



AGENDA

Washington County Board of Elections April 8, 2025

Board Meeting to be held on Tuesday, April 8, 2025 at **3:00PM**. Meeting will be held in person but may also be attended virtually. Call in information is provided below.

Call Meeting to Order/Pledge of Allegiance:

Declaration of Quorum Present:

Record Those Present:

Approval of Draft Agenda:

Executive Session:

The meeting will be closed in accordance with Open Meeting Act Procedures, for the purpose of (10) discuss public security, if the public body determines that public discussion would constitute a risk to the public or to public security, including:

(ii) the development and implementation of emergency plans

Approval of Draft Minutes of March 11, 2025 executive meeting:

Approval of Draft Minutes of March 11, 2025 regular meeting:

Correspondence:

Reports:

- I. Election Director
- II. Attorney

Unfinished Business:

- I. Financial Disclosures
- II. FY26 Budget
- III. Report on MAEO Local Board Committee Meeting

New Business:

- I. SBE Biennial/MAEO Conference

Members Remarks:

Guest Remarks:

Scheduling of Next Meeting:

Distributed Information:

Board Packet

Future Events:

SBE Biennial and MAEO Annual Conference, May 4-8, 2025

Election Worker Night at the Flying Boxcars II, June 6, 2025

Public Participation: Members of the public may address the Board. Pursuant to §3.2B of the Board's bylaws, public participation at a meeting must be pre-scheduled and pre-approved by the President. To request approval to speak at a board meeting, contact Barry Jackson at 240.313.2054 or by Email at barry.jackson@maryland.gov no later than 5 pm the day before the meeting.

Call In Instructions for the Meeting:

Join with Google Meet

meet.google.com/bzw-rpvv-hdv

Dial-in: (US) +1 475-355-7367

PIN: 415 204 656#

Nearly 60% of Marylanders Support Shifting Election Day Voting to Countywide Vote Center


New data from the Washington Post-UMD poll shows strong support for shifting Election Day voting in Maryland from neighborhood polling sites to vote centers that can be used by anyone in that county.



SAM NOVEY
APR 03, 2025



Share



More and more Marylanders are choosing not to vote at neighborhood polling places. In 2024, they did not return to pre-pandemic voting habits.

Over the last 20 years, Marylanders have dramatically shifted the way we vote. In the 2008 general election, over 90% of votes in Maryland were cast at neighborhood polling places on Election Day. As recently as 2016, over 60% of votes in Maryland were cast this way. But more and more Marylanders are taking advantage of early voting and vote-by-mail to vote before Election Day. This trend, already underway before 2020, was dramatically accelerated during the pandemic.

In 2020, Maryland did not open neighborhood polling places on Election Day and instead opened “vote centers” that could serve anyone in the county. In November 2024, we had our first presidential election since the pandemic with neighborhood polling sites open on Election Day in Maryland. And while some Marylanders who immunocompromised or otherwise at particular risk are still avoiding indoor interactions, the vast majority of voters were conducting life as they did pre-pandemic.

But Marylanders did not return to their pre-pandemic voting habits in 2024. Instead, we see clear evidence that the shift away from voting at neighborhood polling sites already underway before the pandemic - is here to stay. Just over 40% of Maryland votes in the 2024 General Election were cast at a neighborhood polling site on Election Day.

In our last Washington Post-UMD poll, we found nearly 60% of Marylanders support shifting

Election Day voting from neighborhood polling places to countywide vote centers.

After seeing how many Marylanders chose not to vote at neighborhood polling places in November, we wanted to learn more about whether this change in behavior is also reflected in public opinion. Across the country, many states conduct elections with neighborhood polling places and instead conduct their election completely by mail with a mix of vote-by-mail and “vote centers” that can be used by anyone in the county. In our January Washington Post-UMD poll of Maryland voters ², we asked the following questions to learn more about whether Marylanders support a policy shift away from neighborhood polling sites.


Here’s what we asked about vote centers:

Currently, early voting sites in Maryland are open to any county registered voter. But those voting on Election Day have to vote at their neighborhood voting location. Would you support or oppose extending the same rules for early voting through Election Day, if that meant a much smaller number of voting locations but with a larger staff at each location? Do you (support/oppose) strongly or somewhat?

Here’s what we asked about vote-by-mail:


Would you support or oppose Maryland limiting in-person voting and instead conducting elections by mailing all voters a ballot which they can mail back or drop off at a county office or drop box. Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

Here’s what we found:




Less than a third of Marylanders supported a shift to the kind of vote-by-mail policy in place in states like Oregon, Washington, California, and Utah. But we found that nearly 60% of Marylanders supported having a smaller number of better staffed vote centers on Election Day that can serve anyone in the county instead of neighborhood polling sites. Even more remarkable to us was the distribution of this support - vote centers receive majority support overall and across nearly all of the individual characteristics considered in our poll.

Black Marylanders are particularly supportive of shift to vote centers.




While a majority of respondents of all racial backgrounds supported a shift to vote centers in our poll, we found Black voters were particularly supportive of this policy change. Nearly 70% of Black Marylanders support this change.

There is bipartisan support for a shift to vote centers. Democrats and Republicans support it at similar rates.




Public opinion about voting policies is increasingly polarized by political party. But that was not the case among Maryland voters regarding a shift to vote centers. Roughly 60% of both Democrats and Republicans support this policy change.

A majority of Marylanders in all regions of the state support shifting from neighborhood pollin places to vote centers on Election Day.



Maryland is blessed with many regions that have different levels of density and distinct political cultures and heritage. Nevertheless, we find majority support for a shift to vote centers in every region of the state with particularly high levels of support in Baltimore City and Prince George's County.

A majority of Marylanders who voted at a neighborhood polling place in 2024 support a shift to vote centers.



One of the most durable findings in political science is that voting is “habitual.” People form habits and rituals around political participation that they stick with over time. So we thought that many Marylanders who voted at a neighborhood polling place in November 2024 might be reluctant to change their habits in the future. But that’s not what we found. Even among Marylanders who currently vote at a neighborhood polling place, nearly 60% support shifting to vote centers.

The upshot? Policy makers face important questions about how to allocate resources and shift policy as Maryland voters change behavior.

The world and the state we love is changing around us every day. And so the future Maryland elections may need to look different from the past. We hope these data can provide valuable insights into the behavior and opinions of Maryland voters so that

can all have a fruitful and constructive conversation about the future of Maryland elections. It's through this kind of informed and forward looking dialogue that we work towards strengthening democracy for all Maryland communities.

Subscribe to receive new posts.

Type your email...	Subscribe
--------------------	-----------

Sam Novey is Chief Strategist at the Center for Democracy and Civic Engagement. Richard Engstrom, Mike Hanmer, and Kennedy Lighty all contributed to this report.

- 1 This chart includes 95% - 98% of all ballots cast in each Presidential General Election in Maryland since 2008. It does not include provisional ballots.
- 2 The survey was fielded January 24-28, 2025, and included 1,002 Marylanders randomly sampled from a voter registration database with 63% reached by cell phone, 16% reached landline, and 21% who completed the survey online via a text message invitation. The toplines and details about the methodology can be found [here](#)

Subscribe to Center for Democracy and Civic Engagement

Launched 2 years ago

Community news, cutting edge research, and provocative new ideas from the Center for Democracy and Engagement at the University of Maryland!

Type your email...	Subscribe
--------------------	-----------

By subscribing, I agree to Substack's [Terms of Use](#), and acknowledge its [Information Collection Notice](#) and [Privacy Policy](#).

Discussion about this post

Comments

Restacks



Write a comment...

Director's Report – April 8, 2025

A. Personnel –

1. County CFO Kelcee Mace presented the revised budget at the Commissioner's Meeting this morning, which included our original request for 3 new full time employees and a 4th Early Voting site.
2. Optimum Healthcare is making us a referral agency for fingerprinting our personnel, which will streamline the process.

B. Meetings:

1. Barry attending the EAC LLC Annual Conference in Charlotte April 21-23rd, then to the Election Center Workshop in Pittsburgh April 23-27th.
2. Director's Meetings:
 - a) Highlights from March 20, 2025 meeting:
 - (1) LBEs should be able to dispose of their 2020 and 2022 records by May.
 - (2) SBE Cybersecurity Director will be scheduling site visits with each LBE to do a security assessment.
 - (3) Five LBEs are 100% complete with their inventory, including Washington County.
 - (4) The new MDCRIS is being rolled out any day now.
 - (5) Proposals for new pollbook solution are due April 16.
 - (6) Drop Box lock reconfiguration demonstration at SBE warehouse on 4/8.
 - b) Next Meeting: TBD, because of Biennial in May.
3. Trainings: N/A

C. Legislative Update: Sine Die was Monday, April 7th at Midnight. See the attached list of bills that have been sent to the Governor.

D. Voter Registration Activities and Statistics:

1. Registration Statistics for March 2025 were distributed to the Board.

E. Candidate Filings: Candidate Filing for 2026 Gubernatorial Election began February 25, 2025. There have been 10 filings so far:

1. 2 for County Commissioner
2. 1 for Clerk of the Circuit Court
3. 1 for Register of Wills
4. 3 for Democratic Central Committee
5. 1 for Sheriff
6. 2 for States Attorney

F. Voting System Activities:

1. Quarterly recharging done.

G. Projects:

1. New Website
2. Combined Citizens Guide/First Time Voters Guide
3. "I Voted" Sticker Contest
4. Election Board Night at Flying Boxcars – June 6, 2025

2025 General Assembly Bills Sent to Governor for Signature

House Bill	Senate Bill	Title	Effective Date
HB0041	SB0267	Petitions for the Formation of a New Political Party - Process	7/1/2025
HB0075	SB0262	Special Elections (County elections)	Emergency
HB0199	SB0257	Notice to Permanent Absentee Voters	7/1/2025
HB0272	SB0236	Maryland Department of Planning - Modernization	10/1/2025
HB0276	SB0260	State Government - Forms - Reporting Requirement - Repeal	7/1/2025
HB0412	SB0337	Local Boards of Elections and Boards of Canvassers - Open Meeting Requirements (Local Boards of Elections Transparency Act)	6/1/2025
HB0426	SB0313	Postelection Tabulation Audits - Risk Limiting Audits	6/1/2025
HB0448	SB0275	Modernization of Military Laws Act	10/1/2025
HB0562	SB0352	Baltimore County - Republican Party Central Committee - Elections	10/1/2025
HB0788	SB0619	Commission on Judicial Disabilities - Temporary Appointment	Constitutional
HB0932	SB0723	Public Ethics - Conflicts of Interest and Blind Trust - Governor	10/1/2025
HB0983	SB0685	Local Boards of Elections - Language-Related Assistance	10/1/2025
HB0235	SB0244	State Government - Information Technology - Cybersecurity Revisions	10/1/2025
HB0274	SB0259	Local Boards of Elections - Election Plan Requirements	7/1/2005
HB0350	SB0319	Operating Budget	7/1/2025
HB0906	SB0633	Campaign Finance - Political Organizations - Disclosures on Solicitations (Stop Scam PACs Act)	7/1/2025
HB0945	SB0645	Gubernatorial Primary Election - Date	10/1/2025
HB0322	SB0088	State Administrator of Elections - Municipal Elections - emergency (Muni elections)	Emergency
HB0839	SB0543	Provisional Ballots - Nonpartisan Board of Education	10/1/2025
	SB0308	Contests aka Partial Ballot Acceptance	10/1/2025
		Chief Election Judges – Party Affiliation	10/1/2025
HB738	SB705	Department of Information Technology - Major Information Technology Development Projects - Oversight	6/1/2025
HB1524	SB1032	Wicomico County Board of Education - Election of Members, Student Member, and Compensation	10/1/2025
HB0586	SB0534	Election Judges - Compensation	10/1/2025
		State Government - Equal Access to Public Services for Individuals With Limited English Proficiency and	
HB1473		Individuals With Disabilities	10/1/2025
HB0500	SB0426	Procurement Reform Act of 2025	10/1/2025

Monthly Statistical Report

Last Transaction Date From: 03/01/2025 To: 03/31/2025

ADDITIONS TO COUNTY REGISTRATION

METHOD	DEM	REP	GRN	WCP	UNA	OTHERS	TOTAL	EXACT	DUPES
ERIC Report	24	11	0	0	26	0	61		0
Motor Vehicle Administration	120	99	3	0	178	5	405		1
NVRA by Mail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		0
Online Voter Registration	3	0	0	0	1	0	4		0
Online Voter Update	1	1	0	0	1	0	3		0
Social Security Administration	1	1	0	0	1	0	3		0
State Designated Agencies	3	0	0	0	2	0	5		1
USPS Sticker	2	1	0	0	2	0	5		3
Volunteers	1	1	0	0	1	0	3		0
TOTAL	156	114	3	0	212	5	490		5

SUBTRACTIONS FROM COUNTY ACTIVE STATUS

REASON	DEM	REP	GRN	WCP	UNA	OTHERS	TOTAL
Confirmation Mail Process-NVRA	66	68	1	0	85	13	233
Death Notice	43	80	0	0	23	2	148
Death Notices Other than DHMH	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Moved Out of State	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Not Eligible	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Returned VNC	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
Voter Request	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Duplicate/Merged	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
County Transfer Out	70	35	0	0	52	5	162
TOTAL	181	190	1	0	162	20	554

AFFILIATION CHANGES

CHANGE	DEM	REP	GRN	WCP	UNA	OTHERS	TOTAL
From	60	27	0	1	29	14	131
To	22	37	1	1	58	12	131
TOTAL	-38	10	1	0	29	-2	0

Monthly Statistical Report

Last Transaction Date From: 03/01/2025 To: 03/31/2025

CURRENT ACTIVE REGISTRATION

ACTIVITY	DEM	REP	GRN	WCP	UNA	OTHERS	TOTAL
BEGINNING OF REPORT	30612	45567	128	92	24602	1706	102707
ADDITIONS (+)	156	114	3	0	212	5	490
REINSTATED (+)	10	11	0	0	15	0	36
CANCELLED (-)	-45	-86	0	0	-25	-2	-158
COUNTY TRANSFER OUT (-)	-70	-35	0	0	-52	-5	-162
AFFILIATION CHANGES (+ OR -)	-38	10	1	0	29	-2	0
* INACTIVATED (-)	-66	-69	-1	0	-85	-13	-234
* REACTIVATED (+)	15	17	1	0	20	3	56
END OF REPORT TOTALS	30574	45529	132	92	24716	1692	102735

Monthly Statistical Report

Last Transaction Date From: 03/01/2025 To: 03/31/2025

INACTIVE REGISTRATION SUBTRACTIONS FROM COUNTY INACTIVE STATUS

REASON	DEM	REP	GRN	WCP	UNA	OTHERS	TOTAL
Confirmation Notice	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Death Notice	3	3	0	0	1	0	7
Motor Vehicle Administration	15	17	0	0	15	2	49
Moved Out of State	4	9	0	0	2	0	15
NVRA by Mail	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Social Services Agencies	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
State Designated Agencies	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Duplicate/Merged	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
County Transfer Out	14	1	0	0	6	1	22
TOTAL	39	30	0	0	28	3	100

CURRENT INACTIVE REGISTRATION

ACTIVITY	DEM	REP	GRN	WCP	UNA	OTHERS	TOTAL
BEGINNING OF REPORT	2194	2325	14	14	2071	177	6795
* INACTIVATED (+)	66	69	1	0	85	13	234
*REACTIVATED (-)	-18	-17	0	0	-19	-2	-56
COUNTY TRANSFER OUT (-)	-14	-1	0	0	-6	-1	-22
AFFILIATION CHANGES (+ OR -)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CANCELLED FROM INACTIVE (-)	-7	-16	0	0	-3	0	-26
PENDING FROM INACTIVE (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL INACTIVE	2221	2360	15	14	2128	187	6925

TOTAL REGISTRATION RECORDS ACTIVE AND INACTIVE REGISTRATION

ACTIVITY	DEM	REP	GRN	WCP	UNA	OTHERS	TOTAL
ACTIVE REGISTRATION	30574	45529	132	92	24716	1692	102735
INACTIVE REGISTRATION	2221	2360	15	14	2128	187	6925
TOTAL RECORDS	32795	47889	147	106	26844	1879	109660

Monthly Statistical Report

Last Transaction Date From: 03/01/2025 To: 03/31/2025

Address Changes Within Jurisdiction	<u>595</u>		
Address Changes Statewide	<u>39239</u>	Confirmation Mailings Sent	<u>304</u>
Name Changes	<u>279</u>	Confirmation Responses	<u>10</u>
Number of current Statewide voter registration application on hand	<u> </u>	Number of NVRA Agency voter registration Applications on hand	<u> </u>
Signature of person who prepared the report	<u> </u>	Date report completed	<u> </u>
Other = Those individuals designating affiliation with a party that is not established under Maryland Law.	<u> </u>	Unaffiliated = those individuals declining to affiliate with a party.	<u> </u>



Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Protects the Integrity of American Elections

RESTORING TRUST IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS: Today, President Donald J. Trump signed an Executive Order to protect the integrity of American elections.

