared whenever a voting system does not utilize printed ballots to assure a ballot for all electors or voting machines. For all other elections the municipal clerks shall certify to their county clerk, on the first day of the 2nd month preceding the month in which the primary is held, the approximate number of electors in the municipality. The county clerk shall total these estimates and order a sufficient supply to assure ballots for all electors and voting machines.

(2) The county clerk or board of election commissioners shall print a sufficient number of sample ballots. The municipal clerk or board of election commissioners shall print sample ballots whenever the municipality prepares ballots under s. 7.15 (2) (b) or (c). Sample ballots shall be printed on nonwhite colored paper and shall be overprinted "SAMPLE". Voting machine sample ballots shall be a reduced size diagram of the face of the board or screen inside the voting machine with all candidates, issues and voting instructions as they will appear on the official ballot. Sample ballots to be used with an electronic voting system in which ballots that are distributed to electors are used shall be an actual size copy of the ballot. The clerk or board of election commissioners printing the ballots shall distribute the samples approximately as follows: 45% shall be kept in the clerk's or board's office and distributed to electors requesting them; 45% shall be sent to the municipalities, or, if the municipality prints ballots, 45% shall be sent to the county for distribution to the electors; and 10% shall be reserved to be sent to the polling places by municipalities in proportion to the number certified in sub. (1) and made available to electors at the polls on election day.


5.68 Cost of elections. (1) The cost of acquisition of ballot boxes and voting booths, voting machines or electronic voting systems and regular maintenance thereof shall be borne by the municipalities in which the boxes, booths, machines or systems are used.

(2) Except as otherwise expressly provided, all costs for ballots, supplies, notices and any other materials necessary in preparing or conducting any election shall be paid for by the county or municipality whose clerk or board of election commissioners is responsible for providing them. If a ballot is prepared for a school, technical college, sewerage or sanitary district, the district shall pay for the cost of the ballot. If no other level of government is involved in a school, technical college, sewerage or sanitary district election, the district shall pay for all costs of the ballots, supplies, notices and other materials. If ballots, supplies, notices or other materials are used for elections within more than one unit of local government, the costs shall be proportionately divided between the units of local government involved in the election. In a 1st class city, all costs otherwise attributable to a school district shall be paid by the city.

(3) If voting machines are used or if an electronic voting system is used in which all candidates and referenda appear on the same ballot, the ballots for all national, state and county offices and for county and state referenda shall be prepared and paid for by the county wherein they are used. If the voting machine or electronic voting system ballot includes a municipal or school, technical college, sewerage or sanitary district ballot, the cost of that portion of the ballot shall be reimbursed to the county or paid for by the municipality or district, except as provided in a 1st class city school district under sub. (2).

(3m) The election administration council shall provide guidance to local units of government concerning the procurement of election apparatus, ballots, ballot forms, materials, and supplies for use in elections in this state to help ensure that competitive prices are obtained by those units of government.

(4) Except as provided under sub. (7), the cost of compensation of election officials and trainees shall be borne in the manner provided in s. 7.03.

(5) If a charge is made for the use of a polling place, the charge shall be paid by the municipality establishing the polling place under s. 5.25 (2) unless the polling place is used to conduct a special election that is called by a unit of government other than the state or the municipality establishing the polling place and the special election is not held concurrently with an election specified in s. 5.02 (5), (18), (21) or (22). In such case the charge shall be paid by the unit of government that calls the special election.

(6) The clerk of each county or municipality shall submit an invoice to the clerk of each municipality or district which is responsible for payment of election costs under this section. The municipality or district shall make payment to the county or municipal treasurer.

(7) Any municipality that maintained polling hours beginning later than 7 a.m. prior to April 29, 2006, and that incurs additional costs to adjust its polling hours to begin at 7 a.m. at any election held after April 29, 2006, may file a claim with the board for reimbursement of those costs. The claim shall be accompanied by appropriate substantiation of all costs incurred. The board shall audit the claim and, if the board finds that the costs have been incurred by the municipality, and the costs would not have been incurred but for the requirement to open polling places at 7 a.m., the board shall reimburse the municipality for those costs. No claim is payable under this subsection unless the claim is filed with the board, together with appropriate substantiation, within 60 days following the date on which the costs are incurred.


5.72 Correcting ballot errors. (1) As soon as possible after ballots are delivered to the county clerk or to the municipal clerk if the municipality is preparing ballots under s. 7.15 (2), but not later than 3 weeks before any election relating to a state or national office or statewide referendum, the county or municipal clerk preparing the ballots shall submit one copy of each ballot to the board for review of possible errors. If the contractor preparing the ballots supplies proofs in advance of ballot preparation, the clerk shall submit one copy of the proofs in lieu of actual ballots. If a voting machine ballot or other ballot combining local candidates or referenda with state or national candidates or referenda is used, the entire ballot shall be submitted, but if ballots intended for distribution to electors are used, only those ballots relating to state or national offices and statewide referenda need be submitted. This subsection does not require delay of ballot distribution or mailing of absentee ballots.

(2) The board shall review ballots and proof copies submitted under sub. (1) and shall notify the county and municipal clerk of any error as soon as possible but in no event later than 7 days after
count, the ballots and programs used shall be sealed and retained under the custody of the municipal clerk in a secure location.

History: 1979 c. 311; 2001 a. 16; 2005 a. 92.

5.85 Receiving, counting, tallying and return of ballots. (1) At any polling place at which an electronic voting system is utilized, the following procedures for receiving, counting, tallying and return of the ballots shall be used. Whenever paper ballots are not being utilized at a polling place in combination with ballots employed in an electronic voting system, the paper ballots shall be deposited in a separate ballot box or boxes, according to the types of ballots used. For the purpose of transporting the ballots or the record of the votes cast, the municipal clerk shall provide a secure container for each polling place. At each polling place, the applicable portions of the procedure prescribed for initiating the canvas under s. 7.51 (1) and (2) shall be performed, except that no count of the ballots, except write-in votes and paper ballots used for absentee voting and other purposes authorized by law, may be performed at a polling place if a central counting location is designated for the counting of ballots at that polling place by the municipality.

