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Chapter 160: Felons Who Violate “Public Trust” Banned from Elected Office

Kevin Heitz

Code Section Affected

Elections Code § 20 (new).
AB 2410 (Fuentes); 2012 STAT. Ch. 160.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 2012, voters in California’s 39th Assembly District were stuck between a rock and a hard place as they chose between Los Angeles City Council Member Richard Alarcon and Raul Bocanegra. At the time of the election, Alarcon was facing eighteen felony charges, including voter fraud, perjury, and living outside of his district. Bocanegra, for his part, had been accused—by Alarcon—of engaging in insider trading to obtain an interest-free city loan to buy a condominium. Meanwhile, six legislators with recent arrest records were campaigning for reelection in California. For example, Senator Rodrick Wright faced eight felonies, including perjury and voter fraud.

Although none of the aforementioned candidates had yet been convicted of the crimes charged, each was potentially guilty of violating public confidence. To ensure that persons like Alarcon and Wright would be ineligible to hold a public office in the state if convicted of certain felony charges, California State

---

5. Id.
6. See Press Release, Felipe Fuentes, Cal. State Assembly Member, Bill Banning Elected Officials Convicted of a Felony for Running for Office Passes State Assembly Unanimously (May 17, 2012) [hereinafter Press Release, Fuentes State Assembly] (on file with the McGeorge Law Review) ("[P]ublic officials have been accused or convicted of misusing their authority and violating the public’s trust.")
Assembly Member Felipe Fuentes introduced Chapter 160, known as the Elective Office Felony Conviction Law, passed in the state legislature nearly unanimously (65–1), and the governor signed the bill into law on July 23, 2012.

II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

This section begins with an examination of federal law regarding persons who are eligible to hold elected office. Part B discusses existing California law and the numerous restrictions on holding public office in California.

A. Federal Law

Pursuant to the United States Constitution, any person who satisfies an enumerated age, citizenship, and residency requirements may hold federal elected office. For example, any person who is at least thirty years old, who has been a citizen of the United States for nine years, and who is an inhabitant of the state in which he or she is running can run for the Senate. Existing federal law disqualifies persons who commit certain offenses—such as treason and bribery of public officials—from holding federal public office. Furthermore, the Senate and House of Representatives can vote out members for “disorderly [b]ehaviour.” States cannot supplant the Constitution’s qualifications for

7. Id.
10. CAL. ELEC. CODE § 20 (enacted by Chapter 160).
11. See infra notes 23–27 and accompanying text (discussing certain restrictions on holding public office in California).
12. See U.S. CONST. art. I, §§ 2–3 (providing the eligibility requirements for the House of Representatives and Senate).
13. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3; see also id. art. I, § 2 (setting requirements for the U.S. House: individuals must be twenty-five years of age, a U.S. citizen for seven years, and an inhabitant of the state when elected); id. art. II, § 1 (stating that any “natural born [c]itizen” who reaches thirty-five years of age and has been a resident of the United States for fourteen years can run for President).
14. See 18 U.S.C. § 2381 (2006) (“Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason . . . and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.”) (emphasis added); id. § 201(b) (“Whoever [bribes] any public official . . . shall be fined . . . or imprisoned . . . , or both, and may be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.”) (emphasis added).
15. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 5; see also In re Chapman, 166 U.S. 661, 669–70 (1897) (explaining that Congress’s right to expel a member “extends to all cases where the offence is such as in the judgment of the Senate is inconsistent with the trust and duty of a member”). In more than two-hundred years, Congress rarely has used its power to expel members. Ellen Sorokin, In Congress’ 213-Year History, Expulsion ‘Exceedingly Rare’, WASH. TIMES, July 25, 2002, at A10. In 2002, Representative James Traficant, Jr., became just the fifth
eligibility to run for federal office; if a person meets the Constitution’s age, citizenship, and habitability requirements for public office, state law cannot disqualify that person from holding federal office.\textsuperscript{16} Therefore, all state-level restrictions apply only to persons seeking state or local office.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{B. Existing California Law}