- This Order strengthens voter citizenship verification and bans foreign nationals from interfering in U.S. elections.
 - The Election Assistance Commission will require documentary, government-issued proof of U.S. citizenship on its voter registration forms.
 - Agencies like the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Social Security Administration and Department of State must provide states with access to Federal databases to verify eligibility and citizenship of individuals registering to vote.
 - The Attorney General will prioritize prosecuting non-citizen voting and related crimes, including through use of DHS records and coordination with state attorneys general.
- Federal election-related funds will be conditioned on states complying with the integrity measures set forth by Federal law, including the requirement that states use the national mail voter registration form that will now require proof of citizenship.
- The Order improves the integrity of elections by directing the updating of the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines 2.0 and security standards for voting equipment and prioritizing federal grant funds accordingly.
 - This includes requiring a voter-verifiable paper ballot record and not using ballots in which the counted vote is contained within a barcode or QR code.
- It directs the Attorney General to enter into information-sharing agreements with state election officials to identify cases of election fraud or other election law violations.
 - Non-compliant states may face prioritized Federal enforcement of election integrity laws and loss of funding given their unwillingness to police fraud.
- The Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security shall prevent non-citizens from any involvement in administering elections.
- The Attorney General will fully enforce the voter-list maintenance requirements of the National Voter Registration Act and the Help America Vote Act.
- Given clear Federal law setting a single Election Day deadline, the Attorney General shall take appropriate action against states that count ballots received after Election Day in Federal elections. Federal election funding will be conditioned on compliance.



- The Attorney General will prioritize enforcement of laws prohibiting foreign nationals from contributing to or donating in U.S. elections.
- All agencies must report on compliance with undoing Biden Executive Order 14019, which turned Federal agencies into Democratic voter turnout centers.

SAFEGUARDING THE VOTE: President Trump recognizes that free, fair, and honest elections—unmarred by fraud, errors, or suspicion—are essential to our Constitutional Republic.

- The United States lags behind other nations in enforcing basic and necessary election protections.
 - India and Brazil tie voter identification to a biometric database, while the United States largely relies on self-attestation for citizenship.
 - Germany and Canada require paper ballots when tabulating votes, while the United States has a patchwork of methods that often lack basic chain-of-custody protections.
 - Denmark and Sweden sensibly limit mail-in voting to those unable to vote in person—and late arrivals do not count—while American elections now feature mass voting by mail, even after Election Day.
- Without proper enforcement of Federal laws, illegal voting, discrimination, fraud, and other forms of malfeasance and error dilute the votes of lawful American citizens.
- Federal law establishes a uniform Election Day across the nation for Federal elections, but numerous states fail to comply with those laws by counting ballots received after Election Day.
- The Biden Administration blocked states from removing aliens from voter rolls, while foreign nationals and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) exploited loopholes to pour millions into influencing U.S. elections.

MAKING ELECTIONS SECURE AGAIN: Voters deserve elections they can trust, and that confidence is being restored thanks to President Trump.

- President Trump is following through on his promise to secure our elections.
 - President Trump: “We're going to fix our elections so that our elections are going to be honorable and honest and people leave and they know their vote is counted. We are going to have free and fair elections. And ideally, we go to paper ballots, same-day voting, proof of citizenship, very big, and voter ID, very simple.”



- President Trump: “We will secure our elections, and they will be secure once and for all.”
- Unlike the Biden Administration, which prioritized political agendas over fair elections, President Trump is putting the American people back in charge.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

- - - - -

PRESERVING AND PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF AMERICAN ELECTIONS

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered:

Section 1. Purpose and Policy. Despite pioneering self-government, the United States now fails to enforce basic and necessary election protections employed by modern, developed nations, as well as those still developing. India and Brazil, for example, are tying voter identification to a biometric database, while the United States largely relies on self-attestation for citizenship. In tabulating votes, Germany and Canada require use of paper ballots, counted in public by local officials, which substantially reduces the number of disputes as compared to the American patchwork of voting methods that can lead to basic chain-of-custody problems. Further, while countries like Denmark and Sweden sensibly limit mail-in voting to those unable to vote in person and do not count late-arriving votes regardless of the date of postmark, many American elections now feature mass voting by mail, with many officials accepting ballots without postmarks or those received well after Election Day.

Free, fair, and honest elections unmarred by fraud, errors, or suspicion are fundamental to maintaining our constitutional Republic. The right of American citizens to have their votes properly counted and tabulated, without illegal dilution, is vital to determining the rightful winner of an election.

Under the Constitution, State governments must safeguard American elections in compliance with Federal laws that protect Americans' voting rights and guard against dilution by illegal

voting, discrimination, fraud, and other forms of malfeasance and error. Yet the United States has not adequately enforced Federal election requirements that, for example, prohibit States from counting ballots received after Election Day or prohibit non-citizens from registering to vote.

Federal law establishes a uniform Election Day across the Nation for Federal elections, 2 U.S.C. 7 and 3 U.S.C. 1. It is the policy of my Administration to enforce those statutes and require that votes be cast and received by the election date established in law. As the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recently held in *Republican National Committee v. Wetzel* (2024), those statutes set "the day by which ballots must be both *cast* by voters and *received* by state officials." Yet numerous States fail to comply with those laws by counting ballots received after Election Day. This is like allowing persons who arrive 3 days after Election Day, perhaps after a winner has been declared, to vote in person at a former voting precinct, which would be absurd.

Several Federal laws, including 18 U.S.C. 1015 and 611, prohibit foreign nationals from registering to vote or voting in Federal elections. Yet States fail adequately to vet voters' citizenship, and, in recent years, the Department of Justice has failed to prioritize and devote sufficient resources for enforcement of these provisions. Even worse, the prior administration actively prevented States from removing aliens from their voter lists.

Additionally, Federal laws, such as the National Voter Registration Act (Public Law 103-31) and the Help America Vote Act (Public Law 107-252), require States to maintain an accurate and current Statewide list of every legally registered voter in the State. And the Department of Homeland Security is required

to share database information with States upon request so they can fulfill this duty. See 8 U.S.C. 1373(c). Maintaining accurate voter registration lists is a fundamental requirement in protecting voters from having their ballots voided or diluted by fraudulent votes.

Federal law, 52 U.S.C. 30121, prohibits foreign nationals from participating in Federal, State, or local elections by making any contributions or expenditures. But foreign nationals and non-governmental organizations have taken advantage of loopholes in the law's interpretation, spending millions of dollars through conduit contributions and ballot-initiative-related expenditures. This type of foreign interference in our election process undermines the franchise and the right of American citizens to govern their Republic.

Above all, elections must be honest and worthy of the public trust. That requires voting methods that produce a voter-verifiable paper record allowing voters to efficiently check their votes to protect against fraud or mistake. Election-integrity standards must be modified accordingly.

It is the policy of my Administration to enforce Federal law and to protect the integrity of our election process.

Sec. 2. Enforcing the Citizenship Requirement for Federal Elections. To enforce the Federal prohibition on foreign nationals voting in Federal elections:

(a)(i) Within 30 days of the date of this order, the Election Assistance Commission shall take appropriate action to require, in its national mail voter registration form issued under 52 U.S.C. 20508:

- (A) documentary proof of United States citizenship, consistent with 52 U.S.C. 20508(b)(3); and

(B) a State or local official to record on the form the type of document that the applicant presented as documentary proof of United States citizenship, including the date of the document's issuance, the date of the document's expiration (if any), the office that issued the document, and any unique identification number associated with the document as required by the criteria in 52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(5)(A), while taking appropriate measures to ensure information security.

(ii) For purposes of subsection (a) of this section, "documentary proof of United States citizenship" shall include a copy of:

(A) a United States passport;

(B) an identification document compliant with the requirements of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-13, Div. B) that indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States;

(C) an official military identification card that indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States; or

(D) a valid Federal or State government-issued photo identification if such identification indicates that the applicant is a United States citizen or if such identification is otherwise accompanied by proof of United States citizenship.

(b) To identify unqualified voters registered in the States:

(i) the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, consistent with applicable law, ensure that State and local officials have, without the requirement of the payment of a fee, access to appropriate systems for verifying the citizenship or immigration status of individuals registering to vote or who are already registered;

(ii) the Secretary of State shall take all lawful and appropriate action to make available information from relevant databases to State and local election officials engaged in verifying the citizenship of individuals registering to vote or who are already registered; and

(iii) the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the DOGE Administrator, shall review each State's publicly available voter registration list and available records concerning voter list maintenance activities as required by 52 U.S.C. 20507, alongside Federal immigration databases and State records requested, including through subpoena where necessary and authorized by law, for consistency with Federal requirements.

(c) Within 90 days of the date of this order, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, consistent with applicable law, provide to the Attorney General complete information on all foreign nationals who have indicated on any immigration form that they have registered or voted in a Federal, State, or local election, and shall also take all appropriate action to submit to relevant State or local election officials such information.

(d) The head of each Federal voter registration executive department or agency (agency) under the National Voter

Registration Act, 52 U.S.C. 20506(a), shall assess citizenship prior to providing a Federal voter registration form to enrollees of public assistance programs.

(e) The Attorney General shall prioritize enforcement of 18 U.S.C. 611 and 1015(f) and similar laws that restrict non-citizens from registering to vote or voting, including through use of:

- (i) databases or information maintained by the Department of Homeland Security;
- (ii) State-issued identification records and driver license databases; and
- (iii) similar records relating to citizenship.

(f) The Attorney General shall, consistent with applicable laws, coordinate with State attorneys general to assist with State-level review and prosecution of aliens unlawfully registered to vote or casting votes.

Sec. 3. Providing Other Assistance to States Verifying Eligibility. To assist States in determining whether individuals are eligible to register and vote:

(a) The Commissioner of Social Security shall take all appropriate action to make available the Social Security Number Verification Service, the Death Master File, and any other Federal databases containing relevant information to all State and local election officials engaged in verifying the eligibility of individuals registering to vote or who are already registered. In determining and taking such action, the Commissioner of Social Security shall ensure compliance with applicable privacy and data security laws and regulations.

(b) The Attorney General shall ensure compliance with the requirements of 52 U.S.C. 20507(g).

(c) The Attorney General shall take appropriate action with respect to States that fail to comply with the list maintenance requirements of the National Voter Registration Act and the Help America Vote Act contained in 52 U.S.C. 20507 and 52 U.S.C. 21083.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall update the Federal Post Card Application, pursuant to the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, 52 U.S.C. 20301, to require:

- (i) documentary proof of United States citizenship, as defined by section 2(a)(ii) of this order; and
- (ii) proof of eligibility to vote in elections in the State in which the voter is attempting to vote.

Sec. 4. Improving the Election Assistance Commission.

(a) The Election Assistance Commission shall, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 21003(b)(3) and 21142(c) and consistent with applicable law, take all appropriate action to cease providing Federal funds to States that do not comply with the Federal laws set forth in 52 U.S.C. 21145, including the requirement in 52 U.S.C. 20505(a)(1) that States accept and use the national mail voter registration form issued pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20508(a)(1), including any requirement for documentary proof of United States citizenship adopted pursuant to section 2(a)(ii) of this order.

(b)(i) The Election Assistance Commission shall initiate appropriate action to amend the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines 2.0 and issue other appropriate guidance establishing standards for voting systems to protect election integrity. The amended guidelines and other guidance shall provide that voting systems should not use a ballot in which a vote is contained within a barcode or quick-response code in the vote counting process except where necessary to accommodate individuals with

disabilities, and should provide a voter-verifiable paper record to prevent fraud or mistake.

(ii) Within 180 days of the date of this order, the Election Assistance Commission shall take appropriate action to review and, if appropriate, re-certify voting systems under the new standards established under subsection (b) (i) of this section, and to rescind all previous certifications of voting equipment based on prior standards.

(c) Following an audit of Help America Vote Act fund expenditures conducted pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 21142, the Election Assistance Commission shall report any discrepancies or issues with an audited State's certifications of compliance with Federal law to the Department of Justice for appropriate enforcement action.

(d) The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, consistent with applicable law, shall in considering the provision of funding for State or local election offices or administrators through the Homeland Security Grant Programs, 6 U.S.C. 603 *et seq.*, heavily prioritize compliance with the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines 2.0 developed by the Election Assistance Commission and completion of testing through the Voting System Test Labs accreditation process.

Sec. 5. Prosecuting Election Crimes. To protect the franchise of American citizens and their right to participate in fair and honest elections:

(a) The Attorney General shall take all appropriate action to enter into information-sharing agreements, to the maximum extent possible, with the chief State election official or multi-member agency of each State. These agreements shall aim

to provide the Department of Justice with detailed information on all suspected violations of State and Federal election laws discovered by State officials, including information on individuals who:

- (i) registered or voted despite being ineligible or who registered multiple times;
- (ii) committed election fraud;
- (iii) provided false information on voter registration or other election forms;
- (iv) intimidated or threatened voters or election officials; or
- (v) otherwise engaged in unlawful conduct to interfere in the election process.

(b) To the extent that any States are unwilling to enter into such an information sharing agreement or refuse to cooperate in investigations and prosecutions of election crimes, the Attorney General shall:

- (i) prioritize enforcement of Federal election integrity laws in such States to ensure election integrity given the State's demonstrated unwillingness to enter into an information-sharing agreement or to cooperate in investigations and prosecutions; and
- (ii) review for potential withholding of grants and other funds that the Department awards and distributes, in the Department's discretion, to State and local governments for law enforcement and other purposes, as consistent with applicable law.

(c) The Attorney General shall take all appropriate action to align the Department of Justice's litigation positions with the purpose and policy of this order.

Sec. 6. Improving Security of Voting Systems. To improve the security of all voting equipment and systems used to cast ballots, tabulate votes, and report results:

(a) The Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall take all appropriate actions to the extent permitted by 42 U.S.C. 5195c and all other applicable law, so long as the Department of Homeland Security maintains the designation of election infrastructure as critical infrastructure, as defined by 42 U.S.C. 5195c(e), to prevent all non-citizens from being involved in the administration of any Federal election, including by accessing election equipment, ballots, or any other relevant materials used in the conduct of any Federal election.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in coordination with the Election Assistance Commission and to the maximum extent possible, review and report on the security of all electronic systems used in the voter registration and voting process. The Secretary of Homeland Security, as the head of the designated Sector Risk Management Agency under 6 U.S.C. 652a, in coordination with the Election Assistance Commission, shall assess the security of all such systems to the extent they are connected to, or integrated into, the Internet and report on the risk of such systems being compromised through malicious software and unauthorized intrusions into the system.

Sec. 7. Compliance with Federal Law Setting the National Election Day. To achieve full compliance with the Federal laws that set the uniform day for appointing Presidential electors and electing members of Congress:

(a) The Attorney General shall take all necessary action to enforce 2 U.S.C. 7 and 3 U.S.C. 1 against States that violate these provisions by including absentee or mail-in ballots

received after Election Day in the final tabulation of votes for the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) Consistent with 52 U.S.C. 21001(b) and other applicable law, the Election Assistance Commission shall condition any available funding to a State on that State's compliance with the requirement in 52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(6) that each State adopt uniform and nondiscriminatory standards within that State that define what constitutes a vote and what will be counted as a vote, including that, as prescribed in 2 U.S.C. 7 and 3 U.S.C. 1, there be a uniform and nondiscriminatory ballot receipt deadline of Election Day for all methods of voting, excluding ballots cast in accordance with 52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq., after which no additional votes may be cast.

Sec. 8. Preventing Foreign Interference and Unlawful Use of Federal Funds. The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prioritize enforcement of 52 U.S.C. 30121 and other appropriate laws to prevent foreign nationals from contributing or donating in United States elections. The Attorney General shall likewise prioritize enforcement of 31 U.S.C. 1352, which prohibits lobbying by organizations or entities that have received any Federal funds.

Sec. 9. Federal Actions to Address Executive Order 14019. The heads of all agencies, and the Election Assistance Commission, shall cease all agency actions implementing Executive Order 14019 of March 7, 2021 (Promoting Access to Voting), which was revoked by Executive Order 14148 of on January 20, 2025 (Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions), and, within 90 days of the date of this order, submit to the President, through the Assistant to the

President for Domestic Policy, a report describing compliance with this order.

Sec. 10. Severability. If any provision of this order, or the application of any provision to any agency, person, or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this order and the application of its provisions to any other agencies, persons, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 11. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

- (i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or
- (ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.

