

# **DTMG Testimony HB0645- Election Law–Electronic Bal**

Uploaded by: Barbara Noveau

Position: FAV



**Barbara Noveau, Founder, DoTheMostGood**

**Committee:** Ways and Means

**Testimony on:** HB0645- Election Law – Electronic Ballot Return System – Study and Request for 2 Proposals

**Position:** Favorable

**Hearing Date:** February 28, 2023

**Bill Contact:** Delegate Jessica Feldmark

DoTheMostGood (DTMG) is a progressive grassroots organization with members across Montgomery County as well as a number of neighboring counties. DTMG supports legislation and activities that protect the fundamental rights of all Maryland residents, and which promote equity across all our diverse communities.

DTMG supports HB0645- Election Law – Electronic Ballot Return System – Study and Request for 2 Proposals. This bill would authorize a study in Maryland to evaluate creation of an electronic ballot return system.

There are significant drawbacks in existing law that require ballots delivered electronically to be returned in paper 17 form. This requirement particularly impacts voters with disabilities and absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters. Additionally, due to current voting systems, all ballots delivered to voters electronically and returned in paper form must be transferred to forms that can be read electronically. This slows down vote processing and creates unnecessary opportunities for errors.

In sum, DTMG believes that every step that can be taken to improve our voting systems and processes will bring Maryland closer to ensuring that every voter can cast their vote and know that their vote will count.

DTMG strongly supports HB0645 and urges a **FAVORABLE** report on the bill.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Barbara Noveau", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Barbara Noveau  
Founder, DoTheMostGood  
[barbara@dtmg.org](mailto:barbara@dtmg.org)  
240-338-3048

**Candice Kerestan - HB 645 - FAVORABLE.pdf**

Uploaded by: Candice Kerestan

Position: FAV

## TESTIMONY TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

### HB 645 – Election Law – Electronic Ballot Return System - Study and Request for Proposals

---

**POSITION:** Favorable

**NAME:** Candice Kerestan

**HEARING DATE:** February 28, 2023

Committee Chair Atterbeary and Distinguished Committee members,

My name is Candice Kerestan, and I am calling in today from Munich, Germany. Thank you for allowing me to testify remotely.

I currently serve as the State Party Chair of Democrats Abroad, one of the Democratic National Committee's 57 state parties. Democrats Abroad is the largest organization of U.S. citizens outside of the United States, and represents the millions of Americans living permanently or temporarily abroad, including many from Maryland.

At the center of our mission is ensuring that U.S. citizens overseas – regardless of party – can and do exercise their constitutional right to vote. That is why I am asking you to please support House Bill 645, which prescribes a study be implemented on creating an electronic ballot return system for Maryland voters.

Overseas voters – including active duty military, military families, veterans, and civilians like myself – are guaranteed the right to vote under current U.S. law. The majority of U.S. states permit their citizens abroad with the right to return their ballots via electronic methods, such as by fax, email or online upload. This is not the case in Maryland. In fact, all Maryland voters abroad are required to return their ballots exclusively by postal mail.

Maryland voters abroad live all around the world. While hard to imagine, U.S. citizens live in countries that lack reliable postal service. They also live in remote places where even if the mail service works, the time between sending and receiving mail can take weeks or months. During the COVID-19 pandemic, some countries suspended international airmail entirely.

In addition to barriers of functionality and time, cost is also a problem. We often hear that voters return their ballots by courier services to ensure their ballot will be received and counted. This can be very expensive, \$50 or more. Voters report that these costs mean they cannot afford to vote.

House Bill 645 paves the way for Maryland to join the majority of states that ensure their citizens abroad can have a say in their government without logistical or financial obstacles. Being able to vote is a pillar to our democracy - and both a responsibility and privilege of being a US citizen.

As I recently traveled the roads of Maryland, Governor Moore's name along with the phrase, "Leave No One Behind" stood out. In advocating for the voting rights of Marylanders living all around the world, I ask you to not leave your overseas voters and their rights behind. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Candice Kerestan

**RESIDES IN:** Munich, Germany

**VOTES IN:** Pennsylvania

**HB645.pdf**

Uploaded by: Hindley Williams

Position: FAV



**HB645- Electronic Ballot Return System - Study and Request for Proposals**

Support

Testimony of Maryland Centers for Independent Living

House Ways and Means, February 28, 2023

The seven Centers for Independent Living (CIL) were established by federal law and work to ensure the civil rights and quality services of people with disabilities in Maryland. Centers for Independent Living are nonprofit disability resource and advocacy organizations located throughout Maryland operated by and for people with disabilities. CIL staff and Boards are at least 51% people with disabilities. We are part of a nationwide network which provides Information and Referral, Advocacy, Peer Support, Independent Living Skills training, and Transition Services.

The current system for Vote by Mail strips the right from individuals with disabilities to vote privately and independently. The mailing system is extremely unreliable because of the time it takes for the election board to receive the information. Their vote may never be received and may never be counted. People with print disabilities must return their ballot at the cost of losing privacy and ballot secrecy. The ballot can be marked online accessibly but must be printed and signed before it can be sent by mail or dropped in a ballot box. They require assistance from another person in finding where to sign their ballot and preparing it for delivery by mail or by drop box. Those who assist them are able to see for whom the voter voted, which is inconsistent with voter privacy and independence principles. The voter must coordinate transportation to a drop box, which places undue burden on the voter.

The Maryland Centers for Independent Living support electronic ballot return because it would remove transportation and accessibility barriers by transmitting the ballot to the Board of Elections. The Board of Elections would still process the ballots in the same way they process those coming through the mail, but the burden would not be on the disabled voter to get the ballot there or to interact with the document in an inaccessible way. Many states are currently exploring electronic ballot return procedures and election security experts are confident there are secure platforms that are not vulnerable to hacking. Other groups, such as voters overseas and military personnel, would benefit from electronic ballot return, which would diversify the voter groups using this method and make the ballots of individuals less identifiable.

