

THE MORSE FAMILY AND COMMUNITY PUBLIC POLICY SCHOLARSHIP
SUMMER 2006

**TRUTH-IN-VOTING: ELECTION REFORM AND MANHATTAN
COMMUNITY**

by

KATE ROMANOVA

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

Host Organization:
The Riley County League of Women Voters

TABLE OF CONTENT

Introduction	3
Help America Vote Act: Background	5
HAVA in Kansas	8
Voting Technology: Direct Recording Electronic Voting System	10
Advantages of Direct Recording Electronic Voting System	12
Disadvantages of Direct Recording Electronic Voting System	16
The Role of VVPATs	18
Effect of HAVA on Riley County	19
Election Day in Riley County: August 1, 2006 – Primary	21
Conclusions	25
Annotated Bibliography	27
Attachment 1	41
Attachment 2	43
Attachment 3	44
Attachment 4	46
Attachment 5	47

INTRODUCTION

The 2000 and 2004 elections and controversy with the ballot counting led to a series of debates among political elites and voting population about election organization and voting technology employed at polling places across the United States. Before that, Americans hardly ever paid attention to the voting technology and election regulations, which varied across counties and across the states. Paper ballots, lever machines, optical scanning, direct recording electronic voting system along with a number of other methods were used at polling places. Poll workers training, voter education and voters' registration campaigns were largely prerogative of NGOs and PACs.

Since then, lawmakers passed several resolutions and took a number of steps to repair the flaws in the system of election administration, the most familiar being the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. Election technology became the target of scrutiny, research and debates in communities, in academia, and among election specialists. The federal requirements that HAVA imposes on the state election triggered implementation of new programs, purchase of new technology, and an increased interest of communities.

An introduction, development and implementation of new technologies and other innovations are always challenged by a certain degree of suspicion, resistance, and reluctance to accept. However, such attitudes allow new technology to be improved, to become more familiar to a community and users, and to be more accepted as innovations enter the market. Each new technology, especially the one regarding election procedures, should never be taken for granted without proper evaluation and assessment of its impact on the election procedure and the voting population. Election is the basis of democratic processes in the society.

Voters can be regarded as consumers of political information, information about candidates, voting technologies, voting regulations and procedures required by the federal and state laws. From the moment voters have registered at their voting precincts to the moment the voting results are announced, voting population should be aware of all election procedures. Voters as consumers have a right to independently and securely cast their votes, be sure that their votes have been cast correctly, recorded and counted appropriately, and that all their needs are met and answered respectively.

This report is the result of a research on voting technological innovations and regulations, which are required by the Help America Vote Act of 2002. It looks into HAVA activities and implements in various states and particular in Riley County, Kansas. It analyzes the impact of DREs on voting activities and Manhattan community. The research became possible with the support of the hosting organization, the Riley County League of Women Voters, and the Morse Family and Community Public Policy Scholarship, provided by the Hale Library, Kansas State University.

HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT: BACKGROUND

As the response to the infamous 2000 election, which exposed deep flaws in the voting system, when Americans became familiar with hanging chads, butterfly ballots, poll workers education and training, and other arcane issues of election administration, lawmakers passed the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002 (HAVA - <http://www.fec.gov/hava/hava.htm> -text of the law). It became one of the major and broadest voting reforms in recent decades. The reform raised a number of questions about election process in the United States, questioning issues that were taken for granted by citizens. The sanctity of election laws were challenged by questions such as -- Who should administer election? Why elections are conducted in a particular way? Should the election be a federal or a state issue? Should partisan observers conduct elections? Who should pay for elections? And are the needs of all voting population met?

HAVA is an attempt to regulate and to an extent homogenize the diverse election procedures and techniques used by various precincts. It affects every aspect of the voting process. It regulates the use of voting machines and provisional ballots, establishing requirements for voter registration and for poll workers training. Although, HAVA requires compliance with the federal law, it leaves much room for state variation and implementation of the specifics of the law. Each state is responsible for issuing provisional ballots, creating statewide computerized voter lists, allowing for “second chance voting,” and increasing access for disabled voters. Every state made accents on different issues. While ADA accessibility of voting places and voting technology did not raise too many questions, voting technology and voting machines themselves led to wide

debates and controversial arguments among different interest groups, voters, communities, and election officials.

States received partial federal funding to “improve the administration of elections.” However, states were left one on one with problems such as meeting the deadlines set by HAVA and the requirements imposed by it, and providing funds to cover the rest of the election reform. The latter especially became a keen problem for many counties. An extra financial burden limited the extent to which the reform was implemented. Every state stressed different aspects of the federal law and election reform, accentuating those most significant or challenging for the state and county. Thus, mass media, local communities, PACs, and election officials provided different coverage of election reform issues. Some states followed the federal law to the letter, some imprecisely interpreted its loose language. Unintentionally, Help America Vote Act contributed to the already existing diversity in election procedures between counties.

The goal of HAVA is to improve administration of elections nationwide, to bring more voters to the polling places and overcome barriers and challenges that kept millions of voters disenfranchised. Even very noble ideas without a proper supervision can fall victim of abuse and malfunction. The degree of variance between the states that the federal law provides gives not only the advantages to the state election reforms, but also poses challenges to every innovation.

The requirements of HAVA are the following (DEMOS - <http://www.demos.org/page54.cfm>):

- To enhance voting standards and education of poll workers and voting population.

- To create a statewide, centralized, interactive, computerized Voter Registration System in every state. This system allows election officials better safeguard duplicated registration, efficiently verify voter eligibility, and determine polling place location for first time or new voters immediately at the polling-place.
- To offer provisional ballots to voters who claim to be registered but whose names do not appear on the registration list. Provisional ballots are counted after their eligibility is proved.
- To assure that every polling place is ADA accessible and offers at least one DRE voting machine, which allows physically and visually impaired voters independently and securely to cast their vote without any assistance.
- All polling workers must undergo training on voting rights and regulations, and the use of voting technology.
- People with felony convictions should be informed about their voting rights. States must develop new voter registration forms, which integrate the list of eligible voters with a state record on felony convictions.

Each state was required to develop a timetable and a budget of the implementation of the law. The federal law provided partial financial assistance for the purchase of voting technology and voter registration system. States were given three years to reconcile the state laws with the federal requirements for the election under HAVA. The 2006 elections are the deadline for the states to comply and fulfill all the requirements. The primaries are the first test of the election reform that will demonstrate advantages and disadvantages, achievements and flaws of the innovations, new technology and new voting regulations.

The voters' turn out and voters' satisfaction will be the primary measure of the success of the election reform.

The loose language of the federal law allowed more room for variations of the way the election reform took place. Although there are certain major requirements that all states must comply with, state officials were able to choose voting technology, time-period, and contractors to purchase voting machines or voter registration system themselves, to meet the needs of every county and to act according to the financial resources available. The example of diversity of election procedures and degree to which the election reform was implemented can be the choice of New Mexico only to rely on paper ballots, while Georgia decided to substitute paper ballots with DRE voting system in all counties. In Kansas, two-third of counties chose Direct Recording Electronic voting system, the rest preferred optical scanning or hand-count ballots (www.kssos.org).

HAVA IN KANSAS

To comply with the federal law, beginning January 1, 2003, Kansas passed a number of resolutions and bills, which enact federal mandates to state laws, one of them being Senate Bill 479. Kansas received sufficient funding that sponsors up to fifty percent in the purchase of the new equipment and creating a new voter registration system.

Kansas has developed training and education programs for voters and election officials conducted throughout the state. Counties remain responsible to train poll workers, to guarantee smooth Election Day procedures and voting technology operation. Since January 2006, every polling place in Kansas is ADA accessible and provides voting equipment, which enables individuals with disabilities to cast an unassisted vote. A

number of precincts had to close polling places that did not meet HAVA accessibility requirements decreasing the total number of them, which potentially can lead to disenfranchisement of voters and longer wait period on Election Day. The number of polling places statewide declined from about 2,400 in 2000 to fewer than 2,000 in 2006. Some counties were forced to close more than a half of the polling places. Another reason to reduce the number of polling places was poor funding. The federal distribution of money for purchase of voting machines was done according to the population. Some of the rural counties were allocated too little to afford provision of voting technology for all polling places, forcing election officials to reduce a number of them.