(b) This order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

(c) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

DONALD J. TRUMP

THE WHITE HOUSE,

March 25, 2025.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA; STATE OF NEVADA; COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS; STATE OF ARIZONA; STATE OF COLORADO; STATE OF CONNECTICUT; STATE OF DELAWARE; STATE OF HAWAII; STATE OF ILLINOIS; STATE OF MAINE; STATE OF MARYLAND; PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN; STATE OF MINNESOTA; STATE OF NEW JERSEY; STATE OF NEW MEXICO; STATE OF NEW YORK; STATE OF RHODE ISLAND; STATE OF VERMONT; STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States; PAMELA BONDI, in her official capacity as Attorney General of the United States; UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION; DONALD L. PALMER, in his official capacity as Chairman of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission; THOMAS HICKS, in his official capacity as Vice Chair of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission; CHRISTY McCORMICK and BENJAMIN W. HOVLAND, in their official capacities as Commissioners of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission; PETE HEGSETH, in his official capacity as Secretary of Defense,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-10810

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1. The President's constitutional role in elections is limited to competing in them and enforcing election laws enacted by Congress. Nonetheless, on March 25, 2025, Defendant President Donald J. Trump issued Executive Order No. 14248, entitled "*Preserving and*

Protecting the Integrity of American Elections” (“Elections EO”), to transform how federal elections are conducted throughout the Nation.

2. The United States Constitution is clear about the power to regulate elections: as the sovereigns closest to the people, the States have primary responsibility. As Madison explained at the Virginia Convention, “[i]t was found necessary to leave the regulation of [federal elections], in the first place, to the state governments, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people.” 3 Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, p. 312 (M. Farrand ed. 1911).

3. Under the Elections Clause, Congress may preempt State elections law for federal contests but nowhere does the Constitution provide the President, or the Executive Branch, with *any* independent power to modify the States’ procedures for conducting federal elections.

4. The Elections EO usurps the States’ constitutional power and seeks to amend election law by fiat.

5. In large measure, the unconstitutional Elections EO targets the Election Assistance Commission (the “Commission”), an independent, bipartisan agency that Congress established under its constitutional elections authority. To protect our elections, Congress required the Commission to operate independently. It also required the Commission to make its decisions under standards of bipartisanship, reasoned decision-making, and collaboration with the States, which actually administer the Nation’s elections. The Elections EO seeks to eradicate all those safeguards—aiming to force the Commission to rubberstamp the President’s policy preferences on, among other things, voter registration and voting systems.

6. If not enjoined, the Elections EO would impose onerous “documentary proof of citizenship” requirements for federal voter registration forms that would harm both Plaintiff States and their citizens. This portion of the Order directly impacts most Plaintiff States because the National Voter Registration Act (“NVRA”) requires all States subject to its provisions—44

out of 50—to make the federal mail registration form (the “Federal Form”), or its equivalent, available to register voters for federal elections. 52 U.S.C. §§ 20506, 20508.¹

7. The Elections EO would also effectively preclude Plaintiff States from administering vote-by-mail systems that permit voters to make their choices by Election Day, upending processes that accommodate more voters, decrease obstacles, and increase voter participation. While unclear, it may also prohibit voters in Plaintiff States from curing minor technical problems with timely ballots after Election Day. The Elections EO relies on a fundamentally incorrect interpretation of federal Election Day statutes to support this command, which itself is an unconstitutional invasion of State and Congressional election regulation.

8. The Elections EO thus unconstitutionally treats Plaintiff States as mere instruments of the President’s policy agenda. To implement the President’s policies, the Elections EO necessarily commandeers Plaintiff States’ elections apparatus because States administer almost the entirety of the national elections system. For instance, there is no federal voter registration database—each State maintains its own registration system. The mandates of the Elections EO therefore require State officials to participate in the verification of voters’ citizenship documentation, a purported requirement that is itself contrary to the NVRA.

9. Likewise, Section 2(d) of the Elections EO commands the head of each State-designated federal voter registration agency under the NVRA to immediately begin “assess[ing] citizenship prior to providing a Federal voter registration form to enrollees of public assistance programs.” This ambiguous provision potentially sweeps in a wide range of State and local

¹ The NVRA applies to Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia. Six states are exempt. See 52 U.S.C. § 20503(b); see also U.S. Dep’t of Justice, *The National Voter Registration Act Of 1993 (NVRA) Questions and Answers* (Nov. 1, 2024), <https://tinyurl.com/43whaduz>. Some of the exempt states, however, like Minnesota, accept the Federal Form as a valid voter registration form and will be required to make the same changes to that form for voters who choose to register in that manner. Minn. Stat. § 201.071, subd. 1.

offices serving low-income and disabled residents, obligating them to bear new administrative burdens.

10. Likewise, there is no national ballot; again, each State provides its own ballots, tabulates votes, and certifies its own results. Each of these steps are governed by State law. The Elections EO unilaterally and baselessly attempts to rewrite those laws to prohibit States from counting ballots that arrive after Election Day, even though they were postmarked on or before that date.

11. The Elections EO violates the Constitution. It interferes with States' inherent sovereignty and their constitutional power to regulate the time, place, and manner of federal elections. It also usurps Congress's powers to legislate (under the Elections Clause) and to appropriate (under the Spending Clause) because Congress has not chosen to implement the changes the President seeks to impose by decree. The critical funds at issue have in large measure already been appropriated by Congress. And if these coercive threats were not enough, the Elections EO threatens to target Plaintiff States with Department of Justice investigations and potential prosecution.

12. It bears emphasizing: the President has no power to do any of this. Neither the Constitution nor Congress has authorized the President to impose documentary proof of citizenship requirements or to modify State mail-ballot procedures. Indeed, the text, structure, and history of the NVRA itself confirm that the Federal Form can only require citizenship verification by attestation. The President cannot add a documentary proof of citizenship requirement to the Federal Form, because even the Commission could not impose that requirement. Even if a documentary proof of citizenship requirement were substantively consistent with the NVRA, which it is not, only the Commission can change the Federal Form, and then only "in consultation" with the States, with the majority approval of its bipartisan Commissioners, and through reasoned decision-making subject to Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") review. *See* 52 U.S.C. §§ 20508, 20921, 20923, 20928; 5 U.S.C. § 706; *League of Women Voters of United States v. Newby*, 838 F.3d 1, 12 (D.C. Cir. 2016). As a consequence,

the Elections EO is facially unconstitutional, ultra vires, and an affront to the States' sovereignty and their constitutional authority to regulate the administration of elections.

13. The injuries Plaintiff States face are real, imminent, and irreparable. If the provisions of the Elections EO challenged in this lawsuit are not enjoined, they will immediately impose significant harm on Plaintiff States. Elections administration is complex, and the Elections EO effectively orders Plaintiff States, at breakneck pace, to implement trainings, testing, coordination, implementation, and voter education across multiple State agencies and databases. Forcing Plaintiff States to complete these tasks effectively orders them to invest enormous time and resources, diverting election staff from vital election priorities—like ensuring the operation of State voter registration systems and the sound operation of State and local elections, as well as primary preference elections, which occur regularly. In the compressed and finite timeline of State elections and legislative sessions, this work cannot simply be picked up later. For this reason, implementation of the Elections EO's unlawful directives necessarily comes at the cost of serving Plaintiff States' residents and implementing State priorities. Even with this effort, the Elections EO sows confusion and sets the stage for chaos in Plaintiff States' election systems, together with the threat of disenfranchisement.

14. If instead Plaintiff States choose not to comply with the President's blatantly unconstitutional attempt to legislate-by-fiat, they will suffer severe cuts in federal funding that will throw the national electoral system into disarray. The Framers carefully crafted a federal compact that protects the States from this Hobson's choice.

15. For all these reasons, the Elections EO is unconstitutional, antidemocratic, and un-American. It intrudes on the constitutionally reserved powers of the States and Congress. It purports to subvert laws that Congress has passed, in ways that Congress did not allow and in conflict with the text of those laws. Through this action, Plaintiff States seek a judgment declaring certain, specific provisions of the Elections EO to be unlawful and void and corresponding preliminary and permanent orders enjoining action on or enforcement of those specific provisions by any Defendant except the President.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

16. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 2201(a).

17. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) and (e)(1). Defendants are United States agencies or officers sued in their official capacities.

18. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a resident of this District, and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this Complaint occurred and continue to occur within the District of Massachusetts.

THE PARTIES

I. PLAINTIFFS

19. The State of California is a sovereign state of the United States. California is represented by Attorney General Rob Bonta, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

20. The State of Nevada is a sovereign state of the United States. Nevada is represented by Attorney General Aaron Ford, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

21. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a sovereign state of the United States. Massachusetts is represented by Attorney General Andrea Joy Campbell, who is the Commonwealth's Chief Law Officer.

22. The State of Arizona is a sovereign state of the United States. Arizona is represented by Attorney General Kris Mayes, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

23. The State of Colorado is a sovereign state of the United States. Colorado is represented by Attorney General Philip J. Weiser, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

24. The State of Connecticut is a sovereign state of the United States. Connecticut is represented by Attorney General William Tong, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

25. The State of Delaware is a sovereign state of the United States of America. This action is brought on behalf of the State of Delaware by Attorney General Kathleen Jennings, the "chief law officer of the State." *Darling Apartment Co. v. Springer*, 22 A.2d 397, 403 (Del.

1941). Attorney General Jennings also brings this action on behalf of the State of Delaware pursuant to her statutory authority. 29 Del. C. § 2504.

26. The State of Hawaii is a sovereign state of the United States. Hawaii is represented by Attorney General Anne E. Lopez, who is the State's Chief Legal Officer.

27. The State of Illinois is a sovereign state of the United States. Illinois is represented by Attorney General Kwame Raoul, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

28. The State of Maine is a sovereign state of the United States. Maine is represented by Attorney General Aaron M. Frey, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

29. The State of Maryland is a sovereign state of the United States. Maryland is represented by Attorney General Anthony G. Brown who is the State's Chief Legal Officer.

30. The People of the State of Michigan are represented by Attorney General Dana Nessel. The Attorney General is Michigan's chief law enforcement officer and is authorized to bring this action on behalf of the People of the State of Michigan pursuant to Mich. Comp. Laws § 14.28.

31. The State of Minnesota is a sovereign state of the United States. Minnesota is represented by Attorney General Keith Ellison, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

32. The State of New Jersey is a sovereign state of the United States. The Attorney General of New Jersey is the State's chief legal adviser and is authorized to act in federal court on behalf of the State on matters of public concern.

33. The State of New Mexico is a sovereign state of the United States. New Mexico is represented by Attorney General Raúl Torrez, who is the State's Chief Legal Officer.

34. The State of New York, represented by and through its Attorney General, is a sovereign state of the United States. The Attorney General is New York State's chief law enforcement officer and is authorized under N.Y. Executive Law § 63 to pursue this action.

35. The State of Rhode Island is a sovereign state of the United States. Rhode Island is represented by Attorney General Peter F. Neronha, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

36. The State of Vermont is a sovereign state of the United States. Vermont is represented by Attorney General Charity R. Clark, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

37. The State of Wisconsin is a sovereign state of the United States. Wisconsin is represented by Attorney General Josh Kaul, who is the State's Chief Law Officer.

II. DEFENDANTS

38. Defendant Donald J. Trump is the President of the United States. He is responsible for the actions and decisions that are being challenged by Plaintiff States in this action and is sued in his official capacity, and only for declaratory relief.

39. Defendant Pamela Bondi is the Attorney General of the United States. She is sued in her official capacity.

40. Defendant United States Election Assistance Commission is an independent federal commission established under 52 U.S.C. § 20921. The Commission is responsible for developing the Federal Form, in consultation with the chief election officers of the States, for the registration of voters for elections for federal office. 52 U.S.C. § 20508(a)(2). The Commission is further responsible for disbursing statutory elections funds to Plaintiff States. *Id.* § 21001.

41. Defendant Donald L. Palmer is a Commissioner and the Chairman of the Election Assistance Commission. He is sued in his official capacity.

42. Defendant Thomas Hicks is a Commissioner and the Vice Chair of the Election Assistance Commission. He is sued in his official capacity.

43. Defendants Christy McCormick and Benjamin W. Hovland are Commissioners of the Election Assistance Commission. They are sued in their official capacities.

44. Defendant Pete Hegseth is the Secretary of Defense. He is sued in his official capacity.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

45. On March 25, 2025, the President issued Executive Order No. 14248, entitled "Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections" ("Elections EO"). Although the

President invoked “the authority vested in [him] as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America,” the Elections EO is not authorized by either.

46. Through the Elections EO, the President seeks to unconstitutionally seize the right to prescribe regulations for federal elections, authority reserved to the States and Congress. The Elections EO also seeks to repurpose a set of existing federal programs and funding streams and use them as a cudgel to enforce rules that Congress never enacted.

47. The Elections EO accomplishes these aims in part by purporting to order the independent, bipartisan, and multimember Commission to take actions that are contrary to law, trampling upon the protections that Congress created to ensure that the Commission’s work would be evenhanded and independent. The Elections EO is a unilateral attempt by the Executive to assume powers that the Constitution assigns exclusively to Plaintiff States and Congress.

48. Plaintiff States and local elections officials, as frontline election administrators, will be directly harmed by the Elections EO’s unconstitutional purported amendment of federal voting law.

49. By this Complaint, Plaintiff States challenge the following specific provisions of the Elections EO (the “Challenged Provisions”) that will cause imminent and irreparable harm to the States if they are not enjoined:

- a. **Section 2(a)**. The Elections EO orders the Commission “to require, in its national mail voter registration form issued under 52 U.S.C. 20508 . . . documentary proof of United States citizenship,” contrary to existing federal law and the status of the Commission as an independent agency. *See* Elections EO, § 2(a). The Elections EO directs State and local elections officials to implement the burdensome documentation requirements associated with this provision, though the President has no authority over State and local officials. *See id.* § 2(a)(i)(B).
- b. **Section 2(d)**. The Elections EO orders “the head of each Federal voter registration executive department or agency” to “assess citizenship prior to

providing a Federal voter registration form to enrollees of public assistance programs,” raising the specter of commandeering Plaintiff State agencies and resources in violation of fundamental State sovereignty if it extends to State and local agencies designated under the NVRA. *See id.* § 2(d).

- c. **Section 3(d)**. The Elections EO orders the Secretary of Defense to “update the Federal Post Card Application, pursuant to the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, 52 U.S.C. 20301, to require documentary proof of United States citizenship” and “proof of eligibility to vote in elections in the State in which the voter is attempting to vote[,]” drastically amending the statute contrary to its purpose and text and rendering the application costly and challenging to implement. *See id.* § 3(d).
- d. **Section 4(a)**. The Elections EO orders the Commission to “take all appropriate action to cease providing Federal funds to States that do not comply with the Federal laws set forth in 52 U.S.C. 21145, including the requirement in 52 U.S.C. 20505(a)(1) that States accept and use the national mail voter registration form issued pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20508(a)(1), including any requirement for documentary proof of United States citizenship adopted pursuant to” the unlawful Elections EO’s requirements. *See id.* § 4(a).
- e. **Section 7(a)**. The Elections EO directs the Attorney General to “take all necessary action to enforce” a draconian and incorrect interpretation of federal Election Day statutes that would preclude States from counting ballots that arrive after Election Day, even if they were mailed on or before that day. *See id.* § 7(a). This erroneous interpretation might also conflict with State laws that allow voters to cure ballots with minor technical problems that were timely submitted.
- f. **Section 7(b)**. The Elections EO orders the Commission to enforce this interpretation of the Election Day statutes by conditioning “any available funding to a State on that State’s compliance” with the Elections EO’s new institution of a

“ballot receipt deadline of Election Day,” even though the Commission has no statutory authority to condition funding on these grounds. *See id.* § 7(b).

I. STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL REGULATION OF ELECTIONS

50. The President’s unlawful order amending statutes governing the conduct of federal elections dramatically oversteps the limits of Presidential power.

51. The Constitution’s Elections Clause reserves elections administration to the States, subject only to Congress’s preemption power: “The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1. Similarly, the Electors Clause specifies that “[e]ach State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.” U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 2.

52. The Constitution, then, “invests the States with responsibility for the mechanics of [federal] elections,” but allows Congress—not the President, unilaterally—to preempt those choices in the context of federal elections. *Foster v. Love*, 522 U.S. 67, 69 (1997). Unless Congress provides otherwise, States have the authority “to provide a complete code for [federal] elections, not only as to times and places, but in relation to notices, registration, . . . protection of voters, [and] prevention of fraud and corrupt practices.” *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 366 (1932); *see also Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Ariz., Inc.* (“ITCA”), 570 U.S. 1, 8–9 (2013) (quoting *Smiley*, 285 U.S. at 366). In short, States are authorized “to enact the numerous requirements as to procedure and safeguards which experience shows are necessary in order to enforce the fundamental right involved.” *Smiley*, 285 U.S. at 366.

