

February 24, 2025

***Submitted Electronically***

Vanessa E. Atterbeary, Chair  
Jheanelle K. Wilkins, Vice Chair  
House Ways and Means Committee  
Room 131  
House Office Building  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

***RE: House Bill 1044 – The Maryland Voting Rights Act of 2025 – Preclearance and Voter Intimidation and Obstruction – Favorable***

Chair Atterbeary and Vice Chair Wilkins:

On behalf of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF),<sup>1</sup> we appreciate the opportunity to submit written testimony in strong support of H.B. 1044, the Maryland Voting Rights Act of 2025 – Preclearance and Voter Intimidation and Obstruction.<sup>2</sup> H.B. 1044 provides key protections against discrimination, harassment, intimidation, obstruction, and deception in voting, and is a key part of the Maryland Voting Rights Act (“MDVRA”) legislative package.<sup>3</sup> Its enactment would cement Maryland’s status as a national leader in protecting the right to vote, just as we are facing increasing threats at the federal level.

The MDVRA builds upon the best parts of the landmark federal Voting Rights Act of 1965<sup>4</sup> and recent efforts by states such as New York, Connecticut, Minnesota, and neighboring Virginia to provide much-needed protections against voting discrimination.<sup>5</sup> Through this critical legislative package, Maryland would help set the standard for state-level protections for Black voters and other

---

<sup>1</sup> Since its founding in 1940, LDF has used litigation, policy advocacy, public education, and community organizing strategies to achieve racial justice and equity in the areas of education, economic justice, political participation, and criminal justice. It has been a separate organization from the NAACP since 1957.

<sup>2</sup> H.B.1044, 2025 Leg., 447th Sess. (Md. 2025), <https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2025RS/bills/hb/hb1044F.pdf> (hereinafter “H.B. 1044”).

<sup>3</sup> In the 2025 legislative session, the MDVRA legislative package includes H.B. 1044, H.B. 1043, S.B. 342, H.B. 983, and S.B. 685.

<sup>4</sup> 52 U.S.C. §§ 10301–10314.

<sup>5</sup> A.6678E / S.1046E, 2021 Reg. Sess. (N.Y. 2022), <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2021/A6678> (hereinafter “NYVRA”); H.B. 6941, 2023 Reg. Sess (Conn. 2023), <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/ACT/PA/PDF/2023PA-00204-R00HB-06941-PA.PDF> (hereinafter “CTVRA”); H.F. 3527, 93rd Leg. (Minn. 2024), [https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/text.php?number=HF3527&version=0&session\\_year=2024&session\\_number=0&format=pdf](https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/text.php?number=HF3527&version=0&session_year=2024&session_number=0&format=pdf) (hereinafter “MNVRA”); S.B. 1395, 2022 Reg. Sess. (Va. 2021), <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?211+sum+SB1395>.

voters of color, and immediately become a national leader in building an inclusive, multiracial democracy.

Advancing the MDVRA is a top affirmative voting rights priority for our organization, and Maryland voters agree. Eight-in-ten Maryland voters support passing a MDVRA (81%) and would like their state legislators to prioritize enacting such legislation (80%).<sup>6</sup>

H.B. 1044 contains two critical pieces of the broader MDVRA legislative package. First, H.B. 1044 would stop voting discrimination before it occurs through a “preclearance” program that requires local governments in high-risk places to get changes to key voting rules or practices pre-approved by the Attorney General or a court before they go into effect.<sup>7</sup> Second, H.B. 1044 provides robust civil protections against voter intimidation, deception, and obstruction to complement existing criminal prohibitions.<sup>8</sup> Both of these individual provisions are extremely popular with Maryland voters. More than eight-in-ten (81%) support preclearance; and more than nine-in-ten (91%) support protections against voter intimidation.<sup>9</sup>

For the reasons outlined herein, Maryland should enact H.B. 1044, as well as the broader MDVRA package.

### **The Legal Defense Fund’s Long History of Protecting and Advancing Voting Rights**

Founded in 1940 under the leadership of Maryland native Thurgood Marshall, LDF is America’s premier legal organization fighting for racial justice. Through litigation, advocacy, and public education, LDF seeks structural changes to expand democracy, eliminate disparities, and achieve racial justice in a society that fulfills the promise of equality for all Americans.

LDF has prioritized its work protecting the right of Black communities to vote for more than 80 years—representing Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and other marchers in Selma, Alabama in 1965, advancing the passage of the Voting Rights Act (VRA), litigating seminal cases interpreting the federal VRA’s scope,<sup>10</sup> and working in communities across the South to strengthen and protect the ability of Black voters to participate in the political process free from discrimination.

In the wake of recent Supreme Court cases that have undercut the federal VRA,<sup>11</sup> as Congress struggles to respond with federal legislation,<sup>12</sup> and as states across the country move to further restrict the franchise,<sup>13</sup> LDF has prioritized working to advance state voting rights acts to meet the urgent need to protect Black voters from discrimination. LDF worked with partners to successfully advocate for the enactment of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act of New York (the New York Voting Rights Act or “NYVRA”) in 2022, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act of

---

<sup>6</sup> *Poll Finds Overwhelming Support for a Maryland Voting Rights Act*, Legal Def. Fund & Impact Research (Jan. 30, 2025), <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/IMPACT-LDF-MDVRA-Key-Findings.pdf> (hereinafter “Poll”).

<sup>7</sup> H.B. 1044 §§15.5-202–208.

<sup>8</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5-301.

<sup>9</sup> Poll, *supra* note 6.

<sup>10</sup> *Merrill v. Milligan*, 142 S. Ct. 879 (2022).