To meet the requirements of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), the State of Kansas adopted an **Election Voter Information System**, which was named ELVIS. The system is designed to serve as a centralized, statewide, real-time voter registration and election management solution. The 2006 election cycle is the first time this system will be tested. This fully automated and interactive system allows election officials:

- to verify voter registration in real time;
- to reduce the number of duplicate voter registration records;
- to improve transmission of information from state agencies to local election precincts;
- to enhance security of voter information and registration;
- to increase savings through the reduction of paperwork and the elimination of time-consuming record maintenance activities;
- to improve efficiency of counting, tabulation and reporting capabilities of the election results on the Election Night;

- to assist with advance voting ballot processing;
- to track candidates, election workers and volunteers;
- to standardize election forms and procedures used throughout the state (www.kssos.org).

Kansas Secretary of State Office decided to substitute paper ballots with new voting machines, which directly record the votes cast. Automated voting system allows faster tabulation of the results and meets the ADA requirements. The Secretary of State approved five different voting technology manufacturers for counties to purchase their voting machines. Counties actually purchased Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting system from three main producers of voting technology in the country, Election Systems and Software (ES&S) being the most popular one in the State of Kansas. ES&S is also the manufacturer of the voter registration system used in Kansas. The same company provided Riley County with the 170 voting machines used at all polling places across Riley County.

VOTING TECHNOLOGY: DIRECT-RECORDING ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM

Help America Vote Act is the federal law that initiated the largest voting reform in the country in the recent decades. However, the voting technology became the corner stone of the reform. Automated and computerized voting triggered wide debates in the voting population. In the era of technology, when computer innovations became an increasingly larger part of the daily life of Americans, it was the matter of time for electronic or computerized voting to enter the market.

The computerized voting technology is represented but not limited to the Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting machines. Using DREs, a voter directly enters the votes, which are recorded electronically (http://lwy.manhattanks.org/lwy_dre.html). Almost all DREs are touch-screen voting machines, however some of them also have knobs and switches instead of touch-screen to record the vote. Often times, these computerized voting machines are presented as completely new technology that has never been tried before or is implemented only in the United States. Direct Recording Electronic voting system is used on a large scale in India, Brazil, Venezuela and Australia. The first electronic voting machines were introduced to the United States in the early 1980s. By the middle of the 1990s, 7.7 % of the registered voters in the United States used some type of Direct Recording Electronic Voting System. The innovations required by HAVA only increased the popularity of the machines. In November 2006, DREs will be used in 37 states, in 1,050 counties, by 39% of voters (www.election.org).

As any electronic technology, voting machines have their advantages and disadvantages. The evaluation of pluses and minuses of the voting reform and technological modernization of the voting process requires careful analysis. Elections are the basics of democracy, which should not be challenged by technological innovations, political agenda or financial constrains. The checks and balances that guarantee the fulfillment of democratic principles in the society, should be installed to guarantee fair and smooth elections.

Advantages of a Direct-Recording Electronic Voting System

There are several stages of reaction to innovations. First, people treat new technology with a certain degree of superstition and mistrust. Some people know about it and only a few actually use it. With time, new technology is introduced to various aspects of daily life of people. It becomes essential to daily routine of millions. Users can no longer imagine conducting old operations without new machines or automated programs. The debates about advantages and disadvantages fade in the context of significant benefits of implementation of innovations. Early warnings about security issues and drawbacks help establish proper 'checks and balances' for the new programs to work efficiently. Later, the use of the technology becomes essential to operation and work in various areas of human activity. Research and study of the technology is targeted not only on proving the benefits of its use, but on improvement, modification and advancement of rapidly developing technology.

Direct Recording Electronic voting machines are going through the same stages of suspicion, controversy, trust and modification. When these voting machines were first introduced to the general public in the early 1980s, only some U.S. voters were aware about existence of such machines and less than 10% of voting population used them. After HAVA became a federal law, these voting machines draw more attention than any other aspect of the bill. Computer technology specialists, researchers, academicians, voting specialists, political elites and general public continue discussing advantages and disadvantages of automated voting machines. Different interest groups present various arguments and viewpoints on the voting innovation. Although HAVA encourages the use of DREs, it does not require total substitution of paper ballots. However, the fact that the

large number of states chose voting machines demonstrate that people are willing to accept the introduced technology and see benefits that it can bring to the voting process. At the same time, the unquestionable acceptance of DREs without the established system of proper checks and balances can challenge the democratic process of election. Analysis of disadvantages and possible ways of technological malfunction should be always considered and kept in mind to avoid, predict or deal with election procedures failures.

Advocates of Direct Recording Electronic Voting System argue that these machines offer significant improvements to preventing human errors in the election process. As any computerized technology, voting machines double check human activity to prevent the possibility of a human factor mistake or warn about an error. Thus, DREs avert over-voting and inform a voter about under-voting. It also allows “second-chance” voting, when voters are not satisfied with the initial choices. DRE voting machines allow poll workers faster and more accurately tabulate the election results and announce them shortly after the polling places are closed.

Most voting machines comply with HAVA ADA requirements. They are easily accessible to voters with visual or motor impairments. Touch screens are simple in use. Various devices, headphone and speakers allow people with physical and motor disabilities to cast an unassisted secret vote. There are several types of voting machines, some of them are especially equipped with audio system and Braille navigation buttons for visually impaired voters. However, all voters are allowed to use those machines, to avoid the possibility of tracking votes to handicapped voters. That problem may especially become keen in small precincts where the numbers of physically impaired voters are low.

The voting programs installed in DREs support a number of different languages, allowing voters with a limited knowledge of English to participate in the election process. This innovation reaches out to the voting population that is traditionally disenfranchised due to their language abilities or education level. DREs are provided with an alphabetic keyboard that allows for the possibility of write-in votes.

Automated system and computerized tabulation and storage of information reduce expenses for specialist printing and paper cost. These savings allow for distribution of available funds for other costs and expenses. Manufacturers and voting officials that have indorsed automated voting technology promote advantages of machines and the programs, assuring consumers and voters that the protection and safeguards installed in them prevent malfunction and guarantee smooth operation.

All voting machines encourage voters to double check the correctness of their votes on the “review screen” that appears after the selections are done, but the ballot is not yet cast. The sound system warns voters about over-votes and under-votes and does not let them walk away without pressing the “vote button.”

All voting machines are equipped with three different forms of built-in supplementary memory. These forms of memory can be used in case of failure of the portable device (PEB), where all the voting information is generated and transferred on at the end of the Election Day. This supplementary memory provides a safeguard for the information stored in the machine during the Election Day. In case of a recount, election officials and poll workers can always refer to it to double check the total numbers of votes cast.

Manufacturers of voting programs and machines advertise them as an easily accessible and simple in use technology. ES&S, the company that has provided Riley County with the voters' registration system and voting machines presents voting procedure in four simple steps. First, a poll worker activates a DRE machine with a PEB and brings up the appropriate ballot. Second, a voter makes a selection. In case s/he changes their mind, a voter can select a different name by touching the appropriate name or retouching the already selected name to cancel the vote. Third, a voter proceeds to the "review screen" to check the correctness of the record. Finally, by pressing a big red "VOTE" button the ballot is cast. Prior to casting the ballot, a voter can always cancel the selection and start anew.

All advertisement campaigns are meant to encourage and promote an innovation. The presentation of a simple operation of voting machines targets voters that can be estranged and disenfranchised from the voting process due to the lack of education or computer illiteracy. Older people that traditionally represent the main voting population, as well as voters with poor knowledge of the English language, poor reading abilities and physically and mentally challenged voters can be especially challenged by such technological innovations. The proper education campaigns conducted by election officials and local communities should target these groups of voting population in order to maintain or even increase number of voting population. The installation of technology can also help attract more young people to the polls.

Technological innovations can be also a challenge for poll workers, often represented by older citizens. New machines can reduce an already low numbers of volunteers on the Election Day. HAVA regulations require appropriate training for staff

and volunteers on voting regulations and voting technology to guarantee and assure a smooth election process.

