

July 18, 2025

Jared DeMarinis
State Administrator of Elections
Maryland State Board of Elections
151 West Street, Suite 200
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Administrator DeMarinis:

As you are aware, the National Voter Registration Act and the Help America Vote Act require States to maintain an accurate and current voter registration roll for elections for federal office. Based on our analysis, Maryland is in violation of Section 8 of the NVRA. A 2023 state legislative audit found that the State Board of Elections does not adequately remove dead and duplicate voters from their registrations, nor require that local authorities correct errors in their registrations. The results of this failure to comply with federal law can be seen by comparing publicly available voter registration records with the U.S. Census Bureau's most recent citizen voting-age population (CVAP) data.¹

Maryland has between 4.0 million and 4.2 million active registered voters over the review period of 2019-2023. When compared with American Community Survey (ACS) Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) estimates, this indicates an active voter registration rate of 93% to 94% over the study period. By comparison, the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) has reported 3.3 (2022)² and 3.5 million (2024) *total* registered voters,³ which yields a registration rate of between 76% and 80%. The CPS estimates are replicated nearly identically by Harvard University's Cooperative Election Study.⁴ Active registered voters are a subset of these estimates and indicate a gap of *at least* half

¹ The U.S. Census Bureau publishes CVAP one-year estimates annually for geographies with more than 65,000 population; available at perma.cc/UH99-9F33. Fifteen of Maryland's counties, plus Baltimore City, are above this threshold. Eight counties (Caroline, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, and Worcester) are below this threshold and are reported only as 5-year estimates annually.

² U.S. Census Bureau Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2022, Table 4a, bit.ly/4nXsSrI.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Cooperative Election Study*, Harvard Univ., bit.ly/46bEqkI.

a million unaccounted-for registered voters, and a difference in registration rates of *at least* 13% with Maryland SBE Statistics.⁵

These statewide differences are manifested within certain counties. We have determined that two of Maryland’s largest counties (Howard and Montgomery) have had more active registered voters than eligible adult citizens in multiple years during our 2019-2023 period of review.⁶ Three smaller counties have also had recent registration rates nearing 100%.⁷

This evidence shows that your office and officials in these counties are not conducting appropriate list maintenance to ensure that the voter registration roll is accurate and current, as required by federal law.

Congress enacted the NVRA “to protect the integrity of the electoral process.” 52 U.S.C. §20501(b)(3). Specifically, it enacted Section 8 “to ensure that accurate and current voter registration rolls are maintained.” *Id.* §20501(b)(4). Retaining voter rolls bloated with ineligible voters harms the electoral process, heightens the risk of electoral fraud, and undermines public confidence in elections. After all, “[c]onfidence in the integrity of our electoral processes is essential to the functioning of our participatory democracy.” *Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U.S. 1, 4 (2006) (per curiam). Section 8 of the NVRA obliges States to “conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to remove the names of ineligible voters from the official lists of eligible voters” due to death or change of residence. 52 U.S.C. §20507(a)(4). And as the U.S. Supreme Court has confirmed, “federal law makes this removal mandatory.” *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute*, 138 S. Ct. 1833, 1842 (2018).

This letter provides statutory notice that the Republican National Committee and the Maryland Republican Party, political committees with substantial interests in having accurate voter lists to ensure secure elections and successful get-out-the vote efforts; Reardon Sullivan, a Maryland voter and Chairman of the Maryland ballot issue committee known as the Committee to Control MoCo Spending; and Nicolee Ambrose, a Maryland voter and a Maryland National Committeewoman, will bring a lawsuit against you and, if appropriate, against the counties named in this letter, if you fail to take specific actions to correct these violations of Section 8 within the 90-day timeframe

⁵ See Maryland Board of Elections Voter Registration Activity Report December 2023, perma.cc/LL8E-J44W (SBE voter registration statistics for December 2023 indicate 305,686 inactive voters—for a total of 4,476,375 total registered voters).

⁶ See Attachment A for county-by-county CVAP analysis and additional sources.