The California Elections Code generally governs the procedures and regulations of elections in the state, including who can vote\textsuperscript{18} and who is eligible to be on the ballot.\textsuperscript{19} The California Constitution provides that a person convicted of bribery involving an election or appointment cannot hold elected office.\textsuperscript{20} It also directs the legislature to create laws that “exclude persons convicted of bribery, perjury, forgery, malfeasance in office, or other high crimes from office . . . .”\textsuperscript{21} Because that provision is not self-executing,\textsuperscript{22} the legislature enacted restrictions on holding office.\textsuperscript{23} For example, a person convicted of bribing an executive officer to influence his or her actions cannot hold elected office in California.\textsuperscript{24} The California Constitution allows for the removal of public officials for “misconduct in office,”\textsuperscript{25} and various laws revoke a state official’s right to run for office based on crimes committed against public power,\textsuperscript{26} such as the crime of taking any gratuity or reward in exchange for appointing another person to public office.\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{itemize}
  \item member of the House to get expelled following his convictions of bribery, racketeering, and tax evasion. \textit{Id.} The Senate has expelled fifteen members, with fourteen of those senators thrown out of office for supporting the Confederacy in the Civil War. \textit{Id.} The only other senator kicked out of office was Senator William Blount in 1797, when he was expelled for treason. \textit{Id.}
  \item \textsuperscript{16} See \textsc{Jack Maskell, Cong. Research Serv., RL 31532, Congressional Candidacy, Incarceration, and the Constitution’s Inhabitancy Qualification} 3 (2002) (“Once a person meets the three constitutional qualifications . . . that person, if duly elected, is constitutionally ‘qualified’ to serve in Congress . . . .”).
  \item \textsuperscript{17} \textit{Id.}
  \item \textsuperscript{18} \textsc{cal. Elec. Code} § 2101 (West 2003).
  \item \textsuperscript{19} \textit{Id.} § 201.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} \textsc{cal. Const. art. VII, § 8.}
  \item \textsuperscript{21} \textit{Id.}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} See \textsc{Taylor v. Madigan}, 53 \textsc{cal. App. 3d} 943, 951, 126 \textsc{Cal. Rptr.} 376, 381 (1st Dist. 1975) (“A constitutional provision contemplating and requiring legislation is not self-executing.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{23} See \textsc{cal. Gov’t Code} § 1021 (West 2010) (“A person is disqualified from holding any office upon conviction of designated crimes as specified in the Constitution and laws of the State.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{24} See \textsc{cal. Penal Code} § 67 (West 1999) (disqualifying any person who gives or offers a bribe to influence an executive officer from holding any California office); see also \textit{id.} § 165 (disqualifying any person convicted of bribing “any member of any common council, board of supervisors, or board of trustees” from holding office).
  \item \textsuperscript{25} \textsc{cal. Const. art. IV, § 18(b); see also Morton v. Broderick}, 118 \textsc{cal. 474, 482–83, 50 P. 644, 646 (1897)} (“[T]he legislature may provide that an act of misfeasance, nonfeasance, or malfeasance—in short, any dereliction in official duty—may work a forfeiture of office, yet that act need not necessarily be a crime.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{26} \textsc{Penal § 88; see also Gov’t § 9055} (West 2005) (“Every member of the Legislature convicted of any crime defined in this article . . . forfeits his office and is forever disqualified from holding any office in the
California’s courts recognize that a person’s right to participate in politics “is a fundamental principle of a democratic society” and that disqualifying persons from holding public office is a “significant civil disability.” However, the state’s interest in promoting confidence in its elected officials takes precedence over a person’s right to hold office. For example, in 

III. Chapter 160

Chapter 160 adds Section 20 to the California Elections Code. Chapter 160 establishes certain felonies as violations of public trust and bars those convicted of such felonies from running for public office. Felonies that violate the public trust are bribery, embezzlement, “extortion[,] or theft of public money, perjury, or conspiracy to commit any of those crimes.” Under Chapter 160, unless a “public trust” felon obtains an official pardon, he or she cannot run for elected office. Further, Chapter 160 does not limit the felony convictions to those prosecuted in California, but includes convictions from another state or country, of any crime that would be one of the listed felonies if committed in California.

IV. Analysis

Chapter 160 expands the existing limitations on candidate eligibility. The goal is to ensure that candidates for state and local offices are “honorable,
upstanding" individuals. However, there is no ban on felons holding federal office. Chapter 160, therefore, only pertains to elected officials in the state of California.