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., *Shelby Cnty. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013); *Brnovich v. Democratic Nat’l Comm.*, 594 U.S. 647 (2021).

<sup>12</sup> Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act, H.R. 5746, 117th Cong. (2021).

<sup>13</sup> *Voting Laws Roundup: September 2024*, Brennan Ctr. for Just., N.Y.U. (Sept. 26, 2023), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-laws-roundup-september-2024>.

Connecticut (the Connecticut Voting Rights Act or “CTVRA”) in 2023, and the Minnesota Voting Rights Act (“MNVRA”) in 2024.<sup>14</sup> This year we are working with robust coalitions of civil and voting rights advocates seeking to advance similar laws here in Maryland, as well as in New Jersey.

As a vibrantly diverse state<sup>15</sup> with historic Black leadership, as a state with a longstanding history of racial discrimination that has made substantial strides in opening its democracy,<sup>16</sup> and as the birthplace of our founder Thurgood Marshall, we are excited to work with the General Assembly to ensure that Maryland can lead the way forward. The Free State can become a national leader by meeting a critical local need.

### **Why Preclearance is Important in Maryland**

The importance of the right to vote cannot be overstated. The United States Supreme Court has long described voting as a fundamental right, because it is preservative of all other rights.<sup>17</sup> Voting is “the citizen’s link to his laws and government”<sup>18</sup> and “the essence of a democratic society.”<sup>19</sup> If the right to vote is undermined, the Court has cautioned, other rights “are illusory.”<sup>20</sup> Thus, in a democracy, safeguarding the right to vote “is a fundamental matter.”<sup>21</sup>

Preclearance has proven to be a tremendously powerful and effective tool to protect these rights. Preclearance programs require certain jurisdictions with demonstrated histories of discrimination to secure the approval of state officials or a court before implementing changes to voting policies or practices that could harm voters of color.<sup>22</sup> Such programs are based upon the simple premise that when it comes to a matter as fundamental as the right to vote, an ounce of prevention can be worth a pound of cure.

Preclearance was the “heart” of the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965<sup>23</sup> because it prevented voting discrimination *before* it occurred. Challenging voting discrimination can be expensive and time-consuming,<sup>24</sup> and often several elections take place before discriminatory rules are addressed

---

<sup>14</sup> NYVRA, N.Y. Elec. L. §§ 17-200–222; CTVRA, Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 9-368i–q; MNVRA, Minn. Stat. §§ 200.50-200.59.

<sup>15</sup> Marissa J. Lang & Ted Mellnik, *Census Data Shows Maryland Is Now the East Coast’s Most Diverse State, While D.C. Is Whiter*, Wash. Post (Aug. 12, 2021), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2021/08/12/dc-virginia-maryland-census-redistricting-2/>.

<sup>16</sup> Bennett Leckrone, *Election Reforms Will Make Voting More Accessible in Maryland, Advocates Say*, Md. Matters (June 16, 2021), <https://marylandmatters.org/2021/06/16/election-reforms-will-make-voting-more-accessible-in-maryland-advocates-say/>.

<sup>17</sup> See *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886).

<sup>18</sup> *Evans v. Cornman*, 398 U.S. 419, 422 (1970).

<sup>19</sup> *Harman v. Forssenius*, 380 U.S. 528, 537 (1965).

<sup>20</sup> *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 17 (1964).

<sup>21</sup> *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 561-62 (1964).

<sup>22</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 10303; NYVRA § 17–210; CTVRA § 414(c)-(f).

<sup>23</sup> *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 315 (1966).

<sup>24</sup> Legal Def. Fund, *The Cost (in Time, Money, and Burden) of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act Litigation*, (Sept. 2021), <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Section-2-costs-9.19.21-Final.pdf>; *Voting Rights Act: Section 5 of the Act – History, Scope, and Purpose: Hr’g Before the Subcomm. on the Const. of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109<sup>th</sup> Cong. 79 (2005) (“[Two] to [five] years is a rough average” for the length of Section 2 lawsuits), [https://commdocs.house.gov/committees/judiciary/hju24120.000/hju24120\\_0f.htm](https://commdocs.house.gov/committees/judiciary/hju24120.000/hju24120_0f.htm).

through litigation or policy action.<sup>25</sup> What the Supreme Court observed over fifty years ago remains true today: “Voting suits are unusually onerous to prepare” and “[l]itigation has been exceedingly slow, in part because of the ample opportunities for delay afforded voting officials.”<sup>26</sup> Once an election has taken place under a discriminatory system, it generally cannot be undone; there is no “do over” when a person’s right to vote is denied or abridged in an election. It was for this reason that the drafters of the federal Voting Rights Act devised preclearance as a way to have a second set of eyes on potentially discriminatory voting policies *before* they can go into effect, thus “shift[ing] the advantage of time and inertia from the perpetrators of the evil to its victims.”<sup>27</sup>

Notably, many jurisdictions that were subject to federal preclearance saw the program not as a burden, but rather as a valuable way to garner expert advice on the probable impact of proposed voting changes and minimize the chances of costly litigation down the line.<sup>28</sup>

In 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the particular criteria for determining which jurisdictions would be covered by the federal preclearance program, not the concept of preclearance itself.<sup>29</sup> One indication of the effectiveness of federal preclearance is that, after the program became inoperative, voters in jurisdictions that were previously required to pre-clear voting changes began to face substantially increased discrimination.<sup>30</sup>

Maryland has made substantial progress in making voting more equitable and accessible, yet substantial racial disparities persist in both voter participation and local representation.