⁷ Queen Anne’s, Talbot, and Worcester Counties’ most recent 5-year ACS data (2019-2023, centered on 2021) indicate registration rates near 100%.

specified in federal law. *See Green v. Bell*, 2023 WL 2572210, at *3 (W.D.N.C. Mar. 20, 2023). Furthermore, while we hope to avoid litigation, we still formally request that the Maryland Administrator of Elections and the counties named in this letter (if they maintain separate records) act to preserve documents as required by Section 8(i) of the NVRA. 52 U.S.C. §20507(i)(1)-(2).

As the State Administrator of Elections, you are responsible for coordinating the required statewide list maintenance under the NVRA. The NVRA requires each State to “designate a State officer or employee as the chief State election official to be responsible for coordination of State responsibilities under” the law. *Id.* §20509. Maryland law designates the Administrator of Elections as the State’s chief election officer charged with overseeing and maintaining voter registration. *See* Md. Code Ann., Elec. Law §2-103. This letter explains how we concluded that Maryland and Montgomery and Howard Counties are violating Section 8 of the NVRA, and the curative steps needed to avoid litigation.

I. The NVRA protects election integrity by requiring States to make reasonable efforts to maintain accurate and current lists of registered active voters.

Maryland’s voter registration list-maintenance program must be “uniform, non-discriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act.” 52 U.S.C. §20507(b)(1). Section 8 requires that States “remove the names of ineligible voters from the official lists of eligible voters by reason of (A) the death of the registrant; or (B) a change in the residence of the registrant” to outside of his or her current voting jurisdiction. *Id.* §20507(4)(A)-(B).

Additionally, the Help America Vote Act requires States to adopt computerized statewide voter registration lists and maintain them “on a regular basis” in accordance with the NVRA. *Id.* §21083(a)(2)(A). States must “ensure that voter registration records in the State are accurate and are updated regularly,” a process which must include making a “reasonable effort to remove registrants who are ineligible to vote from the official list of eligible voters.” *Id.* §21083(a)(4). HAVA’s list-maintenance mandates include coordination with “State agency records on death” and “State agency records on felony status” to facilitate the removal of individuals who are deceased or rendered ineligible under State law due to felony conviction. *Id.* §21083(a)(2)(A)(ii)(I)-(II).

As the chief election official for Maryland, the responsibility rests with you to coordinate and oversee the list-maintenance activities of local and county election officials. *See, e.g., Scott v. Schedler*, 771 F.3d 831, 839 (5th Cir. 2014) (“[T]he

NVRA’s centralization of responsibility counsels against ... buck passing.”); *United States v. Missouri*, 535 F.3d 844, 850 (8th Cir. 2008) (explaining that a State or chief election official “may not delegate the responsibility to conduct a general program to a local official and thereby avoid responsibility if such a program is not reasonably conducted”); *see also, e.g.*, Md. Code Ann., Elec. Law §2-103 (requiring the Administrator of Elections to “implement” a “single, uniform, official, centralized, interactive computerized statewide voter registration list.”).

II. The State Board of Elections fails to complete statutorily required voter registration list maintenance.

Despite the requirements of state and federal law, the State Board of Elections does not ensure its voter registration database is up to date. A 2023 audit by the Office of Legislative Audits of the Maryland General Assembly found that the State Board of Elections’ processes “were not as comprehensive as necessary to identify certain potentially deceased voters.” Office of Legislative Audits, *Audit Report: State Board of Elections*, at 11 (Oct. 31, 2023), perma.cc/XJP4-QXDJ. The audit revealed an especially significant failure for death removals: the Department of Health’s admitted refusal to provide complete sets of death records to the Board “due to agency policy.”⁸ *Id.* at 26 (PDF). The same audit also found the Board process does not “detect all duplicate voters.” *Id.* at 11. The auditors identified thousands of potential deceased and duplicate active voter registrations.

Nor does the Board ensure that local election boards “correct[] errors in voter data,” *id.*, despite the Board’s statutory requirement to “supervise the operations of the local boards,” Md. Code Ann., Elec. Law §2-103(b)(4). Even after a previous audit identified the same problem, the Board did not follow “the established process,” and “the review of voter registration data remained inadequate.” *Audit Report*, at 12.