Disadvantages of a Direct Recording Electronic Voting System

Technological innovations introduce not only advantages and benefits to a particular activity or process, but acquaint users to new types of malfunction, technological failures and errors. There is no ideal computer program or automated machine void of programming mistakes, glitches or possible machine malfunctions. Computer technology became an essential part of numerous activities of people nowadays. However, all computer-users have experienced computer shutdowns, errors or failures at some point of their work. Relying on computers for storing information or computing data, users have already learnt to use supplementary storing devices in case of malfunction to assure the safety of the information and in order to save the time and efforts in case of recovering lost or tampered data.

Voting machines are often called by critics "black box" machines (www.blackboxvoting.org). Computer users are aware that the simplest programming activity can alter the data shown on the screen and save it in a corrupted form. Most of DRE voting technology saves the data in the in-built memory that is also recorded in the supplementary memory. This supplementary memory does not provide a back-up system that allows for a recount. Once the data has been corrupted, it is recorded in its altered form on all types of memory provided in the machines. Thus, the main criticisms of voting machines are that they lack transparency in voting records. There is no way for voters to double check that the votes have been recorded the same way they appeared to

voters on the “review screen.” The only way to double-check the correctness of the voting records is through installation of Voter-Verifiable Paper Audit Trails (VVPAT) (<http://vote.nist.gov/ecposstatements/VVPAT.doc>). Unfortunately, often times election officials ignore installation and the use of VVPATs, because it can increase the cost of machines.

As any automated technology, voting machines are potential objects of human manipulation, tampering and malfunction. Manipulation can occur not only at local precincts, targeting the machines themselves, but also at the manufacturing site. Programming remains the prerogative of the manufacturing company. Neither election officials nor independent computer scientists-observers have access to the programming codes. Election officials rely solely on the competency, honesty and professionalism of the producers of the programs. Once a malfunction or a glitch has been detected, election officials can not access the codes to install the patch or correct the mistake. They are not qualified or accredited to conduct such program writings. Another concern is that in case of installation of a patch on a programming glitch, a program requires a new certification. Neither the federal nor the state laws define requirements for the voting program certification, which can lead to controversy in case of recount or close election results.

One of the main concerns for the Election Day procedures is what the regulations in case of computer malfunction and voting machines failures are. Election officials, poll workers and volunteers are provided only with the cursory information about a possible malfunction. Unfortunately, the manufacturers in an attempt to sell their product do not mention or even completely ignore the possibility of DREs shutdowns. They do not provide election officials with the sufficient information of the action in such a situation.

The presence of a specialist at every polling place significantly increases the cost of elections. The federal law does not provide a mandate of actions, leaving election officials to their own resourcefulness. Only the major failure of the Direct Recording Electronic Voting System that will greatly influence the election results and outcomes is able to establish a mandate for actions in such situations.

The role of VVPATs

Researchers of the voting machines warn election officials about sufficient “checks and balances” to be installed in the voting machines. Since the majority of the states decided to use DRE voting system, the question now is what the appropriate checks and balances that guarantee the security of the machines are.

Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trail is one of the major devices that DREs can easily accommodate (www.notablessoftware.com). A VVPAT is a small external device that can be added to any modern touch-screen voting machine. It represents a paper trail that keeps records of the information stored in the memory of the computer, not what is displayed on the screen. Thus, VVPATs allow voters to verify that their intent was recorded correctly. Even if the ballot is tabulated in the precinct and fed into the reading device in the presence of the voter, neither the voter nor the poll-worker manning the reader can see what it is recording in its memory (www.notablessoftware.com). Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trail verifies the votes in the presence of the voter and later during a recount. The paper trail is used in case of an audit or a recount (<http://www.sos.state.oh.us/sos/hava/ess110405.pdf>). Paper trail can be referred to in order to reconcile the total number of voters and number of ballots cast at the end of the

Election Day. The vote totals can be verified also through a hand count of the paper record.

A number of reports on the security of DREs, Brennan Report being one of the most influential, informative and exhaustive, suggest that the use of VVPATs and required random routine audits of DREs significantly decrease the chances of malfunction, machine tampering, vote fraud and manipulation (Brennan Center for Justice - <http://www.brennancenter.org/>).

The State of Kansas Law does not require the use of VVPATs due to the increase in the cost of the voting machines. Twenty-six states, which chose DRE voting system for the election procedures, require VVPATs. Election officials arguing that the cost of the machine will increase in case of installation of VVPAT devices do not consider the fact that it is only a one-time expenditure and in case of failure, the paper trail can significantly help save funds for recovering of the information.

EFFECT OF HAVA ON RILEY COUNTY

The election reform affected Riley County in the same way it did the majority of counties across the country. The county strictly followed the major requirements of HAVA such as poll workers training, accessibility of polling places and implementation of voting technology. Providing ADA access at all polling places did not create controversy and problems, because most of them already met these requirements. Riley County did not have to shut down a large number of precincts, as it was common in other counties in Kansas. However, the significant influx of new-coming militaries and their families to the Fort Riley can potentially be a challenge for an accommodation of all

voting population in Manhattan. The County Clerk's Office has rearranged several precincts in order to include rapidly developing housing units. The number of voting precincts has increased in Riley County, but it was the result of growing population, rather than the outcome of the election reform.

The major innovation that HAVA introduced to Manhattan is the voting machines. Riley County Clerk's Office decided to completely substitute paper ballots that were optically scanned or in case of machine failure, hand counted with a Direct Recording Electronic voting system. Riley County purchased 170 machines to supply all polling places. Fifty percent of the funds were provided through the election reform federal program. The county had to pay for the rest amount. The city and county commissions were aware of the coming reform and have allotted sufficient funds for the election innovations.

The ES&S was the major contractor for the purchase of the voting technology, both the voter registration system and voting machines. There are two types of machines at each polling place, one especially equipped for physically impaired voters. The County Clerk's Office decided not to install VVPATs, arguing that it would increase the cost of the machines up to \$700 per unit. The election officials appealed to the fact of numerous security devices already installed in the machines. In public debates and voting machine presentations, the confusion arose after the representatives of the Clerk's office assured voters that there is a paper trail in these machines. However, they referred to the trail that is printed from the memory of the machines before the beginning of the elections to assure that all machines have been zeroed out and after the polling places are closed to confirm the total number of people voted (Mercury, August 2, 2006). The printouts with

the total numbers of votes are not Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trails. Voters have no access to this data, which is used exclusively by election officials for their audits. The lack of understanding of technicalities of voting machine operations on the part of the election officials put the election process in jeopardy.

The County Clerk's Office did a good job of presenting voting machines to the public and acquainting voters with the new technology. Election officials organized a number of presentations in retiring communities, at political parties' meetings, in schools and public libraries. Machines were available to the voting population for a try-out. The office also sent out information about DREs to all voters in the county. Still, the representatives of the Clerk's office were not eager to discuss alternatives for the use of DREs or installing appropriate security measure to the purchased machines. The primary election in August was the first time the county used voting machines for its election process.

ELECTION DAY IN RILEY COUNTY: AUGUST 1, 2006 – PRIMARY

At 7 pm on Tuesday, August 1, 2006, all polling places in Riley County opened for the primary election. The night before, the voting machines were installed at every polling place. The machines were supposed to be zeroed out and ready to use before the precincts are open. A representative from each political party has to verify that there are zero votes in the memory of the machines before the beginning of elections and to reconcile the number of ballots recorded in the memory with the number of people voted at the end of the day. However, election officials were still working on the machines, when the first voters came in to cast their ballot. At some places, only one machine was

available (Art Center, See Attachment 3). Some voters reported that they had to vote on paper ballots, because machines were not ready. A number of voters complained about the lack of privacy that machines provided (See attachment 3).

The County Clerk's Office instructed all poll workers and volunteers to encourage voters to use voting machines. Paper ballots were still available for those voters that did not feel comfortable using DREs or in case malfunction of the machines. Only 68 people referred to paper ballots on Election Day.