A. Chapter 160 Passes Constitutional Muster

Chapter 160 is unique in that it can disqualify a person from holding office based on felonies committed prior to serving in public office, but its limitations are reasonable, and most importantly, constitutional. The United States Supreme Court has held that it is constitutional for states to impose reasonable, non-discriminatory limitations on who is eligible to run for office. For example, in Anderson v. Celebrezze, the Court explained that not all eligibility restrictions “impose constitutionally suspect burdens,” and that there is no “litmus-paper test” to resolve constitutional challenges to a state’s election laws. In separating valid from invalid restrictions, a court considers whether the state’s interest in imposing a restriction is such that it is “necessary to burden the plaintiff’s rights.” In Lubin v. Wilson, the California Fourth District Court of Appeal held that a disqualification from office pending appeal of felony convictions does not violate a person’s right to hold public office because the state had a compelling interest in safeguarding confidence in government. If challenged, Chapter 160’s ban on public-trust felons holding office will likely be seen as furthering the state’s compelling interest in ensuring the general public’s confidence in the government it elects.

B. California Joins Growing Trend

By passing Chapter 160, California joins a growing trend barring felons from holding office beyond their incarceration period, with a number of states taking a
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similar path to protect the public trust.\textsuperscript{48} For example, recently West Virginia State Senator Corey Palumbo wanted to keep felons off the ballots in response to a former sheriff’s campaign for the same office after spending a year in prison for buying votes in every election for fourteen years.\textsuperscript{49} In 2010, Michigan voters approved an amendment to the state’s constitution disqualifying certain felons from holding public office.\textsuperscript{50} And in 2012, South Carolina considered a bill that would extend that state’s ban on felons holding office from fifteen years to a lifetime.\textsuperscript{51} Five states forever deny convicted felons the right to hold office, regardless of whether there is a restoration of other civil rights.\textsuperscript{52} More than a dozen states restore the right to hold office at the same time the right to vote is restored,\textsuperscript{53} and a handful of states take the federal approach and allow convicted felons to run for office.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{C. Is Chapter 160 Needed?}

Chapter 160 may be more about “send[ing] a clear message” than solving an existing problem.\textsuperscript{55} According to Assembly Member Fuentes, Chapter 160 is meant to create accountability while ensuring that only those worthy of holding public office will have the right to represent Californians.\textsuperscript{56} For example, if either Wright or Alarcon were convicted of the felony charges facing them in 2012,\textsuperscript{57} they would be disqualified from holding office under Chapter 160.\textsuperscript{58} However,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49} Editorial, Our Views: The State Must Ban Felons as Candidates One of Crime’s Consequences Should Be a Loss of Rights, CHARLESTON GAZETTE & DAILY MAIL, May 22, 2012, at 4A.
\item \textsuperscript{50} M.L. Elrick et al., Ban on Felons in Office Passes, DETROIT FREE PRESS (Nov. 3, 2010), http://www.freep.com/article/20101103/NEWS01/11030516/Ban-felons-office-passes (on file with the McGeorge Law Review).
\item \textsuperscript{52} Steinacker, supra note 42, at 807.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Id. at 806.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Id. at 804; see also Christopher Keating, Former Prisoner Ernie Newton Wins Democratic Endorsement, HARTFORD COURANT (May 21, 2012), http://www.courant.com/news/connecticut/hc-newton-wins-0521-20120521,0,18320.story (on file with the McGeorge Law Review) (reporting that former Connecticut state Senator Ernie Newton won the Democratic endorsement for his old post just two years removed from serving time in federal prison on corruption and bribery charges).
\item \textsuperscript{55} Press Release, Fuentes State Assembly, supra note 6.
\item \textsuperscript{56} ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND REDISTRICTING, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 2410, at 3–4 (May 1, 2012).
\item \textsuperscript{57} 6 Calif. Candidates’ Records Show Arrests, supra note 4.
\item \textsuperscript{58} CAL. ELEC. CODE § 20 (enacted by Chapter 160).
\end{itemize}
there is little evidence that felons are being elected to public office in the state.\textsuperscript{59} The Assembly Committee on Elections and Redistricting also noted that there is no information showing that “convicted felons are being elected to office in California.”\textsuperscript{60}