Other procedural issues plague Maryland elections. The NVRA envisions that States will police their lists by sending change-of-address notices to suspected movers and removing voters whose mail is returned as undeliverable or who don’t reply after a waiting period. Since 2015, however, Maryland no longer permits counties to conduct list maintenance based on mail returned without some voter identifying information attached. This hampers the ability of the state to remove ineligible voters. Moreover, Maryland only removes voters

⁸ Instead of taking steps to remedy the audit’s findings regarding Maryland’s shortcomings in removing deceased voters, SBE recently enacted a policy which will make it harder for counties to do so. *See* SBE Policy 2025-02.

suspected to have moved out of State, not those who move between counties. *See* Md. Elec. Law §3-502(e); *contra* 52 U.S.C. §20507(c)(1)(B)(ii) (use of mail confirmation process for suspected inter-county movers as meeting one criterion for NVRA’s reasonable efforts safe harbor). Combined with Maryland’s other policies, this inflates the active voter registration database with incorrect registrations.

These issues at least partially explain Maryland’s inflated voter registration numbers.

III. Several Maryland counties have impossible or implausibly high active voter registration rates

Despite the legislative audit’s findings, recent data show that Maryland’s registration records have gotten worse, not better. Based on estimates of CVAP gathered from the ACS and registered voter data available from the Maryland SBE, Maryland is failing to meet its list maintenance obligations. For the state as a whole, Maryland’s rate of active voter registration (active registered voters / CVAP) is 94.54% (as of 2023), which is completely inconsistent with U.S. Census Bureau Current Population Survey and Harvard University’s Cooperative Election Study—which estimate Maryland’s total voter registration rates of between 75% and 80%.⁹ Active voter registration rates are a subset of this—making the inconsistency even more glaring.

Why are Maryland’s voter registration rates so high? The data show that the problem is statewide and that points to systemic failures emanating from the State Board of Elections. We compared the ACS CVAP to the number of active registered voters by county from 2019 to 2023. Several counties have had extraordinarily high active voter registration rates between 2019 and 2023, and two: Howard, with 101.2% in 2020 and Montgomery, with 100.4% in 2020 and 100.1% in 2022 include years with greater than 100% active voter registration. In 2023, those and other counties’ registration rates remain near 100%.¹⁰

In other words, there are more active registered voters than possible voters in Howard and Montgomery Counties—and many other Maryland counties are approaching that impossibility. Many of the other largest counties across the state have had voter registration rates greater than the already

⁹ Brian Schaffner, et al., *Cooperative Election Study Common Content*, 2024, perma.cc/RS3X-UZTQ.

¹⁰ These statistics were not contrived. They are derived using the best period statistics available for CVAP, and the reasonable assumption that the end-of-year (December) counts of active registered voters from SBE are comparable.

improbably high state average of 94.5% (2023): Anne Arundel (95.4%), Carroll (96.5%), Charles (97.3%), Frederick (95.9%), Harford (96.7%), and Prince George's (95.8%). Some smaller counties such as Queen Anne's, who had a 99.9% voter registration rate in 2020 and a 99.6% rate in 2021,¹¹ are faring even worse.

Altogether, counties with suspiciously or impossibly high voter registrations form the vast majority of the state's population. Only one county, Somerset, has had an active voter registration rate (73.2%) in the range of that reported by the CPS and Cooperative Election Study for the state as a whole. This shows that voter registration records are not being properly maintained in most Maryland counties.

These voter registration rates are abnormally or, in the case of counties with greater than 100 percent registration, impossibly high. This constitutes strong evidence that Maryland's voter rolls are not being properly maintained. Data from the 2022 Election Administration and Voting Survey shows that Maryland boasts a registration rate of 94.5% of their CVAP, which aligns with our county-based analysis.¹² The U.S. total that year was 85.4%, making Maryland an outlier and its most populous counties extreme outliers. *Id.* at 166.

