

Butler County Ohio Voters Who Moved To and Voted in Another State

Key Issues

- **Inconsistent Board Decisions:** The Board of Elections granted **104** of **119** North Carolina challenges, then denied **105** of **108** Georgia challenges, raising concerns about consistent application of the law and evidentiary standards. More concerning, a voter who has moved to and voted in another state – or someone impersonating that voter – may still be able to cast a regular ballot in Ohio, despite no longer meeting residency requirements.
- **Personal Identifying Information:** The Board now contends that it cannot determine whether the Ohio and Georgia records refer to the same voter without personal identifying information to “definitively confirm” their identity, despite the following:
 - **Last four digits of SSN (SSN4) is an imperfect means of identity verification:** As of August, 2026, **652** Butler County voters either have no SSN4, or SSN4 does not match SSA records. In 2026 alone, **74,435** Ohio registrations did not match SSA records [<https://www.ssa.gov/data/HAVV.html>]. Requiring SSN4 verification could allow a voter who moved and voted in another state to remain eligible to vote in Ohio simply because the SSN4 is missing or does not match.
 - **The following independent identity chain was sufficient for the Board to grant challenges to remove voters who moved and voted in North Carolina:** Official state records in both states share the same name and DOB, while USPS National Change of Address (NCOA) records connect the same name to the OH “moved-from” address and the NC “moved-to” address.
 - **Other county Boards accept the identity chain** as sufficient to grant similar challenges.
 - **SSN4 is not available to private citizens, and Ohio law does not require challengers to provide unobtainable information;** requiring it undermines the statutory right to challenge.
 - **The Board has used SSN4 to investigate.** The Board used its investigative authority to compare a voter’s SSN4 with another state’s records in a prior challenge.
 - **Secretary LaRose “strongly urge[d]” Boards to “further investigate challenged electors”** in an October 2, 2024 letter to a county Board of Elections.
- **Limited Investigation:** The Board appears to generally limit its investigation to information already contained in its own records, although Ohio law requires Boards to “**investigate and determine the residence qualification of electors**” R.C. 3501.11(Q). The Board may not:
 - Seek relevant information from the Secretary of State;
 - Use all available methods to contact the voter, such as phone or email;
 - Contact election officials in the other state to determine whether the Ohio and the other state registrations belong to the same person. Georgia law expressly permits personal identifying information to be made available to other states for identity verification; and
 - Use other available methods to determine the voter’s residence qualification.
- **Residence Is Not Independently Determined:** When the Board’s own records do not resolve an identity or residence question, it generally appears to treat the voter as an “Ohio resident” rather than independently determining the voter’s residence qualification. This raises the question of whether the Board is fulfilling its statutory duty to “**determine the residence qualification of electors.**”

Form 257 Challenges and Cancellation Safeguards

- Challenges allow citizens to present evidence for Board investigation and residence determination, with safeguards against erroneous cancellation, including provisional voting and reinstatement.
- **There is no comparable safeguard against ineligible registrants voting in Ohio after moving to and voting in another state,** potentially diluting the votes of eligible Ohio voters.
- The Secretary of State currently has interstate data-sharing agreements with only **10** states to identify Ohio voters who may have moved and voted in another state.
- Ohio citizens are attempting to help address the gap for voters who may have moved and voted in states not covered by those agreements.