



UTAH ELECTION WEBSITE REVIEW

PREPARED BY: DISABILITY LAW CENTER

A review of election website content across Utah's 29 counties, including information for voters with disabilities.



PRIMARY

20
26

ELECTION



DISABILITY
LAW CENTER

Your rights matter.



1. Purpose & Methodology

The Disability Law Center (DLC) reviewed the election websites of all 29 Utah counties ahead of the 2026 election cycle. The review focused on whether specific categories of election information — including disability-specific accessibility information — were present and reasonably easy to find on each site.

Each county website was independently reviewed against a 21-item content checklist by three separate DLC reviewers. Reviews were conducted between May 22, 2026, and June 15, 2026. Two counties (Salt Lake and San Juan) were also reviewed for additional language-access items; those results are noted separately in the applicable county reports and are not included in the statewide statistics below, which are based on the common 21-item checklist applied to all 29 counties.

Using three independent reviewers per site allows DLC to report, for each checklist item, how many of the three reviewers found that information on a given county's website. The statewide tables below (Sections 2 and 6) report that full breakdown: how many counties had the item found by all three reviewers, by two of three, by one of three, or by none. Section 5 discusses reviewer disagreement in more detail.

2. Statewide Findings

The table below shows, for each checklist item, how many of the three independent reviewers found that information on the county website, summed across all 29 counties. "All 3" means all three reviewers found the item on that county's site; "None" means no reviewer found it. Items are ordered, so the items reviewers found least often appear first. Disability-specific items are marked with an asterisk (*).

Checklist item	All 3	2 of 3	1 of 3	None	% None
* Information about options for voters with print disabilities who want to vote at home	2	2	4	21	72%
Notice to bring picture ID for any in-person voting	3	8	0	18	62%
* Mentions the accessible features available with the accessible voting equipment	7	2	3	17	59%
Information about same-day (provisional) registration	7	6	4	12	41%
Deadline for requesting a mail-in ballot	8	4	8	9	31%
* ADA-accessible voting equipment available to voters	11	4	3	11	38%
* How to request a voting accommodation or get help with an accessibility issue	14	2	1	12	41%
Date/time ballots must be received by Clerk's office	12	8	6	3	10%
Date of voter registration deadline	13	8	4	4	14%
List of locations where you can vote in person	14	8	4	3	10%
Sample ballot for 2026 election	17	7	0	5	17%
Name of county clerk or chief elections official	18	8	2	1	3%
Utah state elections website link	19	7	3	0	0%
Register to vote information	21	4	3	1	3%

Checklist item	All 3	2 of 3	1 of 3	None	% None
Early voting dates, times, and locations	18	9	2	0	0%
Phone number, email, and address contact information for Clerk's office	19	8	2	0	0%
Official notice of 2026 election	23	3	2	1	3%
List of ballot drop-box locations	22	5	1	1	3%
Information about prior elections	24	2	1	2	7%
Current information about elections, including accurate dates and times for the 2026 election	23	4	2	0	0%
Election website is operational	27	2	0	0	0%

* Disability-specific item

3. Disability-Specific Findings

Four checklist items specifically addressed disability-related voting information. Statewide results:

- Information about options for voters with print disabilities who want to vote at home: found by all three reviewers on 2 of 29 county sites; two of three on 2; one of three on 4; no reviewer found it on 21 sites.
- Mentions the accessible features available with the accessible voting equipment: found by all three reviewers on 7 of 29 county sites; two of three on 2; one of three on 3; no reviewer found it on 17 sites.
- ADA-accessible voting equipment available to voters: found by all three reviewers on 11 of 29 county sites; two of three on 4; one of three on 3; no reviewer found it on 11 sites.
- How to request a voting accommodation or get help with an accessibility issue: found by all three reviewers on 14 of 29 county sites; two of three on 2; one of three on 1; no reviewer found it on 12 sites.