53. U.S. elections are administered consistent with the constitutional command. State legislatures, as representatives of their constituents, enact statutes that comprehensively structure State and federal elections. Plaintiff States’ election officials implement and clarify those laws with regulations and guidance. These laws and regulations govern a wide range of election

issues, including early voting, vote-by-mail, and voter identification. Plaintiff States also design their own ballots and do their own redistricting—including redrawing congressional district boundaries. Election codes can differ significantly by State, with each State tailoring its rules to the needs and preferences of its residents.

54. Beyond setting most election rules, Plaintiff States and their subdivisions also administer elections. Plaintiff States and their subdivisions purchase, maintain, test, and certify all voting machines, and maintain their election information management systems and poll books. Plaintiff States answer questions from voters and local election officials and develop a wide range of training and educational resources for their staff, counties, poll workers, and voters. These resources range from technical instructions for the voting machines to guidance on the implementation of a new law. Plaintiff States design and issue ballots; provide support for local officials who operate polling locations; and collect and secure ballots. Once voting has closed, States canvass and certify the vote. Finally, in a Presidential election, after all votes have been counted and the vote audited, Plaintiff States certify the results to Congress. 3 U.S.C. § 5.

55. Especially relevant here, Plaintiff States also register voters, coordinate maintenance of voter registration lists, and ensure that voter registration data is secure and accurate. But they do not have free reign in deciding who to register and how. To facilitate registering voters and to ensure maximum access to the ballot in federal elections by eligible citizens, Congress exercised its Elections Clause preemptive authority—first with the Uniformed Overseas Citizen Absentee Voting Act (“UOCAVA”), then with the NVRA and the Help America Vote Act (“HAVA”)—to regulate aspects of voting registration. Congress has also exercised its Spending Power under the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, to allocate federal funds to support States in implementing federal law and conducting elections. *See, e.g.*, 52 U.S.C. § 21001.

56. In contrast, the President has no constitutional authority to “make or alter” laws governing federal elections. In fact, the Constitution grants the President no legislative power at all. *Cf.* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4. Although the President may “recommend to [Congress’s]

consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient,” *id.*, art. II, § 3, and may veto legislation passed by Congress, *id.*, art. I, § 7, he may neither alter a duly enacted law nor impose his own law by fiat.

57. Instead of granting the President a free hand to rewrite federal law, the Constitution imposes on him the mandatory duty to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” *Id.*, art. II, § 3.

58. For these reasons, and as explained below, the Challenged Provisions are unconstitutional, ultra vires, and violative of the separation of powers and State sovereignty.

II. FEDERAL LAWS ENACTED BY CONGRESS GOVERNING FEDERAL ELECTIONS

A. The National Voter Registration Act & the “Federal Form”

59. Congress passed the NVRA in 1993 to reduce barriers to voter registration, protect the integrity of federal elections, and improve the accuracy of voter registration rolls. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 20501(b).

60. In crafting the NVRA, Congress sought to “make it possible for Federal, State, and local governments to implement” the law “in a manner that enhances the participation of eligible citizens as voters in elections for Federal office.” *Id.*

61. The NVRA establishes several methods to register to vote in federal elections, in addition to any registration method provided by State law. Those options include an “application made simultaneously with an application for a motor vehicle driver’s license,” 52 U.S.C. § 20503(a)(1), a “mail application,” *id.* § 20503(a)(2), and “by application in person” at a variety of qualifying sites, including federal, state, and local agencies designated by the States, *id.* § 20503(a)(3).

62. The NVRA requires States to accept and use a federal “mail voter registration application form”—commonly referred to as the “Federal Form”—or its equivalent for mail registration and during in-person registration at certain government or nongovernment offices designated in the statute. *See id.* §§ 20505(a)(1), 20506(a)(6)(A). States may also create and use

their own mail registration forms for federal elections if they satisfy the NVRA's statutory criteria. *See id.* § 20505(a)(2).

63. Responsibility for creating the Federal Form rests with the Commission, which was created by HAVA in 2002. Congress made clear that the Commission must develop the Federal Form “in consultation with the chief election officers of the States.” *Id.* § 20508(a)(2).

64. The Commission's discretion in developing the Federal Form is carefully circumscribed by statute. For example, the Federal Form “may require *only* such identifying information (including the signature of the applicant) and other information (including data relating to previous registration by the applicant) as is necessary to enable the appropriate State election official to assess the eligibility of the applicant and to administer voter registration and other parts of the election process.” *Id.* § 20508(b)(1) (emphasis added).

65. Likewise, the Federal Form “may *not* include any requirement for notarization or other formal authentication.” *Id.* § 20508(b)(3) (emphasis added).

66. As the D.C. Circuit has explained, the statutory text of the NVRA is “straightforward.” *Newby*, 838 F.3d at 10. If a given datapoint is “‘necessary’ to enforce voter qualifications, then the NVRA and probably the Constitution require its inclusion” in the Federal Form. *Id.* But “if not, the NVRA does not permit its inclusion and the Constitution is silent.” *Id.*

67. The NVRA addresses citizenship by providing that the Federal Form must require the applicant to attest that they meet “each eligibility requirement (including citizenship)” and sign under penalty of perjury. *Id.* § 20508(b)(2). The decision to address citizenship through attestation rather than documentary proof reflects the considered judgment of Congress, which considered, but declined to adopt, a requirement of documentary proof of citizenship, reasoning that it was “not necessary or consistent with the purposes of” the NVRA. H.R. Rep. No. 103–66, at 23–24 (1993).

68. Indeed, the Commission has previously denied requests to include requirements for documentary proof of citizenship on the Federal Form. In January 2014, acting on requests

from both Kansas and Arizona, the Commission declined to amend the Federal Form to include requirements for registrants in those States to provide documentary proof of citizenship. Among other reasons for its decision, the Commission highlighted Congress's explicit rejection of proposals related to documentary proof of citizenship as inconsistent with the purposes of the NVRA and likely to interfere with its registration provisions, to the point of "effectively eliminat[ing]" mail-in registration. The Commission also determined that the Federal Form "currently provides the necessary means for assessing applicants' eligibility," and that the States had "myriad of means available to enforce their citizenship requirements without requiring additional information from Federal Form applicants." Finally, the Commission determined that granting the requests would undermine the purposes of the NVRA by imposing additional burdens on registrants and thwarting organized voter registration programs, which the NVRA sought to encourage in 52 U.S.C. § 20505(b) by directing States to make mail-in registration forms available for distribution, "with particular emphasis on making them available for organized voter registration programs."

69. Even in the limited set of circumstances where the Commission may lawfully amend the Federal Form by adding required information, the Commission must comply with key procedural requirements. Among other things, the Federal Form must be developed and amended "in consultation with the chief election officers of the States." 52 U.S.C. § 20508. In other words, the Commission cannot act unilaterally. And, even after consulting the States, the Commission can only amend the form following the normal notice-and-comment process mandated by the APA, with judicial review. *See Newby*, 838 F.3d at 11–12.

70. Congress took pains to define the Federal Form's substance and the process for development and amendment because the Federal Form is enormously important to the complex process of registering voters and administering federal elections. The 44 States subject to the NVRA must "accept and use" the Federal Form for registering voters in federal elections. 52 U.S.C. § 20505(a)(1).

71. These requirements mean that, in practice, most Plaintiff States' voter registration mechanisms are intertwined with the Federal Form's requirements.

72. In some Plaintiff States, the overlap is particularly extensive. For example: Nevada registers voters online, by mail, at county clerks' offices, and at polling locations. It also registers votes at the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles; certain offices of the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services; the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation; and U.S. Armed Forces Recruitment Offices. Right now, each agency offers Nevada's version of the Federal Form, whether on paper or through verbal questions—which workers must be trained to administer.

B. The Help America Vote Act

73. Congress passed HAVA in 2002 following the 2000 presidential election. HAVA sought to upgrade voting systems by setting standards for voting machines and voter registration databases and by providing federal funding to the States for elections purposes. *See* 52 U.S.C. §§ 20901, 21081, 21083. HAVA also established rules allowing voters to cast provisional ballots. *Id.* § 21082.

74. As explained above, HAVA established the independent, bipartisan Commission. *Id.* § 20921. The four members of the Commission are appointed to four-year terms and are evenly split between the two political parties. *Id.* § 20923(a), (b). The four-year terms of Commission members are staggered at two-year intervals, and a Commission member may serve no more than two four-year terms. *Id.* § 20923(b)(1), (2). The Commission may only act within its statutory authority and with the "approval of at least three of its members." *Id.* § 20928.

C. The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act

75. In 1986, Congress passed UOCAVA, which governs voting by overseas citizens. 52 U.S.C. §§ 20301–20311.

76. Under UOCAVA, each State is required to permit absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters to use absentee registration procedures and vote by absentee ballot in all federal elections. 52 U.S.C. § 20302(a)(1).

77. The President is required to designate the head of an executive department to have the primary responsibility for federal functions under UOCAVA. 52 U.S.C. § 20301(a). Chief among those responsibilities is to prescribe a single post card registration form and absentee ballot (the “Federal Post Card Application”) to be sent to overseas voters and voters in the uniformed services for federal elections and which will be used by the States. *Id.* § 20301(b)(2).

78. Under UOCAVA, States must “use the official post card form” prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and “accept and process . . . any otherwise valid voter registration application and absentee ballot application from an absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter,” which would include the Federal Post Card Application. 52 U.S.C. § 20302(a)(2), (4). Several Plaintiff States have codified this requirement. *See, e.g.*, Cal. Elec. Code §§ 3102(c), 3105(b)(2); Mass. Gen. Laws c. 54, § 91C.

D. Federal Laws Governing the Date of Federal Elections

79. States have the authority to regulate the “Times, Places, and Manner” for congressional elections, unless preempted or supplemented by Congress. U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1. And States establish the “Manner” of choosing Presidential electors, *id.* art. II, § 1, cl. 2, while Congress “determine[s] the Time of chusing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes,” *id.* art. II, § 1, cl. 4. Among the “Manner[s]” left for the States to decide is the “counting of votes.” *Smiley*, 285 U.S. at 366.

80. Congress has set days for federal elections, consistent with these constitutional mandates. In 2 U.S.C. § 7, Congress has “established . . . the day for the election” of members of the House of Representatives, and in 3 U.S.C. §§ 1 and 21(1), the “election day” for Presidential electors. Election Day statutes addressed the problem of some States setting their election day earlier than others, strongly influencing elections before they were concluded. *Foster*, 522 U.S. at 73–74. These laws required “only that if an election does take place, it may not be consummated prior to election day.” *Id.* at 71–72 & n.4 (emphasis added). They do not prohibit States from receiving and counting ballots that were indisputably mailed by Election Day or

curing minor, technical errors after Election Day to ensure that ballots timely cast before Election Day are counted.

81. 52 U.S.C. § 21081(a)(6) requires “[e]ach State” to “adopt . . . standards that define what constitutes a vote and what will be counted as a vote for each category of voting system used in the State.” It does not prescribe *what* standards must be used, nor does it provide that the President or the EAC has authority to dictate those standards. Each Plaintiff State has adopted such standards.

82. Consistent with this federal regulation, Plaintiff States have exercised their own constitutional and statutory authority to determine for each of their respective jurisdictions how to best receive and count votes that are timely cast by mail in federal elections. Many of the Plaintiff States provide for the counting of otherwise timely absentee and mail ballots received after Election Day including, ballots postmarked by Election Day but received after the close of polls. *See, e.g.*, Cal. Elec. Code § 3020(b); Mass. Gen. Laws c. 54, § 93; Nev. Rev. Stat. § 293.269921(1)(b), (2); N.J. Stat. Ann. § 19:63-22(a); N.Y. Election Law sec. 8-412(1), 8-710(1). Others offer procedures allowing voters to fix or “cure” minor errors in timely cast ballots after Election Day to allow their ballot to be counted.

E. Congressional Efforts to Pass the SAVE Act

83. Although some version of a bill amending the NVRA to impose proof of citizenship requirements for federal registrants has been introduced in the last two Congresses, it has never passed the Senate or been presented to the President for signature.

84. In May 2024, Texas Congressman Chip Roy introduced the “Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act,” more commonly known as the “SAVE Act.” The SAVE Act would have amended the NVRA to provide that “[u]nder any method of voter registration in a State, the State shall not accept and process an application to register to vote in an election for Federal office unless the applicant presents documentary proof of United States citizenship with the application.” H.R. 8281 (118th Cong.), § 2.

85. Although this version of the bill passed the House on a near party line vote, it was never referred to committee in the Senate or considered for final passage.

86. The most recent version of Congressman Roy's bill, H.R. 22, was introduced on the first day of the new Congress, January 3, 2025. The House referred the reintroduced version of the SAVE Act to the Committee on Administration, where it languished until March 27, 2025—three days after the President issued the Elections EO. Then, without hearing, the bill was transferred to the House Rules Committee. On April 1, 2025, the Rules Committee passed a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 22 by the House.

87. Neither version of the SAVE Act has ever proven popular enough to pass through the ordinary democratic process. President Trump and his administration cannot bypass the ordinary legislative process to legislate by fiat, assuming for the Executive Branch powers that are reserved for the States and the Legislative Branch.

III. THE ELECTIONS EO

88. The Elections EO commands several significant changes to federal elections law and practice. Some of these changes would be effectuated through the Commission and other federal agencies. Others are imposed directly on the States, enforced by punitive funding conditions and investigatory threats. This lawsuit addresses the following Challenged Provisions:

89. **Forcing the Elections Assistance Commission and the States to Require Documentary Proof of Citizenship with the Federal Form.** The Elections EO directs the Commission to take action to revise the Federal Form—within 30 days—to require “documentary proof of United States citizenship, consistent with 52 U.S.C. § 20508(b)(3).” Elections EO, § 2(a)(i). The Elections EO defines the scope of documents sufficient to prove citizenship narrowly: a U.S. passport, a driver's license indicating citizenship, military identification indicating citizenship, or other “valid Federal or State government-issued photo identification if such identification indicates that the applicant is a United States citizen or if such identification is otherwise accompanied by proof of United States citizenship.” *Id.* § 2(a)(ii).

90. The Elections EO requires State and local officials to implement that mandate by “record[ing] on the [registration] form the type of document that [an] applicant present[s] as documentary proof of United States citizenship, including the date of the document’s issuance, the date of the document’s expiration (if any), the office that issued the document, and any unique identification number associated with the document . . . while taking appropriate measures to ensure information security.” *Id.* § 2(a)(i)(B).

91. The Elections EO requires the Commission to “take all appropriate action to cease providing Federal funds to States” that do not accept the Federal Form, as unlawfully amended to require documentary proof of citizenship. *See id.* § 4(a).

92. **Commandeering State Agencies to Determine Citizenship Before Registering Voters.** Section 2(d) of the Elections EO commands the head of each State-designated federal voter registration agency under the NVRA to immediately begin “assess[ing] citizenship prior to” providing public assistance to residents. These agencies represent a wide range of direct service providers.

93. **Requiring Military and Overseas Voters to Submit Documentary Proof of Citizenship and Eligibility to Vote in State Elections.** The Elections EO requires similar changes to the Federal Post Card Application form used for voters in the military or living abroad. It orders the Secretary of Defense to “update the Federal Post Card Application, pursuant to the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, 52 U.S.C. 20301, to require” documentary proof of citizenship, as defined above, and “proof of eligibility to vote in elections in the State in which the voter is attempting to vote.” *Id.* § 3(d).

94. **Coercing States to Alter Their Ballot Counting Laws.** The Elections EO purports to enforce a single, “uniform day for appointing Presidential electors and electing members of Congress,” which requires States to exclude “absentee or mail-in ballots received after Election Day [from] the final tabulation of votes for the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.” *Id.* § 7(a). The EO directs the Commission to “condition any available funding to a State on that

State's compliance with" the requirement that "each State adopt uniform and nondiscriminatory standards within that State that define what constitutes a vote and what will be counted as a vote," including the requirement that States exclude absentee or mail ballots received after election day in the final tabulation of the vote for federal elections. *Id.* § 7(b).

IV. FEDERAL FUNDING STREAMS IMPLICATED BY THE ELECTIONS EO

95. The Elections EO threatens to withhold various streams of federal funding to the States for purported noncompliance with the Challenged Provisions. HAVA funds, upon which many Plaintiff States rely, are directly implicated.

96. Section 4(a) of the Elections EO requires that the Commission "take all appropriate action to cease providing Federal funds to States that do not comply with the Federal laws set forth in 52 U.S.C. 21145, including the requirement in 52 U.S.C. 20505(a)(1) that States accept and use the national mail voter registration form issued pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20508(a)(1), including any requirement for documentary proof of United States citizenship adopted pursuant to section 2(a)(ii) of this order."