(2) (a) The election officials shall examine the ballots and the record of votes cast for write-in votes and shall count and tabulate the write-in votes. When an electronic voting system is used in which ballots are distributed to electors, before separating the remaining ballots from their respective covering envelopes, the election officials shall examine the ballots for write-in votes. When an elector has cast a write-in vote, the election officials shall compare the write-in vote with the votes on the ballot to determine whether the write-in vote results in an overvote for any office. In the case of an overvote for any office, the election officials shall make a true duplicate ballot of all votes on the ballot except for the office that is overvoted, by using an official ballot of that kind used by the elector who voted the original ballot, and one of the marking devices so as to transfer all votes of the elector except for the office overvoted, to an official ballot of that kind used in the ward at that election. Unless election officials are selected under s. 7.30 (4) (c) without regard to party affiliation, the election officials shall consist in each case of at least one election official of each of the 2 major political parties, whenever officials of both parties are present.

(b) Write-in votes shall be counted as provided in s. 7.50 (2) (d). The original ballot upon which there is an overvote shall be clearly labeled “Overvoted Ballot” and the duplicate ballot produced under par. (a) shall be clearly labeled “Duplicate Overvoted Ballot.” The election officials shall place the same serial number on each “Overvoted Ballot” and its corresponding “Duplicate Overvoted Ballot” commencing with number “1” and continuing consecutively for each of the ballots for which a “Duplicate Overvoted Ballot” is produced in that ward or election district. The election officials shall initial the “Duplicate Overvoted Ballot” ballots and shall place them in the container for return of the ballots. The “Overvoted Ballot” ballots and their envelopes shall be placed in the “Original Ballots” envelope.

(c) Ballots bearing write-in votes marked in the place designated for write-in votes, bearing the initials of an election official, not resulting in an overvote, and otherwise complying with the election laws as to marking shall be counted, tallied, and their votes recorded on a tally sheet provided by the municipal clerk. Ballots and ballot envelopes shall be separated and all ballots except any that are defective or overvoted shall be placed separately in the container for return of the ballots, along with the ballots marked “Duplicate Overvoted Ballots.”

(3) The election officials shall examine the ballots to determine if any is damaged or defective so that it cannot be counted by the automatic tabulating equipment. If any ballot is damaged or defective so that it cannot be properly counted by the automatic tabulating equipment, the election officials, in the presence of witnesses, shall make a true duplicate ballot of all votes on that ballot by using one of the marking devices so as to transfer all votes of the elector to an official ballot of that kind used by the elector who voted the original ballot in that election. Unless election officials are selected under s. 7.30 (4) (c) without regard to party affiliation, the election officials shall consist in each case of at least one election official of each of the 2 major political parties, whenever officials of both parties are present. The original ballot shall be clearly labeled “Damaged Ballot” and the ballot so produced “Duplicate Damaged Ballot,” and each shall bear the same number which shall be placed thereon by the election officials, commencing with number “1” and continuing consecutively for the ballots of that kind in the ward. The election officials shall initial the “Duplicate Damaged Ballot” ballots, and shall place them in the container for return of the ballots. The officials shall place “Damaged Ballot” ballots and their envelopes in the “Original Ballots” envelope.

(4) The original ballots shall be preserved with the duplicate ballots and delivered by the inspectors to the municipal clerk. The officials shall then make out slip indicating the number of electors voting in person, number of absentee ballots deposited in the ballot box, and the total number of electors of each ward served by the polling place who voted at the election, which shall be signed by all the inspectors.

(5) If the municipality has designated a central counting location to be used to count ballots under s. 7.51 (1), the inspectors shall count and deposit the paper ballots in the container. The inspectors shall then place the slip made out under sub. (4) in the container. The inspectors shall also place the tally sheet recording the write-in votes and other votes cast on paper ballots, and all other ballots, or the record of the voter count on an electronic voting system where no ballots are distributed to electors, in the container and shall thereupon immediately seal the container with an adhesive seal provided by the municipal clerk for the purpose in such manner that the seal completely covers the opening in the container, and each of the inspectors shall sign the seal. The “Defective Ballots” envelope, and “Original Ballots” envelope each shall be securely sealed and the flap or end thereof of each signed by the inspectors and returned to the central counting location with the box for return of the ballots, enclosed ballots and returns. Thereupon, the municipal clerk or 2 of the election officials shall forthwith and by the most direct route transport the container and envelopes to the central counting location designated by the municipal clerk. Unless election officials are selected under s. 7.30 (4) (c) without regard to party affiliation, the election officials shall consist in each case of at least one election official of each of the 2 major political parties, whenever officials of both parties are present.


5.86 Proceedings at central counting locations. (1) All proceedings at each central counting location shall be under the direction of the municipal clerk or an election official designated by the clerk unless the central counting location is at the county seat and the municipal clerk delegates the responsibility to supervise the location to the county clerk, in which case the proceedings shall be under the direction of the county clerk or an election official designated by the county clerk. Unless election officials are selected under s. 7.30 (4) (c) without regard to party affiliation, the employees at each central counting location, other than any specially trained technicians who are required for the operation of the automatic tabulating equipment, shall be equally divided between members of the 2 major political parties under s. 7.30 (2) (a) and all duties performed by the employees shall be by teams consisting of an equal number of members of each political party whenever sufficient persons from each party are available.

(2) At each central counting location, a team of election officials designated by the clerk or other election official having charge of the location under sub. (1) shall check the container returned containing the ballots to determine that all seals are intact, and thereupon shall open the container, check the inspectors’ slip and compare the number of ballots so delivered against the total number of electors of each ward served by the polling
counts the vote of an elector who casts a vote for a candidate for an office outside the straight party ticket for that office only.

(3) Except in primary elections, it enables an elector to vote for a ticket selected in part from the nominees of one party, and in part from the nominees of other parties, and in part from independent candidates and in part of candidates whose names are written in by the elector.

(4) It enables an elector to vote for a ticket of his or her own selection for any person for any office for whom he or she may desire to vote whenever write-in votes are permitted.

(5) It accommodates all referenda to be submitted to the electors in the form provided by law.

(6) The voting device or machine permits an elector in a primary election to vote for the candidates of the recognized political party or the independent candidates of his or her choice, and the automatic tabulating equipment or machine rejects any ballot on which votes are cast in the primary of more than one recognized political party, except where a party or independent candidate designation is made or where an elector casts write-in votes for candidates of more than one party on a ballot that is distributed to the elector.