Rich Vargo, Riley County Clerk, reported that the elections went smoothly with no machine failures or voters' complains. He did not consider complains of voters that came to polling places early in the morning. During the day, poll workers did not experience any problems with the machines, did not face long lines or crowded precincts. The turnout was much lower than previously predicted. Rich Vargo said that 3,995 voters, including those who voted in advance, cast their vote. It is only about 13.28 percent of all registered voters in Riley County (Mercury, August 2, 2006; www.rileycountyks.gov). The poor turnout could be attributed to extreme high temperatures in Kansas, few contested runs and the time of the election, when a large number of people are out of town on vacation and the school is not yet in session.

During the Election Day, poll workers performed a good job on checking the machines and answering the needs of voters. All poll workers went through an extensive training program to learn how to use the machines, which remained the main concern on Election Day. Poll workers seemed uncomfortable and ill at ease around the machines, referred to their training guides and were reluctant to answer technical questions about the machines. Poll workers ran several checkups during the day to verify the numbers and

to make sure the machines were running correctly. The final check was performed at 5 pm to compare the number before the machines were turned off and the numbers turned in to the Clerk's office.

The results were tabulated the same day. It was the result of electronic records and the poor turnout. The primary was the first test for voting technologies. However, even the poor turnout revealed problems with the machines and again raised controversial debates about the election reform.

As part of my project, I observed a polling place on the Election Day. All LWV observers had to fill out the questionnaire, which was developed by the "Voting Reform Advisory Group" that I was a member of (See attachment 3). From my observations, I noted that machines were not ready to be used at the time the polling places were open to public. Also, the way the machines were set at the precinct did not provide any privacy for voters. The machines were too close to each other and in such proximity, it was possible to see what a voter does on the screen. In case a voter needed poll workers' assistance, the only way a poll worker could approach a machine and a voter was from the front side of the machine, which allowed a poll worker to see the voter's selection. A poll worker could not approach the machines from the rear, because they were placed along the wall. Thus, trying to provide privacy and to guarantee a secret and unassisted vote for all groups of voting population by installing voting machines, new technology and the lack of knowledge about the machines challenged the idea of secrecy of the ballot and election procedures.

Another concern that arose shortly before the Election Day was related to the program available on the Riley County Clerk's Office and the Secretary of State's Office,

which determines a voter's precinct according to the address (www.rileycountyks.gov; www.kssos.org). Since some of the precincts were moved to other locations, many voters were confused about the place they should vote. All voters received a card with the location of a new polling place, however, the website provided an old address. The Voter Registration Program was not available at every precinct and several people appeared on the voters' list, although they are no longer Kansas residents. The program seemed to work from the Secretary of State's Office website, but not from the Riley County Clerk's Office website.

These small nuances that badly influenced the election process during the primary should be address accordingly prior to the national elections in November. The national election will attract more voters, the runs will be more competitive and more people will be able to vote at that time. The bigger turnout and busier polling places can aggravate the smallest malfunctions and lead to significant problems in the election process.

CONCLUSIONS

The election reform is in a full swing now. Many vital decisions have already been made, the new technology has been purchased and the federal funds have already been exhausted. At this point of election reform, the question is not how to conduct the reform and how to innovate the election process and voting technology, but how to guarantee the security of the already selected technology and to encourage people to vote. The primary election demonstrated that advantages of the voting reform have improved the election process, but at the same time, it revealed potential problems and disadvantages of the new voting machines.

The election officials took a position of justifying their choice, completely ignoring the reports on voting technologies, questions and concerns of the community, and suggestions of the computer specialists. It is not the right time and the right example to demonstrate the success of the primary election. It is crucial at this point to pay attention to mistakes and miscalculations revealed by the primary and to take appropriate steps to solve them before the major election time. It is important for election officials to be open to criticisms and advice of computer specialists, analysts and general public. Unfortunately, the election officials and the majority of voters do not pay attention to election procedures until a major crisis happens, when there is a close election or a major technological failure.

The current election reform introduces important significant positive innovations to the election process. The use of modern technology is inevitable in the modern era of technology. It helps to improve the election and to reach out to traditionally disenfranchised groups of voting population. The attempts to draw attention to drawbacks

and possible problems in the election process, voting technology and voting regulations do not aim to discourage or criticize the election reform, but aim at improving the process and guaranteeing proper checks and balances.

Election remains one of the most important processes that maintain democracy in any society. Education, involvement and active participation of voters that consume information about election, political activities, and political leaders should be the main prerogative of election reform and community organization. Election officials, NGOs and PACs on national, regional, state, and local levels should educate voters about the technological innovations introduced to the voting process; advocate for the appropriate checks and balances that can secure the process of storing, conveying and tabulating of ballots and votes; and to inform voters about constantly developing election technologies and innovations that enter the market daily.

Manhattan, as a college town, has a very specific voting population. The proximity to the Fort Riley adds to the diversity. The rate of young people voting remains rather low. Military and their families more often than others refer to advance or absentee voting. The reach of election officials to these groups of voters and a proper advertisement of voting technologies can help significantly improve voters' turnouts. However, it is important not to neglect traditionally disenfranchised population and older voters, who represent the majority of voters, and educate them about voting reform and voting innovation. Education of voters and presentation of the complete information can guarantee the success of voting reform.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Electronic materials and electronic addresses:

BlackBoxVoting.org

www.blackboxvoting.org

It is a nonpartisan non-profit organization, which is interested in the consumers' rights. Black Box Voting advocates for consumer protection for election. The website offers information on the election laws, different group's position to the election procedures and regulations, and the most up-dated information on the election across the country. It includes links to other relevant references and PDF files of the reports on the effectiveness or vulnerability of DREs, such as "Diebold TSx Evaluation," by Hursti, and LWV Report on the position against DREs without VVPAT.

BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE

<http://www.brennancenter.org/>

The Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law advocate nonpartisan agenda to promote democracy. This report is a part of the voting rights and election series. The report was the result of a year-long collaboration between specialist of different fields representing various interest groups and independent observers. The report on the voting machines finds that DREs are vulnerable to software attacks, computer malfunction and human manipulation. It also offers solutions how to minimize these problems.

CENTER FOR CORRECT, USABLE, RELIABLE, AUDITABLE, AND
TRANSPARENT ELECTIONS

<http://accurate-voting.org/>

The website provides comprehensive information about voting procedures and laws in the states. It has an updated information sources about current publications and actions on election.

CIVIL RIGHTS COALITION FOR THE 21st CENTURY

www.civilrights.org

It is the product of collaboration of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund. The website provides updated and complete information on civil rights issues in the country. Voting rights is one of the main concerns of the organization. The website is updated regularly. It has information on the voting rights, rights violations, and various regulations in different state across the country. It provides readers with news and information on voting reform and the latest legislation actions. It has links to the VOTING RIGHTS RESOURCES, where readers can refer to with questions regarding HAVA, voting procedures in their state, voting machines and the new implementation of the voting technology and programs in different states.

Examples:

Statement of Principles on Electronic Voting – Fact Sheet

<http://www.civilrights.org/issues/voting/details.cfm?id=18922>

Statement of Principles on Electronic Voting – Report

<http://www.civilrights.org/issues/voting/details.cfm?id=18481>

COMMON CAUSE

<http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG&b=186966>

Common Cause, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization committed to honest, open and accountable government. The website is interested in such issues as election reform and voting rights of Americans. It offers a report on DREs and their vulnerability to machine malfunction and human manipulation. Common Cause concludes that the only way to ensure accurate election results is to require all voting systems to produce a voter verified paper ballot (VVPB) - either marked by the voter or printed by an electronic voting machine or a ballot-marking machine and approved by the voter. Common Cause reports the political circumstances and reasons that led to using the DRE machines in the election process. It details security and reliability issues with DREs and presents information on what states are of greater risk for ballot fraud during the up-coming election. It lays out recommendations on how to avoid compromising November election.

DEMOS: Network for Ideas & Actions

<http://www.demos.org/page54.cfm>

It is a nonpartisan public research and advocacy organization. The website provides profound and broad information on the reasons of changes in the voting procedures in the United States. It familiarizes readers with the Help American Voting Act (HAVA 2002), which serves as a guideline for the state official in the voting reform. It has various materials in forms of guides from the legislation and public discussions about registration procedures, polling workers training and voting rights of Americans, etc.