Discrepancies on this scale cannot be attributed to anything other than deficient list maintenance. They certainly cannot be attributed to Maryland's policy allowing sixteen-and seventeen-year-olds to pre-register if eligible in time for the next election. In the first case, the total number of eligible sixteen and seventeen—year-olds is low, around 2% of Maryland's population.¹³ And of those eligible, only a third avail themselves of the opportunity to pre-register.¹⁴ Howard and Montgomery stand around 37% of eligible teens pre-registered, while Queen Anne's sees 45% pre-registered. *Id.* Taking these numbers into account, our analysis suggests that even generous assumptions about the eligible number of 16- to 17-year-olds in the 2023 data can explain at most 1.17% of statewide registrations.¹⁵ In the three highlighted counties they can't account for

¹¹ Using 2018-2022 ACS, centered on 2020 and 2019-2023 ACS, centered on 2021.

¹² U.S. Election Assistance Commission, *The 2022 Election Administration and Voting Survey Comprehensive Report* 165 (June 2023), perma.cc/22DY-G3DR.

¹³ 80,097 16-year-olds and 79,311 17-year-olds, perma.cc/A8AV-Q496.

¹⁴ Laura W. Brill, Michael Hamner & Sam Novey, *Maryland Registers 64% of 18-Year-Olds to Vote, More Reforms Needed to Close the Gap*, Center for Democracy and Civil Engagement (Sept. 17, 2024), perma.cc/JB2M-6Q5J.

¹⁵ 159,408 16- and 17 year olds, with a 33% registration rate equals an estimated 52,604 newly registered. Among 4,411,478 active registered in 2023, this represents 1.2%.

more than 1.5% of registrations. The state remains seven points ahead of the national average, and the numbers from the counties highlighted strain credulity.

Maryland's failure to provide accurate voter rolls violates federal law, jeopardizes the integrity of the upcoming 2026 federal election, and signals to voters that elections in Maryland are not being properly safeguarded.

IV. Avoiding litigation

The NVRA includes a private right of action, empowering any “person who is aggrieved by a violation” of the statute to bring a civil action in federal district court for declaratory or injunctive relief. 52 U.S.C. §20510(b)(1)-(2); *see Green*, 2023 WL at *1-7. If the violations we have identified are not corrected within 90 days of receipt of this letter, we will have to file a lawsuit. *See* 52 U.S.C. §20510(b)(2).

We hope to avoid litigation and would welcome immediate efforts by your office to bring Maryland into compliance with Section 8. We ask that you evaluate your current list maintenance procedures and protocols to identify the cause of the compliance failures discussed in this letter. We also ask that you modify your current list maintenance program to ensure that it is comprehensive, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with federal law. Your list maintenance program must identify and remove these categories of individuals from the official lists of eligible voters:

1. All persons who are ineligible to vote by reason of a change in residence;
2. Deceased individuals;
3. Incarcerated convicted felons;;
4. All other ineligible voters.

We also ask that you (and, should they want to respond separately, each named county) respond in writing within 45 days of the date of this letter. This response should fully describe the efforts, policies, and programs you are taking, or plan to undertake before the 2026 general election to bring Maryland into compliance with Section 8. This response should also note when you plan to begin and complete each specified measure and the results of any programs or activities you have already undertaken. We also ask you to advise us what policies are presently in place, or will be put in place, to ensure effective and routine coordination of list maintenance activities with the federal, state, and local entities outlined below—including the new tools to verify citizenship status

developed by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.¹⁶ Finally, we seek a description of the specific steps you intend to take to ensure routine and effective list maintenance on a continuing basis beyond the 2026 election. To avoid litigation, we may seek certain reasonable assurances that you will affirmatively undertake these efforts, including the execution of a settlement agreement.

Should you refuse to comply with Section 8 and thus require legal action, you should know that the NVRA authorizes courts to award “reasonable attorney fees, including litigation expenses, and costs” to the prevailing party. 52 U.S.C. §20510(c). Therefore, if litigation ensues, you risk bearing the financial burden of the full cost of the litigation.