(7) It permits an elector to vote at an election for all persons and offices for whom and for which the elector is lawfully entitled to vote; to vote for as many persons for an office as the elector is entitled to vote for; to vote for or against any question upon which the elector is entitled to vote; and it rejects all choices recorded on a ballot for an office or a measure if the number of choices exceeds the number which an elector is entitled to vote for on such office or on such measure, except where an elector casts excess write-in votes upon a ballot that is distributed to the elector.

(8) It permits an elector, at a presidential or gubernatorial election, by one action to vote for the candidates of a party for president and vice president or for governor and lieutenant governor, respectively.

(9) It prevents an elector from voting for the same person more than once for the same office, except where an elector casts excess write-in votes upon a ballot that is distributed to the elector.

(10) It is suitably designed for the purpose used, of durable construction, and is usable safely, securely, efficiently and accurately in the conduct of elections and counting of ballots.

(11) It records correctly and counts accurately every vote properly cast and maintains a cumulative tally of the total votes cast that is retrievable in the event of a power outage, evacuation or malfunction so that the records of votes cast prior to the time that the problem occurs is preserved.

(12) It minimizes the possibility of disenfranchisement of electors as the result of failure to understand the method of operation or utilization or malfunction of the ballot, voting device, automatic tabulating equipment or related equipment or materials.

(13) The automatic tabulating equipment authorized for use in connection with the system includes a mechanism which makes the operator aware of whether the equipment is malfunctioning in such a way that an inaccurate tabulation of the votes could be obtained.

(14) It does not employ any mechanism by which a ballot is punched or punctured to record the votes cast by an elector.

(15) It permits an elector to privately verify the votes selected by the elector before casting his or her ballot.

(16) It provides an elector with the opportunity to change his or her votes and to correct any error or to obtain a replacement for a spoiled ballot prior to casting his or her ballot.

(17) Unless the ballot is counted at a central counting location, it includes a mechanism for notifying an elector who attempts to cast an excess number of votes for a single office that his or her votes for that office will not be counted, and provides the elector with an opportunity to correct his or her ballot or to receive and cast a replacement ballot.

(18) If the device consists of an electronic voting machine, it generates a complete, permanent paper record showing all votes cast by each elector, that is verifiable by the elector, by either visual or nonvisual means as appropriate, before the elector leaves the voting area, and that enables a manual count or recount of each vote cast by the elector.


Cross-reference: See also ch. GAB 7, Wis. adm. code.

5.92 Bond may be required. Before entering into a contract for the purchase or lease of an electronic voting system or any ballots, voting devices, automatic tabulating equipment or related equipment or materials to be used in connection with a system, any municipality may require the vendor or lessor to provide a performance bond with a licensed surety company as surety, guaranteeing the supply of additional equipment, parts or materials, provision of adequate computer programming, preventive maintenance or emergency repair services, training of election officials and other municipal employees or provision of public educational materials for a specified period, or guaranteeing the security of the computer programs or other equipment or materials to be utilized with the system to prevent election fraud, or other guarantees as the municipality determines to be appropriate.

History: 1979 c. 311.

Cross-reference: See also ch. GAB 7, Wis. adm. code.

5.93 Administration. The board may promulgate reasonable rules for the administration of this subchapter.

History: 1979 c. 311; 1985 s. 352 s. 251 (1).

Cross-reference: See also ch. GAB 7, Wis. adm. code.

5.94 Sample ballots; publication. When an electronic voting system employing a ballot that is distributed to electors is used, the county and municipal clerk of the county and municipality in which the polling place designated for use of the system is located shall cause to be published, in the type B notices, a true actual-size copy of the ballot containing the names of offices and candidates and statements of measures to be voted on, as nearly as possible, in the form in which they will appear on the official ballot on election day. The notice may be published as a newspaper insert. Municipal clerks may post the notice if the remainder of the type B notice is posted.

History: 1979 c. 311; 2001 a. 16.

5.95 Elector information. The board shall prescribe information to electors in municipalities and counties using various types of electronic voting systems to be published in lieu of the information specified in s. 10.02 (3) in type B notices whenever the type B notice information is inapplicable.

History: 1979 c. 311.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Trump</th>
<th>Trump’s 2016 PA Win</th>
<th>Trump’s 2016 PA Win in Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>44,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>44,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre County</td>
<td>$863,828</td>
<td>48.71%</td>
<td>46.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>67.63%</td>
<td>29.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>$148,729</td>
<td>48.57%</td>
<td>46.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CTCL PA Grant</td>
<td>$13,237,557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CTCL’s $10 million grant to Philadelphia is three times higher than CTCL’s second largest grant. CTCL granted Philadelphia more money than anywhere else because President Trump can’t win his reelection if he doesn’t win Pennsylvania’s electoral votes. If CTCL’s $10 million voter participation grant increases just the Philadelphia Democratic voter turnout by 7.5%, then CTCL has flipped Pennsylvania for Democrat Joe Biden.

Hillary Clinton had her second largest winning percentage in Delaware County behind the City of Philadelphia. CTCL’s Pennsylvania grants to Democratic strongholds in Philadelphia and Delaware County will play a significant role in determining whether Biden or Trump wins Pennsylvania.

State of Michigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton Vote</th>
<th>Trump Vote</th>
<th>+ Clinton Votes</th>
<th>+ Trump Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>$3,512,000</td>
<td>234,871</td>
<td>7,682</td>
<td>227,189</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>$443,742</td>
<td>65,272</td>
<td>22,390</td>
<td>42,882</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City County</td>
<td>CTCL Grant</td>
<td>Clinton Vote</td>
<td>Trump Vote</td>
<td>+ Clinton Votes</td>
<td>+ Trump Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>$43,850</td>
<td>26,146</td>
<td>8,294</td>
<td>17,852</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>$475,625</td>
<td>16,163</td>
<td>4,677</td>
<td>11,486</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>$417,000</td>
<td>128,025</td>
<td>50,335</td>
<td>77,690</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon</td>
<td>$433,580</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>10,263</td>
<td>11,077</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>$405,564</td>
<td>14,351</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>11,616</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus</td>
<td>$16,645</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>$218,869</td>
<td>18,644</td>
<td>5,456</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CTCL MI</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,966,875</strong></td>
<td><strong>530,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>411,959</strong></td>
<td><strong>814</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If CTCL’s $3.5 million Detroit grant increases Democrat Joe Biden’s vote by 4.5% in just Detroit, CTCL’s grant will have flipped Michigan from Red to Blue. CTCL’s $3.96 million in Michigan grants to Democratic strongholds in Detroit, Flint, Lansing and East Lansing increase Democrat Joe Biden’s chance of winning Michigan’s statewide and 16 electoral votes.