Examples:

Demos Advocate Guide: Election Day Registration and the Help America Voting Act

Demos Advocate Guide: Voting Right Restoration and the Help America Voting Act

Demos Advocates' Guide to HAVA Task Forces in the States, May 2003

HAVA Implementation in the 50 States: A summary of State implementation plans

ELECTION SYSTEMS & SOFTWARE, INC. (ES&S)

<http://www.essvote.com>

ES&S is the largest company that develops and provides voting technologies in the world. It manufactures voting machines and develops voting programs. Kansas was given a choice of five companies that specialize in voting technology. Riley County chose ES&S for its voting places. The website provides information on the company's activities and offers opportunities for readers to test their equipment on-line. Visitors of the website can address their questions and concerns to the representatives of the company.

ELECTION. Org

www.election.org

Offers links to website about election and its regulations across the country. An easy search of such topics as History of the U.S. Election, Report on Election Reform, Voting precincts in a particular state, etc.

ELECTRONIC VOTING

Mercuri, Rebecca. Facts About Voter Verified Paper Ballots

www.notablesoftware.com

The website provides an exhaustive counter-arguments for the electronic and Internet voting procedures. The author provides computer security arguments as well as moral issues that arise from electronic voting.

ELECTRONIC VOTING MACHINE INFORMATION SHEET

http://www.eff.org/Activism/E-voting/20040818_ess_ivotronic_v0.8.pdf

Provides detailed description of voting machines and their operation, about the elections procedures and the ways the ballots are cast and stored in the machine. Offers visual images of DREs and PEBs manufactured by ES&S. Has a list of past problems with the voting machines that occurred during elections in different states.

ES&S COMMENTS ON THE DRAT STANDARD FOR VOTER VERIFIABLE AUDIT TRAILS ON DRE VOTING SYSTEMS (DRE:VVPAT)

Draft Version March 2, 2005

<http://vote.nist.gov/ecposstatements/VVPAT.doc>

The chart offers arguments for and against the use of the VVPAT in DRE voting machines. It gives a computer science professional perspective on the positive side, as well as drawbacks of the paper trail use.

ES&S DIRECT RECORDING ELECTRONIC (DRE) AND VOTER VERIFIED PAPER AUDIT TRAIL (VVPAT) TECHNICAL SECURITY ASSESMENT REPORT

<http://www.sos.state.oh.us/sos/hava/ess110405.pdf>

The document contains the results for the security reassessment for the Election Systems & Software (ES&S) Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting system and an initial security assessment of the ES&S Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT), conducted in September of 2005 by Compuware Corporation. The report tests DRE and VVPAT. It perform test steps to ensure that the functionality of the DRE was not affected by the addition of the VVPAT to the DRE.

HAVA – HELP AMERICA VOTING ACT (text of the law and supporting documents)

<http://www.fec.gov/hava/hava.htm>

KANSAS SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE

www.kssos.org

The website provides information about activities of the Kansas Secretary of State's office, employees, and legislative and public information regarding voting issues in the States of Kansas. Visitors of the website can find contact information of the office to address the representatives of the office with the questions on voting, voting technology, and new voting procedures and requirements.

Examples:

Canvassing Kansas: An Update on Election News from Kansas Secretary of State Ron Thornburgh, March 2004

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

www.lwv.org

It is a nonpartisan political organization that aims to improve and affect public policies through citizen education and advocacy. It provides analysis of effect of the HAVA on the American society and the consequences this law will have on the voting reform in the country.

Examples:

Next Steps on Election Reform: Report on a Forum sponsored by The League of Women Voters Education Fund and The McCormick Tribune Foundation

LOW-WAGE JUSTICE PROJECT

Vol. XXXI, No. 1, Expanding voting Rights to Felons, part of the HAVA of 2002.

www.dsausa.org/lowwage

One of the requirements of the HAVA is the education of voting rights. Different states have various requirements for convicted felons, which are often disenfranchised even after being reintegrated into the community. The project provides a thorough analysis of convicted felons' voting rights.

MOVEON.ORG: DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

<http://www.moveon.org/about.html>

MoveOn is an organization that encourages community participation in political life. The organization advocates a number of issues that are beneficiary for the community and the country. The organization promoted the use of VVPATs during elections, which rely on DRE voting system.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE ELECTION DIRECTORS

<http://www.nased.org/index.htm>

A group of state election officials maintain the website and provides information about certification process and certified voting technology. HAVA increased the importance of communication between election officials and having common grounds to discuss voting technology.

OHIO VOTER EDUCATION

www.ohiovotereducation.com/voterTryout.html

A very user-friendly educational website that provides information about voting regulations, provides on-line Interactive Voter Tryout of new electronic voting machines.

OPEN VOTING CONSORTIUM

<http://www.openvotingconsortium.org/>

The Open Voting Consortium is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to the Development, maintenance, and delivery of trustable and open voting systems for use in public elections. The organization consists of coputer experts, voting experts, and voting rights activists. The website offers exhaustive and user-friendly information on the election procedures, innovations, regulations, and reports instances of voting rights violations.

RILEY COUNTY LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

http://lwv.manhattanks.org/lwv_dre.html

The website contains exhaustive information on the reasons of voting changes in the country, the legislative activities on the federal and state level regarding voting reform. It offers information and links to the resources that evaluate electronic voting process, voting machines and voting process available on the markets, analyzes advantages and disadvantages of them and offers links to the testing options, where readers can try voting technology on line. The website provides direct links to other recourses that readers can find useful in the research of voting reform or heir desire to learn more before the upcoming elections. The website contains only reliable sources and is connected to the LWV official website.

RILEY COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

www.rileycountyks.gov

The website provides information specifically regarding election procedures in Riley County, the choice of machines and the programs the office chose for the elections. It contains information on the cost of equipment, it storage process and the reasoning to use it. It has office contact information that the readers can use to reach the representatives of the office to ask questions regarding the up-coming elections in August 2006.

VERIFIED VOTING FOUNDATION

www.verifiedvotingfoundation.org

The website provides different opinions on voting technologies and implemented regulations. It has various arguments that represent the opinions of different groups of population and touches the challenges that officials can face during the elections period. It offers a question-answer section, where readers can post their own question.

VIDEO PRESENTATION OF THE ELECTION PROCESS USING IVOTRONIC VOTING MACHINES

http://elections.metro-dade.com/video_pres.asp

Offered by Miami-Dade County.

VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDELINES

http://www.eac.gov/vvsg_intro.htm

On December 13, 2005, the U.S Election Assistance Commission (EAC) adopted the 2005 Voluntary Voting System Guidelines, which establishes certain requirements to assure security for the election procedures. It is in compliance with HAVA requirements.

VOTING AND ELECTIONS BY DOUGLAS JONES

<http://www.cs.uiowa.edu/~jones/voting/>

This website provides information on voting technology through the eyes of computer and electronic technology specialist. It analyzes the drawbacks of voting technology and offers certain suggestions for voters to consider before heading to the polling places.

VOTING-PAD

www.vote-pad.us

Voting-on-Paper Assistive Device offers an alternative, inexpensive, non-electronic form of ballot that helps most people with visual or dexterity impairments to vote independently. The Vote-Pad complies with HAVA requirements. The website offers description of the device and details the way it can be used by voters to cast a secure and independent vote. It has an on-line demonstration of the ballot. The patent for this device is pending.

WHERE'S THE PAPER TRAIL EVERY VOTER CAST

www.wheresthepaper.org

A website is dedicated to verifiable election results. It offers arguments for the Paper trails and offers suggestions how to guarantee verifiable elections results.

Academic Literature:

Coopersmith, Jonathan. Pretty Good Technologies and Visible Disasters. *Technology and Culture* 42.1 (2001) 204-207

Fisher, Eric A. 2003. Election Reform and Electronic Voting Systems (DREs): Analysis of Security Issues. CRS Report for Congress. Library of Congress, Order code RL 32139

Knack, Stephen and Kropf, Martha. Who Uses Inferior Voting Technology? *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 35 (3), Sep., 2002, 541-548.

Shocket, Peter A., Heighberger, Neil R., and Brown Clyde. The Effect of Voting Technology on Voting Behavior in a Simulated Multi-Candidate City Council Election: A Political Experiment of Ballot Transparency. *The Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 45 (2) June 1992, 521-537.