97. Section 7(b) of the Elections EO similarly directs that the Commission "condition any available funding to a State on that State's compliance with the requirement in 52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(6) that each State adopt uniform and nondiscriminatory standards within that State that define what constitutes a vote and what will be counted as a vote," including that there be a uniform ballot receipt deadline of Election Day for all methods of voting.

98. Pursuant to HAVA, the Commission provides "requirements payments" to States for the primary purpose of improving the administration of elections for Federal offices. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 21001(b). These include grants to improve election infrastructure, update voting equipment, enhance cybersecurity, ensure accessibility, and support voter education initiatives. The amount of funding a State receives is determined through a formula that considers multiple factors. By statute, each State must receive a minimum payment, not less than one-half of one percent of the total amount appropriated for the year. *Id.* § 21002(c)(1). A State's remaining amount is then determined by its "allocation percentage," a fixed calculation that is the quotient

of the State's voting age population and the total voting age population of all the States. *Id.* § 21002(b).

99. Requirements payments disbursed by the Commission are statutorily conditioned on States' certification of a funding plan that directs money to activities to improve the administration of elections. *Id.* § 21003(b)(1); *see id.* § 21004(a). States must also certify compliance with a list of enumerated laws, including the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the NVRA. *Id.* § 21003(b); *see id.* § 21145(a) (listing laws). With respect to the NVRA, each State is required to accept and use the Federal Form issued by the Commission pursuant to 52 U.S.C. § 20508. *See id.* § 20505(a)(1). However, outside of design and issuance of the Federal Form and promulgation of related regulations, the Commission does not have "any authority to issue any rule, promulgate any regulation, or take any other action which imposes any requirement on any State or unit of local government." *Id.* § 20929.

100. Since 2003, the Commission has administrated more than \$4.35 billion in HAVA formula funding to States and territories. In that time, California has received a total of over \$505 million from the Commission. Nevada has received over \$36 million. New York has received more than \$49 million in HAVA Election Security Grants since 2018, more than \$172 million in HAVA Requirements Payments since 2005, and more than \$16 million in HAVA Election Improvement funds since 2003. Michigan has similarly been awarded more than \$27 million in HAVA Security Grant funding. Delaware has received \$13 million in HAVA Requirements Payments. Minnesota has received \$17 million in HAVA funding. Colorado has received more than \$16 million in HAVA Election Security Grants, and prior to 2018 received more than \$38 million in HAVA Election Improvement grants. Arizona has received approximately \$12 million in HAVA funds since 2020, which the State apportions among election officials at the county and State level to administer elections. Massachusetts has received more than \$94 million in HAVA funding. New Jersey has received more than \$76 million in HAVA Section 251 payments. Vermont has received \$5 million in HAVA Election

Improvement Funds, over \$12 million in HAVA Section 251 Requirements Payments, and \$12 million in HAVA Security Grant funding. Connecticut has received more than \$13 million in HAVA Security Grant funding since 2018. Rhode Island has received a total of \$9.2 million in HAVA section 101 elections security grants since 2018, and previously received \$13 million in HAVA section 251 grants. Maine has received at least \$9,634,743 in HAVA funds since 2018.

V. HARM TO PLAINTIFF STATES

101. If the Challenged Provisions are implemented, they will irreparably harm Plaintiff States in several concrete ways.

102. To start, the Challenged Provisions will blatantly transgress on the Plaintiff States' constitutional power to prescribe the time, place, and manner of federal elections. The Elections EO amounts to an unprecedented seizure of power over elections administration by the federal Executive Branch, which has no constitutional authority over elections. The Challenged Provisions seek to amend and dictate election law by fiat and relegate Plaintiff States to mere instruments of the President's policy agenda. Its provisions do affirmative harm to Plaintiff States' efforts to secure the voting rights of their citizens. This invasion of State constitutional power, in and of itself, amounts to concrete constitutional injury.

103. Aside from usurping Plaintiff States' constitutional power over elections, the Challenged Provisions in the Elections EO directly harms them in at least three additional ways.

104. *First*, the Elections EO's documentary proof of citizenship requirement would impose a significant burden on the voter registration systems maintained at the State and local level in the Plaintiff States.

105. As required under HAVA, Plaintiff States maintain statewide voter registration databases. 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a). In many Plaintiff States, counties and other smaller political subdivisions likewise maintain their own voter registration databases that push information to a statewide voter registration database. The Elections EO commandeers this infrastructure wholesale, requiring State and local officials to check documentary proof of citizenship and record the type of proof shown when an applicant uses the Federal Form to register. Elections

EO, § 2(a)(i)(B). State and local elections officials would be required to devote time and personnel to setting up the infrastructure, policies, and technology to implement the new requirements, including by implementing “appropriate measures to ensure information security” with regard to the new information they are charged with collecting. *Id.*, § 2(a). Such sweeping changes to interconnected databases are a huge undertaking; they require time, money, and significant people power.² Because elections administration is generally decentralized, implementing these changes requires substantial lead-time.

106. **Second**, the Elections EO presents Plaintiff States with a lose-lose proposition: implement the President’s unconstitutional orders to change their elections administration systems, even though the changes would disenfranchise lawful voters and are contrary to the States’ and Congress’s judgment, or lose access to essential federal funding.

107. The funding that Plaintiff States receive from Defendants is significant and ongoing. Since 2003, the Commission has administered more than \$4.35 billion in HAVA funding to the States and territories, including funding totaling \$1.4 billion from 2018 to 2024. These critical funds support the administration of elections for federal office, election security, and improvements to voting and elections systems. This money is critical to some of the Plaintiff States. For example, California has received a total of over \$505 million from the Commission. Nevada received at least \$12 million for 2018 to 2024. New York has received more than \$49 million in HAVA Election Security Grants since 2018, more than \$172 million in HAVA Requirements Payments since 2005, and more than \$16 million in HAVA Election Improvement funds since 2003. Michigan has similarly been awarded more than \$27 million in HAVA Security Grant funding. Delaware has received \$13 million in HAVA Requirements Payments. Minnesota has received \$17 million in HAVA funding. Colorado has received more than \$16 million in HAVA Election Security Grants and prior to 2018 received more than \$38

² One of the Plaintiff States, Arizona, already requires documentary proof of citizenship for voter registration, at least for State elections. However, Arizona defines documentary proof of citizenship quite differently from how the Elections EO defines it. *Compare* A.R.S. § 16-166(F) *with* Elections EO, § 2(a)(ii).

million in HAVA Election Improvement grants. Arizona has received approximately \$12 million in HAVA funds since 2020, which the State apportions among election officials at the county and State level to administer elections. Massachusetts has received more than \$94 million in HAVA funding. New Jersey has received more than \$76 million in HAVA Section 251 payments, including more than \$22 million from 2019 to the present. Vermont has received \$5 million in HAVA Election Improvement Funds, over \$12 million in HAVA Section 251 Requirements Payments, and \$12 million in HAVA Security Grant funding, which are essential to administering elections in the state. Connecticut has received more than \$13 million in HAVA Security Grant funding since 2018. Rhode Island has received a total of \$9.2 million in HAVA section 101 elections security grants since 2018, and previously received \$13 million in HAVA section 251 grants. Maine has received at least \$9,634,743 in HAVA funds since 2018. These existing funding amounts were not meant to cover the new requirements purportedly imposed by the Elections EO, and they are insufficient to cover the dramatic changes to voter registration systems and election administration procedures contemplated by the Executive Order. Such unfunded mandates harm the States.

108. The Elections EO presents Plaintiff States with an unconstitutional choice: either lose access to essential funds, harming States' practical ability to conduct their elections, or institute unlawful and unfunded conditions that would have the effect of disenfranchising their own citizens in order to continue receiving existing funding.

109. **Third**, the Elections EO further impacts Plaintiff States' administration of elections because it sets forth an interpretation of the federal Election Day statutes that is not consistent with the text of those statutes and conflicts with many Plaintiff States' method for counting ballots. Under federal law, Plaintiff States must adopt standards that define what constitutes a vote and what will be counted as a vote. 52 U.S.C. § 21081(a)(6). Plaintiff States have adopted varying standards pursuant to this requirement, including many Plaintiff States that allow absentee and mail-in ballots postmarked before or on Election Day to be counted, so long as they are received within a limited period of time after Election Day. *See, e.g.*, Cal. Elec. Code

§ 3020(b); Mass. Gen. Laws c. 54, § 93; N.J. Stat. Ann. § 19:63-22(a); Nev. Rev. Stat. § 293.269921(1)(b), (2); N.Y. Election Law sec. 8-412(1), 8-710(1). Many Plaintiff States also have laws that allow rejected ballots—e.g., ballots with a non-matching signature—to be cured by voters and counted. Even these laws could be deemed to violate the Elections EO.

110. The Elections EO declares these State laws that allow for counting a vote received after Election Day to be “violations” of the federal Election Day statutes and directs the Attorney General to enforce those Election Day statutes against States. Plaintiff States with laws allowing for the tabulation of timely cast ballots received or cured after Election Day intend to administer federal elections in accordance with these State laws, notwithstanding this conflict. Because the Elections EO directs the Attorney General to “take all necessary action to enforce” the President’s incorrect and conflicting interpretation of federal law, there is an actual controversy between Plaintiff States and the Attorney General and there is a credible threat of immediate enforcement by the Attorney General against Plaintiff States.

111. The Elections EO also seeks to give immediate, punitive effect to the President’s legal position by ordering the Commission to withhold funding from States that do not acquiesce. The Elections EO therefore directly interferes with Plaintiff States’ administration of federal elections because it attempts to force changes in the way votes are counted. Were Plaintiff States compelled to follow the President’s erroneous interpretation of the federal Election Day statutes, it would upend their established State laws and procedures for administering federal elections, resulting in widespread voter confusion and disenfranchisement.

112. No adequate remedy at law is available to redress these irreparable harms.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Elections EO § 2(a) - Ultra Vires / Separation of Powers - Presidential Action in Excess of Authority; Usurping the Legislative Function; Violation of the Bicameralism and Presentment Clauses

(Against the President, the Commission, and Commissioners)

113. Plaintiff States restate and reallege paragraphs 1 to 112 as if fully set forth herein.

114. Plaintiff States have a non-statutory right of action to enjoin and declare unlawful official action that is ultra vires.

115. The Elections EO instructs the Commission to amend the Federal Form to require documentary proof of citizenship. Elections EO, § 2(a). It also directs that State and local elections officials be tasked with implementing the burdensome documentation requirements associated with this provision. *Id.* § 2(a)(I)(B).

116. The Commission is a multimember, bipartisan body composed of experts in elections and their administration. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 20923. To ensure its trustworthy and neutral work, Congress established the Commission as an “independent entity.” *Id.* § 20921. Congress also required the Commission to have a bipartisan majority to approve any action. *Id.* § 20928.

117. The President has no constitutional authority to interfere with State and Congressional regulations of the times, places, and manner of elections, including voter registration. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, art. II, § 1; *ITCA*, 570 U.S. at 8, 14–15. Where, as here, the President takes action that undermines the authority and independence of Congress, his action is properly struck down as violative of the constitutional separation of powers. The Elections EO’s attempt to dictate policy and actions of the Commission in a manner inconsistent with Congressional approval requirements is ultra vires and in excess of the President’s powers.

118. Because a substantive change to the Federal Form functions as a command to the sovereign States, the Commission can change the Federal Form only upon “consultation with the chief election officers of the States.” 52 U.S.C. § 20508(a)(2). And, like all Commission decisions, such changes require the approval of at least three out of four Commissioners. *Id.* § 20928. Commission changes to the Federal Form must also be made through reasoned decision-making subject to APA review. *See id.* §§ 20921, 20923, 20928; 5 U.S.C. § 706; *Newby*, 838 F.3d at 11–12.

119. Regardless, Congress has never authorized the Commission’s creation of a documentary proof of citizenship requirement on the Federal Form. In fact, in drafting the NVRA, Congress determined that a documentary proof of citizenship requirement was “not

necessary or consistent with the purposes of’ the statute. H.R. Rep. No. 103–66, at 23–24 (1993).

120. The Commission may exercise only that authority which is conferred by statute. *See City of Arlington v. FCC*, 569 U.S. 290, 297–98 (2013). By directing the Commission and imposing duties on it that are not contained in federal law, the Elections EO attempts to amend, repeal, rescind, or circumvent duly enacted federal statutes based on the President’s own policy preferences. These actions exceed the President’s Article II powers, unconstitutionally infringe upon Congress’s powers, and attempt to amend federal legislation while bypassing Article I’s Bicameralism, Presentment, and Elections Clauses.

121. The Plaintiff States will be harmed by implementing these burdensome, harmful, and costly requirements.

122. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that Section 2(a) of the Elections EO violates the separation of powers and impermissibly arrogates to the Executive power that is reserved to Congress.

123. Plaintiff States are further entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing the Commission and the Defendant Commissioners from enforcing or implementing Section 2(a) of the Elections EO.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Elections EO § 2(a) - Ultra Vires / Contrary to Statute - Presidential Action in Excess of Authority; Usurping the Legislative Function; Violation of the Bicameralism and Presentment Clauses

(By all Plaintiff States except Arizona Against the President, the Commission, and Commissioners)³

124. Plaintiff States restate and reallege paragraphs 1 to 123 as if fully set forth herein.

125. Plaintiff States have a non-statutory right of action to enjoin and declare unlawful official action that is ultra vires.

³ Due to unique requirements of Arizona law, Arizona does not join this cause of action.

126. The Elections EO instructs the Commission to amend the Federal Form to require documentary proof of citizenship. Elections EO, § 2(a). It also directs State and local elections officials to implement the burdensome documentation requirements associated with this provision. *Id.* § 2(a)(i)(B).

127. The Elections EO violates the substantive provisions of the NVRA, which permits the Federal Form to “require only such identifying information (including the signature of the applicant) and other information (including data relating to previous registration by the applicant), as is necessary to enable the appropriate State election official to assess the eligibility of the applicant and to administer voter registration and other parts of the election process.” 52 U.S.C. § 20508(b)(1).

128. The “statutory text is straightforward.” *Newby*, 838 F.3d at 10. If an aspect of the Federal Form is “‘necessary’ to enforce voter qualifications, then the NVRA and probably the Constitution require its inclusion; if not, the NVRA does not permit its inclusion and the Constitution is silent.” *Id.* at 11; *see also Tenn. Conf. of Nat’l Ass’n for Advancement of Colored People v. Lee*, 730 F. Supp. 3d 705, 740 (M.D. Tenn. 2024).

129. The President has no constitutional authority to interfere with State and Congressional regulations of the times, places, and manner of elections, including voter registration. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, art. II, § 1; *ITCA*, 570 U.S. at 8, 14–15. Where, as here, the President takes action that undermines the authority and independence of Congress, his action is properly struck down as violative of the constitutional separation of powers. The Elections EO’s attempt to dictate policy and actions of the Commission in a manner inconsistent with Congressional requirements is ultra vires and in excess of the President’s powers.

130. Congress has already decided that documentary proof of citizenship is not “necessary” for identifying eligible voters. Citizenship is one aspect of a voter’s eligibility. Under the NVRA, citizenship is proven through attestation: the Federal Form “shall include a statement that” (a) “specifies” all voter eligibility requirements, “including citizenship”; (b) “contains an attestation that the applicant meets each such requirement each such requirement;”

and (c) “requires the signature of the applicant, under the penalty of perjury.” 52 U.S.C. § 20508(b)(2). In drafting the NVRA, Congress concluded that attestation under penalty of perjury and criminal penalties were “sufficient safeguards to prevent noncitizens from registering to vote.” S.Rep. No. 103–6, at 11 (1993). Indeed, the NVRA specifically prohibits including in the Federal Form “any requirement for notarization or other formal authentication.” 52 U.S.C. § 20508(b)(3).

131. Nor has the Commission deemed documentary proof of citizenship “necessary” for identifying eligible voters. To the contrary, the Commission has previously rejected that proposition.

132. The Elections EO attempts to amend, repeal, rescind, or circumvent duly enacted federal statutes based on the President’s own policy preferences. These actions exceed the President’s Article II powers, unconstitutionally infringe upon Congress’s powers, and attempt to amend federal legislation while bypassing Article I’s Bicameralism, Presentment, and Elections Clauses.

133. The Plaintiff States will be harmed by this requirement, which would be burdensome, harmful, and costly to implement and administer.

134. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that Section 2(a) of the Elections EO violates the separation of powers and impermissibly arrogates to the Executive power that is reserved to Congress.

135. Plaintiff States are further entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing the Commission and Defendant Commissioners from enforcing or implementing Section 2(a) of the Elections EO.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Elections EO § 3(d) - Ultra Vires / Separation of Powers - Presidential Action in Excess of Authority; Usurping the Legislative Function; Violation of the Bicameralism and Presentment Clauses

(Against the President and the Secretary of Defense)

136. Plaintiff States restate and reallege paragraphs 1 to 135 as if fully set forth herein.

137. Plaintiff States have a non-statutory right of action to enjoin and declare unlawful official action that is ultra vires.