**State of South Carolina**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton Vote</th>
<th>Trump Vote</th>
<th>Trump’s 2016 SC Win</th>
<th>Trump’s 2016 SC Win in Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richland County</td>
<td>$730,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>52,469</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>300,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston County</td>
<td>$695,000</td>
<td>89,299</td>
<td>75,443</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>300,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>CTCL Grant</td>
<td>Clinton Vote</td>
<td>Trump Vote</td>
<td>Trump's 2016 SC Win</td>
<td>Trump's 2016 SC Win in Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon County</td>
<td>$102,373</td>
<td>7,732</td>
<td>7,386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>74,483</td>
<td>127,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SC Grant</td>
<td>$2,187,373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Republican Senator Lindsey Graham represents South Carolina and is on the November 3, 2020 ballot. CTCL's grants to South Carolina Democratic strongholds improperly increases Democratic votes in Richland and Charleston counties and makes President Trump and Senator Graham's reelection more difficult. State of Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton Vote</th>
<th>Trump Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>297,051</td>
<td>117,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>160,121</td>
<td>152,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougherty</td>
<td>$295,235</td>
<td>23,311</td>
<td>10,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
<td>251,370</td>
<td>51,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GA Grant</td>
<td>$16,695,235</td>
<td>731,853</td>
<td>332,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fulton County is one of the most reliable Democratic Counties in the country. Since 1876 Fulton County has voted Democratic in every presidential election, except in 1928 and 1973. Of the State of Georgia’s 159 counties, Hillary Clinton received more votes in Fulton County than any other Georgia county. Clinton beat Donald Trump by 180,000 votes in Fulton County.
### Iowa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Trump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Hawk</td>
<td>$267,500</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott County</td>
<td>$286,870</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerro Gordo</td>
<td>$20,325</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>$7,302</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>$6,324</td>
<td>32.91%</td>
<td>61.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IA Grant</td>
<td>$744,321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MN Grant</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total NJ Grant</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New York
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton Vote</th>
<th>Trump Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga County</td>
<td>$286,960</td>
<td>53.89%</td>
<td>40.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>41.68%</td>
<td>50.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins County</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>67.69%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total NY Grant</td>
<td>$386,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warren County which voted for Trump in 2016 received the smallest CTCL grant.

Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton Vote</th>
<th>Trump Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>$15,130,433</td>
<td>461,090</td>
<td>262,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie County</td>
<td>$62,095</td>
<td>8,838</td>
<td>24,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays County</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>33,224</td>
<td>33,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins County</td>
<td>$19,952</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>10,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron County</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>59,402</td>
<td>29,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$14,990</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>6,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>319,550</td>
<td>240,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>$86,424</td>
<td>16,253</td>
<td>44,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>$263,644</td>
<td>84,468</td>
<td>104,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Texas Grant</td>
<td>$19,566,538</td>
<td>987,312</td>
<td>757,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016 Clinton won Dallas County by 137,284 votes. In 2016 Bowie County only had 33,4470 votes. Trump won Bowie County by 16,082 votes over Clinton. Trump won Hays County by 602 votes over Clinton. Trump won Hopkins County by 5,412 votes over Clinton.
### Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Union</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Maine Grant</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$90,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Maryland Grant</td>
<td>$90,512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arkansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craighead</td>
<td>$59,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arkansas Grant</td>
<td>$59,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mississippi
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Trump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hinds</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>71.39%</td>
<td>26.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MS Grant</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ohio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Trump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>$544,624</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>38.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>$435,248</td>
<td>47.63%</td>
<td>47.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$975,188</td>
<td>60.43%</td>
<td>34.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>23,318</td>
<td>15,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ohio Grant</td>
<td>$2,020,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kansas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CTCL Grant</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Trump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick</td>
<td>$816,458</td>
<td>36.88%</td>
<td>55.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total KS Grant</td>
<td>$816,458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total CTCL Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Grants</th>
<th>CTCL Grant Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$7,324,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Number of Grants</td>
<td>CTCL Grant Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$13,237,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$6,106,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,527,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$11,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$744,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$19,216,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$386,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$90,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$59,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$544,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CTCL Grants</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$65,493,839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first 26 CTCL grants went only to Democratic strongholds in swing states. CTCL claim that its grants are for the purpose of protecting voters from the COVID-19 pandemic is a blatant lie. CTCL hidden COVID-19 grant agenda is to increase the votes for Democratic presidential candidate Joe Biden, Democratic U.S. Senate candidates and Democratic House of Representative candidates.
What are we to make of a poll showing 72% of Republicans ‘do not trust’ the election outcome?

I can’t cross-examine those numbers to better understand what “do not trust” might mean to them. But it’s not good. It’s very bad. It’s a breeding ground for hyper-partisan divisions ahead.

By Eric Black | Columnist

Former Vice President Joe Biden raises a fist as he delivers remarks on Election Night in Wilmington, Delaware.

REUTERS/Mike Segar

Dec. 10, 2020 We need to try to think clearly about what the poll results discussed below mean. They were taken by the Marist poll organization and
sponsored by National Public Radio and the PBS NewsHour.

Overall, 61 percent of Americans believe that the results of the 2020 election, showing a Joe Biden victory over Donald Trump, were accurate. Five percent say they are unsure. And 34 percent do not believe the results.

As you would imagine, the disbelievers are overwhelmingly Republicans. Here’s that breakdown, by percent who say they do not “trust” the results.

- Democrats: 95 trust the results, 3 percent do not, 2 percent were unsure.
- Independents: 67 trust/5 percent do not/ and 28 percent unsure.
- Republicans: 24 trust/72 do not trust/4 percent unsure.

I don’t know how literally nor how seriously to take those poll results. I can’t, at the moment, find that similar questions were polled after previous elections. I’ve been on the planet since the Truman administration, but I’m pretty sure we’ve never seen anything like this before in a U.S. presidential election.