V. CONCLUSION

Under Chapter 160, individuals convicted of certain felonies are banned from holding any public office in the state of California.\textsuperscript{61} Despite a lack of evidence that public-trust felons have been elected in the state, Assembly Member Fuentes, Chapter 160’s author, hopes that the law will promote accountability and foster confidence in elected officials by guaranteeing that violators of the public’s trust are not allowed to represent the citizens of California.\textsuperscript{62} Chapter 160 constitutionally expands restrictions on eligibility for elected office to those convicted of certain felonies deemed as violations of public trust.\textsuperscript{63} With the passage of Chapter 160, individuals convicted of the felonies of bribery, embezzlement of public money, extortion of public money, theft of public money, or perjury, are forever ineligible to run for public office in California.\textsuperscript{64}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{59} Id. at 7.
\bibitem{60} ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND REDISTRICTING, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 2410, at 7 (May 1, 2012).
\bibitem{61} ELEC. § 20 (enacted by Chapter 160).
\bibitem{62} See Press Release, Fuentes State Assembly, supra note 6 (“People who have already demonstrated they are not worthy of the public’s trust should suffer more severe consequences.”).
\bibitem{63} ELEC. § 20 (enacted by Chapter 160).
\bibitem{64} Id.
\end{thebibliography}
Chapter 497: A Vote for Greater Participation in Elections

Danielle Lenth

Code Sections Affected
Elections Code §§ 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173 (new), §§ 14310, 18001 (amended).
AB 1436 (Feuer); 2012 STAT. Ch. 497.

I. INTRODUCTION

America, while lauded as the melting pot society, failed to provide fair and equal access to its voting polls for centuries.1 Despite the immense efforts of millions of U.S. citizens to secure this right for all, modern voter turnout is often less than half of the eligible population in non-presidential elections and near fifty percent in presidential elections.2 One proposed solution for encouraging civic participation is same day voter registration (SDR).3 Most states provide a deadline for voter registration that is several days before an election; in California, the date is fifteen days before an election day.4 Chapter 497 introduces SDR in California, which allows voters to register and cast a ballot within fifteen days of an election and even on an election day itself.5 Referring to participation in elections as “the bedrock of our representative democracy,” Assembly Member Mike Feuer introduced the legislation as a means for increasing voter participation in the state.6 Studies suggest Chapter 497 will specifically help those who have moved recently, as well as young people and minority groups who are often underrepresented in voting.7

---

1. See generally LAUGHLIN MCDONALD, AMERICAN INDIANS AND THE FIGHT FOR EQUAL VOTING RIGHTS (2010) (highlighting the discrimination American Indians have experienced in fighting for voting rights); see also ELEANOR FLEXNER & ELLEN FRANCIS FITZPATRICK, CENTURY OF STRUGGLE: WOMAN’S RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ix (1996) (declaring that “[f]or more than a century, millions waged an exhausting battle to secure” the right to vote for women); RICHARD M. VALELLY, THE TWO RECONSTRUCTIONS: THE STRUGGLE FOR BLACK ENFRANCHISEMENT (2004) (relaying the hardships African-Americans have faced in voting).


4. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 3 (June 19, 2012).

5. CAL. ELEC. CODE § 2170(a) (enacted by Chapter 497).

6. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 3 (June 19, 2012).

II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

The Federal and California Constitutions, as well as the California Elections Code, grant the right to vote to California residents who are U.S. citizens eighteen years of age or older. Every person must file an affidavit of registration to become an eligible voter. Elections officials accept affidavits of registration up to fifteen days before the day of an election. This includes mailed affidavits, online affidavits, and affidavits filed with a designated voter registration agency, such as the Department of Motor Vehicles, at least fifteen days before the election.

The Elections Code also addresses conflicts that may arise over voter registration. When the registration records cannot verify a voter’s qualifications, that person has the right to cast a provisional ballot. The elections official only counts this ballot after determining from the election office’s records that the person does in fact have the right to vote within the official canvas period. Alternatively, the superior court of the county may order the election official to count the ballot. The Elections Code requires the Secretary of State to grant
provisional voters free access to a system informing them whether their votes were counted and, if not, the reason for this preclusion. In addition to provisions regarding disputes over voter registration, the Elections Code defines the punishment for voter fraud convictions. It orders a maximum fine of $1,000 for misdemeanors and $10,000 and a jail or prison sentence for felony convictions.

III. CHAPTER 497

For all people qualified to vote under the Elections Code and the California and Federal Constitutions, Chapter 497 permits properly filed conditional voter registration within the fifteen days before or on an election day. These registrants’ ballots remain conditional until the elections official can validate the registrant’s information within the canvassing period. This requires identity verification by the database of either the California Department of Motor Vehicles or the federal Social Security Administration.