The Maryland Centers for Independent Living ask the Maryland General Assembly to ensure mail in voting is accessible and private for all people with disabilities. The Centers support

survey efforts to determine if and how electronic ballot return can be implemented in Maryland.

**Contact Information:**

Sarah Basehart  
Independence Now  
240-898-2183  
[sbasehart@innow.org](mailto:sbasehart@innow.org)

Hindley Williams  
The IMAGE Center  
410-305-9199  
[hwilliams@imagemd.org](mailto:hwilliams@imagemd.org)

**Jarryd M. Rauch - HB 645 - FAVORABLE.pdf**

Uploaded by: Jarryd Rauch

Position: FAV



**TESTIMONY TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE**

**HB 645 - Election Law - Electronic Ballot Return System - Study and Request for Proposals**

---

**POSITION:** Favorable

**NAME:** Jarryd M. Rauch

**DATE:** February 28, 2023

Committee Chair Feldman and Committee members,

My name is Jarryd Rauch. I am here in support of HB 645, and wish to extend my gratitude to Senator Brooks for introducing this important legislation.

As Executive Director of Democrats Abroad, I am intimately familiar with how states manage and facilitate the voting process for their uniformed and overseas civilian voters. One of the primary reasons overseas ballots are rejected is they arrive after the ballot return deadline. Mail disruptions during the 2020 election cycle, domestically and internationally, demonstrated how easily voters can be disenfranchised if mail service is not functioning properly.

Even with optimal mail service or utilizing U.S. Embassy mail pouches, from many countries it can take weeks or even months for mail to reach the United States, especially with the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting logistical disruptions. In addition to the slow pace and the risk of ballot loss en-route, postal mail can be prohibitively expensive. If a voter opts to use a courier service to ensure their ballot arrives by the deadline, it can cost the voter anywhere from \$40 to over \$100.

Voting in every election could cost an overseas voter hundreds of dollars a year. This is quite plainly a poll tax on voting that disenfranchises Maryland voters all around the world.

To ensure all U.S. voters abroad can return their ballots without undue cost or delay, it is crucial to allow them to return paper overseas absentee ballots via electronic transmission. The requisite study outlined in HB 645 is an important first step for Maryland to join the two-thirds of U.S. states and the District of Columbia which already permit secure electronic ballot transmission, thus eliminating known barriers for overseas voters to exercise their right to vote.

Many did not have a voice in the election of representation in this General Assembly, but it is the responsibility of this body to grant that all Marylanders, and US citizens, have that capability going forward.

We urge a favorable report for HB 645. Thank you for your time, and I'm glad to take questions from the committee.

Sincerely,

Jarryd M. Rauch

**RESIDES AND VOTES IN:** New York City, New York

**Maryland House Bill 645\_ Melanie Gardner (FAVORABL**

Uploaded by: Melanie Gardner

Position: FAV

Name: Ms Melanie Gardner  
Testimony for House Bill 645 Position: Favorable  
Date: February 28, 2023  
Maryland House Ways & Means Committee

Committee Chair Atterbeary and Esteemed Committee members,

My name is Melanie Gardner, and I am a Montgomery County voter living in Ottawa, Canada. I moved here to join my husband in 2018. I am a lifelong voter, and take pride in voting in every election. From the US Senate to the Board of Education, having my voice heard and my vote counted matters.

As a Maryland voter and US Citizen living abroad, passing House Bill 645 is very important to me. While it may not seem like a long distance, voting from Canada has not always been easy for me to do. The 2020 election cycle was particularly stressful. In frustration, I reached out to friends and family about postal service times they were experiencing as I prepared to mail my ballot back.

In the end, what normally takes 7 to 10 days ended up being over a five-week long process. I do not look back fondly at the many times I had to call my Board of Elections about my ballot's status. Four days prior to the election, I filled out a Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot, as is my Federally protected right to do, paid to send and sent it by UPS as an overnight delivery. After so much uncertainty, both ballots arrived the day before the election and my vote was counted. I experienced the same in 2022.

I am deeply appreciative for Delegate Feldmark introducing HB 645 because it means there is a possibility in the future for Maryland voters like me to have their ballots be returned by electronic submission. Respectfully, I ask you to please pass HB 645 so that hopefully I do not have to endure this stressful experience again.

Thank you for your time, and for allowing me to share my voting experience in Maryland from abroad.

Sincerely,

Ms Melanie Gardner  
Montgomery County Voter in Ottawa, Canada

**MTaube-HB645-WM-testimony-28feb2023.pdf**

Uploaded by: Michelle Taube

Position: FAV

**HB 645 Election Law – Electronic Ballot Return System - Study and Request for Proposals**  
**Testimony to the House Ways and Means Committee**  
**Michelle Taube, Favorable**

Committee hearing February 28, 2023

Dear Committee Chair Atterbeary and distinguished Committee members,

My name is Michelle Taube. I am a Montgomery County voter. I moved to Copenhagen, Denmark 15 years ago to take a job at the National Museum of Denmark. I travel back to Maryland at least once every year to visit family and friends, and I keep up with current events. I vote in every election because I feel a close connection to Maryland and the US.

I always ask to receive my blank ballot electronically so that I do not have to worry about delays or about it getting lost in the mail. But, I cannot print, vote, sign the oath, and then return my ballot electronically. All I can do is put it in the post and hope that it doesn't get damaged or stuck to another envelope and that it is received on time.

I am fortunate to live in a country with a reliable postal system. However, as Denmark has gone more electronic, many of the postboxes have been removed. Collection at the few that remain is usually only once a week, so it is necessary to make a special trip to a postal counter to send my voted ballot.

One of the worst parts about having to return my voted ballot by mail is that the timing makes it difficult to be an informed voter. As an overseas voter, I receive my ballot 45 days before Election Day, but voting guides typically only come out about 30 days before the election. It is difficult to balance the timing of voting and returning my ballot with learning about the issues on the ballot.