It’s worth mentioning that there have been a lot of much closer elections in the past, including, especially, the 2000 Bush vs. Gore election, which was decided by a very small number of votes in one state featuring many vagaries, including the infamous “hanging chads.”

I wouldn’t call Biden’s margins exactly a landslide, but they are very solid margins in both the popular and electoral vote. To “not trust” that Biden won, you would have to believe that several states, including states controlled by Republicans, committed fraud large enough to cheat on tens of thousands, or perhaps hundreds of thousands of ballots.
It makes no sense. It’s creepy. I refer you back to a recent post of mine, linking to a piece by “On Tyranny” author Timothy Snyder, suggesting one of the breeding grounds for the rise of Hitler in post-World War I Germany was the widespread belief in Germany that their country had not really lost World War I but had been “stabbed in the back” by traitors.

To decide how seriously to worry about the huge 72 percent “do not trust” portion of Republicans, and to not freak out unnecessarily, we perhaps need to consider the possibility that many of them really mean something closer to “do not like.” But that would be a leap of faith, or perhaps of hope, and it would do those respondents the unkindness of assuming that they can’t distinguish between what happened and what they wished would happen, but didn’t.

Their leader, Donald John Trump, is telling his supporters that the election was stolen by fraud. Although he has been unable to produce any evidence of that fraud that would convince anyone engaged in a modicum of critical thinking, and has not even been able to get a Supreme Court composed of two-thirds Republican appointees and three appointed by Trump himself to say that the election was stolen from him, still, 72 percent of Republicans “do not trust,” which pretty much means “do not accept” the results.

I can’t cross-examine those numbers to better understand what “do not trust” might mean to them. But it’s not good. It’s very bad. It’s a breeding ground for hyper-partisan divisions ahead. If we take it literally, and especially if we take it seriously, it could threaten the future of democracy in America.

A full write-up of the poll by NPR is here.

And a detailed breakdown of the results by age, gender, region, etc, is here.
Eric Black

Veteran journalist Eric Black writes Eric Black Ink for MinnPost. His latest award is from the Society of Professional Journalists, which in May 2017 announced he’d won the national Sigma Delta Chi Award for online column writing. Email him at eblack@minnpost.com.
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Election officials must restore confidence in elections

Here is my full column that ran in the Washington County Daily News earlier in the week.

The nonpartisan Legislative Audit Bureau released its 168-page audit of Wisconsin's handling of the November 2020 election. The findings are deeply concerning for anybody who cares about whether or not our government still operates with the consent of the governed.

The entire purpose of holding elections is for the governed to choose who should do the governing. For this purpose, we go through a rigorous process to establish laws to ensure that every person who is eligible to vote can do so, and that we will only count one vote for each eligible voter.

What the LAB audit found was that under the cover of COVID, the state's Wisconsin Elections Commission and local election clerks flagrantly ignored multiple laws designed to ensure free and fair elections. Further, several of those clerks refused to cooperate with the LAB's investigation. The end result is that the audit's findings are incomplete, and we will never have a full accounting of what went on during the November 2020 election. In conducting the audit, the LAB surveyed all of Wisconsin's municipal and county clerks. Only
conducted the audit, the LAB surveyed all of Wisconsin’s municipal and county clerks. Only 47.9% of the municipal clerks and 81.9% of the county clerks bothered to respond. Also, citing obscure guidance from the U.S. Department of Justice, the city of Madison, Milwaukee County, and the Town of Little Suamico refused to allow the LAB auditors to physically inspect any election records. This means that 623,700 ballots from two areas of the state that most flagrantly ignored election laws were not inspected by the LAB. One can only speculate why every other Wisconsin clerk thought it acceptable to let the LAB inspect election records.

Given the lack of cooperation from Milwaukee and Madison and given that Milwaukee and Madison were ground zero for election shenanigans, the LAB’s findings are incomplete, at best. Even so, the LAB’s audit documented several instances where election officials ignored or intentionally violated established election law.

Wisconsin law requires that election officials must continue counting ballots when the polls close until the counting is complete. They are not permitted by law to adjourn and come back at a later time to finish. The reason for the law is simple. Leaving boxes of ballots sitting around for hours or days is an invitation for election tampering. Also, when there is a large gap in time between when the votes are cast and the results are announced, it causes people to lose confidence in the integrity of the counting. Despite this law, the WEC issued permitted local election officials to adjourn before they finished counting the ballots. The WEC’s guidance is in direct violation of Wisconsin statutes.

Wisconsin law requires that municipal elected government establish polling places at least thirty days before an election. In March 2020, the WEC wrote guidance allowing municipal clerks to unilaterally change polling places without the approval of the governing body. At the time, it was the beginning of the pandemic and the guidance allowed clerks to move polling places away from nursing homes and other places more vulnerable to the pandemic. The WEC’s guidance remains in effect in violation of the law.

Perhaps no other area of election process was more flagrantly abused than with absentee ballots. Prior to 2020, Wisconsinites could easily vote absentee in person at their local municipal office or by mail. It required a witness and, with rare exception, a photo identification. In 2020, many of Wisconsin’s election officials abandoned any notion of ballot security for absentee ballots. In Dane County, many absentee voters claimed an exemption to avoid showing a photo ID. Unsecure ballot drop boxes were strewn across the state for people to deposit completed ballots. Missing or incomplete information was routinely filled in by election workers.

The results shown in the LAB audit are staggering: 59.6% of all ballots counted in the November 2020 election were absentee. The counties with the highest absentee ballots were Dane (74.4%) and Milwaukee (70.6%). Not coincidentally, these two liberal counties had record turnout and have largely refused to cooperate with outside audits.

Despite the record number of absentee ballots being cast by people who, presumably, were voting absentee for the first time, a shockingly low 0.2% of the ballots were rejected compared to 0.5% being rejected in the previous presidential election. Clearly, election...
compared to 2.5% being rejected in the previous presidential election. Clearly, election officials were turning a blind eye to possibly fraudulent ballots.

Wisconsin's election officials and the Wisconsin Elections Commission have a lot of work to do to re-establish confidence in the integrity of Wisconsin's elections. They could start by following the law.

MAR on October 29, 2021 at 8:12 AM

This doesn't help with confidence in elections:

JASON on October 29, 2021 at 10:26 AM

The fact that the Left are unified in their "This was the most secure and audited election ever, you're LYING" will never lead to Trust. I've seen a few of the meetings of the WEC, Ann Jacobs is a cunt, and Mark Thomson is a stain collector. Disgraceful and neither one of those two could be trusted with anything.

