

Brief History of Problems with Diebold Optical Scan System Used In Vermont

Vermont Secretary of State Deb Markowitz has stated on many occasions that our Diebold voting system is safe, secure and has operated “without incident.” This is misleading because until 2006 there had never been an audit on the system and only a few recounts had ever been conducted. So we have no way of knowing if problems have occurred, but gone undetected. It is also misleading to say there have not been problems, by only looking in our small state. This list of documented problems shows a history of failures, bugs, and unexplained miscounts, all with the exact same Diebold Optical-Scan system currently used in Vermont.

11/1998 Pima County, Arizona

For the third time in as many elections, Pima County, Arizona, found errors in the tally. The computers recorded no votes for 24 precincts in the 1998 general election, but voter rolls showed thousands had voted at those polling places.

The Arizona Daily Star, 11 Nov. 1998.

11/2000 Bernalillo County, New Mexico

Election officials in the state’s most populous county found that a flaw in the ballot programming caused 67,000 absentee and early-voting ballots to be incorrectly counted following the Nov. 7 presidential election.

Government Computer News; November 20, 2000; Vol. 19 No. 33

11/2000 Volusia County, Florida

Internal Diebold memos (leaked in 2003) show that the company officials knew about the 16,022 Gore votes that were subtracted, and they still don’t have an explanation for why the votes were lost. Tampering may have been the cause.

The Porterville Recorder; June 10, 2004

11/2002 Robeson County, North Carolina.

Ballot tabulating machines failed to work properly in 31 of 41 precincts. Local election officials said the problem was the result of a software glitch, and ballots had to be recounted.

Sun News. September 12, 2002.

10/2003 California

In a notable aberration in the 2003 California recall-election vote totals in the 17 California counties that used Diebold, several minor candidates recorded widely disproportionate vote totals.

The Porterville Recorder; June 10, 2004

12/2003 California

Secretary of State discovers that Diebold installed uncertified software throughout California before the recall election, without informing county officials.

Wired News. December 17, 2003

3/2004 San Diego County, California.

Out of 208,446 ballots, the machines miscounted 2,821 votes in the Democratic presidential race and the Republican U.S. Senate seat.

NC Times April 7, 2004

4/2004 Uxbridge, Massachusetts.

The machine failed to read 171 ballots because they were completed with the wrong kind of lead. Recount of the selectman race overturned the election. Because other candidates did not file for a recount in time, the other races cannot legally be recounted. Thus the other races remain in question.

4/2004 Alameda County, California.

A bug in the software caused the machines to count absentee ballots inaccurately. The County must use a workaround.

Report of Assurances to Alameda County. April 26, 2004. By Diebold Election Systems, Inc. Pages 2,3.

5/2004 Marblehead, Massachusetts

Machine count showed 1834 to 1836. Manual recount showed 1831 to 1830, overturning the election outcome.

The Daily Item; Wednesday, June 2, 2004

7/2004 Clayton County, Georgia

In violation of Georgia state law, Diebold delayed absentee voting by failing to deliver ballots to the county within the required time.

3/2006 Grafton, New Hampshire

Two vote tabulators were seized by the state's Attorney General after malfunctioning during elections held on March 14.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=6557>

5/2006 Cuyahoga County, Ohio

Machine malfunctions delay poll opening until 1:30 pm.

<http://www.newsnet5.com/politics/9144311/detail.html>

5/2006 Barry County, Michigan

Optical scanners "scramble" results. Officials have to do the count by hand.

<http://www.woodtv.com/Global/story.asp?S=4855576&nav=0Rce>

11/2/2004 Volusia County, FL

Machine malfunction. A computer error caused a failure of the memory card which stores vote data. 13,000 ballots must be rescanned.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=3615>

11/16/2004 Ripley County, IN

Machine malfunction.. The memory cards that count the votes in optical scanners had the wrong precinct labels, so the cards were sent back to the company to be reprogrammed.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=3862>

11/8/2006 Marin County, San Francisco, CA

Machine malfunction. Scanners wouldn't accept the first page of the ballot.

<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2006/11/07/BAGROM7KQ27.DTL>

11/7/2006 Duval County, FL

Machine malfunction. In Woodlawn precinct, the Diebold scanner that counted the votes from the ballots was not working.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=6767>

11/3/2006 Cuyahoga County, OH

Machine malfunction. Diebold scanner fails one of four pre-election tests. Michael Vu said, "It's not unusual in the testing that we find an anomaly. Our testing is going over and beyond the normal testing of the past." The officials will check the calibration. Some machines may be too sensitive and will be set aside and replaced.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=6717>

11/9/2006 Waterville, ME

Diebold scanners malfunction. Results show 27,000 votes in a town with 16,000 registered voters.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=6810>

11/2007 Florida

Diebold memory cards -- used in precinct optical scanners -- fail at rates as high as 9.2% and 9.4% in some counties. Failures have caused vote losses in the past. Diebold will inspect all the machines in Florida, but only those in Florida if they do not receive complaints from other states.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=7284>

1/2008 Hanover, Exeter, Nashua, and Manchester Counties, NH

Problems with the Premier (Diebold) optical scan machines reported by the officials in all four counties. Break down of the visor that guides write-in votes into the right bin, and memory card failures

<http://www.bradblog.com/?p=5553>

1/2008 Sarasota County, FL

Six optical scanners quit working and had to be replaced. Some machines had problems with the memory card, while others had a faulty scanner.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=7445>

2/2008 Manchester County, CT

An optical scanning machine did not work and voters had to put their ballots in an auxiliary slot to be counted later.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=7497>

2/2008 Hartford, CT

Six optical scan machines used in the state had to be replaced with back-ups, three due to improper programming.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=7489>

5/30/2008 New Milford, CT

Memory card failures

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=7727>

6/14/2008 Connecticut

More votes than voters on Diebold Optical Scan system.

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=7756>

8/2008 Ohio

Ohio county discovers flaw in software and files suit against Diebold

August 2008, Ohio

<http://www.votersunite.org/article.asp?id=7828>

8/29/2008

Premier Election Solutions, the nation's leading manufacturer of voting machines, last week alerted election officials to flaws in 1,750 jurisdictions nationwide. Both optical scanners that count paper ballots and direct-recording electronic voting machines

<http://www.miller-mccune.com/article/646>

Vermonters for Voting Integrity is a group of concerned citizens working to improve the security and reliability of Vermont's electronic voting system. Our current focus is to ask the Secretary of State to comply with the recommendations of the Brennan Report – the most comprehensive study on electronic voting ever conducted. Many other states are already following these procedures, but Vermont is falling behind and our system is vulnerable to hacking, rigging, software bugs, and undetected errors. Most of the Brennan recommendations are simple and could be implemented in the 2008 election, which would address many of the vulnerabilities with the system. Please sign our petition and get more information on our website:

VTVOTERS.ORG