Chapter 497 outlines the additional duties that this registration places upon elections officials. First, the elections official must offer conditional voter registration at “all permanent offices of the county elections official in the county” and inform provisional voters that their ballots’ inclusion is contingent upon verification of the registration form. The elections official must then

19. Id. § 14310(d).
20. See generally id. § 18001 (ordering and defining the punishment for voter fraud).
21. Id. § 18001. Voter fraud encompasses fraudulently voting or attempting to vote when one is not entitled to, voting, or attempting to vote more than once, or impersonating or attempting to impersonate another voter. Id. § 18560.
22. Id. § 2170(b) (enacted by Chapter 497).
23. This registration must provide all the information required for an affidavit under Article 4 of the Code, beginning with section 2150. Id. § 2171(a) (enacted by Chapter 497).
24. Id. § 2170(a) (enacted by Chapter 497). It necessarily expands section 2107 (allowing for registration on or before the fifteenth day prior to an election). Id. § 2107 (amended by Chapter 497). It also adds to section 14310 (allowing for provisional voting when voter information cannot be immediately verified) by including provisional ballots “cast and included in the canvass” pursuant to Chapter 497. Id. § 14310(c)(2)(A)(ii) (amended by Chapter 497).
25. Id. § 2170(a) (enacted by Chapter 497). In California, the canvassing period is thirty-one days. Press Release, Debra Bowen, Cal. Sec’y of State, When are Election Results Final? Post-Election Canvass Under Way in California Counties (June 6, 2012) (on file with the McGeorge Law Review).
26. ELEC. § 2170(c)(1) (enacted by Chapter 497). Elections officials waive this latter criterion if the voter is otherwise eligible. In such cases, the State assigns the registrant a “unique identification number pursuant to Section 2150 and the conditional voter registration shall be deemed effective.” Id. § 2170(c)(2) (enacted by Chapter 497).
27. Id. § 2170(d) (enacted by Chapter 497).
28. Id. § 2170(d)(1) (enacted by Chapter 497). The official may also provide this service at Election Day voting polls beyond the permanent election offices. Id. § 2170(e) (enacted by Chapter 497).
29. Id. § 2170(d)(2) (enacted by Chapter 497).
establish the veracity of the registration affidavit;\textsuperscript{30} once this is determined, the official must include the ballot in the official counting.\textsuperscript{31}

Chapter 497 increases the maximum permissible fine for felony convictions of voter fraud from $10,000 to $25,000.\textsuperscript{32} If Chapter 497’s new voting policies result in state-mandated costs, the local agencies and school districts will be recompensed under the Government Code.\textsuperscript{33} The legislation will not take effect until “January 1 of the year following the year in which the Secretary of State certifies that the state has a statewide voter registration database.”\textsuperscript{34}

IV. ANALYSIS

Research suggests that Chapter 497, by enabling SDR, will lead to positive increases in voter turnout.\textsuperscript{35} The actual implementation of SDR is not without its difficulties, however, and critics argue increased civic participation will come at the cost of election integrity.\textsuperscript{36} While on the surface this debate is about cost and voter fraud, the dispute over Chapter 497 is rooted in the same partisan division that characterizes recent voter laws across the country.\textsuperscript{37}

A. Achieving Greater Voter Turnout

The bill author implemented Chapter 497 to increase voter participation in California elections.\textsuperscript{38} Despite being hailed one of the most basic and most

\textsuperscript{30} Id. § 2170(d)(4) (enacted by Chapter 497).

\textsuperscript{31} Id. § 2170(d)(5) (enacted by Chapter 497). If a voter has multiple registrations as a result of conditional voter registration, the elections official must cancel the extra registrations. Id. § 2172 (enacted by Chapter 497). This must be done in accordance with Chapter 3 of the California Elections Code. Id. § 2172(a) (enacted by Chapter 497). This generally requires the elections official to write or stamp the word “canceled” on the canceled affidavit and the date that this cancellation occurred; the official must then remove the affidavit from the valid affidavits file. Id. § 2203 (West 2003).

\textsuperscript{32} Id. § 18001 (amended by Chapter 497).