Recent research from the Brennan Center for Justice shows that Maryland ranked second in the nation in 2022 for the number of Black voters that did not vote but would have if turnout rates were equal between Black and white Marylanders.<sup>31</sup> In other words, due to Maryland’s significant Black population, its racial turnout disparities are warping its electorate to sharply reduce Black political power.

ACLU of Maryland has found that, as of 2024, more than half of Maryland municipalities have substantial populations of people of color, and nearly a quarter those municipalities have all

---

<sup>25</sup> In just one example, Plaintiffs successfully challenged Texas’ voter identification law, which an appellate court once considered the most restrictive in the country. During three years of appeals after a federal court held that the law created an unconstitutional burden on the right to vote, Texas voters elected dozens federal, state, and local candidates. *Veasey v. Abbott*, 830 F.3d 216 (5th Cir. 2016).

<sup>26</sup> *Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. at 314.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* at 328.

<sup>28</sup> See Br. for the States of N.Y., Cal., Miss., and N.C. as Amici Curiae in Supp.of Resp’ts, *Shelby Cnty.*, 570 U.S. 529; Br. for the States of N.C., Ariz., Cal., La., Miss., and N.Y. as Amici Curiae in Supp. of Eric H. Holder, Jr., et al., *Nw. Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1 v. Holder*, 08-322 at 11 (2009); see also Br. for Amicus Curiae, the City of N.Y., the Council of the City of N.Y., Michael R. Bloomberg, in his Capacity as Mayor of the City of N.Y., and Christine S. Quinn, in her Capacity as the Speaker of the City Council of the City of N.Y., in Supp. of Resp’ts, *Shelby Cnty.*, 570 U.S. 529.

<sup>29</sup> *Shelby Cnty.*, 570 U.S. 529.

<sup>30</sup> Democracy Diminished, Thurgood Marshall Inst., Legal Def. Fund (Oct. 6, 2021), [https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Democracy-Diminished\\_-10.06.2021-Final.pdf](https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Democracy-Diminished_-10.06.2021-Final.pdf).

<sup>31</sup> Kevin Morris & Coryn Grange, *Growing Racial Disparities in Voter Turnout, 2008–2022*, Brennan Ctr. for Just., N.Y. U. L. (Mar. 2, 2024), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/growing-racial-disparities-voter-turnout-2008-2022>.

white governments.<sup>32</sup> And they found that one-third of the counties with substantial populations of people of color lack any elected officials of color.<sup>33</sup> There is a high risk that Black voters and other voters of color have not been able to elect candidates of their choice.

The recent process of redrawing district lines after the 2020 Census demonstrates why bringing the successful preclearance process to Maryland will both prevent future discrimination and also save voters and taxpayers time and money. In several jurisdictions throughout the state, the process caused public concern about the potential discriminatory impact of newly drawn districts, and some places required expensive and time-consuming litigation to address these concerns.<sup>34</sup>

One case in point involves Baltimore County’s districting plan. Despite demographic shifts over the past decade that led to nearly half the County population being people of color, the County Council enacted a districting plan that packed Black voters into a single super-majority district while maintaining significant white majorities in the six remaining districts.<sup>35</sup> The Council acted in the face of sustained advocacy by voting rights groups and clear warnings that the proposed plan would violate federal non-discrimination standards.<sup>36</sup> Local residents and civil rights groups sued under the federal Voting Rights Act and secured a court ruling invalidating the discriminatory plan.<sup>37</sup> This process, however, cost organizations time and effort better spent on affirmative priorities such as expanding voting access; and will almost certainly cost Baltimore County taxpayers at least one million dollars in legal fees.<sup>38</sup>

Given the County’s history of discrimination,<sup>39</sup> it would likely qualify as a “covered jurisdiction” under the MDVRA’s preclearance program.<sup>40</sup> If the MDVRA had been in place and Baltimore County was deemed covered by the preclearance program, the Attorney General or the Anne Arundel Circuit Court would almost certainly have declined to preclear the proposed districting plan under the MDVRA’s standard of review,<sup>41</sup> and the County would have gone back to the drawing board to produce a nondiscriminatory plan—producing fair districts more quickly and saving taxpayer resources.

Similarly, in 2023, Black voters and organizations that represent them, such as the NAACP and the Caucus of African American Leaders, were forced to sue the Town of Federalsburg to end a

---

<sup>32</sup> *Why Maryland Needs Its Own Voting Rights Act*, ACLU of Md. (2024), [https://www.aclu-md.org/sites/default/files/mdvra\\_need\\_public\\_onepager\\_mdga25\\_english.pdf](https://www.aclu-md.org/sites/default/files/mdvra_need_public_onepager_mdga25_english.pdf).

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

<sup>34</sup> ACLU of Md., Testimony for Ways & Means Comm. (Mar. 7, 2023), [https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/cmte\\_testimony/2023/wam/Inse5lqvngZ\\_P9ljK6PoDcUMxyTW0tzHy.pdf](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/cmte_testimony/2023/wam/Inse5lqvngZ_P9ljK6PoDcUMxyTW0tzHy.pdf).

<sup>35</sup> *Balt. Cnty. Branch of the NAACP v. Balt. Cnty.*, 2022 WL 657562 (D. Md. 2022).

<sup>36</sup> Bennett Leckrone, *In Baltimore County Redistricting Case, Plaintiffs Say New Council Map Doesn’t Comply with Voting Rights Act*, Md. Matters (Mar. 10, 2022), <https://www.marylandmatters.org/2022/03/10/in-baltimore-county-redistricting-case-plaintiffs-say-new-council-map-doesnt-comply-with-voting-rights-act/>.