My friends who vote in states that utilize electronic ballot return have the possibility of waiting until almost the last minute to return their voted ballots. In fact, I know a voter who had just moved to Denmark, but was able to request, vote, and return her ballot on Election Day itself. I am glad that Maryland has a generous ballot receipt deadline, but I don't dare to wait until the last minute to send my ballot.

Thank you for the opportunity to add my testimony. I hope that the legislature passes this bill and that the proposed study leads to an electronic ballot return system for Maryland.

Sincerely yours,  
Michelle Taube

Votes in: Montgomery County (district 16)  
Resides in: Copenhagen, Denmark

**HB645.pdf**

Uploaded by: Phil Eanes

Position: FAV

Philip Eanes - Favorable

Maryland House Ways & Means Committee Testimony

HB 645 Election Law – Electronic Ballot Return System – Study and Request for Proposals

February 28, 2023

Dear Committee Chair Atterbeary and House Ways & Means Committee,

My name is Philip Eanes, I vote in Elkton, and I am grateful to be able to share my support for House Bill 645 with you today from where I live here in Türkiye. This is especially true as you might imagine due to recent earthquakes here. Fortunately my family and I are safe and well.

I moved abroad for my work, and have additionally lived in Jordan and Russia. My father and other relatives are still in the U.S., and I try to visit home at least once a year. When I retire, I am planning to do so in Maryland.

Voting in Maryland is important for me because I want to keep my ties to the state and ensure that the state is stronger with my voice. Both local and statewide issues are of importance to me, because my loved ones still live there and I hope to return there someday. If I will end up living in that community, I want my voice to be heard and vote in every election.

I am still very incensed about my attempt to vote in our recent 2022 Midterm elections. I say attempt, because the situation was a disaster. My ballot was opened during transit at a mail processing facility in Tennessee. Due to this failure of the postal system, my Maryland ballot was not counted. I feel that if mail in ballots cannot be guaranteed delivery, even with a private company, how many other Marylanders will lose their voice? I'm sure many Marylanders also send in their ballots because they are unable to leave home, are unable to vote in person, or due to other circumstances.

Senate Bill 488 requires a study on the impact and best practices for implementing electronic return of ballots for Maryland voters like me. My voice and my vote in Maryland's government at all levels is important. If the option had existed in Maryland to return ballots by secure electronic means in the last cycle, I believe that my ballot would have both arrived and been counted.

Please pass SB 488 so that my ability to successfully vote in future elections is no longer an apprehension and futile cost paid. Thank you for the opportunity to share my story and for your time.

Sincerely,

Philip Eanes

VOTES FROM: Türkiye

VOTING DISTRICT: Cecil County Voter (District 36)

# **HB645\_ DD Council\_Support.pdf**

Uploaded by: Rachel London

Position: FAV





## Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council

CREATING CHANGE • IMPROVING LIVES

House Ways and Means Committee

**HB 645: Election Law – Electronic Ballot Return System – Study and Request for Proposals**

**February 28, 2023**

**Position: Support**

The Maryland Developmental Disabilities Council (DD Council) is an independent, public policy organization that creates changes to make it possible for people with developmental disabilities to live the lives they want with the support they need. People with developmental disabilities and their families lead the DD Council. **From that perspective, the DD Council supports HB 645 because the potential increase in options for voting helps people with disabilities.**

### **WHAT does this legislation do?**

HB 645 requires:

- The Department of Legislative Service, in consultation with experts in the disability rights and military communities, to complete a study on the creation of an electronic ballot system.
- The study to include the impact on voters with disabilities and service members; best practices for electronic ballot return systems; implementation; the cost; and whether changes to the existing processes are needed.

### **WHY is this legislation important?**

- All Marylanders must have equitable access to their fundamental right to vote.
- All Marylanders, including those with disabilities must be able to vote easily and privately, and fairly participate in the electoral process.
- Twelve states already introduced electronic ballot return.

SB 488 is an important step to ensure that people with disabilities have the options and opportunities necessary to exercise their fundamental right to vote. For that reason, the DD Council supports HB 645.

Contact: Rachel London, Executive Director, [RLondon@md-council.org](mailto:RLondon@md-council.org)

**Sabrina Gren - HB 645 - FAVORABLE.pdf**

Uploaded by: Sabrina Gren

Position: FAV

**Ms. Sabrina Gren**  
**House Bill 645 - Testimony in Favor**  
**Maryland House Ways and Means Committee**

February 28, 2023

Chair Atterbeary, Vice Chair Wilkins, and Esteemed Committee members,

My name is Sabrina Gren, and I am a Montgomery County voter living in Germany. I moved here with my former husband and our daughter at the end of 2018. As a former military spouse, we moved several times over the years with Maryland as where we last lived before moving overseas.

I am relatively new to the voting process, having become a naturalized citizen in October 2021. I take pride in voting, and in doing so having my voice heard on the issues that matter to me and my family. This is the first time I have ever gotten involved in the advocacy process, but it feels good to be able to share how a potential law change will benefit me directly with the representatives who work so diligently for all of Maryland's constituents.

To address my personal voting experience: most of the process for voting from abroad in Maryland has been relatively easy. I am appreciative for how detailed the Board of Elections voting instructions are to follow. That said, it can be somewhat confusing to actually return my ballot back by postal mail. This includes making sure that everything, such as on the envelope itself, has the necessary elements for the German and US postal systems. It is important to me that my ballot is accepted, both by the postal service and the Board of Elections.

If House Bill 645 passes and a secure electronic ballot return system is implemented, this will make a huge difference for me as a Maryland voter in Germany. I will be able to focus more on voting and less on the uncertainty that the mail will get my ballot back. It will also help me get the voting process completed faster as I know I don't have to worry about the extra trip to the postal office which as a full time working single mother it helps! Another added benefit of this would be eliminating the cost of postal mail itself which from overseas can be a significant extra cost.