Solop, Frederic I. Digital Democracy Comes of Age: Internet Voting and the 2000 Arizona Democratic Primary Election. *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 34 (2), Jun., 2001, 289-293.

Rui Joaquim, André Zúquete, Paulo Ferreira. "REVS – A ROBUST ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM"

National Press:
On-line access –

Voting Machine Vendor Vows to Make Improvements, August 1, 2006.
<http://www.todaysthv.com/printfullstory.aspx?storyid=32155>

Congress bungles voting machine reforms: Lawmakers waste billions on unreliable, balky equipment, August 1, 2006.
<http://www.detnews.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060801/OPINION01/608010304/1008>

New voting machine put through its paces, August 1, 2006.
<http://www.t-g.com/story/1162540.html>

Witnesses Concerned About Ballot Security, July 20, 2006, Roll Call.
http://www.rollcall.com/issues/52_9/news/14393-1.html

Electronic Voting Machines Need More Safeguards, Computing Professor says, July 20, 2006
<http://chronicle.com/wiredcampus/article/1429/electronic-voting-machines-need-more-safeguards-computing-professors-say>

Study: All Electronic Voting Machines Vulnerable to Software Attacks, June 29, 2006
<http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=06/06/29/1421212>

Lou Dobb's show
www.loudobbs.com
Transcripts of the programs from June 27, 2006 - Widespread Problems With Electronic Voting Machines;
June 20, 2006 - Voting Machine Controversy;
June 15, 2006 – State Officials Who've Bought Electronic Voting Machines Blocking Efforts to Independently Verify Accuracy;
June 14, 2006 – Election Officials Required to Provide Ballots and Voting Materials in Numerous Languages;
June 2, 2006 - Venezuelan Film Could Take Over One Of This Country's Top Voting Machine Firms;

Software Attacks Pose Real Danger to All Electronic Voting Machines, U.S. Newswire, June 27, 2006
<http://releases.usnewswire.com/GetRelease.asp?id=68353>

Analysis Finds e-voting Machines are vulnerable, USA TODAY, June 26, 2006
http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2006-06-26-e-voting_x.htm

Debating the Bugs of High-Tech Voting; The Washington Post, May 30, 2006

www.washingtonpost.com

How to Steal an Election, The Washington Post, March 16, 2006
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/graphic/2006/03/16/GR2006031600213.html>

Print Media:

Touch screens struggle to get leg up over paper ballots, Star News (Wilmington, NC), May 3, 2006.

Primary to test need for paper trail, Tribune-Review (Greensburg, PA), May 7, 2006.

Group challenging use of touch-screen voting machines, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, May 10, 2006.

Machines pass first test; Polling places iron out wrinkles in optical-scan and touch-screen systems, Charleston Daily Mail (West Virginia), May 10, 2006.

Blind man happy to be voting without assistance, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, May 10, 2006.

Voters trust touch screens, Tribune-Review (Greensburg, PA), May 10, 2006.

Security risk found with Diebold voting machines, The Times Union (Albany, New York), May 11, 2006.

City auditor: No deal for voting machines; Official questions contract, possible conflict of interest, Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), May 12, 2006.

Experts see new Diebold flaw; They call it worst security glitch to date in state's voting machines and a 'big deal'; Maryland votes 2006 , The Baltimore Sun, May 12, 2006.

Experts: Voting machines not secure, The Capital (Annapolis, MD), May 12, 2006.

Counties warned of security glitch in machines, Pittsburgh Post – Gazette (Pennsylvania), May 12, 2006.

Measure to extend Voting Rights Act creates little friction, St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), May 15, 2006.

On the rise; The Journal high on Diebold CEO, Crain's Cleveland Business, May 15, 2006.

New electronic voting machines help disabled: Other voters report problems at polls, Messenger-Inquirer, May 17, 2006.

Voting machines make debut: Touch-screen system proves easy to use but lacks paper trail, Centre Daily Times (Pennsylvania), May 17, 2006.

Students learn power of the vote, Connecticut Post Online (Bridgeport, Connecticut), May 17, 2006.

Voters not intimidated by new systems, The Evening Sun (Hanover, Pennsylvania), May 17, 2006.

Voting Machines for Disabled in New York City, The New York Times, May 17, 2006.

Electronic voting debuts 'smoothly,' though not error-free, Pittsburgh Tribune Review, May 17, 2006.

Votes are in: Machines a hit: New iVotronic makes its debut in Luzerne County, The Times Leader, May 17, 2006.

Voting machines praised by election officials despite hiccups, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, May 17, 2006.

Election officials pleased with machines, Centre Daily Times (Pennsylvania), May 18, 2006.

Primary Election 2006; A memorable election: quirky machines, big Harrisburg changes, delayed write-ins, Morning Call (Allentown, Pennsylvania), May 18, 2006.

Touch of democracy the new voting machines pass their first test, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania), May 18, 2006.

County gives good grade to new voting machines, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania), May 18, 2006.

New machines may be problem for tall voters, Ark. prosecutor says, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, May 20, 2006.

Fallout from new voting machines; Law changes drive up special-elections costs, The Columbus Dispatch (Ohio), May 21, 2006.

Voting gets a new look; Punch-card system gone, The Daily News of Los Angeles, May 21, 2006.

Touch-screens a first for voters in many areas System easy to work, users say, Arkansas Democrat-Gazette (Little Rock), May 21, 2006.

Voting machines raise security concerns; Group warns of tampering; firm deems risk low, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (Wisconsin), May 22, 2006.

Counties retain paper ballots; Some precincts opt to let people choose preferred voting method, Charleston Daily Mail (West Virginia), May 24, 2006.

Democracy depends on reliable voting machines, Morning Call (Allentown, Pennsylvania), May 25, 2006.

Voting machines: too early to tell here if tweaking is needed; Mary Stehman, chief clerk of the county's board of elections, reserved judgment on whether the process needs to be streamlined and whether more machines should be bought., Lancaster New Era (Pennsylvania), May 26, 2006.

Galvin may face primary battle, The Boston Globe, May 27, 2006.

Ready or not: Touch-screen voting machines await election test, The Record, May 27, 2006.

Could tabulator simplify voting?, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), May 29, 2006.

Debating the Bugs of High-Tech Voting; Test of Software in Machines Renews Security Concerns, The Washington Post, May 30, 2006.

How the vote got messed up; Late deliveries, late tests led to election night chaos in Cuyahoga, Plain Dealer (Cleveland), May 31, 2006.

50 years later, no more levers, The York Dispatch (Pennsylvania), May 31, 2006.

More voting machines to offset fewer polling places: County commissioners approve the purchase after 146 voting locations were eliminated, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), June 1, 2006.

Voters plan lawsuit over touch-screen machines, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, June 1, 2006.

Group sues to block use of some voting machines, Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), June 2, 2006.

New machines to reduce residual votes, officials say, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, June 2, 2006.

No paper ballot? No sweat for teens; Counties recruit technology-savvy students as elections judges, The Baltimore Sun, June 4, 2006.

Diebold's reassurances are not enough, The Salt Lake Tribune, June 2, 2006.

New technology not a problem for primaries, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, June 6, 2006.

The Election Day test No one is sure how well 60 new machines will work, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), June 6, 2006.

Voting system's performance in primary praised A state board certifies the election results as officials tout the success of new equipment., Omaha World-Herald (Nebraska), June 6, 2006.

Why some results will be delayed: Backup systems and Absentee ballots will take longer for officials to count, San Jose Mercury News (California), June 6, 2006.

Teens wanted at polls, The Berkshire Eagle (Pittsfield, Massachusetts), June 7, 2006.

Voting machines prompt complaint, Centre Daily Times (Pennsylvania), June 7, 2006.

Vote count finished early, Tribune-Review (Greensburg, PA), June 7, 2006.

A Foot in the Door of the Voting Booth, The New York Times, June 8, 2006.

Voting machines' accuracy questioned again, Centre Daily Times (Pennsylvania), June 14, 2006.

Only a paper audit trail confirms voters' intentions, Morning Call (Allentown, Pennsylvania), June 14, 2006.

New booths coming in November: The privacy shields, which cost \$475, will prevent anyone in line from seeing voters' faces, The Times Leader, June 14, 2006.