<sup>37</sup> *Balt. Cnty. Branch of the NAACP v. Balt. Cnty.*, 2022 WL 657562.

<sup>38</sup> Meredith Curtis Goode, *Victory: Federal Judge Orders Baltimore County to Submit Redistricting Plan that Complies with Voting Rights Act*, ACLU of Md. (Feb. 22, 2022), <https://www.aclu-md.org/en/press-releases/victory-federal-judge-orders-baltimore-county-submit-redistricting-plan-complies>.

<sup>39</sup> No Black candidate was elected to County office until 2002, and only one Black official has served at any given time since.

<sup>40</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(D).

<sup>41</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–203(B); § 15.5–205(E).



discriminatory at-large election system that has kept governance exclusively White for two centuries in a community that is now nearly half Black.<sup>42</sup> Black residents warned of the discriminatory impact of the current at-large system prior to filing suit.<sup>43</sup> Under a court order, Federalsburg created a new election system that led to the election of the community's first ever Black town council members in October 2023.<sup>44</sup> This victory, however, has come at substantial cost to both voters and local taxpayers. And there are other communities where residents of color suffer underrepresentation yet the particular circumstances are less amenable to a federal lawsuit.<sup>45</sup>

At least nine counties in Maryland use full or partial at-large election systems, in addition to municipalities such as Federalsburg.<sup>46</sup> Nearly two-thirds of municipalities with substantial populations of people of color use at-large systems.<sup>47</sup> These systems and unfair district maps have contributed to significant underrepresentation for Black Marylanders and other people of color at the local level. Approximately one-third of Maryland counties and one-quarter of municipalities with substantial populations of people of color have all-white government, according to an analysis by ACLU of Maryland.<sup>48</sup>

Establishing a preclearance program for the local redistricting that will occur after the next Census will help avoid such discriminatory election systems, resulting in fairer outcomes and saving taxpayer money. But the benefits of preclearance go well beyond redistricting. For example, a shortage of election judges and voting machines has led to long lines at the polls, particularly in Black and brown communities.<sup>49</sup> Under preclearance, certain municipalities would need to submit

---

<sup>42</sup> Ezola Webb & Meredith Curtis Goode, *Black Voters, Advocates Challenge Election System in Eastern Shore Town Shamefully Marking Bicentennial with Continued All-White Government*, ACLU of Md. (Feb. 22, 2023), <https://www.aclu-md.org/en/press-releases/black-voters-advocates-challenge-election-system-eastern-shore-town-shamefully>.

<sup>43</sup> *Id.*

<sup>44</sup> Order Directing Def. to Submit to This Court, by No Later Than 5/23/2023, a Status Report, *Caroline Cnty. NAACP et al. v. Federalsburg*, No. 1:23-cv-00484-SAG (D. Md. 2024), ECF No. 27; Joe Heim & Erin Cox, *After Lawsuit, a Town Elects First Black Leaders in Its 200-Year History*, Wash. Post (Oct. 1, 2023), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2023/10/01/federalsburg-election-naacp-aclu-maryland/>.

<sup>45</sup> The Town of Delmar is an example of a community with a substantial Black population that does not appear to be sufficiently concentrated in one part of the community to meet the requirements of a federal lawsuit. *See Delmar, MD*, Data USA, <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/delmar-md/>; Rachel Lord, *Delmar Commission Election to Take Place on Nov. 16*, Morning Star Publ'ns (Sept. 23, 2021), <https://starpublications.online/delmar-commission-election-to-take-place-on-nov-16/>.

<sup>46</sup> H.B. 655, 2021 Leg., 443rd Sess. (Md. 2021), [https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2021RS/fnotes/bil\\_0005/hb0655.pdf](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2021RS/fnotes/bil_0005/hb0655.pdf).

<sup>47</sup> *Why Maryland Needs Its Own Voting Rights Act*, *supra* note 32.

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*

<sup>49</sup> Scott Dance & Cassidy Jensen, *As Maryland Voters Cast In-Person Ballots Tuesday, Election Judge Shortages Punctuate an Unusual Primary Election Season*, Balt. Sun (July 19, 2022), <https://www.baltimoresun.com/politics/bs-md-pol-election-day-updates-20220719-sh6cvarkofgvzmmx4vdzug2yca-story.html>; Hannah Klain et al., *Waiting to Vote*, Brennan Ctr. for Just., N.Y.U. L. (June 3, 2020), [https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/waiting-vote#footnoteref6\\_etr2asr](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/waiting-vote#footnoteref6_etr2asr); Barry Simms, *Some Counties Reducing Numbers of Polling Places Due to Election Judge Shortage*, WBALTV11, <https://www.wbaltv.com/article/maryland-election-judge-shortage-counties-reduce-number-of-polling-places/33457657#> (reporting the reduction in polling sites in certain counties due to election judge shortages); Ovetta Wiggins et al., *Citing a History of Voter Suppression, Black Marylanders Turn Out to Vote in Person*, Wash. Post (Oct. 25, 2020), [https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/md-politics/maryland-early-voting-prince-georges-trust/2020/10/25/847c5afc-1537-11eb-ad6f-36c93e6e94fb\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/md-politics/maryland-early-voting-prince-georges-trust/2020/10/25/847c5afc-1537-11eb-ad6f-36c93e6e94fb_story.html) (discussing the long lines Black voters had to wait in when voting in the 2020 election); Rachel Baye, *Maryland Lawmakers Say Local Election Officials*

their proposed allocation of polling locations across communities for review to ensure that resource allocation decisions do not leave Black or Latino neighborhoods with longer lines on Election Day.<sup>50</sup>

While preclearance would impose a small compliance requirement on covered localities, it would ultimately save many of those jurisdictions significant time and money by identifying discriminatory policies *before* they are enacted, thereby avoiding subsequent litigation. Moreover, it would serve as a powerful prophylactic to prevent voting discrimination and promote fairness and equal access to the fundamental right to vote for Maryland citizens.