138. The Elections EO commands the Secretary of Defense to update the federal post card application provided under UOCAVA to require documentary proof of citizenship and proof of eligibility to vote in state elections. Elections EO § 3(d).

139. The President has no constitutional authority to interfere with State and Congressional regulations of the times, places, and manner of elections, including voter registration. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, art. II, § 1; *ITCA*, 570 U.S. at 8, 14–15. Where, as here, the President takes action that undermines the authority and independence of Congress, his action is properly struck down as violative of the constitutional separation of powers. The Elections EO’s attempt to dictate policy in a manner inconsistent with Congressional requirements is ultra vires and in excess of the President’s powers.

140. Congress has never authorized the Election EO’s additional requirements for the “official post card form” prescribed by the Secretary of Defense under UOCAVA for military and overseas voters to use to register to vote in federal elections. 52 U.S.C. § 20302(a)(4). Nowhere in the Act is there a requirement that this form demand documentary proof of citizenship or proof of eligibility to vote in elections in the State in which the applicant is attempting to vote. Rather, the Act unequivocally grants military and overseas voters the ability to register and cast a ballot “in the last place in which the person was domiciled before leaving the United States.” *Id.* § 20310(5)(B).

141. By directing the Secretary of Defense to include requirements for the Federal Post Card Application not contained in federal law, the Elections EO attempts to amend, repeal,

rescind, or circumvent duly enacted federal statutes based on the President's own policy preferences. These actions exceed the President's Article II powers, unconstitutionally infringe upon Congress's powers, and attempt to amend federal legislation while bypassing Article I's Bicameralism, Presentment, and Elections Clauses.

142. The Plaintiff States will be harmed by this requirement, which would be burdensome and costly to implement and administer.

143. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that Section 3(d) of the Elections EO violates the separation of powers and impermissibly arrogates to the Executive power that is reserved to Congress.

144. Plaintiff States are further entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing the Secretary of Defense from enforcing or implementing Section 3(d) of the Elections EO.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Elections EO § 4(a) - Ultra Vires / Separation of Powers - Presidential Action in Excess of Authority; Usurping the Legislative Function; Violation of the Bicameralism and Presentment Clauses

(Against the President, the Commission, and Commissioners)

145. Plaintiff States restate and reallege paragraphs 1 to 144 as if fully set forth herein.

146. Plaintiff States have a non-statutory right of action to enjoin and declare unlawful official action that is ultra vires.

147. The Elections EO orders the Commission to condition federal funding to States on their acceptance of the Federal Form as unlawfully amended to require documentary proof of citizenship. Elections EO, § 4(a).

148. The President has no constitutional authority to interfere with State and Congressional regulations of the times, places, and manner of elections, including voter registration. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, art. II, § 1; *ITCA*, 570 U.S. at 8, 14–15. Where, as here,

the President takes action that undermines the authority and independence of Congress, his action is properly struck down as violative of the constitutional separation of powers.

149. The Commission is a multimember, bipartisan body composed of experts in elections and their administration. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 20923. To ensure its trustworthy and neutral work, Congress established the Commission as an “independent entity.” *Id.* § 20921. Congress also required the Commission to have a bipartisan majority to approve any action. *Id.* § 20928. The Elections EO’s attempt to dictate policy and actions of the Commission in a manner inconsistent with Congressional approval requirements is ultra vires and in excess of the President’s powers.

150. Nor has Congress authorized the Commission to withhold funds on these grounds. To the contrary, it has specified the precise formula for calculating the grants that the Commission administers and the conditions for those funds. 52 U.S.C. §§ 21001–21003, 21142(c)(1). Plaintiff States are statutorily entitled to those funds upon satisfaction of the requirements of the program under which the funds are provided.

151. The Commission may exercise only that authority which is conferred by statute. *See City of Arlington*, 569 U.S. at 297–98. By directing the Commission and imposing duties on it that are not contained in federal law, the Elections EO attempts to amend, repeal, rescind, or circumvent duly enacted federal statutes based on the President’s own policy preferences. These actions exceed the President’s Article II powers, unconstitutionally infringe upon Congress’s powers, and attempt to amend federal legislation while bypassing Article I’s Bicameralism, Presentment, and Elections Clauses.

152. This unlawful order will harm the Plaintiff States by targeting them for loss of federal funding.

153. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that Section 4(a) of the Elections EO violates the separation of powers and impermissibly arrogates to the Executive power that is reserved to Congress.

154. Plaintiff States are further entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing the Commission and the Defendant Commissioners from enforcing or implementing Section 4(a) of the Elections EO.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Elections EO § 7(a) - Ultra Vires / Separation of Powers - Presidential Action in Excess of Authority; Usurping the Legislative Function; Violation of the Bicameralism and Presentment Clauses; Violation of the Elections Clause and the Electors Clause

(Against the President and the Attorney General)

155. Plaintiff States restate and reallege paragraphs 1 to 154 as if fully set forth herein.

156. Plaintiff States have a non-statutory right of action to enjoin and declare unlawful official action that is ultra vires.

157. The Elections EO directs the Attorney General to “take all necessary action to enforce” federal statutes setting the date of federal elections against States that purportedly “violate these provisions” by counting absentee or vote-by-mail ballots received after Election Day “in the final tabulation of votes for” federal office, adopting a draconian and incorrect rule that would preclude States from counting ballots that arrive after Election Day, even if they were mailed on or before that day. Elections EO, § 7(a).

158. The President has no constitutional authority to interfere with State and Congressional regulations of the times, places, and manner of elections, including voter registration. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, art. II, § 1; *ITCA*, 570 U.S. at 8, 14–15. Where, as here, the President takes action that undermines the authority and independence of Congress, or invades the constitutional and statutory rights of the States, his action is properly struck down as violative of the constitutional separation of powers.

159. The Elections EO attempts to direct the Attorney General to adopt and enforce an interpretation of the federal Election Day statutes, 2 U.S.C. § 7 and 3 U.S.C. § 1, that conflicts with State laws allowing for votes validly cast by Election Day but received after that date to be counted. The President has no legal authority to amend the Election Day statutes to prohibit the

counting of ballots validly cast under State law, nor to direct the Attorney General to enforce his erroneous interpretation of federal law against States.

160. By directing the Attorney General to enforce the President's incorrect interpretation of federal law, the Elections EO attempts to amend, repeal, rescind, or circumvent duly enacted federal statutes based on the President's own policy preferences. These actions exceed the President's Article II powers, unconstitutionally infringe upon Congress's powers, and attempt to amend federal legislation while bypassing Article I's Bicameralism, Presentment, and Elections and Electors Clauses.

161. This unlawful order harms Plaintiff States by the imminent threat of enforcement by the Attorney General. There is an actual controversy about whether Plaintiff States can count ballots that are received after Election Day. Plaintiff States intend to administer federal elections according to State laws, notwithstanding that many of those laws directly conflict with the Elections EO's incorrect interpretation of the federal Election Day statutes. The Elections EO directs the Attorney General to take all appropriate actions to enforce the Elections EO's incorrect interpretation, establishing an actual controversy and a credible threat of civil prosecution.

162. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that Section 7(a) of the Elections EO violates the separation of powers and impermissibly arrogates to the Executive power that is reserved to Congress and the Plaintiff States.

163. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that the federal Election Day statutes do not preclude the Plaintiff States from enacting and implementing State laws that allow for counting a timely cast ballot received after Election Day.

164. Plaintiff States are further entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing the Attorney General from enforcing or implementing Section 7(a) of the Elections EO.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Elections EO § 7(b) - Ultra Vires / Separation of Powers - Presidential Action in Excess of Authority; Usurping the Legislative Function; Violation of the Bicameralism and Presentment Clauses

(Against the President, the Commission, and Commissioners)

165. Plaintiff States restate and reallege paragraphs 1 to 164 as if fully set forth herein.

166. Plaintiff States have a non-statutory right of action to enjoin and declare unlawful official action that is ultra vires.

167. The Elections EO requires the Commission to condition federal funding on Plaintiff States' acquiescence to an incorrect interpretation of federal Election Day statutes that would preclude Plaintiff States from counting ballots that arrive after Election Day, even if they were mailed on or before that day. Elections EO, § 7(b).

168. The President has no constitutional authority to interfere with State and Congressional regulations of the times, places, and manner of elections, including voter registration. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, art. II, § 1; *ITCA*, 570 U.S. at 8, 14–15. Where, as here, the President takes action that undermines the authority and independence of Congress, his action is properly struck down as violative of the constitutional separation of powers.

169. The Commission is a multimember, bipartisan body composed of experts in elections and their administration. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 20923. To ensure its trustworthy and neutral work, Congress established the Commission as an “independent entity.” *Id.* § 20921. Congress also required the Commission to have a bipartisan majority to approve any action. *Id.* § 20928. The Elections EO's attempt to dictate policy and actions of the Commission in a manner inconsistent with Congressional approval requirements is ultra vires and in excess of the President's powers.

170. Nor has Congress authorized the Commission to withhold funds on these grounds. To the contrary, it has specified the precise formula for calculating the grants that the Commission administers and the conditions for those funds. 52 U.S.C. §§ 21001–21003; *see*

also 21142(c)(1). Plaintiff States are statutorily entitled to those funds upon satisfaction of the requirements of the program under which the funds are provided.

171. Moreover, outside of specified duties regarding the design and issuance of the Federal Form, the Commission does not have “any authority to issue any rule, promulgate any regulation, or take any other action which imposes any requirement on any State or unit of local government,” such as adopting the draconian position insisted upon in the Elections EO. *Id.* § 20929.

172. The Commission may exercise only that authority which is conferred by statute. *See City of Arlington*, 569 U.S. at 297–98. By directing the Commission and imposing duties on it that are not contained in federal law, the Elections EO attempts to amend, repeal, rescind, or circumvent duly enacted federal statutes based on the President’s own policy preferences. These actions exceed the President’s Article II powers, unconstitutionally infringe upon Congress’s powers, and attempt to amend federal legislation while bypassing Article I’s Bicameralism, Presentment, and Elections Clauses.

173. This unlawful order will harm Plaintiff States by targeting them for loss of federal funding.

174. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that Section 7(b) of the Elections EO violates the separation of powers and impermissibly arrogates to the Executive power that is reserved to Congress.

175. Plaintiff States are further entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing the Commission and the Defendant Commissioners from enforcing or implementing Section 7(b) of the Elections EO.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

All Challenged Provisions – Separation of Powers / Intrusion on States’ Election Powers Granted by Article I, Section 4 and Article II, Section 1 of the United States Constitution

(Against All Defendants)

176. Plaintiff States restate and reallege paragraphs 1 to 175 as if fully set forth herein.

177. The Constitution “invests the States with responsibility for the mechanics of [federal] elections, but only so far as Congress declines to preempt legislative choices.” *Foster*, 522 U.S. at 69 (citations omitted); *see also* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1; Art. II, § 1, cl. 2. It is “solicitous of the prerogatives of the States, even in an otherwise sovereign federal province” because “the Framers recognized that state power and identity were essential parts of the federal balance.” *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 841 (1995).

178. The President has no constitutional authority to interfere with State and Congressional regulations of the times, places, and manner of elections, including voter registration. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, art. II, § 1; *ITCA*, 570 U.S. at 8, 14–15. Where, as here, the President takes action that undermines the authority and independence of Congress, his action is properly struck down as violative of the constitutional separation of powers. For the same reasons, where the President takes action unauthorized by the Constitution or statute that undermines the constitutional powers of the States, his action is properly struck down as violative of the vertical separation of powers.

179. Plaintiff States have a non-statutory right of action to enjoin and declare unlawful official action that commandeers State executive power or otherwise intrudes on Plaintiff States’ inherent sovereignty and powers granted by the Constitution. In the Elections EO, the President invades Plaintiff States’ sovereignty and their powers to regulate federal elections by Presidential fiat and commandeers State election administrative personnel and processes to implement a Presidential decree.

180. Pursuant to their constitutional authority, Plaintiff States have each enacted statutes governing elections, and each maintains a complex administrative apparatus to carry out federal elections. The Elections EO purports to overwrite State laws, regulations, and processes relevant to registration, voting systems, and ballot counting. But it is *Congress*, not the Executive, in which the Constitution vests the power to “make or alter” State regulations governing federal elections. *See* U.S. Const., art. I, § 4. The Elections EO goes far beyond any statute lawfully enacted by Congress.

181. The Elections EO conditions critical funding streams on Plaintiff States' capitulation to its new and unlawful rules. It thus seeks to control Plaintiff States' exercise of their sovereign powers through raw Executive domination, contrary to the Constitution and its underlying principles of federalism and the separation of powers.

182. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Plaintiff States are entitled to a declaration that the Challenged Provisions of the Elections EO violates the separation of powers, intrudes on Plaintiff States' sovereignty and the election powers granted to them by Article I, Section 4 and Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution, and unconstitutionally commandeers States' executive powers to implement a Presidential decree.

183. Plaintiffs are further entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing all Defendants, except the President, from enforcing or implementing the Challenged Provisions of the Elections EO.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff States pray that this Court:

1. Issue a judicial declaration that the Challenged Provisions of the Elections EO are unconstitutional and void, because they are ultra vires and violate both the separation of powers and the States' sovereignty and elections power under the United States Constitution;
2. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin all Defendants, except President Trump, from implementing or enforcing the Challenged Provisions of the Elections EO;
3. Award Plaintiff States their reasonable fees, costs, and expenses, including attorneys' fees; and
4. Grant any other relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: April 3, 2025

ROB BONTA

Attorney General of California

By: /s/ Nicholas R. Green

Nicholas R. Green (BBO No. 698510)

Deputy Attorney General

Anne P. Bellows*

Deputy Attorney General

Thomas S. Patterson*

Senior Assistant Attorney General

John D. Echeverria*

Supervising Deputy Attorney General

Michael S. Cohen*

Malcolm A. Brudigam*

Kevin L. Quade*

Lisa Ehrlich*

Deputy Attorneys General

Counsel for the State of California

KRISTIN K. MAYES

Attorney General of the State of Arizona

By: /s/ Joshua M. Whitaker

Joshua M. Whitaker*

Karen J. Hartman-Tellez*

Kara Karlson*

Assistant Attorneys General

Counsel for the State of Arizona

PHILIP J. WEISER

Attorney General for the State of Colorado

By: /s/ Shannon Stevenson

Shannon Stevenson*

Solicitor General

Peter Baumann*

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the State of Colorado

Respectfully Submitted,

AARON FORD

Attorney General of Nevada

By: /s/ Craig Newby

Craig Newby*

First Deputy Attorney General

Heidi P. Stern*

Solicitor General

Counsel for the State of Nevada

ANDREA JOY CAMPBELL

Attorney General of Massachusetts

By: /s/ M. Patrick Moore

M. Patrick Moore (BBO No. 670323)

First Assistant Attorney General

Anne Sterman (BBO No. 650426)

Chief, Government Bureau

Phoebe Fischer-Groban (BBO No. 687068)

Deputy Chief, Constitutional &

Administrative Law Division

Chris Pappavaselio (BBO No. 713519)

Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the Commonwealth of
Massachusetts

WILLIAM TONG

Attorney General for the State of
Connecticut

/s/ Maura Murphy

Maura Murphy*

Deputy Associate Attorney General

Counsel for the State of Connecticut

(additional counsel on following page)

KATHLEEN JENNINGS
Attorney General of the State of Delaware

By: /s/ Ian R. Liston
Ian R. Liston*
Director of Impact Litigation
Vanessa L. Kassab*
Maryanne T. Donaghy*
Deputy Attorneys General

Counsel for the State of Delaware

ANNE E. LOPEZ
Attorney General for the State of Hawai‘i

By: /s/ David D. Day
David D. Day*
Special Assistant to the Attorney
General
Kaliko‘onālani D. Fernandes*
Solicitor General

Counsel for the State of Hawai‘i

KWAME RAOUL
Attorney General for the State of Illinois

By: /s/ Alex Hemmer
Alex Hemmer*
Deputy Solicitor General

Counsel for the State of Illinois

AARON M. FREY
Attorney General for the State of Maine

By: /s/ Jonathan R. Bolton
Jonathan R. Bolton*
Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the State of Maine

ANTHONY G. BROWN
Attorney General for the State of Maryland

By: /s/ Adam D. Kirschner
Adam D. Kirschner*
Senior Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the State of Maryland

DANA NESSEL
Attorney General of Michigan

By: /s/ Erik Grill
Erik Grill*
Danny Haidar*
Heather S. Meingast*
Assistant Attorneys General

Counsel for the People of the State of
Michigan

KEITH ELLISON
Attorney General for the State of Minnesota

By: /s/ Peter J. Farrell
Peter J. Farrell*
Deputy Solicitor General
Angela Behrens*
Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the State of Minnesota

MATTHEW J. PLATKIN
Attorney General Of New Jersey

By: /s/ Meghan K. Musso
Meghan K. Musso*
Jonathan Mangel*
Deputy Attorneys General

Counsel for the State of New Jersey

RAÚL TORREZ
Attorney General of New Mexico

By: /s/ James W. Grayson
James W. Grayson*
Chief Deputy Attorney General

Counsel for the State of New Mexico

LETITIA JAMES
Attorney General of New York

By: /s/ Colleen K. Faherty
Colleen K. Faherty*
Special Trial Counsel

Counsel for the State of New York

(additional counsel on the following page)

PETER F. NERONHA
Attorney General of Rhode Island

By: /s/ James J. Arguin
James J. Arguin (BBO No. 557350)
Special Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the State of Rhode Island

CHARITY R. CLARK
Attorney General for the State of Vermont

By: /s/ Ryan P. Kane
Ryan P. Kane*
Deputy Solicitor General

Counsel for the State of Vermont

JOSHUA L. KAUL
Attorney General for the State of Wisconsin

By: /s/ Charlotte Gibson
Charlotte Gibson*
Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the State of Wisconsin

**Pro hac vice applications forthcoming*



Open Session Item

SUBJECT: FY2026 General Fund Budget – Proposed – Draft 3

PRESENTATION DATE: April 8, 2025

PRESENTATION BY: Kelcee Mace, Chief Financial Officer; Kim Edlund, Director Budget & Finance

RECOMMENDED MOTION: For informational purposes only.