Help America Vote Act of 2002 requires N.Y. old voting machines be replaced, Long Island Business News (Long Island, NY), June 16, 2006.

Iowa ballots counted by hand Problems with electronic machines in Pottawattamie County could delay primary results until Thursday. Omaha World-Herald (Nebraska), June 7, 2006.

Voting goes high-tech: Touch-screens have smooth debut, Chico Enterprise-Record (California), June 7, 2006.

Touch screens pass first trial, Chico Enterprise-Record (California), June 7, 2006.

All Virginia voting will be electronic; State has used federal help to convert to optical-scan and touch-screen machines, Richmond Times Dispatch (Virginia), June 8, 2006.

Counties reduce, move polling sites to comply with federal law, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, June 9, 2006.

Computer voting secure, Chico Enterprise-Record (California), June 10, 2006.

Touch-screens in the doghouse; Optical scanners are answer, Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), June 10, 2006.

Technician fire over Leflore voting machine problems, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, June 12, 2006.

Primary is debut for voting machines designed for disabled, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, June 13, 2006.

Voting made easier, Fairbanks Daily News-Miner (Alaska), June 14, 2006.

Doubts plague e-vote systems, The Kansas City Star, June 15, 2006.

Elections officials: Registration rules not likely a problem, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, June 16, 2006.

Voting act requires New York to replace outdated machines, Kansas City Daily Record (Kansas City, MO), June 17, 2006.

Voting Machines become an issue, The Augusta Chronicle (Georgia), June 18, 2006.

ELECTION 2006; Touch-screen voting's steep learning curve; Rollout in 21 counties brings glitches, The San Francisco Chronicle (California), June 19, 2006.

A Single Person Could Swing the Election: Electronic Systems' Weaknesses May Be Countered With Audits, Report Suggests, Washington Post, June 28, 2006.

Mississippi and Utah Successfully Deploy Touch-Screen Voting From Diebold Election Systems; Voter acceptance of the touch-screen system overwhelmingly positive, PR Newswire US, June 29, 2006.

Voting machine vendor vows to improve communications with Ark., The Associated Press State & Local Wire, August 1, 2006.

Step right up to your new voting future: Forget the old punch-card booths used for decades? Jackson County introduces new machines, The Kansas City Star (Missouri), August 4, 2006.

Kansas Press:

New voting machines perform well on first test, Journal-World (Lawrence, Kansas), August 3, 2006.

New equipment, fewer voters, The Manhattan Mercury, August 2, 2006.

And oh, yeah, there was an election today... The Manhattan Mercury, August 1, 2006.

New voting machines stand ready, Journal-World (Lawrence, Kansas), August 1, 2006.

Get out and vote, Topeka Capital-Journal (Kansas), August 1, 2006.

Primaries to demonstrate changes in how Kansans vote, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, August 1, 2006.

Democrats propose changes at polls, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), July 24, 2006.

County braces for balloting switch: Polling places in eastern Jackson County will have more workers Aug. 8 as the InkaVote system makes its debut. The Kansas City Star (Missouri), July 23, 2006.

Paper ballots will be main option for primary, Journal-World (Lawrence, Kansas), July 19, 2006.

Coalition seeks more polling sites: Republicans and Democrats say they share the nonpartisan coalition's concern over the loss of more than 140 voting locations in Sedgwick County. The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), July 11, 2006.

Group works to aid voters, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), July 10, 2006.

New voting methods must ensure security, accuracy, The Kansas City Star, June 20, 2006.

Doubts plague e-vote systems, The Kansas City Star, June 15, 2006.

New voting machines improve poll position, Journal-World (Lawrence, Kansas), June 13, 2006.

The Election Day test No one is sure how well 60 new machines will work, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), June 6, 2006.

More voting machines to offset fewer polling places: County commissioners approve the purchase after 146 voting locations were eliminated, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), June 1, 2006.

Registering, advance voting, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), May 9, 2006.

County eliminates 146 voting locations, The Wichita Eagle (Kansas), May 7, 2006.

Thornburgh runs again, Topeka Capital-Journal (Kansas), April 18, 2006.

KC scrapping its punch-card equipment, The Kansas City Star, April 11, 2006.

KC voters to mark ballots two ways, The Kansas City Star, December 9, 2005.

KC voting booth will look different in 2006, The Kansas City Star, December 4, 2005.

Topeka Capital-Journal (Kansas), December 2, 2005.

KC, county split on casting better ballots, The Kansas City Star, September 23, 2005.

Some Missouri voters to experience touch-screen voting next week, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, July 29, 2005.

Thornburgh: Cultural changes needed to boost voter participation, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 7, 2004.

All state polling places must have electronic machines by 2006, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, September 7, 2004.

Boulder County's new paper ballot system slows results, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, August 11, 2004.

Voter ID dispute could cost money, lead to lawsuits, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, May 26, 2003.

Election reform has politicians sparring, Topeka Capital-Journal (Kansas), April 10, 2003.

Voters would have to show ID at polls under bill, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, April 9, 2003.

Voter turnout tops predicted 51 percent on Tuesday, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, November 6, 2002.

Thornburgh called to Washington, Topeka Capital-Journal (Kansas), October 4, 2002.

Bond, Brownback address regional election officials on election reform, The Associated Press State & Local Wire, December 10, 2001.

Inspection of election law might be good idea after Florida fiasco, Associated Press, December 22, 2000.

THE MORSE FAMILY AND COMMUNITY PUBLIC POLICY SCHOLARSHIP
APPLICATION, SUMMER 2006

Project Title: **Truth-in-Voting: election reform and Manhattan community**

Author: **Kate Romanova, graduate student,
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work,
Kansas State University**

Host Organization: **The Riley County League of Women Voters**

Rationale- the background for the research and the project:

The 2000 and 2004 presidential elections posed a number of challenges to the voting system and organization of elections in the United States. Since then, lawmakers passed several resolutions and took a number of steps to repair the flaws in the system of election administration, the most familiar being the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002.

HAVA clarifies such issues as voter registration, provisional ballots, training of voting poll personnel, etc. This act also suggests a transition to the electronic voting system and an increased use of technology in the voting process and ballot counts. The latter raised significant controversial issues.

Until the 2000 presidential election, American voters paid little attention to voting technologies. However, the transition to electronic voting is a socially significant event that can contribute to the election process and potential outcomes. Voter variability, ballot security, "paper trails," availability and accessibility are only a few questions that worry not only public officials, but the general public as well.

The coming local, regional and primary elections will demonstrate the level and the quality of voting administration system. Thus, the suggested project is very timely and will serve the community during the election period.

Objectives - the goals and principle activities envisioned:

Voters can be considered as a category of consumers. They consume information about the candidates, policies and regulations. They have a right to know about the voting procedures, especially if there is a tendency to introduce a new, completely automated voting process. The voters, as consumers, have a right to know about who writes the computer programs, how they operate, how the information is collected and stored. Voters' education is the fundamental principle to sustain democracy in any society.

The project goals are:

Goal 1: To research the issue of voting policy regulations and potential innovations in the voting administration system;

During the project period, I will collect public information and academic research on this issue and develop a bibliography that can be used for education, academic or research purposes.

Goal 2: To look at different arguments, pros and cons, of electronic voting systems;

This project does not aim at making a certain decision about innovations in the voting administration system, but aims to objectively evaluate different arguments, possible consequences and effects on the voters' behavior.

Goal 3: To consider the impact it will have on the voting process and the outcomes, especially in the Manhattan community, where the population is very diverse due to the high number of students and soldiers;

The specificity of the Manhattan community, the growing population of the city, the large influx of military, the diversity in socio-economic statuses of people can significantly affect the voting process. The project can help contribute to the delivering information to a wide audience of voters.

Goal 4: To assess social implications, such as accessibility to the voting technology for people of different socio-economic and educational statuses, physically impaired people, etc;

One of the challenges that new technologies pose is that it is often not available for certain socio-economic groups of people. New technologies can be very exclusive in their nature. The latter should never be an issue in a democratic process of voting.

Project outline – the nature of the project:

The Riley County League of Women Voters agreed to host this project. The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan political organization that aims to improve and impact public policies through citizen education and advocacy. The main goal of the organization is education. The main goal of my project is to research the new voting policies and develop an accessible information bulletin and bibliography for public use. The non-partisan character of the hosting organization allows to avoid biases and to objectively evaluate the information available.