### **How the MDVRA's Preclearance Program Works in H.B. 1044**

H.B.1044's preclearance program is modeled after the programs enacted by New York State in 2022<sup>51</sup> and Connecticut in 2023,<sup>52</sup> which were in turn based upon the successful federal program.<sup>53</sup> The program requires a limited set of jurisdictions with a demonstrated history of discrimination to secure pre-approval from the Attorney General or a court before making changes to an enumerated set of voting practices. To ensure that covered jurisdictions may move forward with nondiscriminatory changes in a timely manner, a jurisdiction may seek preclearance either through a streamlined administrative process with defined timelines run by the Attorney General<sup>54</sup> or by the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County.<sup>55</sup> A covered jurisdiction may appeal the denial of preclearance by the Attorney General<sup>56</sup> or the Circuit Court.<sup>57</sup>

### **Covered Jurisdictions**

To determine which jurisdictions are subject to the preclearance requirement, the MDVRA constructs a coverage framework consisting of five distinct criteria, or “prongs.” Each prong provides a different way to assess the jurisdiction’s history of discrimination in a manner that courts have found relevant to the accessibility of the political process. Critically, each prong is time-bound, only encompassing jurisdictions that meet its criteria within a certain number of years. This ensures that the coverage framework is responsive to current conditions. It also means that jurisdictions that come under preclearance are not covered in perpetuity; rather, they can roll out of coverage after a sustained period of nondiscriminatory voting administration.

---

*Violated State Law by Opening Fewer Polling Places*, WYPR (Sept. 30, 2022), <https://www.wypr.org/wypr-news/2022-09-30/maryland-lawmakers-say-local-election-officials-violated-state-law-by-opening-fewer-polling-places> (discussing the consolidation of polling places for the 2022 election, resulting in declines of as much as 45% of a county’s voting locations); Maryland Gen. Ass. H. Ways & Means Comm., *Election Data Overview* (Sept. 29, 2022), <https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/23115106/election-data-overview-9-29-22.pdf> (showing the comparative difference in the amount of polling places per county in 2018 versus in 2022).

<sup>50</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(E)(2). Because county election administration is largely controlled by the State Board of Elections, counties are only subject to preclearance for the purposes of redistricting.

<sup>51</sup> NYVRA § 17–210.

<sup>52</sup> CTVRA § 414(c)-(f).

<sup>53</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 10303.

<sup>54</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–203(B).

<sup>55</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–205.

<sup>56</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–203(D).

<sup>57</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–205(G).

The following criteria qualify a county, municipality, or school board as a covered jurisdiction:

*Any local government with at least one voting rights violation in the past 25 years.*<sup>58</sup> Past voting discrimination is perhaps the clearest sign that a jurisdiction may engage in future voting discrimination. The federal Voting Rights Act’s preclearance coverage was based upon whether certain jurisdictions had discriminatory practices in place when the law was passed.<sup>59</sup> The leading legislation in Congress to restore federal preclearance determines geographic-based preclearance coverage based largely upon voting rights violations within the past 25 years, similar to this prong of the MDVRA’s coverage.<sup>60</sup> The 25-year rolling look-back window provides a long enough period to establish patterns<sup>61</sup> while also ensuring that coverage is based upon present conditions rather than the more distant past.<sup>62</sup>

*Any local government with at least one race-based civil rights violations “concerning a pattern, practice, or policy of discrimination” in the past 25 years.*<sup>63</sup> Congress and the courts have long recognized that underlying social conditions resulting from past and ongoing discrimination often interact with particular voting rules to cause or exacerbate voting disparities.<sup>64</sup> For example, courts have long considered “the effects of discrimination in such areas as education, employment, and health” to be relevant to analyzing potential voting rights violations because such conditions can “hinder [a minority group’s] ability to participate effectively in the political process.”<sup>65</sup> The MDVRA relies upon the same body of law and social science research and evidence or findings in

---

<sup>58</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(D)(1) (“Covered jurisdiction means any local government: that, within the immediately preceding 25 years has become subject to a court order or government enforcement action based on a finding of a violation of this title, the federal Voting Rights Act, the 15th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, or a voting-related violation of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution for discrimination against members of a protected class.”).

<sup>59</sup> See 52 U.S.C. § 10303.

<sup>60</sup> John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2023, H.R. 14, 118<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2023), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/14>.

<sup>61</sup> Voting discrimination, for example, is often concentrated during redistricting, which occurs once-per-decade after each decennial census, and a 25-year look-back allows consideration of two redistricting cycles—including the post-redistricting litigation that may span several years before a court adjudication that a redistricting plan illegally discriminated against voters of color.

<sup>62</sup> Although states have more leeway to pass voting protections than does Congress (which must act pursuant to the Elections Clause or specific authority to enforce the U.S. Constitution), it is notable that this 25-year rolling look-back period is consistent with the period of time the U.S. Supreme Court has considered voting and other civil rights violations to be relevant for informing current conditions. In the 1999 case *Lopez v. Monterey County*, the Court upheld the constitutionality of Section 5 at that time, and rejected a challenge brought by a jurisdiction that was covered based on conditions in the jurisdiction in 1968. 525 U.S. 266, 282–285 (1999). *Lopez* thereby recognizes that evidence of voting discrimination from 30 years ago may justify preclearance, and that Congress, in 1982, acted properly in subjecting jurisdictions to preclearance for 25 additional years based on evidence of voting discrimination from 1968. Similarly, in *Tennessee v. Lane*, the Court upheld Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) as applied to court access by looking to evidence of discrimination dating back to 1972—32 years before the Court’s decision in *Lane*, and 18 years before Congress enacted the ADA in 1990. *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 525 nn. 12 & 14 (2004).