REPORT-IN-BRIEF: The FY26 Proposed General Fund budget remains balanced at \$326,805,540.

DISCUSSION: Major changes from the last proposed version include:

- Increase in Election Board budget to add personnel requests and operating expenses to allow for a fourth early voting site.
- Reduced CIP reserve budget to allow for increase in Election Board budget.
- Decrease in General Operations to allow for an increase in Election Board budget.

Staff is also coming back in front of you to receive further comment and/or direction for the FY26 General Fund budget.

FISCAL IMPACT: \$326,805,540

CONCURRENCES: N/A

ALTERNATIVES: N/A

ATTACHMENTS: Proposed General Fund Expense Summary – Draft 3

AUDIO/VISUAL NEEDS: N/A

Washington County, Maryland
General Fund Expenditures - Proposed - Draft 3
FY 2026

Page	Cost Center	Department/Agency	FY 2026 Requested Budget	Adjustment	FY 2026 Proposed Budget	\$ Change	% Change	FY 2025 Original Budget
<u>Education:</u>								
<u>Direct Primary:</u>								
3-1	90000	Board of Education	118,473,490	0	118,473,490	8,300,650	7.53%	110,172,840
			118,473,490	0	118,473,490	8,300,650	7.53%	110,172,840
<u>Secondary:</u>								
3-3	90040	Hagerstown Community College	10,543,380	0	10,543,380	307,090	3.00%	10,236,290
<u>Other:</u>								
3-5	93400	Free Library	4,924,540	(69,380)	4,855,160	0	0.00%	4,855,160
3-7	10990	Clear Spring Library Building	143,000	0	143,000	0	0.00%	143,000
3-9	10991	Smithsburg Library Building	150,750	0	150,750	0	0.00%	150,750
3-11	10992	Boonsboro Library Building	171,810	0	171,810	0	0.00%	171,810
3-13	10993	Hancock Library Building	141,700	0	141,700	0	0.00%	141,700
			5,531,800	(69,380)	5,462,420	0	0.00%	5,462,420
		Total Education	134,548,670	(69,380)	134,479,290	8,607,740	6.84%	125,871,550
<u>Law Enforcement:</u>								
3-15	11300	Sheriff - Judicial	4,187,630	(5,700)	4,181,930	(14,590)	(0.35%)	4,196,520
3-23	11305	Sheriff - Process Servers	181,750	(200)	181,550	6,600	3.77%	174,950
3-26	11310	Sheriff - Patrol	18,046,870	(157,720)	17,889,150	977,390	5.78%	16,911,760
3-45	11311	Sheriff Auxiliary	90,200	0	90,200	0	0.00%	90,200
3-47	11315	Sheriff - Central Booking	1,522,050	(2,040)	1,520,010	48,410	3.29%	1,471,600
3-53	11320	Sheriff - Detention Center	24,870,210	(61,010)	24,809,200	562,260	2.32%	24,246,940
3-71	11321	Sheriff - Day Reporting Center	550,680	(810)	549,870	15,820	2.96%	534,050
3-79	11330	Sheriff - Narcotics Task Force	707,450	(51,660)	655,790	10,220	1.58%	645,570
3-89	11335	Sheriff - Police Academy	59,830	0	59,830	0	0.00%	59,830
			50,216,670	(279,140)	49,937,530	1,606,110	3.32%	48,331,420
<u>Emergency Services:</u>								
3-94	11420	Air Unit	66,480	0	66,480	(29,410)	(30.67%)	95,890
3-100	11430	Special Operations	256,670	(53,060)	203,610	19,290	10.47%	184,320
3-111	11440	911 - Communications	7,271,740	(155,140)	7,116,600	61,060	0.87%	7,055,540
3-127	11520	EMS Operations	7,969,000	(1,326,530)	6,642,470	462,580	7.49%	6,179,890
3-146	11525	Fire Operations	10,699,030	(1,146,610)	9,552,420	2,564,340	36.70%	6,988,080
3-160	11535	Public Safety Training Center	1,422,090	(175,190)	1,246,900	46,470	3.87%	1,200,430
3-179	93110	Civil Air Patrol	4,400	0	4,400	400	10.00%	4,000
3-181	93130	Fire & Rescue Volunteer Services	12,415,540	(118,580)	12,296,960	429,230	3.62%	11,867,730
			40,104,950	(2,975,110)	37,129,840	3,553,960	10.58%	33,575,880
<u>Other:</u>								
3-200	11530	Emergency Management	404,460	126,040	530,500	259,870	96.02%	270,630
3-211	93100	Animal Control - Humane Society	2,800,000	0	2,800,000	450,000	19.15%	2,350,000
			3,204,460	126,040	3,330,500	709,870	27.09%	2,620,630
		Total Public Safety	93,526,080	(3,128,210)	90,397,870	5,869,940	6.94%	84,527,930

Washington County, Maryland
General Fund Expenditures - Proposed - Draft 3
FY 2026

Page	Cost Center	Department/Agency	FY 2026 Requested Budget	Adjustment	FY 2026 Proposed Budget	\$ Change	% Change	FY 2025 Original Budget
<u>Operating/Capital Transfer</u>								
<u>Operating:</u>								
3-213	91020	Highway	10,703,310	0	10,703,310	297,720	2.86%	10,405,590
3-215	91021	Solid Waste	487,170	0	487,170	0	0.00%	487,170
3-217	91023	Agricultural Education Center	255,760	0	255,760	0	0.00%	255,760
3-219	91024	Grant Management	538,470	25,000	563,470	40,960	7.84%	522,510
3-221	91028	Land Preservation	71,960	(1,030)	70,930	47,830	207.06%	23,100
3-223	91029	HEPMPO	6,970	0	6,970	200	2.95%	6,770
3-225	91040	Utility Administration	971,720	(1,060)	970,660	165,820	20.60%	804,840
3-227	91041	Water	176,480	0	176,480	0	0.00%	176,480
3-229	91044	Transit	608,490	0	608,490	(292,820)	(32.49%)	901,310
3-231	91046	Golf Course	158,000	0	158,000	45,070	39.91%	112,930
3-233	92010	Municipality in Lieu of Bank Shares	38,550	0	38,550	0	0.00%	38,550
			14,016,880	22,910	14,039,790	304,780	2.22%	13,735,010
<u>Capital:</u>								
3-235	91230	Capital Improvement Fund	11,490,000	0	11,490,000	3,694,680	47.40%	7,795,320
3-237	12700	Debt Service	16,268,190	0	16,268,190	58,110	0.36%	16,210,080
			27,758,190	0	27,758,190	3,752,790	15.63%	24,005,400
Total Operating/Capital Transfers			41,775,070	22,910	41,797,980	4,057,570	10.75%	37,740,410
<u>Other Government Programs:</u>								
<u>Courts:</u>								
3-239	10200	Circuit Court	2,799,250	(26,960)	2,772,290	49,330	1.81%	2,722,960
3-252	10210	Orphans Court	34,250	0	34,250	0	0.00%	34,250
3-254	10220	State's Attorney	6,097,290	(286,650)	5,810,640	412,500	7.64%	5,398,140
			8,930,790	(313,610)	8,617,180	461,830	5.66%	8,155,350
<u>State:</u>								
3-270	10400	Election Board	2,843,740	(14,130)	2,829,610	188,620	7.14%	2,640,990
3-285	12300	Soil Conservation	380,240	0	380,240	10,730	2.90%	369,510
3-287	12400	Weed Control	363,060	(200)	362,860	5,560	1.56%	357,300
3-293	12410	Environmental Pest Management	90,000	(30,000)	60,000	14,500	31.87%	45,500
3-295	94000	Health Department	3,183,620	0	3,183,620	0	0.00%	3,183,620
3-297	94010	Social Services	569,540	(12,580)	556,960	50,630	10.00%	506,330
3-299	94020	University of MD Extension	305,620	0	305,620	15,500	5.34%	290,120
3-301	94030	County Cooperative Extension	38,730	0	38,730	0	0.00%	38,730
			7,774,550	(56,910)	7,717,640	285,540	3.84%	7,432,100
<u>Community Funding:</u>								
3-303	93000	Community Funding	1,200,000	0	1,200,000	0	0.00%	1,200,000

Washington County, Maryland
General Fund Expenditures - Proposed - Draft 3
FY 2026

Page	Cost Center	Department/Agency	FY 2026 Requested Budget	Adjustment	FY 2026 Proposed Budget	\$ Change	% Change	FY 2025 Original Budget
<u>General Operations:</u>								
3-305	10300	County Administrator	478,160	(1,350)	476,810	15,150	3.28%	461,660
3-312	10310	Public Relations & Marketing	1,044,010	(134,440)	909,570	256,320	39.24%	653,250
3-325	12500	Business Development	1,175,230	(9,430)	1,165,800	122,520	11.74%	1,043,280
3-336	10100	County Commissioners	356,250	(1,500)	354,750	1,870	0.53%	352,880
3-340	10110	County Clerk	207,540	(1,700)	205,840	35,930	21.15%	169,910
3-345	10530	Treasurer	571,980	(4,030)	567,950	26,790	4.95%	541,160
3-352	10600	County Attorney	1,234,320	(1,220)	1,233,100	(28,680)	(2.27%)	1,261,780
3-360	10700	Human Resources	2,167,820	(287,230)	1,880,590	314,710	20.10%	1,565,880
3-368	11200	General Operations	6,917,110	1,669,680	8,586,790	4,891,870	132.39%	3,694,920
3-372	10500	Budget & Finance	2,650,220	(7,430)	2,642,790	75,630	2.95%	2,567,160
3-382	10510	Independent Accounting & Auditing	75,000	0	75,000	0	0.00%	75,000
3-384	10520	Purchasing	718,170	(1,220)	716,950	8,320	1.17%	708,630
3-392	11000	Information Technology	5,555,810	(890,380)	4,665,430	260,950	5.92%	4,404,480
3-401	11540	Wireless Communications	1,760,110	(8,810)	1,751,300	52,770	3.11%	1,698,530
			24,911,730	320,940	25,232,670	6,034,150	31.43%	19,198,520
<u>Other:</u>								
3-408	11100	Women's Commission	2,000	0	2,000	0	0.00%	2,000
3-410	11120	Veteran's Advisory Committee	2,000	0	2,000	0	0.00%	2,000
3-412	11140	Diversity and Inclusion Committee	2,000	0	2,000	0	0.00%	2,000
3-414	11150	Animal Control Board	7,200	0	7,200	0	0.00%	7,200
3-416	11550	Forensic Investigator	30,000	0	30,000	0	0.00%	30,000
3-418	93230	Commission on Aging	1,854,580	0	1,854,580	250,000	15.58%	1,604,580
3-420	93300	Museum of Fine Arts	142,000	0	142,000	2,000	1.43%	140,000
			2,039,780	0	2,039,780	252,000	14.10%	1,787,780
<u>Public Works:</u>								
3-422	11600	Public Works	451,470	(410)	451,060	93,530	26.16%	357,530
3-432	11910	Buildings Grounds and Facilities	2,953,980	(421,640)	2,532,340	(97,680)	(3.71%)	2,630,020
			3,405,450	(422,050)	2,983,400	(4,150)	(0.14%)	2,987,550
<u>Engineering & Permits & Inspections:</u>								
3-448	11620	Engineering	3,210,930	(4,690)	3,206,240	30,530	0.96%	3,175,710
3-459	11630	Permits & Inspections	3,918,790	(171,200)	3,747,590	397,890	11.88%	3,349,700
			7,129,720	(175,890)	6,953,830	428,420	6.57%	6,525,410
<u>Planning and Zoning:</u>								
3-476	10800	Planning and Zoning	1,619,100	6,600	1,625,700	95,120	6.21%	1,530,580
3-486	10810	Board of Zoning Appeals	68,390	0	68,390	1,150	1.71%	67,240
			1,687,490	6,600	1,694,090	96,270	6.03%	1,597,820

Washington County, Maryland
 General Fund Expenditures - Proposed - Draft 3
 FY 2026

Page	Cost Center	Department/Agency	FY 2026 Requested Budget	Adjustment	FY 2026 Proposed Budget	\$ Change	% Change	FY 2025 Original Budget
<u>Parks and Recreation:</u>								
3-488	12000	Martin L. Snook Pool	185,910	0	185,910	6,900	3.85%	179,010
3-491	12200	Parks and Recreation	1,922,990	(1,630)	1,921,360	104,580	5.76%	1,816,780
			2,108,900	(1,630)	2,107,270	111,480	5.59%	1,995,790
<u>Facilities:</u>								
3-499	10900	Martin Luther King Building	101,210	0	101,210	(25,270)	(19.98%)	126,480
3-501	10910	Administration Building	335,910	(5,000)	330,910	(12,970)	(3.77%)	343,880
3-505	10930	Court House	355,630	0	355,630	11,750	3.42%	343,880
3-508	10940	County Office Building	238,850	0	238,850	(18,950)	(7.35%)	257,800
3-511	10950	Administration Annex	156,180	0	156,180	5,580	3.71%	150,600
3-514	10960	Dwyer Center	29,310	0	29,310	(5,080)	(14.77%)	34,390
3-516	10965	Election Board Facility	117,270	(10,000)	107,270	(10,770)	(9.12%)	118,040
3-519	10970	Central Services	136,290	0	136,290	890	0.66%	135,400
3-521	10980	Properties	4,450	0	4,450	2,720	157.23%	1,730
3-523	10985	Senior Center Building	12,210	0	12,210	0	0.00%	12,210
3-525	11325	Public Facilities Annex	122,230	(10,000)	112,230	8,120	7.80%	104,110
			1,609,540	(25,000)	1,584,540	(43,980)	(2.70%)	1,628,520
		Total Other Government Programs	60,797,950	(667,550)	60,130,400	7,621,560	14.51%	52,508,840
		Total Proposed Expenditures	330,647,770	(3,842,230)	326,805,540	26,156,810	8.70%	300,648,730



Maryland Association of Election Officials 2025 Annual Meeting of the Membership Maryland State Board of Elections Biennial

Grand Hotel

2100 Baltimore Avenue, Ocean City, Maryland 21842



TENTATIVE AGENDA

Updated: 4/2/25

Sunday, May 4, 2025, Day 1 - State Board of Elections Biennial

- TRAVEL DAY** *All meals on your own*
- 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Conference Registration & Door Prize Drop off
- After 4:00 pm** Hotel Check-in
- 4:00 pm to 4:30 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Opening Remarks - Michael Summers, Chair, Maryland State Board of Elections
Welcome - Jared DeMarinis, Administrator, Maryland State Board of Elections
- 4:30 pm to 5:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
The Future of Maryland Elections - General Session for All
Alysoun McLaughlin, Senior Fellow, University of Maryland's Center for Democracy and Civic Engagement's Election Workforce Initiative
Sam Novey, University of Maryland Center for Democracy and Civic Engagement
- 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm** **Grand II**
Sexual Harassment Prevention Training - Board Members
(**REQUIRED** for Offices in the State Personnel System)
CJ Komp, Deputy Director of Voter Operations & SBE EEO Officer
Devki Dave, IT Functional Analyst & SBE EEO Officer
Lexy Rhoden, Director of Speial Projects & SBE EEO Officer
- Grand I**
Organizing Inventory Management Roundtable - Election Directors, Deputy Directors & IT Staff
Russell Hicks, Assistant Deputy of Election Operations
Desvin Gabbidon, Regional Manager Supervisor
Paul Noranbrock, Regional Manager
Shomari Hull, Facilities Manager
- 6:00 pm to 6:30 pm** **Self-Serve Snack Break - "Sweet & Salty"**
Salted Soft Pretzel with Mustard, Soft Pretzels with Cinnamon & Sugar, Fresh Baked Cookies, Buttery Popcorn, Assortment of Sodas and Bottled Water
- All meals on your own*