I am thankful for the opportunity to share my voting experience and perspective with the Ways and Means Committee, as well as to Delegate Feldmark for introducing House Bill 645. If passed, hopefully Maryland voters and US citizens abroad like me will have the ability in future elections to electronically submit our ballots.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sabrina Gren  
Montgomery County Voter in Germany

**DRM\_HB 645\_FAV.pdf**

Uploaded by: Samuela Ansah

Position: FAV

**WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE****February 23, 2023****HB 645 Election Law - Electronic Ballot Return System - Study and Request for Proposals****Position: SUPPORT**

Disability Rights Maryland supports HB 645 to establish a study on electronic ballot returns in Maryland. Both voters with disabilities and Uniform overseas voters currently face barriers to the ballot that affect their participation in our elections. For voters with disabilities, this includes physical accessibility concerns that prevent access to an in person voting experience to being unable to physically mark a ballot with a traditional writing utensil. For overseas voters, their location and unreliability of postal services make it hard to ensure their votes will be counted on time.

Voters with disabilities can request a web delivered ballot where a ballot will be sent to their email and allow them to mark their ballot through a computer or by hand. Either way, a voter has to print off their web delivered ballot and return it by mail, at a drop box or to their local board of elections. Currently, voters cannot send a marked ballot online. Voters with disabilities use this option as evidenced by the 14.8% of requests for a web delivered ballot during the 2022 General Election and the 39% who marked their ballot using the online ballot marking device. For voters abroad, the process is much more archaic where they must request a ballot to be mailed to them either directly or through a proxy and must be returned through the mail. Although Maryland provides a variety of ways to cast a ballot, some people are still excluded from participating or have to rely on others to complete their ballot. Allowing the Department of Legislative Services to conduct a study to assess the barrier voters abroad and with disabilities would allow for Maryland to review a variety of policy options to ensure access and privacy in voting.

Although, the 2020 election cycle was rife with allegations and concerns of election fraud due to the massive use of absentee ballots required to mitigate effects of the pandemic, election officials were able to conduct elections under these contentious conditions and administered a safe, reliable, and secure election. These same fears are echoed about electronic ballot returns.



Empowerment. Integration. Equality.

1500 Union Ave., Suite 2000, Baltimore, MD 21211

Phone: 410-727-6352 | Fax: 410-727-6389

[www.DisabilityRightsMD.org](http://www.DisabilityRightsMD.org)

HB 645 only grants the Department of Legislative Services the authority to convene a comprehensive study on the use of electronic ballot return in the country and how it could work in Maryland. The study will include impacted communities that would benefit from electronic ballot returns such as voters with disabilities and voters living abroad. The study will discuss the complexity of the technology that can enable electronic ballot return for voters in Maryland. Additionally, the study will discuss the balance of election security and integrity with the needs of voters with disabilities and abroad that will benefit from electronic ballot returns. The study should describe the current landscape of electronic ballot returns that are currently implemented in 31 states that have some form of electronic ballot return, specifically for those in uniform abroad and voters with disabilities<sup>1</sup>.

Pilot programs in Denver and West Virginia delivered electronic ballot return through software that uses blockchain technology, an encrypted type of ledger that can create a secure database required of elections. West Virginia piloted this technology in their 2018 General Election specifically for 183 eligible voters abroad in 31 different countries. They received about 98% of the ballots with this technology and those ballots were counted<sup>2</sup>. In Denver used the technology in their 2019 Municipal Election for 156 eligible voters in. That election saw an 82% return rate for the pilot program compared to about 54% return rate of ballots in Colorado<sup>3</sup>. These pilot programs underwent strict scrutiny from their state board of elections and Secretary of States to ensure security and privacy were not compromised in administration of electronic ballot return.

There is a benefit of voters abroad and with disabilities to use technology to increase participation in elections. To that end, we recommend the participation of cybersecurity and election security personnel to the table alongside disability and military organizations. Maryland has the opportunity to explore the great advantages technology affords us to assist voters with disabilities and those abroad increase their access to the ballot. For these reasons, Disability Rights Maryland urges a favorable report on HB 645. For any questions, please contact [SamuelaA@DisabilityRightsMD.Org](mailto:SamuelaA@DisabilityRightsMD.Org) or 443-692-2512.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Electronic Ballot Return \(ncsl.org\)](http://ncsl.org)

<sup>2</sup> [Under the hood \(wv.gov\)](http://wv.gov)

<sup>3</sup> [Mobile-Voting-Audit-Report-on-the-Denver-County-Pilots-FINAL.pdf \(cyber-center.org\)](http://cyber-center.org)

# **Maryland State House Testimony.pdf**

Uploaded by: Sarah Streyder

Position: FAV

## **Testimony for the Maryland House Ways and Means Committee**

*Hearing on HB0645 – Electronic Ballot Return System, Study and Request for Proposals*

Tuesday, February 28<sup>th</sup> at 1:00pm

Good afternoon. My name is Sarah Streyder, and I am the spouse of an active-duty U.S. Space Force Guardian. I am also the Executive Director of Secure Families Initiative – a nonpartisan nonprofit organization committed to elevating military partners and family members as voters and advocates for their communities. Last year, I was awarded AFI Military Spouse of the Year for this work.

SFI supports House Bill 645 and thanks the Delegates who are sponsoring it. This legislation is a promising first step in the direction of securely easing the voting process for absentee military voters.

When military service members and their families are stationed far away from home, it can be an isolating and frustrating experience. Getting to vote in elections back home can help families stay connected and ease the transition – it’s a reminder of where we belong and an affirmation that our input matters.

Unfortunately, absentee military voters face high logistical barriers to cast our ballots through existing methods. Military families stationed overseas or in rural domestic locations often face long wait times for mail delivery and return – and that was true even before the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated this problem. Additionally, overseas military families who aren’t stationed near a U.S. military installation don’t have access to military postal services, which requires them to pay steep international postage fees just to vote.

As a result, military voters have shockingly low voter participation rates. In 2020, only 47% of uniformed service members and a mere 8% of overseas citizens voted, compared to 74% of our civilian counterparts. Many of us wanted to vote but were unable due to unnecessary and arbitrary obstacles.