<sup>63</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(D)(2) (“Covered jurisdiction means any local government: that, within the immediately preceding 25 years has become subject to a court order or government enforcement action based on a finding of a violation of a federal or State civil rights law or the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution concerning a pattern, practice, or policy that resulted in discrimination against members of a protected class.”).

<sup>64</sup> See, e.g., *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 44–47 (1986).

<sup>65</sup> *Id.* at 36–47 (quoting S. Rep. No. 97–417, 97th Cong. 2nd Sess. 28–29 (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S.C.C.A.N. 177, 206–207).



constructing its preclearance program. Jurisdictions that have engaged in discrimination in these and other areas of civil rights, such as housing, are more likely to engage in voting discrimination, and discrimination in these areas can make voting more difficult or impossible.

*Any local government with a significant number of citizens of voting age population of any protected class where the traffic stop rate or arrest rate of that protected class is significantly higher than that of the population as a whole.*<sup>66</sup> Getting stopped or arrested is the first step in engagement with the criminal legal system, which can have both immediate and long-term effects on an individual's and a community's engagement in the political process. Most directly, Maryland does not permit those convicted of felonies to vote while incarcerated.<sup>67</sup> In addition, studies have shown that voter turnout is lower in neighborhoods with high incarceration rates, even among residents with no criminal convictions themselves.<sup>68</sup> Congress and the Supreme Court have required lower courts to consider in evaluating claims of racial discrimination in voting brought under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, "the extent to which minorities in the state or political subdivision bear the effects of discrimination in education, employment, and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process."<sup>69</sup> As part of this analysis, courts have considered whether and to what extent there are "disparities . . . in the numbers of law enforcement stops, arrests, fines, and fees."<sup>70</sup> Unlike many other states, Maryland collects and makes publicly available traffic stop data by race, making it feasible to include this metric along with arrest rates.<sup>71</sup>

*Any local government with a significant number of citizens of voting age population of any protected class where there is a substantial disparity (at least 10%) in either voter registration or voter turnout rates between members of a protected class and the jurisdiction as a whole.*<sup>72</sup> Disparities in participation as measured by voter registration and voter turnout are direct evidence of unequal access to the ballot.<sup>73</sup> For this reason, registration and turnout disparities in a particular

---

<sup>66</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(D)(4)(III) ("Covered jurisdiction means any local government: that contains 6,000 citizens of any protected class of voting age, or whose members constitute at least 15% of the citizen voting-age population of the local government and within the immediately preceding 10 years: has had a traffic stop rate or the combined misdemeanor and felony arrest rate of members of any protected class that is more than double the rate of the whole population of the jurisdiction.").

<sup>67</sup> Julie Zauzmer Weil & Ovetta Wiggins, *D.C. and Maryland Have New Policies Allowing Prisoners to Vote. Making It Happen Is Hard*, Wash. Post (Sept. 28, 2020), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2020/09/28/dc-maryland-prisoners-voting/>.

<sup>68</sup> Traci Burch, *Trading Democracy for Justice: Criminal Convictions and the Decline of Neighborhood Political Participation*, Amer. Bar Found. (Aug. 2013), <https://www.americanbarfoundation.org/resources/trading-democracy-for-justice-criminal-convictions-and-the-decline-of-neighborhood-political-participation/>.

<sup>69</sup> See S. Rep. No. 97–417, at 28–29 (S. Comm. on the Judiciary report on 1982 Amendments to Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 52 U.S.C. § 10301); see also *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 44–45 (1986).

<sup>70</sup> See, e.g., *Missouri State Conf. NAACP v. Ferguson-Florissant Sch. Dist.*, 201 F. Supp. 3d 1006, 1071 (E.D. Mo. 2016), *aff'd*, 894 F.3d 924 (8th Cir. 2018).

<sup>71</sup> Governor's Off. of Crime Prevention, Youth, & Victim Servs., *Race-Based Traffic Stop Data Dashboard*, <http://goccp.maryland.gov/data-dashboards/traffic-stop-data-dashboard/>.

<sup>72</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(D)(4)(I)-(II).

<sup>73</sup> Studies have shown that eligible citizens of color often face more substantial burdens or barriers to exercising their fundamental right to vote. *The Impact of Voter Suppression on Communities of Color*, Brennan Ctr. for Just., N.Y. U. (Jan. 10, 2022), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/impact-voter-suppression-communities-color>.

jurisdiction were specifically cited in the federal Voting Rights Act as factors for consideration during federal preclearance determinations.<sup>74</sup>

Unfortunately, substantial voter registration and turnout disparities persist in Maryland, which means that a significant number of Black and brown potential voters are sidelined each election. In April 2022, the nonpartisan Voter Participation Center conducted a nationwide analysis to identify the most severe participation disparities across race, gender, and age. The Center found a 33.3% disparity between white turnout and participation by voters of color in the state in the 2020 election, which put Maryland in the top third of the country.<sup>75</sup> In addition, the share of the citizen population registered to vote was nearly 10% lower than overall share of citizen population for people of color in Maryland.<sup>76</sup> The Center placed Maryland in its top quintile with respect to the need to reduce registration disparities between citizen populations by race.<sup>77</sup> This general picture is confirmed by U.S. Census data for the 2022 elections which reports significant voter registration and turnout disparities between white Marylanders and residents of color, including a more than 10 point turnout gap between white and Black voters and 20 points (or a 50% difference) between white and Latine voters.<sup>78</sup>

