

Good evening. I am Joanne Tosti-Vasey. I STRONGLY urge you to replace our current electronic voting machines with an optical-scan system of voting. I have four concerns about our current machine:

1. Problems recording the correct vote
2. Problems with disability access
3. Problems in reviewing votes for ballot questions
4. Inability to do an accurate recount

First, people deserve and demand that their votes are accurately recorded. Our current machines can't reliably do that. In 2006, I worked as a poll worker in the General Election. During the day, I observed several instances of vote flipping. The first instance of vote flipping occurred at 7:58 am. A gentleman came in to vote. The machine marked the person above his selected choice in three separate attempts. After he finished voting, I motioned him over and asked him what happened. He said that on the first ballot for the U.S. Senate, he punched the 2<sup>nd</sup> (lower) square, but check mark showed up on the 1<sup>st</sup> square. This occurred three times. He also said that this vote flipping happened on another set of ballot candidates. He subsequently filed a complaint with the former Commissioners at their meeting the following Monday after the election. After he left, I suggested that this machine be taken off line. It was not. There continued to be more instances of what appeared to be vote flipping periodically throughout the day.

Second, I am concerned that people with disabilities have full access to a private accurate accounting of their votes. As a disability rights activist, I have tested ADA access prior to the last couple of elections and watched for any problems with disability access as a poll worker. Here's what I have observed.

1. While poll watching, there was a woman who came into the polls wearing an "I have low vision" button. Judge asked her if she wanted to use the audio. She said no. So judge attempted to increase font size when the woman got within inches of the screen and could not read it. She was unable to increase the font size and ended up reading each candidate and pointing in the direction of the candidate's voting square. Woman then punched where she believed judge was pointing. I asked the woman afterwards what she thought. She said she just hoped she pushed where she thought the judge was pointing.
2. A second woman had a cognitive disability and could not read. She requested the audio version of balloting. Initially couldn't hear

anything. So the judge fiddled with the system and got the audio turned on, but couldn't adjust the volume. Woman said it was too loud. I talked to Joyce McKinley two weeks ago about this volume issue. She said you can turn it on and then turn the volume up. But once you start adjusting the initially loud volume, the only change you can make is louder.

You might say that that both problems with font size and audio volume would happen with other DRE or optical-scan ADA writing machine as well. Which I believe is not true. As a candidate I attended the Mifflin County Farm Bureau's "Candidates Night" earlier this month. At this event, the Mifflin County Elections office was showing off their ES&S Automark machine. The Automark, fyi is the ADA machine used to mark optical scan ballots for people with disabilities. I asked their Director of Elections about the volume levels and font sizes on this machine for disability access. She demonstrated that you can both increase and decrease the volume as well as the font sizes on the machine. This proved to me that there are better disability access machines available that provide access for people with disabilities while at the same time providing a voter-verifiable paper trail that can be audited.

Third, the review screens for ballot questions on our electronic machines are inadequate. Last fall, I tested out the ADA voting machine pretending to be blind. I attempted to using only the audio and the buttons at the bottom of the machine. After initially "voting," the audio came up with the reviews of the judicial races. In each of these races, the machine's audio gave me the names of the judicial candidate and whether or not a "Yes" or "No" vote was recorded. This is what should have and did happen. Yet when I went to really vote five days later, I was shocked to find out that the review screens did not give me the names of the judges. Instead it said "Question 1" and then gave the "yes" or "no" vote that I had made. It did NOT say who the judge in each particular race was. With nine judges and with a variety of Yes and No retention votes, I had no idea without backtracking to determine if the review was accurate or not.

Finally, I want every single voter's ballot counted and counted accurately. And when there is a close vote, I want that vote to be accurately recounted. Our current machines do not have a paper trail that can be verified by each

voter and cannot be audited or verified or truly be recounted at the voter level.

When people can see that their votes are counted, that they are accurate, and that they are verifiable, people accept the results of the election. Voter integrity is assured and our democracy is confirmed.

We need to do the same here in Centre County. Get rid of these electronic voting machines that are inaccurate, that flip votes, that are not fully accessible to people with disabilities, provide inadequate reviews, and are not verifiable or truly auditable.

Thank you.