\textsuperscript{33} 2012 Cal. Stat. ch. 497, § 5. Specifically, the agencies will be reimbursed under Part 7 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code. Id.

\textsuperscript{34} Id. § 6. This database, which will be called VoteCal, must comply with the Help America Vote Act of 2002. Id.; Debra Bowen, VoteCal Project Goals and Objectives, CAL. SEC’Y OF ST. (2012), http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/votecal/goals-objectives.htm (on file with the McGeorge Law Review).

\textsuperscript{35} HEARING ON SB 641 BEFORE THE CAL. ST. ASSEMBLY COMM. ON ELECTIONS & REDISTRICTING, supra note 7, at 5.


\textsuperscript{37} See Senate Floor Vote of AB 1436, Unofficial Ballot (Aug. 23, 2012), http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab_1401-1450/ab_1436_vote_20120823_1212PM_sen_floor.html (on file with the McGeorge Law Review); Assembly Floor Vote of AB 1436, Unofficial Ballot (August 27, 2012), http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab_1401-1450/ab_1436_vote_20120827_0637PM_asm_floor.html (on file with the McGeorge Law Review) (evidencing that the final floor votes for both houses of the legislature fell almost entirely along party lines with Democrats voting in favor of the legislation and Republicans against it).

\textsuperscript{38} See SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE
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important democratic functions, voting excitement generally “kicks in” only “two weeks before Election Day,” at which point it is too late for unregistered voters to participate in the election. Studies demonstrate that of the nine states and the District of Columbia that have SDR, eight of them have higher voter turnout than California. For example, in the 2008 presidential election, only 44.1% of the eligible voting population cast ballots, while in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota—which all have SDR—the respective rates were 50.0%, 52.1%, 55.4%. Cumulatively, SDR enabled 1.5 million Americans to vote in the 2008 election.

A study projecting the effects of SDR legislation in California found overall voter turnout would increase by 4.8 percent with even greater increases for young people ages eighteen to twenty-five, people who have moved in the last six months, Latinos, and recently naturalized citizens. These statistics align with Assembly Member Feuer’s goal of “engaging some of the more disadvantaged communities and students.” SDR also results in a significantly reduced need for provisional ballots. Election officials and voters both benefit because officials

ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 3 (June 19, 2012) (quoting the bill author stating voter participation “has fallen to troubling levels” in California, and that Chapter 497 will “promote increased participation”).

39. See Telephone Interview with Andrew-Brian Nguyen, Legislative Aide for Cal. State Assembly Member, Mike Feuer (June 27, 2012) [hereinafter Nguyen Interview] (notes on file with the McGeorge Law Review).


42. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 4 (June 19, 2012). SDR states have higher turnout nationwide as well. HEARING ON SB 641 BEFORE THE CAL. ST. ASSEMBLY COMM. ON ELECTIONS & REDISTRICTING, supra note 7, at 5. “Same Day Registration states have historically achieved turnout rates that are on average 10 to 12 percentage points higher than non-SDR states.” Id.

43. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 4 (June 19, 2012).” Id.

44. HEARING ON SB 641 BEFORE THE CAL. ST. ASSEMBLY COMM. ON ELECTIONS & REDISTRICTING, supra note 7, at 5.

45. Id. at 2.

46. Nguyen Interview, supra note 39. The University of California Student Association is a listed supporter of the legislation. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 7 (June 19, 2012). The President of the Student Association has referred to the bill as a “boon to college students.” Tim Herdt, Same-Day Voter Registration Bill Moves Forward in Legislature, VCSTAR.COM (June 19, 2012), http://www.vcstar.com/news/2012/jun/19/same-day-voter-registration-bill-moves-forward/ (on file with the McGeorge Law Review).

47. HEARING ON SB 641 BEFORE THE CAL. ST. ASSEMBLY COMM. ON ELECTIONS & REDISTRICTING, supra note 7, at 5.
do not need to spend time attempting to match the information on provisional voter affidavits, and voters do not need to worry that their affidavits will be rejected.\textsuperscript{48} Instead, the voter can simply “complete a new voter registration application on Election Day, and vote a regular ballot.”\textsuperscript{49} The ballot remains “conditional” until verified by the mandatory database, VoteCal; however, the new database will be equipped with many features enabling efficient verification.\textsuperscript{50} Statistics gathered from Iowa and North Carolina in 2008, the first major election implementing SDR for both states, demonstrate both increased voter turnout and decreased use of provisional ballots.\textsuperscript{51}