MAR on October 29, 2021 at 12:00 PM

Remember, the Democrats always said that Chicago elections were fair even though half of the people in cemeteries voted.

JASON on October 29, 2021 at 5:22 PM

Well, this won't restore confidence at all..

https://www.foxnews.com/politics/mcauliffe-youngkin-election-virginia-charlottesville

Seems there are a lot of false flag events being run by the Liberal idiots lately.

MAR on October 29, 2021 at 7:37 PM
2020 ELECTIONS

Poll: 70 percent of Republicans don’t think the election was free and fair

The POLITICO/Morning Consult survey found trust in the election system plummeted among Republicans while rising among Democrats after the race was called on Saturday.

Trump supporters rally outside the State Capitol in Phoenix. | AP Photo/Matt York

By CATHERINE KIM
11/09/2020 05:00 PM EST
Republicans’ trust in the election system plummeted, while Democrats’ trust soared, according to a new POLITICO/Morning Consult poll.

Multiple new organizations announced Biden as the election winner on Saturday after four days of counting in several swing states. Following the news, 70 percent of Republicans now say they don’t believe the 2020 election was free and fair, a stark rise from the 35 percent of GOP voters who held similar beliefs before the election. Meanwhile, trust in the election system grew for Democrats, many who took to the streets to celebrate Biden’s victory on Saturday. Ninety percent of Democrats now say the election was free and fair, up from 52 percent before Nov. 3 who thought it would be.

Among those who believed that the election wasn’t free and fair, 78 percent believed that mail-in voting led to widespread voter fraud and 72 percent believed that ballots were tampered with — both claims that have made a constant appearance on the president’s Twitter thread. Like President Donald Trump, a majority of the people that thought the election was unfair, 84 percent, said it benefited Biden.
The lack of trust in the election system has led to Republicans being more skeptical about the election results. Although only 18 percent of Republicans had said the results would be unreliable prior to Election Day, now 64 percent feel the same way following Biden’s victory. By contrast, 86 percent of Democrats say they trust the results.

Republicans were particularly wary of the results coming out of swing states, especially in Pennsylvania, which counted votes for four days before delivering Biden a decisive win on Saturday. Sixty-two percent of Republicans said the Pennsylvania results would be unreliable, a stark contrast to the 8 percent of Democrats who held the same beliefs.

Distrust is similarly high in Wisconsin (55 percent), Nevada (54 percent), Georgia (54 percent) and Arizona (52 percent). The skepticism has particularly been fueled by the Trump campaign, which has filed more than half a dozen lawsuits in states like Pennsylvania, Nevada, Michigan and Georgia since Election Day. Two days after the race was called for Biden, Trump continues to tweet out that “Nevada is turning out to be a cesspool of Fake Votes” and “Pennsylvania prevented us from watching much of the Ballot count.”

However, despite their lack of trust in the results, Republicans are split on whether or not the outcome will change. Thirty-eight percent of Republicans believe the results will be overturned, while 45 percent say it’s unlikely.

The POLITICO/Morning Consult poll was conducted Nov. 6-9, surveying 1,987 registered voters. Some interviews were done before the race was called, but the majority were after the official call. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 2 percentage points.
Morning Consult is a global data intelligence company, delivering insights on what people think in real time by surveying tens of thousands across the globe every single day. More details on the poll and its methodology can be found in these two documents: Toplines | Crosstabs
HOW TO RESTORE TRUST IN ELECTIONS IN A HYPER-PARTISAN LANDSCAPE

Free and fair elections are a cornerstone of democracy. However, Americans have relatively low levels of confidence in our election system and are increasingly wary of partisan proposals to fix the issues. The lack of trust in our electoral process is the critical problem election integrity reform must address.

How confident are Americans in the election system?

State Policy Network, in partnership with Heart+Mind Strategies, conducted in-depth public opinion research on election integrity and reform in the first half of 2021. It revealed just 43% of Americans have a large degree of confidence in the current election system. More concerning is the fact that faith in the process is strongly related to the side that wins the election: 64% of Democrats felt a high level of confidence in our election system in early 2021 as Joe Biden settled in to office compared to just 20% of Republicans. Independents are generally skeptical; just 35% expressed a high level of confidence in the American election system despite saying in the survey they had voted for Biden by a 2-to-1 margin.

![Graph showing confidence in American election system]

Additional data shows this is a long-term pattern. The MIT Election Data and Science Lab shows confidence in accurate vote counting plummets among partisans when their candidate loses a Presidential election and soars when they win.
Americans support election reforms that promote accountability and consistency

Election process reformers may always have to contend with a partisan backdrop, but there are certain fixes that most Americans—from all parties—can get behind, even after the tumultuous 2020 election. Although partisans may struggle to agree on what the laws should be, most Americans strongly concur that officials who break current law should be swiftly and significantly punished. More of these consequences can be codified in states and localities.

Establishing transparent, consistent guidelines and formal training for poll workers also boosts trust in the election system. It is confusing to many Americans why election machines don’t already employ state-of-the-art technology and best practices in tech security. With 84% of all registered voters supporting upgrades to voting equipment and databases, many states could restore Americans’ confidence simply by improving the tools that go into the election process.

These common-ground solutions frequently gain less attention than fiery debates about voter ID, mail-in ballots, or automatic registration, so reformers must make the effort to inform voters when these meaningful changes are made.

Percentage Support for Election Reforms by Partisan Affiliation
### Immediate common-ground election reforms will reap long-term benefits

Our election system needs reform. While many key reforms will require across-the-aisle cooperation and persuasion, several critical fixes can be implemented now, backed by the majority of all Americans. Working to enact these popular, bipartisan reforms will show voters who is serious about election reform and who is simply looking to help shore up the next win at the ballot box. Building trust with voters in this way has a long-term payoff—both in improving our election system and being regarded as the credible side on more contentious reform efforts down the line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>All Registered Voters</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Independents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impose mandatory fines and penalties including removal from their jobs,</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for election officials who mishandle or tamper with ballots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade voting equipment and voter registration databases so that the</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology is more reliable and secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish consistent guidelines within a state for when absentee</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballots must be received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enact fines and penalties, including removal from their position, for</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elected officials and politicians who knowingly spread false</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information about election procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more detailed and more consistent training for poll workers</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and observers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPN Heart+Mind Survey, May 2021
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Russia, Iran have obtained voter data interference campaign: DNI

ALEXANDER MALLIN and LUKE BARR
October 22, 2020 • 5 min read

Senior national security officials alerted the American public Wednesday that Iran and Russia have both obtained voter data in their efforts to interfere in the 2020 U.S. election.