The project will consist of several phases, all of which will take place during summer semester 2006:

1. Research of the issues, collecting data and information;
2. Analyze the social and political impact on the Manhattan community;
3. Develop a booklet and bibliography about the voting policies;
4. Deliver the information to the public;

For the first stage of the project, I will use the Library collection, Consumer Movement Archive, the League of Women Voters resources and internet resources, in order to analyze public policy regulations and the arguments of the debates about electronic voting procedure, its implementation in the U.S. society and its impact on social factors of the Manhattan community. I will collaborate with the local LWV chapter as well as other chapters to gather all the information available and opinions on the new voting regulations in different states.

In the second stage, I will try to evaluate the impact that the introduction of electronic voting systems will have on the Manhattan community, and how it could possibly affect the election procedures and outcomes. The introduction of new technologies brings not only improvement and change to a community, but also poses a number of challenges that need to be considered and evaluated prior to the changes implementation.

In the final stage of the project, I will write an information bulletin and comprise a bibliography on this public policy for the wide potential audience of voters, as well as scholars, in the Manhattan community. This generated information can be used by the LWV in its education events and activities, voters' registration campaigns, candidates' forum and also can be delivered to people through its publication materials. It will be made available to KSU Libraries and Manhattan Public Library users.

PROJECT TIMETABLE

Phase of the project	Time period	Description of the Activity	Activity
Stage 1 – Data gathering	May- June	I joined the LWV advisory group on voting machines. My primary responsibility was to research the topic, collect information and design the way to deliver the data to the public. I have attended several presentations of voting machines conducted by the Riley County Clerk Office.	Library, Internet, and Morse Special Collection Research
Stage 2 – Comprising materials for public use	June – July July 11	I developed a brochure on DRE voting system and handouts on HAVA and election reform for public use, which 50 were approved by the LWV board. I also comprised a bibliography that includes mass media, internet, as well as academic references on the topic. The information can be used during voter registration campaigns, public forums, etc. It is also available on the Riley County LWV website. Mid-project meeting.	Publishing of a DRE brochure and HAVA handout. Selecting information for the website.
Stage 3 - Analysis	July	I analyzed the information gathered about voting reform across the country and specifically activities that take place in Riley County. I volunteered as an observer for the LWV at Primary Election on August 1.	Report; Primary
Stage 4	July 25 Aug. 10	The Riley County League of Women Voters – Brown Bag Lunch: “Voting Machines” The project final meeting – final report, brochures	Presentation

Primary Observing – Aug 1, 2006

Please observe for at least one hour. Please report only those things you observed, leave anything else blank. Karen Mayse will be happy to email this form to you so you can return it by e-mail – her e-mail address appears below. Please send observation reports to Karen Mayse or Karen McCulloh.

Mayse: karenluvsjazz@cox.net, 3340 Newbury, Manhattan, KS 66503

McCulloh: kimmcc@ksu.edu 1516 Leavenworth, Manhattan, KS 66502

THANK YOU for helping us gather data about voting in Riley County during the Primary.

Your name Kate Romanova

The precinct you observed Art Center

1) Were machines kept secure?

Were machines set up at the poll the morning of the primary? Yes No

If not, were machines left unattended overnight in an unlocked area?

I couldn't tell. They appeared to have been kept secure.

They seemed to have been kept unsecured.

Were machines left unattended at any time while you observed? Yes No

If yes, please describe:

The machines were set up the night before the election. The poll workers were still zeroing the machines when the poll place opened at 7 am. At this time only one machine out of five was set up and ready to be used.

Did poll workers zero the machines before anyone voted? Yes No

Note: They should do so by inserting a cartridge and verifying that the machine is starting from zero.

Did poll workers zero the machines between voters? Yes No

How was data retrieved from the machines at the end of the day, and what was done with it? N/A

2) How did the machines perform?

Did you observe any software or hardware failures? If so, please describe.

N/A

Did you observe technicians working on any machines? Yes No

Did the machines report the correct number of voters in this precinct?

N/A

Yes No Not sure

If no, and you know what the numbers are, please record the actual number of voters _____ and the number the machine said voted.

3) Did the poll workers appear to be adequately trained?

Were poll workers ready at the start of the day, or did they seem confused?

ready confused

Did the poll workers know what to do if a voter made a mistake and wanted to start over? Even if that voter already sent their ballot? In other words, did the poll workers know how to spoil a ballot?

Yes No Didn't happen while I was observing.

Did poll workers know how to assist physically disabled voters? Yes

No - N/A

Were there any problems with electricity? Yes No

If so, how was it handled? Did the poll workers know what to do?

Did the poll workers know what to do about provisional ballots?

Yes No This didn't happen while I was observing.

Was anyone turned away from voting, and if so, why?

N/A

4) What was the experience of the voting public?

Were voters confused? Yes No

Did voters express concerns about less privacy? Yes No

What do you think was the average time people had to wait to vote while you observed?

Low turnout – no wait time

Did voters have problems with the machines? If so, what kind of problems?

Some of the voters seemed to be concerned or ill at ease around the machines.

5) Other comments or observations?

The way machines were set allowed less privacy. The poll workers could not assist voters or explain how machines operate without seeing the screen and the selections voters have made. All machines were set in a row and poll workers could not approach them from behind to avoid looking at the screen. The machines were too close to each other. Because of low turnout rate, there were no more than two voters at one time using the machines, but with larger turnout, such close proximity of machines to each other can be a privacy concern for some voters. Some of the polling workers were reluctant to answer voters' questions, perhaps because they confused with the machines themselves.

Again, **THANK YOU** for helping us compile data about voting during the primary election.

HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT 2002

The infamous 2000 election introduced Americans to hanging chads, butterfly ballots and other arcane matters of election administration. The election exposed deep flaws in the election system and voting technology, and spurred lawmakers to pass the **Help America Vote Act (HAVA) in 2002**.

HAVA is the broadest voting reform in recent decades. The legislation aims to improve election administration through establishing minimum standards for states to follow, and through providing funds to the states to improve election administration, voting technology, and poll workers' training. It impacts every part of the voting process throughout the election cycle.

HAVA is an attempt to regulate and to an extent homogenize the diverse election procedures and techniques used by precincts. Although, HAVA requires compliance with the federal law, the loose language of the legislature leaves much room for state variation and implementation of the specifics of the law. Each state is responsible for issuing provisional ballots, creating statewide computerized voter lists, allowing for "second chance voting," and increasing access for disabled voters.

The general requirements of HAVA are the following:

- Every state must enhance voting standards and education.
- Every state must create a statewide, centralized, interactive, computerized Voter Registration System. This system allows election officials better safeguards against duplicated registration and double voting. It is more efficient and enables poll workers to immediately verify voters eligibility.
- All states must offer provisional ballots to voters who claim to be registered but whose names do not appear on the registration list. Provisional ballots are counted after their eligibility is proved.
- Every polling place must be ADA accessible and offer at least one DRE voting machine, which allows physically and visually impaired voters to independently and securely cast secret votes without any assistance.
- All polling workers must undergo training on voting rights, regulations, and the use of voting technology.
- People with felony convictions must be informed about their voting rights. States must develop new voter registration forms, which integrates the list of eligible voters with state record of felony convictions.

The 2006 elections is the deadline for all states to comply and fulfill all the requirements. The primaries are the first test of the election reform that will demonstrate advantages and disadvantages, achievements and flaws of the innovations, new technology and new voting regulation. Voters turn out and voters' satisfaction will be the primary measure of the success of the election reform.

HAVA in Kansas

To comply with the federal law, beginning January 1, 2003, Kansas passed Senate Bill 479, which enacted federal mandates to state laws. Since January 2006, every polling place in Kansas is ADA accessible and provides voting equipment, which enables individuals with disabilities to cast an unassisted vote.

Kansas adopted an **Election Voter Information System**, which is named ELVIS and is designed to serve as a centralized, statewide, real-time voter registration and election management solution. The program was purchased from Election Systems and Software (ES&S), which is also the manufacturer of the voting machines used in Riley County.