B. Heading to the Polls: Putting Chapter 497 into Effect

Chapter 497 will not become effective until “January 1 of the year following the year in which the Secretary of State certifies” VoteCal.\textsuperscript{52} The legislature included this provision to counteract concerns about voter fraud.\textsuperscript{53} The Secretary of State awarded the VoteCal contract to CGI Technologies and Solutions Inc. on March 6, 2013.\textsuperscript{54} Chapter 497 supporters foresee ballot initiatives to raise state revenue—which aim to foster a more positive financial footing for the California Budget—rendering the projected $300,000 implementation cost much less of a concern.\textsuperscript{55} Moreover, the legislation provides for “reimbursement to local agencies and school districts” for costs associated with implementing SDR.\textsuperscript{56} While those concerned with the overspending of taxpayer money argue these costs and their subsequent state reimbursement are problematic,\textsuperscript{57} SDR has not led to undue cost burdens in other states.\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{48} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Id. at 3.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Nguyen Interview, supra note 39. For example, unlike the previous database, VoteCal will maintain a statewide official voter registration list. Bowen, supra note 25. It will also provide voters with online access to their voter registration status and allow them to update and even register to vote on this website. Id.
\item \textsuperscript{51} HEARING ON SB 641 BEFORE THE CAL. ST. ASSEMBLY COMM. ON ELECTIONS & REDISTRICTING, supra note 7, at 5.
\item \textsuperscript{52} 2012 Cal. Stat. ch. 497, § 5; Nguyen Interview, supra note 39.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Nguyen Interview, supra note 39
\item \textsuperscript{55} Nguyen Interview, supra note 39.
\item \textsuperscript{56} 2012 Cal. Stat. ch. 497, § 5.
\item \textsuperscript{57} See Nguyen Interview, supra note 39 (noting that the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association is opposed to the bill because it will cost taxpayers money).
\item \textsuperscript{58} HEARING ON SB 641 BEFORE THE CAL. ST. ASSEMBLY COMM. ON ELECTIONS & REDISTRICTING, supra note 7, at 5. For example, Demos conducted a survey of local election officials in Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, where the majority responded that cost increases in their state was “minimal,” and that the process does not add additional work or costs “but instead shifted the cost burden from one time and place to another.” Id.
\end{itemize}
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The logistics of SDR may cast a shadow on its positive potential. The California Association of Clerks and Election Officials notes its concern that elections officials will be unable to manage the influx of voters immediately before and on Election Day. In a Senate Hearing, Assembly Member Feuer illustrated this issue using the high-density county of Los Angeles. Only “one-half of one percent of the eligible voters in the county” seeking to register and vote in the county elections office on Election Day would equal thirty-thousand people. The Committee noted that having adequate “voting equipment, personnel, and ballots to handle the crowds on Election Day could pose a significant challenge for many counties.” Specifically, long lines resulting from extra steps in the voting process are a concern for larger counties. However, while long lines are not the ideal situation for either election officials or the busy voting citizenry, past difficulties, such as court closures, have resulted in extremely long lines (in the thousands), which were manageable.

Beyond logistical complications, critics also focus on the perceived heightened potential for voter fraud. In response, Assembly Member Feuer argues that much of the fear surrounding Chapter 497 results more from the fact that SDR “has not been tested yet” in California than from any real potential for fraud. Safeguards in Chapter 497, such as the VoteCal requirement, exist to counteract fraud. Moreover, the reality of voter fraud itself is questionable; research in other SDR states indicates that SDR does not cause voter fraud. For example, a Columbia University nationwide study of all SDR states found only one case of voter fraud between 2002 and 2005. The prevalence of such data contradicting the theory of voter fraud, in conjunction with the fact that no

59. See SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 4 (June 19, 2012) (noting that SDR “raises a number of issues that the committee may wish to consider”).
60. Letter from Linda Tulett, Correspondence Sec’y of the Cal. Ass’n of Clerks and Election Officials, to Mike Feuer, Assembly Member, Cal. State Assembly (June 28, 2012) (on file with the McGeorge Law Review).
61. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF AB 1436, at 4 (June 19, 2012).
62. Id.
63. Id.
64. Id.
65. Nguyen Interview, supra note 39.
66. See Upcoming Legislation, HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASS’N (July 8, 2011), http://www.hjta.org/upcoming-legislation (on file with the McGeorge Law Review) (referring to same day voter registration’s potential to “increase fraud”).
67. Nguyen Interview, supra note 39.
70. Id.
contrary evidence is given to support claims of increased voter fraud from SDR, garners the conclusion that some other purpose for opposing SDR may exist.\footnote{71}