V. Preserving records

We also ask that you act to preserve certain records as required under the NVRA, should they be needed in the future or for possible litigation. 52 U.S.C. §20507(i). These documents and records include, but are not limited to:

1. A copy of the most recent voter registration database for the State of Maryland and for each named county, including pertinent information on each voter (name, date of birth, home address, voter activity, and active or inactive status);
2. Internal communications and emails of the State Board of Elections office, applicable county boards of elections, and any divisions, bureaus, offices, third party agents, and contractors relating to voter list maintenance;
3. All emails or other communications between the State Board of Elections and county elections officials concerning their list maintenance activities, their duties to maintain accurate and current lists, and any consequences arising from a failure to do so;
4. All email or other communications between the State Board of Elections and any State or federal offices and agencies, including but not limited to the Maryland Department of Health, in which the State Board of Elections seeks or obtains information about registered voters who have moved, been convicted and imprisoned, died, or are otherwise ineligible, for use in list maintenance activities; and

¹⁶ *USCIS Deploys Common Sense Tools to Verify Voters*, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (May 22, 2025), perma.cc/84PS-5RZC.

5. All email or other communications between the State Board of Elections and any other State, as well as email and communications with the Electronic Registration Information Center, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Authorities, and the National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems, regarding obtaining information about voters who are deceased or who have moved for use in list maintenance activities.

We look forward to working with you in a productive fashion to ensure the accuracy and currency of Maryland's voter rolls to protect the integrity of its voting process and increase voter participation. While we hope to avoid litigation, if we do not receive the requested response, and if Maryland fails to take the necessary curative steps to resolve the issues identified in this letter, you will be subject to a lawsuit seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

/s/ Cameron T. Norris

Thomas R. McCarthy
Cameron T. Norris
Gilbert C. Dickey
Conor D. Woodfin
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Ste. 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
cam@consovoymccarthy.com
tom@consovoymccarthy.com

cc: Maryland State Board of Elections
Maryland Secretary of Health
Howard County Board of Elections
Montgomery County Board of Elections

Attachment A

<u>County</u>	<u>2019*</u>	<u>2019 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2020*</u>	<u>2020 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2021*</u>	<u>2021 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2022*</u>	<u>2022 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2023*</u>	<u>2023 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>Avg. Active v. CVAP % (2019-23)</u>
Allegany	74.7%	2019 1 Year	79.9%	2018-22 5 Year	78.7%	2021 1 Year	80.1%	2022 1 Year	80.8%	2023 1 Year	78.84%
Anne Arundel	91.5%	2019 1 Year	94.8%	2018-22 5 Year	93.8%	2021 1 Year	92.9%	2022 1 Year	95.4%	2023 1 Year	93.68%
Baltimore City	86.2%	2019 1 Year	91.7%	2018-22 5 Year	89.7%	2021 1 Year	91.8%	2022 1 Year	92.4%	2023 1 Year	90.37%
Baltimore County	92.9%	2019 1 Year	91.5%	2018-22 5 Year	89.3%	2021 1 Year	91.7%	2022 1 Year	91.9%	2023 1 Year	91.45%
Calvert	95.1%	2019 1 Year	96.1%	2018-22 5 Year	95.1%	2021 1 Year	95.3%	2022 1 Year	95.0%	2023 1 Year	95.31%
Caroline	85.5%	2017-21 5 Year	88.7%	2018-22 5 Year	89.0%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carroll	95.1%	2019 1 Year	96.5%	2018-22 5 Year	96.1%	2021 1 Year	96.5%	2022 1 Year	96.5%	2023 1 Year	96.14%
Cecil	85.1%	2019 1 Year	88.9%	2018-22 5 Year	88.5%	2021 1 Year	87.8%	2022 1 Year	88.3%	2023 1 Year	87.70%
Charles	96.1%	2019 1 Year	98.4%	2018-22 5 Year	96.3%	2021 1 Year	97.4%	2022 1 Year	97.3%	2023 1 Year	97.08%
Dorchester	86.6%	2017-21 5 Year	90.1%	2018-22 5 Year	89.7%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Frederick	95.2%	2019 1 Year	96.7%	2018-22 5 Year	94.6%	2021 1 Year	97.2%	2022 1 Year	95.9%	2023 1 Year	95.91%
Garrett	84.9%	2017-21 5 Year	87.9%	2018-22 5 Year	87.5%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Harford	93.4%	2019 1 Year	95.3%	2018-22 5 Year	94.9%	2021 1 Year	94.5%	2022 1 Year	96.7%	2023 1 Year	94.96%
Howard	99.8%	2019 1 Year	101.2%	2018-22 5 Year	99.5%	2021 1 Year	99.2%	2022 1 Year	99.4%	2023 1 Year	99.84%
Kent	83.4%	2017-21 5 Year	86.3%	2018-22 5 Year	85.9%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Montgomery	99.2%	2019 1 Year	100.4%	2018-22 5 Year	99.1%	2021 1 Year	100.1%	2022 1 Year	98.8%	2023 1 Year	99.51%