NOTE: *Guests are not permitted to bring outside food and beverage items into any meeting/banquet or other public space of the hotel. Should outside food and beverage items be found in any public space of the hotel, such items will be required to be removed immediately and the group master account will be assessed a fee of \$500.00. Please help protect the property and catering partner from potential liability suits by enforcing this policy.*

Monday, May 5, 2025, Day 2 - State Board of Elections Biennial

- 7:00 am to 8:30 am** **Grand Ballroom**
Breakfast
- 7:00 am to 8:30 am** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Conference Registration & Door Prize Drop off
- 8:45 am to 9:45 am** **Grand Ballroom**
Opening Remarks - Jim Shalleck, Vice-Chair, Maryland State Board of Elections
Welcome - Jared DeMarinis, Administrator, Maryland State Board of Elections
Special Guest - Sarah R. David, Deputy State Prosecutor, Maryland Office of the State Prosecutor
Brittany Dunklow, Senior Assistant State Prosecutor,
Election Integrity, Maryland Office of the State Prosecutor
- 9:45 am to 10:45 am** **Grand I**
Audit & List Maintenance Best Practices - Election Directors, Deputy Directors & LBE Staff
Janet Smith, Director of Audits
Lisa Dennis, Deputy Director of Voter Registration
- Grand II**
Hiring, Job Performance & EEO - Election Directors, Board Members and Counsel (of the State Personnel System)
Christina Lohr-Beatty, Human Resources Director
Marina Rodriguez, Human Resources Officer
Amanda Shepherd, Human Resources Officer
CJ Komp, Deputy Director of Voting Operations & SBE EEO Officer
Lexy Rhoden, Director of Special Projects & SBE EEO Officer
Desvin Gabbidon, Deputy Field Support Manager & SBE EEO Officer
Devki Dave, IT Functional Analyst & SBE EEO Officer
- 10:45 am to 11:00 am** **Break**
- 11:00 am to 12:00 noon** **Grand I**
Voter Registration & Election Management Database Planning - Election Directors, Deputy Directors & LBE Staff
Nikia Wilbon, Director of Software Development
Melissia Dorsey, Assistant Deputy of Election Policy
Crystal McGinn, Director of Voter Registration & Election Operations
- 11:00 am to 12:45 pm** **Grand II**
Board Member Forum - State Board and Local Board Members
Jared DeMarinis, Administrator, Maryland State Board of Elections
Michael Summers, Chair, State Board of Elections
Jim Shalleck, Vice-Chair, State Board of Elections
Guy Mickley, Election Director, Howard County & Local Board Committee
Moderator, MAEO
- 12:00 noon to 12:45 pm** **Grand I**
Running Effective Canvasses - Election Directors, Deputy Directors, LBE Staff
James Harris, Deputy Director of Mail-in Voting
Crystal McGinn, Director of Voter Registration & Operations
Lisa Nash, Deputy Director of Voting Operations

Monday, May 5, 2025, Day 2 - State Board of Elections Biennial - Continued

- 12:45 pm to 1:45 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Lunch - MAEO name badge required
Special Guest - Michael Robson, Crime Investigation Unit, United States Postal Service
Traci Long, National Elections Crime Coordinator, United States Postal Service
State Service Awards
Christina Lohr-Beatty, Human Resources Director
Marina Rodriguez, Human Resources Officer
Amanda Shepherd, Human Resources Officer
Election Official of the Year
Castaway
Board Counsel Breakout - Lunch Included
Dan Kobrin, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Katherine Berry, Deputy State Administrator
- 1:45 pm to 2:15 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
What is Voter Services? - General Session for All
Melissia Dorsey, Assistant Deputy of Election Policy
Nikia Wilbon, Director of Software Development
- 2:15 pm to 3:15 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
2025 Legislative Review - General Session for All
Jared DeMarinis, State Administrator
Jennifer McLaughlin, Director of Mail-in Voting & SBE Legislative Liaison
Kevin Kinnally, Policy Director, Maryland Association of Counties
- 3:15 pm to 3:30 pm** **Break**
- 3:30 pm to 4:30 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Working with Challengers & Watchers - General Session for All
Jared DeMarinis, State Administrator
Mary Ann Mogavero, Director of Election Reform
- After 4:00 pm** Hotel Check-in
- 4:30 pm to 4:45 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Biennial Closing Remarks
Katherine Berry, Deputy State Administrator
- After 5:00 pm** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Vendor Setup
Dinner on your own
- 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Entertainment - Trivia Night

NOTE: *Guests are not permitted to bring outside food and beverage items into any meeting/banquet or other public space of the hotel. Should outside food and beverage items be found in any public space of the hotel, such items will be required to be removed immediately and the group master account will be assessed a fee of \$500.00. Please help protect the property and catering partner from potential liability suits by enforcing this policy.*

Tuesday, May 6, 2025, Day 1 - MAEO Annual Meeting

- 7:00 am to 8:45 am** **Grand Ballroom**
Breakfast
- 9:00 am to 9:20 am** **Grand Ballroom**
2025 Annual Meeting of the Membership, Opening Ceremony
Building Relationships, Building Trust
Call to Order, Welcome and Introduction - Erin Perrone, President
Roll Call, Establish Quorum - Abigail Goldman, Secretary
National Anthem - Anthony Gutierrez, Deputy Director, Frederick County
Pledge of Allegiance - SOMEONE FROM 01, 12 or 22 to LEAD?
Invocation - Barry Jackson, Election Director, Washington County
Moment of Silence and Memorial Slide Show - Barry Jackson, Election Director, Washington County
Approval of 2024 Annual Meeting Minutes - Abigail Goldman, Secretary
Treasurer's Report - Tae Frere, Treasurer
Committee Reports - included in conference folder - Committee Chairs & Co-Chairs
Audit - Jennifer Klem (Harford)
Constitution & Bylaws—Richard Siejack (Anne Arundel) & Sheri Woodruff (Cecil)
Election Judges - Monica Fields (Howard) & Olivia Smith (Carroll)
Elections—Nathan Reynolds (Harford) & Justin Wall (Harford)
Election Technology - Shawn Larson (Baltimore City) & Reider White (Anne Arundel)
In-Person Voting - Teresa Morningstar (Washington) & Karen Perry (Harford)
Legislative - Stephen Feryus (Harford) & John Michael Gudger (Carroll)
Local Board - Moderated by Guy Mickley (Howard)
Mail-in Voting - Mia Faber (Carroll) & Tiffany Ferrell (Howard)
Newsletter - Jessica Noranbrock (Dorchester)
Personnel - Tracy Dickerson (Charles) & Erin Perrone (Carroll)
Standards - Bianca Morgan (Anne Arundel) & Sandra Prudenti (Montgomery)
State Regulations Review (COMAR) - Guy Mickley (Howard)
Voter Outreach - Shawn Larson (Baltimore City) & Isaac Nogueron (Carroll)
Voter Registration - Mia Faber (Carroll) & Tae Frere (St. Mary's)
Website - Nathan Reynolds (Harford) & Olivia Smith (Carroll)
- 9:20 am to 9:45 am** **Grand Ballroom**
Vendor Presentations - General Session for All
- 9:45 am to 10:30 am** **Welcome Address** - Richard W Meehan, Mayor of Ocean City
Opening Remarks - Past MAEO President Speaker Series - David Garreis, MAEO President from 2016 to 2024, Anne Arundel County
- 10:30 am to 11:00 am** **Grand Ballroom**
UOCAVA Review
Jennifer McLaughlin, Director of Mail-in Voting & SBE Legislative Liaison
- 11:00 am to 11:30 am** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Break - "Coffee Break"
Freshly Brewed Regular & Decaf Coffee, Hot Tea & Hot Chocolate

Tuesday, May 6, 2025, Day 1 - MAEO Annual Meeting

- 11:30 am to 12:30 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Risk Limiting Audits - General Session for All
Monica Childers, Senior Election Subject Matter, Election Assistance Commission
CJ Komp, Deputy Director of Operations
Stephanie Taylor, Election Director, Harford County
- 12:30 pm to 1:15 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Lunch - MAEO name badge required
Door Prizes - must be present to win!
- 1:30 pm to 2:45 pm** **Grand I**
BREAKOUT SESSIONS **Continuity of Operations**
Monica Childers, Senior Election Subject Matter, Election Assistance Commission
Ben Jackson, Senior Election Subject Matter, Election Assistance Commission
Fred Brechbiel, Chief Information Officer
Akelius Liggins, Chief Information Security Officer
- Grand II**
Building Trust in Your Community
TJ Pyche, Director of Communications and Program Operations, The Elections Group
- 2:45 pm to 3:15 pm** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Break - "Afternoon Delight"
Fresh Baked Cookies & Fudge Brownies, Assortment of Soda & Bottled Water
- 3:25 pm to 4:40 pm** **Grand I**
BREAKOUT SESSIONS **Continuity of Operations**
Election Assistance Commission
Fred Brechbiel, Chief Information Officer
Akelius Liggins, Chief Information Security Officer
- Grand II**
Building Trust in Your Community
TJ Pyche, Director of Communications and Program Operations, The Elections Group
- 4:40 pm to 5:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Announcements, Reminders & Recess - Reider White, MAEO Board Member
- 5:30 pm to 6:45 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Dinner - MAEO name badge required
Door Prizes - must be present to win!
- 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Entertainment - Beats & Bingo

NOTE: *Guests are not permitted to bring outside food and beverage items into any meeting/banquet or other public space of the hotel. Should outside food and beverage items be found in any public space of the hotel, such items will be required to be removed immediately and the group master account will be assessed a fee of \$500.00. Please help protect the property and catering partner from potential liability suits by enforcing this policy.*



Wednesday, May 7, 2025, Day 2 - MAEO Annual Meeting

- 7:00 am to 8:45 am** **Grand Ballroom**
Breakfast
- 9:00 am to 9:30 am** **Grand Ballroom**
2025 Annual Meeting of the Membership, Day 2
Building Relationships, Building Trust
Reconvene & Introduction - Erin Perrone, President
Roll Call, Establish Quorum - Abigail Goldman, Secretary
Welcome & Opening Remarks - Past MAEO President Speaker Series - Gail Hatfield,
MAEO President from 2012 to 2016, Calvert County
- 9:30 am to 11:00 am** **Grand Ballroom**
The Ethical Leader with Chuck Gallagher - General Session for All
Ethics in the workplace is a serious matter, but talking about it doesn't have to be "business as usual." In his compelling presentations, Chuck starts by setting the scene with his own story, and ends by setting the stage for your ethical success.
- 11:00 am to 11:30 am** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Break - "Coffee Break"
Freshly Brewed Regular & Decaf Coffee, Hot Tea & Hot Chocolate
- 11:30 am to 12:15 pm** **Roundtable Best Practices**
Similar size counties will be in their own rooms to answer questions posed by your colleagues on all things election related. The chairs and co-chairs of the MAEO committees will moderate this session while sharing valuable information. Participants will get tangible items to take back to the office and use in the 2026 elections.
- Grand I - Medium Sized Counties** - Carroll, Charles, Frederick, Harford, Saint Mary's & Washington
- Grand II - Large Sized Counties** - Anne Arundel, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Howard, Montgomery & Prince George's
- Starboard - Small Sized Counties** - Allegany, Calvert, Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico & Worcester
- 12:30 pm to 1:30 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Lunch - MAEO name badge required
Door Prizes—must be present to win!
- 1:30 pm to 3:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Effective Communication: What's Your Strong Suit? with Chuck Gallagher - General Session for All
This is an interactive program that connects the dots between our natural personality profiles and our methods of communication.
- 3:00 pm to 3:30 pm** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Break - "Mediterranean Break"
Homemade Hummus & Tzatziki, Assorted Gourmet Crackers Served with Carrot, Celery, Cucumber Sticks & Cherry Tomatoes, Fresh Baked Cookies & Fudge Brownies, Fruit Infused Lemonade, Iced Tea & Water

Wednesday, May 7, 2025, Day 2 - MAEO Annual Meeting

- 3:30 pm to 5:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Every Choice has a Consequence with Chuck Gallagher - General Session for All
In this session, you will not only come to realize the impact of the choices you make, but also gain an understanding of to use ethics and integrity to create success on a personal and professional level.
- 5:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Announcements, Reminders & Recess - Tae Frere, MAEO Treasurer
- 5:30 pm to 6:45 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Banquet Dinner & Cash Bar
Door Prizes - must be present to win
MAEO Awards - Shining Stars, Antonetti
- 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Entertainment - The Match Game - Preliminary Round
Cash Bar

DRAFT

NOTE: *Guests are not permitted to bring outside food and beverage items into any meeting/banquet or other public space of the hotel. Should outside food and beverage items be found in any public space of the hotel, such items will be required to be removed immediately and the group master account will be assessed a fee of \$500.00. Please help protect the property and catering partner from potential liability suits by enforcing this policy.*



Thursday, May 8, 2025, Day 3 - MAEO Annual Meeting

- 7:00 am to 8:45 am** **Grand Ballroom**
Breakfast
- 9:00 am to 9:45 am** **Grand Ballroom**
2025 Annual Meeting of the Membership, Day 3
Building Relationships, Building Trust
Reconvene & Introduction - Erin Perrone, President
Roll Call, Establish Quorum - Abigail Goldman, Secretary
Welcome Remarks - Commissioner Tom Hicks, Election Assistance Commission
Opening Remarks - Past MAEO President Speaker Series - Guy Mickley, MAEO
President from 2006 to 2012, Howard County
- 9:45 am to 11:00 am** **Grand Ballroom**
Roundtable Best Practices Review - General Session for All
Everyone will share the best practices from yesterday's session. What works for a small county may also work for a large county.
- 11:00 am to 11:30 am** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Break - "Coffee Break"
Freshly Brewed Regular & Decaf Coffee, Hot Tea & Hot Chocolate
- 11:30 am to 12:30 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
De-escalation Tactics - General Session for All
- 12:30 pm to 1:15 pm** **Grand Ballroom**
Lunch - MAEO name badge required
Door Prizes—must be present to win!
- 1:30 pm to 2:45 pm** **Grand I**
BREAKOUT SESSIONS **Teambuilding in Your Office**
Various Local Boards
- Grand II**
How to Breathe When You Feel Like You Can't
Manifest Ra
- Starboard**
How to Create Effective, Yet Affordable, Videos
Various Local Boards
- Castaway**
How to Organize Your "I Voted" Sticker Contest
Mia Faber, Election Program Supervisor, Carroll County
Lisa Deeley, Philadelphia City Commissioner, Vice Chair
- 2:45 pm to 3:15 pm** **Main Hotel Lobby**
Break - "Ice Cream Parlor"
Four Flavors of Hand Dipped Ice Cream served with Chocolate & Caramel Syrup



Thursday, May 8, 2025, Day 3 - MAEO Annual Meeting - Continued

3:15 pm to 4:30 pm
BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Grand I
Teambuilding in Your Office
Various Local Boards

Grand II
How to Breathe When You Feel Like You Can't
Contacted Manifest Ra

Starboard
How to Create Effective, Yet Affordable, Videos
Various Local Boards

Castaway
How to Organize Your "I Voted" Sticker Contest
Mia Faber, Election Program Supervisor, Carroll County
Lisa Deeley, Philadelphia City Commissioner, Vice Chair

4:30 pm to 4:45 pm

Grand Ballroom
Announcements, Reminders & Adjournment - Erin Perrone, MAEO President

4:30 pm to 6:45 pm

Dinner on Your Own

7:00 pm to 10:00 pm

Grand Ballroom
Entertainment - The Match Game - Semifinal & Final Round
Hors D'Oeuvres & Cash Bar
Vegetable Crudit , Cheese Crudit , Homemade BBQ Meatballs, Puff Pastry Frank,
Spanakopita, Chicken Tenders

NOTE: *Guests are not permitted to bring outside food and beverage items into any meeting/banquet or other public space of the hotel. Should outside food and beverage items be found in any public space of the hotel, such items will be required to be removed immediately and the group master account will be assessed a fee of \$500.00. Please help protect the property and catering partner from potential liability suits by enforcing this policy.*

Friday, May 9, 2025, Travel Day - MAEO Annual Meeting - Continued

TRAVEL DAY *Breakfast on Your Own*

Before 11:00 am Hotel Check-out

DRAFT