Across the country during the contentious 2012 presidential election year, recent Republican-backed voting legislation, such as laws requiring photo identification to vote, has resulted in criticisms that the Republican authors of such legislation are using voter fraud as a front for impeding poll access to disadvantaged groups, such as minorities, because said groups typically vote for Democratic candidates.\footnote{72} Republicans respond that most requirements are not “particularly burdensome” in today’s world and point to a published report of election crimes in the last twelve years to justify these laws.\footnote{73}

The echoes of these larger political agendas were heard at times during the debate and passing of Chapter 497.\footnote{74} During an Assembly Floor Hearing, Republican Assembly Member Donnelly challenged the legislation as opening up the door to “unprecedented fraud.”\footnote{75} He also stated that the California people want voter identification for registration and for voting, and immediately followed this with “we should be securing this most sacred right.”\footnote{76} Governor Brown voiced the Democratic position of voter suppression upon his signing of Chapter 497, arguing that “[w]hile other states try to restrict voters with new laws that burden the process, California allows voters to register . . . on Election Day.”\footnote{77} The final floor votes in both houses reflected the partisan nature of Chapter 497, with both votes falling almost completely along party lines.\footnote{78} Thus, the fear over voter fraud is backed by nationwide party politics rather than actual statistics.\footnote{79}


\footnote{72. See Sam Stein, Obama Campaign on Voter Suppression Efforts: This Is Why We Have Our Ground Game, HUFFINGTON POST (Aug. 23, 2012), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/23/obama-voter-suppression-ground-game_n_1824563.html (on file with the McGeorge Law Review) (discussing recent Republican legislation limiting ballot access as “controversial measures, which critics have deemed craven efforts at voter suppression”).}

\footnote{73. Keyssar, supra note 71, at 29. In response to this report, election experts have stated that laws requiring voter ID would only prevent impersonation fraud, which is almost nonexistent. Id.}

\footnote{74. Compare Donnelly, supra note 36 (arguing against Chapter 497 because it would lead to voter fraud), with Brown Signs Bill for Same-Day Voter Registration, TAMPA BAY ONLINE (Sept. 24, 2012), http://www2.tbo.com/news/2012/sep/24/brown-signs-bill-for-same-day-voter-registration-ar-511896/ (on file with the McGeorge Law Review) (discussing the democratic position against stricter voter ID requirements).}

\footnote{75. Donnelly, supra note 36.}

\footnote{76. Id.}

\footnote{77. See Brown Signs Bill for Same-Day Voter Registration, supra note 74 (quoting Governor Brown’s written statement and stating that it was an “apparent reference to laws in some states enacting strict voter identification requirements, efforts that opponents say could disenfranchise large segments of the electorate”).}

\footnote{78. Senate Floor Vote of AB 1436, supra note 37; Assembly Floor Vote of AB 1436, supra note 37.}

\footnote{79. Senate Floor Vote of AB 1436, supra note 37; Assembly Floor Vote of AB 1436, supra note 37.}
V. CONCLUSION

The United States has progressed far in its fight for the widespread right to vote.80 However, polling data suggests that the struggle for high civic participation is far from over.81 Chapter 497 hopefully represents a victory in this fight by enabling many unregistered voters, who might otherwise be denied their vote, the possibility to register and vote in an election immediately before and on an election day.82

80. See THE CONCISE PRINCETON ENCYCLOPEDIA OF AMERICAN POLITICAL HISTORY 861 (Michael Kazin ed., 2011) (noting that “something approximating universal suffrage” in the United States “was finally achieved—almost two centuries after the Constitution was adopted”).
81. See National Voter Turnout in Federal Elections: 1960–2010, supra note 2 (listing voter turnout in federal elections from 1960 to 2010 with no percentage equaling more than sixty-three percent of the vote in a presidential election and no more than forty-eight percent in a midterm election).
82. CAL. ELEC. CODE § 2170(a) (enacted by Chapter 497).