<u>County</u>	<u>2019*</u>	<u>2019 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2020*</u>	<u>2020 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2021*</u>	<u>2021 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2022*</u>	<u>2022 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>2023*</u>	<u>2023 ACS CVAP Source</u>	<u>Avg. Active v. CVAP % (2019-23)</u>
Prince George's	99.2%	2019 1 Year	96.6%	2018-22 5 Year	95.2%	2021 1 Year	94.5%	2022 1 Year	95.8%	2023 1 Year	96.27%
Queen Anne's	96.2%	2017-21 5 Year	99.9%	2018-22 5 Year	99.6%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somerset	66.3%	2017-21 5 Year	69.3%	2018-22 5 Year	69.9%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
St. Mary's	84.8%	2019 1 Year	90.0%	2018-22 5 Year	88.4%	2021 1 Year	85.6%	2022 1 Year	87.3%	2023 1 Year	87.22%
Talbot	93.5%	2017-21 5 Year	96.8%	2018-22 5 Year	97.8%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Washington	85.5%	2019 1 Year	85.4%	2018-22 5 Year	84.0%	2021 1 Year	84.5%	2022 1 Year	86.1%	2023 1 Year	85.09%
Wicomico	83.1%	2019 1 Year	85.5%	2018-22 5 Year	84.8%	2021 1 Year	84.4%	2022 1 Year	86.8%	2023 1 Year	84.92%
Worcester	93.4%	2017-21 5 Year	97.6%	2018-22 5 Year	97.1%	2019-23 5 Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
State Total Active Registration %	93.40%		94.80%		93.32%		94.06%		94.54%		
Statewide CVAP #	4,316,921		4,411,238		4,417,293		4,410,631		4,411,478		
Statewide Active Registration #	4,032,141		4,181,817		4,122,351		4,148,651		4,170,689		

*Denotes percentage of registered active voters reported by the Maryland SBE in December of each year divided by CVAP population.

U.S. Census American Community Survey Sources:

- 2019-2023 5-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2018-2022 5-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2022.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2022.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2017-2021 5-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2021.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2021.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2016-2020 5-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2020.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2020.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2015-2019 5-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2019.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2019.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2023 1 year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2023.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2023.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2022 1-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2022.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2022.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2021 1-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2021.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2021.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)
- 2020 1-year: The U.S. Census Bureau did not report 1-year ACS statistics for 2020
- 2019 1-year:
[https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2019.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24\\$0500000](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT1Y2019.B05003?q=B05003:+Sex+by+Age+by+Nativity+and+Citizenship+Status&g=040XX00US24,24$0500000)

Maryland SBE Sources:

- 2019: https://elections.maryland.gov/pdf/vrar/2019_12.pdf
- 2020: https://elections.maryland.gov/pdf/vrar/2020_12.pdf
- 2021: https://elections.maryland.gov/pdf/vrar/2021_12.pdf
- 2022: https://elections.maryland.gov/pdf/vrar/2022_12.pdf
- 2023: https://elections.maryland.gov/pdf/vrar/2023_12.pdf