UNITED STATES CONGRESS
Committee on Government Reform
Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and the Census

Testimony of Sanford J. Morganstein
President and Founder, Populex Corporation
July 20, 2004

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Clay, Members of the Committee:

My name is Sanford Morganstein. I am the president and founder of Populex Corporation: a company specifically founded to provide new solutions for secure, accurate and confidence-building elections for the nation.

If I have one goal, it is to dispel myths and inaccurate information that may lead American citizens to think they cannot have elections they can trust. At the same time, I would like to emphasize that to accomplish this goal, implementation of new voting systems and enhancements to existing systems must be effective and timely, but not rushed. They also must have bipartisan support.

After the upcoming election, greater attention should be given to the adoption of new, and better voting systems. This will help ensure smooth implementation of new solutions, which is a huge task for any election jurisdiction, requiring careful thought, care, widespread public education and acceptance by the electorate

Voting systems can be produced that use modern touch screens to prohibit overvotes, warn voters of potential undervotes, allow blind voters to vote in private and support multiple languages. Importantly, we have developed a system that has all of these features and more, while still providing voters with an official voter verifiable paper ballot.

In short, voting systems that combine the best of the new (computer assisted touch screen voting) and the best of the old (confidence-building paper ballots) are practical, trustworthy and affordable.

Unfortunately, the myths that persist, and which I hope to dispel, promote the idea that voter verifiable ballots are uncountable, impractical and disenfranchise Americans with disabilities. Please allow me to briefly take each of these one at a time.

Probably all of us have seen the specter of rolls and rolls of cash register paper tape, curled, creased and illegible as if that were the only way to provide a paper audit trail. What I have here are a few paper ballots produced by a modern touch screen computer system on which voters make their selections. These *are* the ballots. There are no vote totals kept in the machine that produced the ballots. Consequently, the perception that the computer count may be different from the audit trail is simply not true. These ballots produce the same result when counted and recounted. They are tangible, they are handled by the voter who has several methods available for verifying them, and they are

deposited in a locked ballot box. This process preserves what is "tried and true" and highly familiar to each and every voter. These ballots are not receipts, which, if taken out of the polling place, could lead to coercion and vote selling. They are the official ballots cast by the voters and left in the ballot box.

These systems are no more expensive than the touch screen systems found to be unacceptable by many voters and so many academicians and computer experts. These machines, designed to overcome the voting problems of the past, are not networked in the polling place: if one machine fails, or indeed if the printer jams, only one machine is momentarily taken out of service. In the unusual event of a paper jam, one voter is perhaps inconvenienced for a minute or two, but even in that case, that voter's vote is not lost.

This system does not disenfranchise blind voters. In fact, the opposite is true. The National Federation of the Blind has been experimenting with two of these systems for several months. While I understand that they will not be recommending any system over any other, and that they will be issuing a report, they have told me that blind voters have opined that they appreciate that *they too* can have a tangible ballot that when scanned reads its contents to them in private over headphones, without assistance.

Other advantages of this voter verifiable paper ballot are numerous: This ballot facilitates handling of provisional ballots, it is not destroyed or lost in the event of a computer crash, it facilitates reconciling the number of cast ballots with the number of voters who vote in the polling place, and the voting process, with selections made on a touch screen with a stylus, involves motions and procedures that are very familiar to voters. More abstractly, I had one professor of political science tell me that because the voter takes ownership of the ballot from the time that voter begins to vote until he or she deposits it in the ballot box, the connection between the voter and his or her democratic duty is strengthened in a salutary manner.

Just last week, I had the honor of working with a committee convened at the National Academy of Sciences here in Washington. In my opinion, the evidence presented to that committee was clear that the kind of voting systems used can significantly reduce voter error as measured by overvotes and undervotes. Precinct count systems are an improvement over non-precinct count systems, and properly designed touch screens can be better yet. This particular system is very close to being certified under the new, more stringent 2002 federal voting system standards. It is not a prototype, and it is affordable. The paper audit trail is practical, and it does not disenfranchise Americans with disabilities. Yes, we can have modern touch screen systems that produce a confidence instilling, voter verifiable, paper ballot that can be counted and recounted, if necessary, with unparalleled accuracy.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I would be happy to address any questions you may have.