SFI is confident that a study of electronic voting methods will illuminate numerous examples where this is already being done smoothly and securely. We strongly encourage Maryland to take this step toward joining the 32 other states and D.C. that allow military service members and dependents to cast their ballot electronically. Doing so would lift a huge weight off our shoulders.

When we move every few years, we already have to worry about finding work, picking the best school for our kids, and meeting our new doctor, often while bridging a language barrier. On top of all that, voting requires the added hassle of finding a post office, calculating proper postage, paying out of pocket, and keeping track of state-specific deadlines – all just to participate in the very democracy we serve to protect.

Thank you for listening. We are invested in this issue and plan to continue monitoring this legislation’s process.

Sarah Streyder

Executive Director

Secure Families Initiative



# **Ballot Return Fact sheet 2023.pdf**

Uploaded by: Sharon Maneki

Position: FAV

Subject: Support for SB488 - Feasibility of an Electronic Online Ballot Return System for Maryland

From: Members of the National Federation of the Blind of Maryland

To: Members of the Maryland General Assembly

Contact: Ronza Othman, President  
National Federation of the Blind of Maryland  
15 Charles Plaza, #3002  
Baltimore, MD 21201  
Phone: 443-426-4110  
Email: [President@nfbmd.org](mailto:President@nfbmd.org)

Sharon Maneki: Oral and written [nfbmdsm@gmail.com](mailto:nfbmdsm@gmail.com)

Ronza Othman: Oral : [President@nfbmd.org](mailto:President@nfbmd.org)

Lou-Ann Blake: Oral [lblake@nfb.org](mailto:lblake@nfb.org)

Date: February 28, 2023

## THE PROBLEM

Maryland claims that it wishes to make casting the ballot as easy as possible for the voter in order to maximize participation in the voting process. Overseas voters, members of the military, and persons with disabilities have been left behind in making voting convenient. In the case of voters with disabilities, the current system for Vote by Mail strips them of their right to vote privately and independently. The Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee should vote in favor of SB488.

## PROPOSED ACTION

The Maryland General Assembly should conduct a study of the question of whether an online ballot return system is feasible for Maryland voters. The study should be completed by December 1, 2023.

It should include such aspects as cost, security and which class of voters should be covered. In addition, the Legislature should direct the Maryland State Board of Elections (MSBE) to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) to assess what vendors are able to create the electronic ballot return system with sufficient time for implementation by the 2024 General Election.

## BACKGROUND

Maryland voters have many choices when casting their ballot. They may vote in person or vote by mail. Voters may submit a permanent request so that they automatically receive an absentee ballot each election. After the ballot is submitted, the election officials can inform the voter that their ballot was received by the Board of Elections in several ways. The voter selects these methods of contact and can even be notified by text message. While these technological advances have improved the voting process, more needs to be done in order to ensure that all voices are heard. For example, the State of Maryland lacks an electronic ballot return system, creating an obstacle for overseas and disabled voters attempting to cast their ballot.

Overseas and military voters must return their ballot by mail. The mailing system is extremely unreliable because of the time it takes for the election board to receive the information. Their vote may never be received and may never be counted.

People with print disabilities must return their ballot at the cost of losing privacy and ballot secrecy. The ballot can be marked online but must be printed and signed before it can be sent by mail or dropped in a ballot box. Many people have no access to a printer, so they must have someone else print their ballot. They require assistance from another person in finding where to sign their ballot and preparing it for delivery by mail or by drop box. Those who assist them are able to see for whom the voter voted, which is inconsistent with voter privacy and independence principles.

## QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED IN THE STUDY CALLED FOR SB488

- Does the current system deprive some voters of their civil rights?

To answer this question, the study should look at the impact of hard copy electronic ballot returns as the sole method for ballot delivery on voters with disabilities and UOCAVA voters. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the Board of Elections should be able to do a better job without leaving voters behind.

- How do other states handle electronic online ballot returns?

Twelve states have already introduced electronic online ballot return, including Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, and West Virginia; the study should gain insight from the experiences of these states. The study should also examine best practices in terms of accessibility for electronic return of ballots.

- How could an online ballot system fit into the current election infrastructure?

The study should determine the cost of adopting an online ballot system in Maryland and whether existing processes would have to be expanded or changed. The study should also develop a plan for how security concerns should be addressed.

## CONCLUSION

The question of whether Maryland should have an online ballot return system for certain classes of voters must receive careful consideration through a study as called for in SB488 conducted by the Maryland General Assembly. Failure to conduct a study would be irresponsible and negligent. Cost, integration, and security are important factors which impact the taxpayers and public trust in the voting system. The study must be completed by December 1, 2023 to ensure that the results can be incorporated into the 2024 election, avoiding another useless study. However, these concerns must be balanced with the right to a secret, private ballot. Moreover, in order for the work of the study to be meaningful and not to disadvantage impacted voters, the General Assembly should require MSBE to issue a nonbinding RFP for a platform which will operationalize electronic ballot return with sufficient time for Maryland to implement this system prior to the 2024 General Election. In a democracy, voting should be as easy and convenient as possible in order to maximize voter turnout. Barriers which diminish civil rights should be eliminated. Everyone's voice should have the opportunity to be heard. No voter should be left behind. Please vote in favor of SB488.

**Elizabeth Landry - HB 645 - FAVORABLE W AMENDMENT.**

Uploaded by: Elizabeth Landry

Position: FWA

**HB 645 Election Law - Electronic Ballot Return System - Study and Request for Proposals**  
**TESTIMONY TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE**  
**Elizabeth Landry, Favorable with Amendment**

February 28, 2023

Committee Chair Feldman, Vice Chair Kagan, and Committee,

My name is Elizabeth Landry. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I am here in support of HB 645, and I want to thank Delegate Feldmark for sponsoring this bill. I am a Maryland voter living abroad in Sweden, and I vote in Frederick.

I was born, raised, and received my Nursing degree in Salisbury. At the end of 2018, my partner and I moved abroad to Sweden for their work. Maryland voters like me living abroad are dependent on mailing in our ballots.