"This data can be used by foreign actors to attempt to communicate false information to registered voters that they hope will cause confusion, sow chaos, and undermine your confidence in American democracy," Director of National Intelligence John Ratcliffe said in a surprise news conference Wednesday evening.

MORE: Federal election fraud would be 'a major challenge for an adversary': FBI director

Ratcliffe also announced that Iran was separately behind a series of threatening emails that were found to be sent this week to Democratic voters, which he said was "designed to intimidate voters, incite social unrest and damage President Trump."

Alireza Miryousefi, spokesman for the Iranian Mission to the U.N., denied the allegations to ABC News.

"Unlike the U.S., Iran does not interfere in other country's elections. The world has been witnessing U.S.'s own desperate public attempts to question the outcome of its

TRENDING

- Gloomy landscape for Democrats in midterms as Biden's approval drops to 38% in USA TODAY/Suffolk poll
- Rappers Travis Scott, Drake sued over deadly Texas concert crush
- A California middle school removed a history teacher who told her students that Trump is still president
- UB40 founding member Astro dies after short illness
- Southwest Flight Attendant Alerts Police After Suspecting Mom Of 'Trafficking' Biracial Child
the U.S. election and no preference for the outcome. The U.S. must end its malign and dangerous accusations against Iran."

Florida law enforcement and the FBI previously had said they were investigating the threatening emails allegedly sent from outside the United States to registered Democrats. The emails claimed to be from by a member of the Proud Boys, according to authorities, something the group denies.

PHOTO: Voters fill out their ballots as they vote at the Stephen P. Clark Government Center polling station, Oct. 21, 2020, in Miami. (Joe Raedle/Getty Images)

According to sheriffs' offices in both Brevard County and Alachua County, the sender claimed to belong to the "alt-right" group and said they were in possession of a voter's personal information.

The Brevard County Sheriff's Office said the email addressed the voter by name, then stated: "We are in possession of all your information. You are currently registered as a Democrat and we know this because we have gained access into the entire voting infrastructure. You will vote for Trump on Election Day or we will come after you."

MORE: Florida sheriffs, FBI investigating emails threatening voters

President Donald Trump in the first presidential debate stirred controversy when, in response to a question about whether he condemned white supremacists, he told the "Proud Boys" to "stand back and stand by." Many argued the moment could serve to energize fringe members of the
build a narrative that would cast Trump supporters as threatening violence against Democratic voters,” a senior administration official told ABC News, reacting to Ratcliffe's statement that Iran’s actions were in part to damage Trump.

Google said spam filters stopped 90% of the emails sent as part of Iran's alleged election interference.

"We and others have seen evidence that an operation linked to Iran sent inauthentic emails to people in the U.S. over the past 24 hours," Google said in a statement overnight. "For Gmail users, our automated spam filters stopped 90% of the approximately 25,000 emails sent. Additionally, this morning we removed one video file on Drive and one video on YouTube with fewer than 30 views, and terminated the associated Google accounts. We referred the matter to the FBI and will continue to work with law enforcement and others in the industry to identify and remove any related content."

Ratcliffe additionally accused Iran of distributing content including a video implying individuals "could cast fraudulent ballots, even from overseas."

"This video and any claims about such allegedly fraudulent ballots are not true," Ratcliffe said. "These actions are desperate attempts by desperate adversaries. Even if the adversaries pursue further attempts to intimidate or attempt to undermine border confidence, know that our election systems are resilient and you can be confident your votes are secure."

MORE: FBI director: 'Russia attempted to interfere in the last election'

FBI Director Christopher Wray separately appeared at the news conference to assure Americans that the bureau will not tolerate attempts at foreign interference in the U.S. election, and would alert the American people when appropriate when it discovers such activity.
"Unverified claims to the contrary should be viewed with a healthy dose of skepticism."

The White House reacted late Wednesday, taking a shot at former President Barack Obama and the president's election opponent in the process.

"Unlike the Obama-Biden Administration, President Trump has and will always put America First," White House press secretary Judd Deere said in a statement. "He has directed the FBI, DOJ, and defense and intel agencies to proactively monitor and thwart any attempts to interfere in US elections, and because of the great work of our law enforcement agencies we have stopped an attempt by America's adversaries to undermine our elections."

PHOTO: The seal of the F.B.I. hangs in the Flag Room at the bureau's headquarters on March 9, 2007, in Washington, D.C. (Chip Somodevilla/Getty Images File)

The announcement followed a joint statement by the Senate Intelligence Committee chairs Marco Rubio and ranking member Mark Warner concerning election security.

"Our adversaries abroad seek to sow chaos and undermine voters' belief in our democratic institutions, including the election systems and infrastructure that we rely on to record and properly report expressions of the voters' will," the statement said. "They may seek to target those systems, or simply leave the impression that they have altered or manipulated those systems, in order to undermine their credibility and our confidence in them."
shows "we are not doing enough to protect our election process."

"Tonight we have learned that foreign entities were able to access voter registration information and send intimidating emails to American voters that were intended to influence how they vote," Cohen said. "The president needs to take this threat seriously, stop spreading Russian disinformation and he needs to tell his allies on Capitol Hill to stop chasing conspiracy theories and instead start focusing on protecting America from foreign attacks."

ABC News' John Santucci and Kirit Radia contributed to this report

Russia, Iran have obtained voter data in election interference campaign; DNI originally appeared on abcnews.go.com
Most Americans trust elections are fair, but sharp divides exist, a new poll finds
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Most Americans trust that elections are fair. But only a third of Republicans agree, a poll finds.

Kaz Fanone for NPR
A majority of Americans trust that elections are fair, are confident in their state and local governments' ability to administer elections, and will trust the results in 2022 and in 2024 regardless of whether their preferred candidate wins, a new NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist poll finds.

The survey also found that most Americans feel that former President Donald Trump has continued to say the 2020 election was rigged mostly because he didn't like the outcome.