*Retain preclearance coverage for any covered jurisdiction that fails to submit required voting changes to either the Attorney General or a court.*<sup>79</sup> This prong does not add to the number of jurisdictions covered under the program, but would rather extend the time period that already-covered jurisdictions would be within the program if they do not follow the rules; therefore it provides a strong incentive for covered jurisdictions to comply. These five coverage prongs are modeled after the recently enacted New York Voting Rights Act and Connecticut Voting Rights Act.<sup>80</sup> Taken as a whole, they serve to identify jurisdictions where recent discrimination substantially increases the risk of current or future voting discrimination.

### Covered Voting Policies and Practices

The MDVRA enumerates a specific set of “covered polic[ies]” and practices that jurisdictions are required to submit for expert review prior to enactment that experience shows have the potential to be deployed in a discriminatory fashion.<sup>81</sup> These covered policies include changes to forms of government, election methods, number of seats on the governing body, district lines,

---

<sup>74</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 10303(a)(2).

<sup>75</sup> State Turnout by Race/Ethnicity, in *Demographic and Turnout Trends from Voter File/Census Estimates (April 2022)*, Voter Participation Ctr., [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Lldx15dtruOmvT7\\_fZsZSR35ci67hKreJ-jdp7BYRIY/edit#gid=799968722](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Lldx15dtruOmvT7_fZsZSR35ci67hKreJ-jdp7BYRIY/edit#gid=799968722).

<sup>76</sup> State Summary Metrics in *Demographic and Turnout Trends from Voter File/Census Estimates (April 2022)*, Voter Participation Ctr., [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Lldx15dtruOmvT7\\_fZsZSR35ci67hKreJ-jdp7BYRIY/edit#gid=1187652746](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Lldx15dtruOmvT7_fZsZSR35ci67hKreJ-jdp7BYRIY/edit#gid=1187652746).

<sup>77</sup> Summary of State Opportunity/Gaps in *Demographic and Turnout Trends from Voter File/Census Estimates (April 2022)*, Voter Participation Ctr., [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Lldx15dtruOmvT7\\_fZsZSR35ci67hKreJ-jdp7BYRIY/edit#gid=1792381242](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Lldx15dtruOmvT7_fZsZSR35ci67hKreJ-jdp7BYRIY/edit#gid=1792381242).

<sup>78</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2022: Table 4b* (Reported Voting and Registration of the Total Voting-Age Population, by Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin, for States: November 2022 [ $<1.0$  MB]) (Apr. 2023), <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/voting-and-registration/p20-586.html>.

<sup>79</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(D)(3).

<sup>80</sup> NYVRA § 17–210, CTVRA § 414(c)-(f).

<sup>81</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(E).

polling locations, and language or disability assistance.<sup>82</sup> The aim is to protect voters against discriminatory changes while making compliance as efficient as possible both for covered jurisdictions and the preclearance administrator.

Counties are subject to preclearance only for the purposes of redistricting, method of election, and number of seats on the governing body since their election administration is largely controlled by state law and the State Board of Elections.<sup>83</sup> Municipalities, on the other hand, are subject to fewer protections or controls on how they administer elections; and are therefore subject to preclearance for a wider range of practices.<sup>84</sup>

### Standard of Review for Preclearance Decisions

The MDVRA differs from federal preclearance and the New York model in that it provides for a standard of preclearance review that is more protective of voters. Under the federal preclearance program, a voting change would be precleared as long as the change would not diminish the voting power of a protected class, a standard that came to be known as anti-retrogression.<sup>85</sup> This standard is the result of statutory interpretation by the Supreme Court, not the explicit intent of the drafters of the VRA, who focused on remedying discrimination in voting not only preventing it from getting worse.<sup>86</sup> The MDVRA includes this standard because it is clear and relatively easy to administer: do not make voters of color worse off.<sup>87</sup>

Anti-retrogression, however, is not sufficient to address discrimination in certain circumstances—such as when a local population has already been suffering from discrimination for years (so a change might not be a step backwards, but maintains a discriminatory regime), or when fairness requires voters of color be given additional opportunities to elect candidates of choice (such as when population shifts should require an additional majority-Black district). For this reason, the MDVRA also prohibits the preclearance of any enumerated policy that “is more likely than not to violate a provision” of the MDVRA as a whole.<sup>88</sup>

Taken as a whole, MDVRA’s preclearance program is designed to help both voters and local jurisdictions avoid voting discrimination before it occurs and save all members of a community the time and expense of bringing a lawsuit to resolve such discrimination after the fact. Because the opportunity to obtain advanced review of voting changes by experts in the Attorney General’s office is a substantial benefit, the MDVRA makes this review available to all Maryland communities, not just those required to preclear changes. Any local government may submit any proposed policy change for preclearance review, regardless of whether that government is a “covered jurisdiction” or the change affects a “covered policy” under the law.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*

<sup>83</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(E)(2)(II).

<sup>84</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–101(E)(2)(I).

<sup>85</sup> *Beer v. United States*, 425 U.S. 130 (1976).

<sup>86</sup> *Id.*

<sup>87</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–203(B); 15.5–205(E).

<sup>88</sup> *Id.*

<sup>89</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5–201(B); H.B. 1044 § 15.5–201(A).