In 2020, postal systems around the world were upended due to the COVID-19 pandemic. With so much uncertainty around the length of time postal mail would require, I ended up paying a courier service to make sure my ballot was returned by the deadline – this cost over \$50. Having to pay this much just to vote was a modern-day poll tax.

Having the ability to electronically return my ballot would save me money and stress of worrying whether or not my ballot will make it back to Maryland. I am grateful for the study outlined in SB 488, and my position is Favorable with an Amendment requesting the inclusion of a public forum available online so that Maryland voters living overseas can give input on how such an electronic ballot return system would improve their ability to vote from their host countries.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak to the committee and for your time.

Respectfully Yours,

Elizabeth Landry

RESIDES IN: Malmö, Sweden

VOTES IN: Frederick County Voter (District 3)

# **LWVMD testimony - HB 645 – Election Law - Electron**

Uploaded by: Janet Millenson

Position: UNF



## TESTIMONY TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

**HB 645 – Election Law - Electronic Ballot Return System - Study and Request for Proposals**

**POSITION: Opposed**

**BY: Nancy Soreng – President**

**Date: February 28, 2023**

The League of Women Voters of Maryland adopted a position as long ago as 1999 to support efforts to determine the feasibility of internet voting via studies, research, and pilot projects. If safely implemented, it would benefit overseas voters and people with certain disabilities.

However, in recent years the internet's vulnerabilities have become more apparent, especially in the context of elections. Disinformation and hacking by domestic and foreign bad actors are serious threats of concern at both the federal and state levels.

A blue-ribbon group of experts hosted by the University of California, Berkeley Center for Security in Politics recently issued a concise and non-technical paper on this topic: "[Working Group Statement on Developing Standards for Internet Ballot Return](#)." It concludes that **"Implementing widespread adoption of secure and accessible internet ballot return requires technologies that do not currently exist and others that have not been fully tested."**

We strongly recommend incorporating the findings of this working group into any Department of Legislative Services study of the feasibility of internet voting in Maryland. Based on the recommendations of a wide range of election security experts, it's clear that this bill's requirement to issue an RFP by January 1, 2024 would be extremely premature.

The League of Women Voters of Maryland urges an unfavorable report on HB 645.



## **HB 645 UNF**

Uploaded by: Susan Greenhalgh

Position: UNF

**Testimony of Susan Greenhalgh**  
**Senior Advisor on Election Security**  
**Free Speech For People**  
**before the**  
**Ways and Means Committee**  
**Maryland General Assembly**  
**Contact: susan@freespeechforpeople.org**

**Re: HB0645-UNFAVORABLE**

**February 28, 2023**

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on SB0488.

Free Speech For People is a national, non-profit, non-partisan public interest legal organization that works to renew our democracy and our United States Constitution for the people. As part of our mission, we are committed to promoting, through legal actions and advocacy, secure, transparent, trustworthy, and accessible voting policies for all voters. For example, we launched a legal challenge to voter registration restrictions in Arizona, resulting in tens of thousands of additional voters being able to register to vote. We avidly support the responsible use of technology to improve access to the ballot for all voters, of all abilities, and support the exploration of increased accessible voting options and improvements for voters with disabilities. But we vigorously oppose the adoption of policies that permit electronic return of voted ballots because ballots transmitted electronically, by email, fax and online ballot portal, are all at high risk for privacy risks, manipulation and fraud. At a time when election confidence is under attack, expanding dangerously insecure electronic ballot return will degrade not just the security of Maryland's elections, but also confidence in elections and trust in government. We urge the Committee to vote NO on HB0645 and not advance it from Committee.

Ballots returned online are at high risk for manipulation or fraud.

Quite plainly, ballots cannot be securely returned electronically. Proponents of electronic ballot return may suggest, erroneously, that secure online return of voted ballots is possible with today's computer security tools, or that the use of

cloud storage or a portal will adequately protect ballot security. All this is incorrect.

In 2020, the **Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the U.S. Election Assistance Commission** published a [risk-assessment](#)<sup>1</sup> which *"recommends paper ballot return, as electronic ballot return technologies are high risk even with controls in place."*<sup>2</sup> [Emphasis added.] **In other words, the Department of Homeland Security recommends states should continue to use paper ballots because there are serious and significant security risks introduced with the electronic transmission of marked ballots that cannot be adequately mitigated with the security tools and controls available, and ballots returned online are at high risk of tampering or manipulation.**

DHS's blunt warning against the use of online voting echoed bipartisan recommendations from the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, published in response to findings that foreign governments were actively trying to attack U.S. election systems. The Committee explicitly wrote: "States should resist pushes for online voting."<sup>3</sup>

In 2018, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) released a report stating that the technology to return marked ballots securely and anonymously over the internet does not exist.<sup>4</sup> Many studies have reviewed specific internet voting systems and consistently, all have found that despite their claims of innovation and security, these systems have fundamental vulnerabilities.

Before the 2020 election, the U.S. Postal Service secretly developed and tested an online voting system that used **blockchain** in an effort to secure the ballots.<sup>5</sup> The Postal Service engaged security researchers at the University of Colorado to test

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at: <https://www.politico.com/f/?id=00000172-9406-dd0c-ab73-fe6e10070001>

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Report of the Select Committee on Intelligence, United States Senate on Russian Active Measures Campaigns and Interference in the 2016 U.S. Election, Volume 1: Russian Efforts Against Election Infrastructure with Additional Views, 2019, Available at [https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Report\\_Volume1.pdf](https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Report_Volume1.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018. "Securing the Vote: Protecting American Democracy." Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Available at: <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/25120/securing-the-vote-protecting-american-democracy>

<sup>5</sup> Joe Marks, Jacob Bagoge, "USPS built and secretly tested a mobile voting system before 2020," *The Washington Post*, December 13, 2021. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2021/12/13/usps-built-secretly-tested-mobile-voting-system-before-2020/>

the system for security. The [researchers](#) were able to compromise the blockchain and tamper with ballots undetectably in multiple ways.

