



THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
PO BOX 8453, COLUMBIA, SC, 29202, (803) 251-2726, WWW.LWVSC.ORG

## TESTIMONY TO THE JOINT VOTING SYSTEM RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Duncan Buell, Professor, USC Computer Science & Engineering Department

NOVEMBER 10, 2015

Last March I was general chair of the Election Verification Network's annual conference. The general theme of the conference was exactly the topic you have today – current voting system technology is aging rapidly, and it must be replaced, and the choice of what to replace it with is difficult.

In one sense you (and we) in South Carolina have an advantage in that there are several jurisdictions that have just purchased, or are purchasing, or are developing new voting systems. At one of our sessions this past March we had election officials from Tallahassee (Leon County), Florida, Fairfax, Virginia, and Philadelphia describing their process for acquisition and the reasons for their choices.

There are yet more jurisdictions that have recently acquired systems, and I would encourage you to take advantage of their analysis prior to acquisition.

There are also two large jurisdictions that are developing their own systems. Los Angeles County is developing a system for use there, but it is not clear that a system would be ready for procurement within the time frame asked for in South Carolina. The system being developed in Austin, Texas, however, is likely to be available. The design of that system has been guided by Dana Debeauvoir, clerk of court in Travis County, and has had the input of some of the best industry and academic minds in hardware system design and in security. Importantly, that system provides a single ballot marking device for all voters, using commodity hardware for low cost, and a totally transparent and totally auditable trail to ensure accurate results and thus maintain voter confidence.

I would encourage you not to make decisions without looking at these reports and systems and without consulting those from around the country who have had to make similar decisions in the recent past.

Finally, I would encourage you to consider only those systems that are totally transparent and totally auditable. The marks the voter sees that indicate the voter's choices should be the marks that are used to tally the votes. There should be no software that intervenes, no coding or hidden transformation that is not understandable by the voter. There should be a capability of a genuine recount, not merely the running of the same computer program on the same data. And the system should be simple to operate. In all my analysis of election data from South Carolina, Colorado, Pennsylvania, and Texas, I have not seen fraud. But we have a very complicated system, and I have seen essentially all possible errors that could be made by tired and inexperienced poll workers at the end of a very long day. The system needs to be simple. A complicated system like the one we currently have is guaranteed to result in errors.

*The League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy. Membership in the League is open to men and women of all ages.*