The weakest area statewide is information about options for print-disabled voters who want to vote at home: all three reviewers found this on only 2 of 29 county websites, and no reviewer found it at all on 21. Accessible-feature descriptions for voting equipment fared slightly better (found by all three reviewers on 7 of 29 sites), and just 14 of 29 counties had all three reviewers find information on how to request an accommodation or accessibility help.

4. General Findings of Note

Beyond disability-specific content, three general voting information items also showed significant statewide gaps:

- Notice to bring picture ID for any in-person voting found by all three reviewers on 3 of 29 county sites; two of three on 8; one of three on 0; no reviewer found it on 18 sites.
- Deadline for requesting a mail-in ballot: found by all three reviewers on 8 of 29 county sites; two of three on 4; one of three on 8; no reviewer found it on 9 sites.
- Information about same-day (provisional) registration found by all three reviewers on 7 of 29 county sites; two of three on 6; one of three on 4; no reviewer found it on 12 sites.

5. Reviewer Discrepancies — A Data Reliability Note

Across all 29 counties, the three reviewers disagreed on 164 of 613 total question-level assessments (about 27%). A "discrepancy" means at least one reviewer marked Yes or No differently than another reviewer for the same website and the same question.

This is a meaningful finding in its own right: when three trained reviewers looking at the same page cannot consistently agree on whether information is present, that is itself evidence the information is difficult to locate, ambiguous in presentation, or buried outside the main election page (e.g., only in a linked PDF or spreadsheet). Full discrepancy detail for each county is provided in the corresponding county report. Counties with the highest number of question-level discrepancies:

County	Discrepancies (of 21 items)
Emery	12
Cache	10
Kane	10
Wayne	10
Box Elder	9
Daggett	7
Duchesne	7
Juab	7
Uintah	7
Beaver	6

6. County-by-County Summary

The results below are based on the 21-item common checklist. For each county, the columns show how many of the 21 items were found by all three reviewers, by two of three, by one of three, or by none. See the individual county report for full item-by-item detail and discrepancy notes.

County	All 3	2 of 3	1 of 3	None	Discrepancies
Beaver	13	5	1	2	6
Box Elder	9	3	5	4	9
Cache	4	5	5	7	10
Carbon	14	6	0	1	6
Daggett	3	3	4	11	7
Davis	12	2	3	4	5
Duchesne	9	4	3	5	7
Emery	6	7	4	4	12
Garfield	11	2	1	7	3

County	All 3	2 of 3	1 of 3	None	Discrepancies
Grand	17	1	0	3	2
Iron	10	5	1	5	5
Juab	9	4	3	5	7
Kane	7	8	2	4	10
Millard	19	0	2	0	2
Morgan	7	3	3	8	5
Piute	10	3	1	7	4
Rich	9	5	3	4	6
Salt Lake	19	2	0	0	4
San Juan	9	2	1	9	2
Sanpete	11	4	2	4	6
Sevier	13	5	0	3	5
Summit	16	2	0	3	2
Tooele	17	1	1	2	1
Uintah	11	7	0	3	7
Utah	16	3	2	0	5
Wasatch	8	5	2	6	6
Washington	16	4	0	1	4
Wayne	3	6	4	8	10
Weber	14	4	2	1	6

7. Observations for Follow-Up

Based on the patterns above, DLC recommends:

- Standardize disclosure of how a voter requests an accommodation or accessibility assistance, ideally in a single, clearly labeled location rather than a general contact line.
- Update information to reflect 2026 statutory requirements.
- Ensure dates are accurate for 2026 elections.
- Publish clear information about options for voters with print disabilities who wish to vote from home; this was the single largest statewide gap.
- State picture ID and mail-ballot deadline requirements directly on the elections page rather than only within linked PDFs, where reviewers frequently disagreed on whether the information was present.
- Where information is presented only in embedded PDFs or spreadsheets, consider also presenting it as accessible on-page text, since this was a recurring source of reviewer disagreement about whether content was "there."