At a time when election security and public confidence in our elections are under attack, increased electronic return of voted ballots, whether from a phone, tablet, or computer, is simply not safe or secure in any form. Furthermore, with the ongoing conflict in Ukraine, the threat of Russian cyber attacks on our election infrastructure has increased.<sup>6</sup> Election security is a matter of the highest U.S. national security, so we would be taking a very grave risk to our democracy any time the threat of foreign interference is escalated, as it is now.

### Online voting is not comparable to online banking.

The public may ask, ‘I can bank online, why can’t I vote online?’ But voting involves critical differences that make it a much more difficult enterprise to secure than online banking or commerce.<sup>7</sup> Online transactions are not secret or anonymous; a customer can check her statement to detect and address fraudulent charges. But we vote by secret ballot; there is no mechanism for the voter or election official to check to ensure ballots were not manipulated or hacked in transit and that the votes are legitimate. This makes online elections especially vulnerable to undetectable hacking.

And even if an attack was detected, there would be no way for election officials to determine which ballots were manipulated and which are legitimate, making an online attack uncorrectable. Such systems are, by definition, not auditable; since there is no indelible, source record of voter intent, there is no audit record. In addition, banks may calculate an acceptable level of fraud and factor that into the cost of doing business, or take out insurance to cover their losses, but we cannot accept any illegitimate ballots. Finally, the assumption that online banking can be done securely is faulty. It is estimated that banks lose millions or even billions of dollars every year to online attacks.<sup>8</sup> High profile hacks like that on Citibank, JP Morgan Chase, and Bank of America prove that even system with high cyber

---

<sup>6</sup> Joseph Marks, “Russian hacking threats aren’t over, Congress was warned last night,” *The Washington Post*, March 9, 2022. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/09/russian-hacking-threats-arent-over-congress-was-warned-last-night/>

<sup>7</sup> “If I Can Shop and Bank Online, Why Can’t I Vote Online?” by David Jefferson, Computer Scientist, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, member, Verified Voting Foundation Board, Board of Directors, California Voter Foundation <https://www.verifiedvoting.org/resources/internet-voting/vote-online/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.iii.org/fact-statistic/facts-statistics-identity-theft-and-cybercrime>

security budgets (much higher than Washington's), cannot resist determined attackers.

### Use of online voting is not evidence that it is secure.

It's true that over two dozen states currently permit electronic ballot return, but that does not mean it's secure or trustworthy.

During the early 2000's, Congress tasked the Department of Defense, through the National Defense Authorization Act, to develop a secure online voting system for military voters. Consequently, many states passed laws to permit electronic ballot return, planning to opt into the system provided by the Department of Defense. A system was developed in 2004, but was never deployed because a security evaluation determined that illegitimate ballots could be cast undetectably. Subsequently, after years of federal research that concluded electronic ballot return could not be made secure,<sup>9</sup> the Department of Defense and federal government abandoned the effort.

It's important to also understand that most of these states enacted policies to allow online return of voted ballots when cyber crime was much less commonplace and mature. Cyber crime has advanced significantly in the last decade, and by expert accounts, the expertise and sophistication of today's cyber criminals has far out-paced our defenses. We know much more today than we did then, and today's policy decisions should be based on the current threat model.

### Alternative accessible voting options should be explored.

At present, voters with disabilities still experience significant barriers to casting their votes privately and securely,<sup>10</sup> and we should make efforts to resolve these challenges. We understand the profound difficulties you face to assure every voter's ability to vote and strongly support interventions to assure voters' equal opportunity and access to cast their vote – securely and verifiably. Recognizing that no current solution is ideal for all voters, we support thoughtful consideration

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.nist.gov/itl/voting/uocava-voting>

<sup>10</sup> "Disability and Voting Accessibility in the 2020 Elections, Final Report on Survey Results." February 16, 2021. Rutgers University; U.S. Election Assistance Commission. Available at: [https://smlr.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/Documents/Centers/Program\\_Disability\\_Research/Disability\\_and\\_voting\\_accessibility\\_2020\\_election\\_Final\\_Report\\_survey\\_results.pdf](https://smlr.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/Documents/Centers/Program_Disability_Research/Disability_and_voting_accessibility_2020_election_Final_Report_survey_results.pdf)

to improve secure innovations, such as mobile accessible voting. Mobile accessible voting is offered in some states where election workers bring accessible ballot marking devices to the residences and workplaces of voters with disabilities. These accessible devices allow disabled voters to privately and independently cast a secured, verifiable paper ballot with accessible technology. (Currently Oregon and San Francisco and its neighboring counties have launched such an effort.<sup>11</sup>)

However, electronic ballot return is not the answer. The 2020 election underscores the importance of being able to examine voted paper ballots, not just digital artifacts. A recent report published in the Journal of Cybersecurity warns, “While current election systems are far from perfect, Internet- and blockchain-based voting would greatly increase the risk of undetectable, nation-scale election failures.”<sup>12</sup>

We would welcome the opportunity to provide the Committee with further information on technical aspects of electronic ballot return. We strongly urge the Committee to vote NO on HB0645, and seek alternative, accessible voting options.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<sup>11</sup> San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose and some of the twelve counties that surround it have invested a \$1 million federal grant to provide Mobile Voting Vehicles to increase voting access to disabled and underserved voters. See: [http://www.bayareauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/approval\\_2022\\_january\\_meeting\\_master.pdf](http://www.bayareauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/approval_2022_january_meeting_master.pdf), page 57.