## **Protections Against Voter Intimidation, Obstruction, and Deception**

As our politics has become more heated in recent years, harassment and intimidation of voters and election officials is an increasing threat—and unfortunately Maryland is not immune to this trend. For example, just after the 2024 general election, several State Board of Election offices were evacuated due to bomb threats.<sup>90</sup> Following the 2020 election, a man in Frederick, Maryland was charged with voter intimidation and sentenced to two years in the Division of Corrections for mailing letters threatening violence to neighbors who displayed lawn signs in support of Joe Biden and Kamala Harris.<sup>91</sup>

In addition, the widespread use of Artificial Intelligence and the rollback of content moderation programs by social media platforms has reduced the cost and increased the risk of efforts to deceive voters—efforts that are often targeted at voters of color.<sup>92</sup>

H.B. 1044 provides robust civil protections against voter intimidation, deception, and obstruction to complement existing criminal prohibitions.<sup>93</sup> The legislation provides the Attorney General with a new, civil cause of action to protect the state’s voters and election officials.<sup>94</sup> Critically, it also empowers voters or election officials to protect themselves against threats and abuse rather than depending upon state officials.<sup>95</sup>

H.B. 1044’s protections build upon Section 11(b) of the federal Voting Rights Act,<sup>96</sup> but are more expansive in two key ways. First, the legislation directly addresses the increasing problem of voter deception.<sup>97</sup> Second, it allows voters to receive financial compensation from those who harm them.<sup>98</sup> This provision for money damages can both deter bad conduct and also make enforcement more feasible by providing a way to hold bad actors accountable after the fact rather than needing to secure a court order to prevent the harmful conduct in real time.

## **Conclusion**

This Committee hearing takes place just prior to the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Bloody Sunday Selma-to-Montgomery march that led directly to the passage of the federal VRA. Maryland now has an opportunity to carry forward that legacy by enacting its own VRA.

---

<sup>90</sup> Pamela Wood, *Here’s What We Know About Bomb Threats at Maryland Elections Offices*, Balt. Banner (Nov. 11, 2024), <https://www.thebaltimorebanner.com/politics-power/state-government/maryland-election-bomb-threats-AAMRPBPQ45CRZJSFH2UN5WVBLI/>.

<sup>91</sup> *Frederick Man Charged with Voter Intimidation*, WDVM (February 24, 2021), <https://www.localdvm.com/news/maryland/frederick-man-charged-for-voter-intimidation/>.

<sup>92</sup> Ali Swenson & Kelvin Chan, *Election Disinformation Takes a Big Leap with AI Being Used to Deceive Worldwide*, AP News (Mar. 14, 2024), <https://apnews.com/article/artificial-intelligence-elections-disinformation-chatgpt-bc283e7426402f0b4baa7df280a4c3fd>.

<sup>93</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5-301; *see also* Md. Att’y Gen., Guidance on Voter Intimidation (Apr. 2024), [https://www.marylandattorneygeneral.gov/Reports/GUIDANCE\\_ON\\_VOTER\\_INTIMIDATION.pdf](https://www.marylandattorneygeneral.gov/Reports/GUIDANCE_ON_VOTER_INTIMIDATION.pdf).

<sup>94</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5-301(C)(5).

<sup>95</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5-301(C).

<sup>96</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 10307(b).

<sup>97</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5-301(B)(2)

<sup>98</sup> H.B. 1044 § 15.5-301(D)(2)

We are experiencing attacks, not progress, on voting rights at the national level. Project 2025, an agenda the Trump Administration has embraced, includes plans to undermine enforcement of protections against voting discrimination.<sup>99</sup> In fact, the administration has already done so by changing the Justice Department’s position in voting cases to threaten fair participation by people of color. This includes a reversal in a critical case on fair districts the Supreme Court is considering this year.<sup>100</sup>

We urge this Committee to seize this opportunity by moving H.B. 1044, a critical piece of the MDVRA, forward to the House floor; and we stand ready to work with you to protect Black voters, and other voters of color, in the Free State.

Please feel free to contact Adam Lioz at (917) 494-2617 or [alioz@naacpldf.org](mailto:alioz@naacpldf.org) with any questions or to discuss H.B. 1044 in more detail.

Sincerely,

/s/ Adam Lioz

Adam Lioz, Senior Policy Counsel  
NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc.  
700 14th Street N.W., Ste. 600  
Washington, DC 20005

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (“LDF”)

Since its founding in 1940, LDF has used litigation, policy advocacy, public education, and community organizing strategies to achieve racial justice and equity in education, economic justice, political participation, and criminal justice. Throughout its history, LDF has worked to enforce and promote laws and policies that increase access to the electoral process and prohibit voter discrimination, intimidation, and suppression. LDF has been fully separate from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (“NAACP”) since 1957, though LDF was originally founded by the NAACP and shares its commitment to equal rights.

---

<sup>99</sup> *What Project 2025 Means for Black Communities: Voting Rights and Black Political Power*, Thurgood Marshall Inst., Legal Def. Fund (Oct. 3, 2024), <https://tminstituteldf.org/threats-to-voting-rights-project-2025/>.

<sup>100</sup> *Louisiana v. Callais*, 732 F.Supp.3d 574 (W.D. La. 2024); Letter of the Acting Solic. Gen. on Behalf of the U.S., *Louisiana v. Callais*, No. 24-109 (U.S. Jan. 24, 2025) [https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/24/24-109/340108/20250124140523161\\_letter%2024-109%2024-110.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/24/24-109/340108/20250124140523161_letter%2024-109%2024-110.pdf).