But those results are largely because of Democrats and independents.

Many Republicans appear to have bought into Trump's lies about nonexistent widespread fraud in an election he lost.

The story is not simply a divide between the parties but also among those who tend to vote for Republicans. There was a big education gap — between those with college degrees and those without — that emerged in the survey when it came to Republicans and Republican-leaning independents.
Among Republican voters, those with a college degree trust elections more than those without

Share of Republicans and Republican-leaning Independents who agree with these statements, by education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Not college graduates</th>
<th>College graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust that elections are fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: 36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident that your state or local government will conduct a fair and accurate election in 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust that the results of the 2022 congressional elections are accurate if your candidate does not win</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: 57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust that the results of the 2024 presidential election is accurate if your candidate does not win</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: 58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump continues to say the 2020 election was rigged mostly because he is right. There were real cases of fraud that changed the results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: 68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States conducted additional recounts after the 2020 election mostly because there were real cases of fraud in these states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: 74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74% 74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist poll of 1,209 U.S. adults conducted Oct. 18-22. The margin of error for the 413 Republicans and Republican-leaning Independents sampled is 6.8 percentage points.
Credit: Alyson Hurt and Rina Torchinsky/NPR

The poll also found President Biden not faring well. His approval rating is down to 44%, with almost half disapproving. And among Democratic voters, there is little confidence in him as the standard-bearer once again in 2024.
Just over a third of Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents said they thought the party has a better chance of winning the presidency in 2024 with Biden on the ballot again as opposed to someone else. Forty-four percent said someone else would be better, and 20% weren’t sure.

This survey of 1,209 adults was conducted nationally from Oct. 18 to 22 and has a margin of error of 4 percentage points, meaning results could be 4 points lower or 4 points higher. Of those surveyed, 1,032 are registered voters. When they are referenced, there is a margin of error of 4.3 percentage points.

**Most trust that elections are fair**

Overall, 58% said they trust elections in the country either a great deal or a good amount.

But while almost 9 in 10 Democrats and 60% of independents said so, just a third of Republicans agreed.

There were also big gaps by education. There’s a 19-point gap between college-educated and non-college-educated on the question, and an even wider chasm among whites with and without college degrees.
Seventy-two percent of whites with degrees said they had trust in elections, while less than half of non-college-educated whites said they did.

Most Americans say they’ll trust the 2024 election, regardless of who wins. But not Republicans

Share of respondents who say they will trust the results of the 2024 elections, even if the candidate they support loses. Shaded areas of the bars are within the margin of error.

Source: NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist poll of 1,209 U.S. adults conducted between Oct. 18 and Oct. 22. The margin of error for the overall sample is 4.0 percentage points. The margin of error for the 315 Democrats sampled is 7.8 percentage points. The margin of error for the 271 Republicans sampled is 8.4 percentage points. The margin of error for the 405 independents sampled is 6.9 percentage points.

Credit: Daniel Wood and Rina Torchinsky/NPR

Confident local governments will conduct accurate elections in 2022

There was more trust in state and local governments than the electoral process overall — even though all elections in this country are conducted at the local level.

Seventy percent said they are either confident or very confident in their state and local governments to conduct elections fairly and accurately in 2022 — and that mostly cuts across party lines. That included 60% of Republicans.

A similar margin of adults overall said they would trust the results if their candidate for Congress does not win in 2022, including a slight majority of Republicans (53%).

Republicans, though, did seem affected by Trump's messaging, because 60% said they have less confidence that their state and local governments will conduct the elections fairly and accurately since the 2020 presidential election.
Sour grapes

Democrats and independents mostly see Republican griping about voter fraud as sour grapes.

When asked about states' efforts to conduct additional recounts of the 2020 presidential election results, 53% overall said those took place mostly because state officials didn't like the outcome.

Democrats (84%) and a majority of independents (56%) believed this to be the case, but a whopping three-quarters of Republicans said those extra counts happened mostly because there are real cases of fraud in these states.

When it came to Trump, there was even wider agreement with Democrats and independents that he's making false claims about the election being rigged mostly because he didn't like his loss.

Among Democrats, it was almost unanimous — 96% — while 69% of independents also said so. But when it came to Republicans, it was whiplash. Three-quarters again said it was mostly because he is right that there were real cases of fraud that changed the results.

No matter how many times it's said that that is flatly untrue, the overwhelming majority of Republicans say they simply don't believe it. It's a lie that Trump continues to push and is amplified by the conservative media echo chamber.

Looking more closely at the Republican education gap

On a host of questions, a very wide education gap emerges among Republicans and Republican-leaning independents, the kinds of people who essentially make up the universe of those who vote for GOP candidates.
On trusting if elections are fair, there is a 19-point divide between those with degrees and those without. About half of those with them say they trust elections, while less than 3 in 10 without degrees said so.

On trusting their local governments to conduct elections fairly and accurately, those with degrees were 12 points more likely to say they do trust them; on whether they will trust results, win or lose in 2022, those with degrees were 18 points more likely to say so; and there was a similar 17-point divide on whether they will trust the 2024 results even if their preferred candidate loses.

On state recounts, there was no difference — 74% said they took place mostly because of real cases of fraud in those states. But when it came to Trump’s claims, those without degrees were 10 points more likely to believe him.

**Not much confidence in Biden or Trump as nominees**

A glaring finding in the survey for Biden is that just 36% of Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents thought they would have a better chance in 2024 with Biden on the ballot as opposed to someone else (44%).

Nonwhites were 10 points more likely to say Democrats have a better chance of winning with Biden than without him — but even they were split with 43% saying so and 43% saying someone else would be better.

That is not a good starting place for a president who might seek reelection.
When it comes to 2022, Democrats have a 3-point edge, 44% to 41%, on who Americans would rather see in charge of Congress. But that is down from an 8-point advantage in September.

Trump starts in a better position than Biden with his base, but it's still not an overwhelming vote of confidence for a former president with as much sway as he appears to have with GOP elected officials.

Just half of Republicans and Republican-leaning independents said they'd be better off with Trump as their nominee than with someone else (35%).

But here there was also a major divide between those with college degrees and those without. While 58% of those who don't have a college degree said they would have a better chance with Trump, just 41% of those with degrees said so.

2021 voting series