<sup>12</sup> Sunoo Park, Michael Specter, Neha Narula, Ronald L Rivest, MIT, Going from bad to worse: from Internet voting to blockchain voting, Journal of Cybersecurity, Volume 7, Issue 1, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cybsec/tyaa025>

# **HB.645.Ex.Coalition.Testimony.pdf**

Uploaded by: Susannah Goodman

Position: UNF



February 24, 2023

**Oppose Senate Bill 488 and House Bill 645**  
AN ACT concerning Election Law – Electronic Ballot Return System – Study and  
Request for Proposals

Dear Legislators:

Thank you for your work to expand and enhance voting access for Maryland voters. We applaud the reforms enacted recently to make voting safe and accessible, including expanding access to mail-in voting, early voting, and voting in correctional facilities throughout the state. We are committed to ensuring that all voters, including those with disabilities and military voters overseas, can exercise their right to vote.

However, we write to you with grave concerns about SB 488 and HB 645 as drafted. If passed at this time, this legislation will put the security of Maryland's election infrastructure at risk and undermine public confidence in election results.

The legislation requires the State Board of Elections to issue a request for proposals for an "electronic ballot return" voting system.

Four federal government agencies have concluded in a recent [risk assessment](#) that "electronic ballot return" is "High" risk. The agencies warn that electronic ballot return "faces significant security risks to the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of voted ballots," and that these risks can "**ultimately affect the tabulation and results and can occur at scale.**" The risk assessment was issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), the U.S. Elections



Assistance Commission (EAC) and the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST).<sup>1</sup>

This risk assessment was issued to address the fact that state policy makers like yourselves are facing pressure to allow internet voting for certain classes of voters.

At a time where the integrity and veracity of election results are continuously called into question, it would not be prudent to ignore the security warning issued by the four government agencies charged with protecting our nation's election infrastructure.

Furthermore, there is broad consensus that electronic ballot return presents severe security risks to the integrity of our elections, because ballots cast over the internet can be intercepted, deleted and altered at scale – and can therefore change election results.

- NIST, the federal agency responsible for issuing cybersecurity standards, has also conducted research on ways to enhance accessibility for voters with disabilities. Its 2022 report, *Promoting Access to Voting*, did not recommend electronic ballot return, instead concluding, “there remain **significant security, privacy, and ballot secrecy challenges**.”<sup>2</sup>
- In 2019, the bipartisan **U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence** reported on its findings that foreign governments were actively trying to attack American election systems. As part of that report, the Committee determined “**States should resist pushes for online voting**. . . While the Committee agrees states should take great pains to ensure members of the military get to vote for their elected officials, no system of online voting has

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Institute of Standards and Technology and the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, *Risk Management for Electronic Ballot Delivery, Marking, and Return*, May 2020, available at [https://s.wsj.net/public/resources/documents/Final\\_%20Risk\\_Management\\_for\\_Electronic-Ballot\\_05082020.pdf?mod=article\\_inline](https://s.wsj.net/public/resources/documents/Final_%20Risk_Management_for_Electronic-Ballot_05082020.pdf?mod=article_inline)

<sup>2</sup> Page 48, *Promoting Access to Voting: Recommendations for Addressing Barriers to Private and Independent Voting for People with Disabilities*, National Institute of Standards and Technology, March 2022, available at <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.1273.pdf>

yet established itself as secure.”<sup>3</sup>

- Just weeks ago, experts convened by the University of California’s Berkeley Center for Security in Policy concluded that creating standards for online ballot return so that it can be done securely and privately *was not feasible*. “When internet ballot return is employed,” the Working Group wrote, **“it may be possible for a single attacker to alter thousands or even millions of votes.** And this lone individual could perpetrate an attack from a different continent from the one where the election is being held – perhaps even while under the protection of a rogue nation where there is no concern of repercussions.”<sup>4</sup>

Senate Bill 488 and House Bill 645 also propose a study of electronic ballot return systems currently available. The study directions do not instruct the Department of Legislative Services to consider security or to consult the the government agencies charged with protecting our national election infrastructure, i.e. DHS’ CISA, the FBI, EAC and NIST. These agencies - especially the FBI and CISA - routinely track the escalating threats to our election infrastructure - both foreign and domestic - and advise election policy makers on how to address these threats. Any study should absolutely include a review of the recommendations of these agencies and a consultation with their personnel. Moreover, a study should review the conclusions of the University of California at Berkeley [Working Group](#), the [National Academy of Sciences](#),<sup>5</sup> and other election security experts. Finally, the study should stand alone and not be linked to a request for proposal.

The accessibility issues some voters, especially voters with print disabilities, face are real. Various programs that help address these challenges are already in use in other jurisdictions, like bringing poll workers and accessible systems to voters who need them. We urge the legislature to invest resources in examining alternative accessible absentee voting methods that will improve access for voters with

---

<sup>3</sup> Report of the Select Committee on Intelligence, *United States Senate on Russian Active Measures Campaigns and Interference in the 2016 U.S. Election, Volume 1* (2019), available at [https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Report\\_Volume1.pdf](https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Report_Volume1.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> R. Michael Alvarez et al., “Working Group Statement on Developing Standards for Internet Ballot Return,” University of California, Berkeley Center for Security in Politics, December 14, 2022. Available at <https://csp.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Working-Group-Statement-on-Internet-Ballot-Return.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Securing the Vote: Protecting American Democracy*, The National Academies Press (2018), available at <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/25120/securing-the-vote-protecting-american-democracy>

disabilities, without returning ballots over the internet. Other technologies are being developed and piloted that may be able to help address these challenges – and their promise is very exciting, but today these technologies are in their infancy. No standards have yet been developed that these systems could be certified to. Any new voting system deployed by the State of Maryland should undergo the rigorous testing and certification that Maryland requires for its polling place ballot marking systems.

Furthermore, at a minimum, there are additional steps Maryland should take to improve voting accessibility – which do not create security risks. As noted above, NIST produced a detailed report<sup>6</sup> of recommendations that we urge you to consider, such as:

- ensuring that county elections websites are accessible;
- providing election-related information in accessible formats, through a variety of channels including social media, radio, text and phone;
- providing physical descriptions of each polling place, indicating accessible entrances, exits, public transit, and parking;
- providing voting education classes for voters with disabilities in collaboration with local disability support agencies;
- implementing alternative attestation methods for voters who cannot sign their mail-in ballot oaths;
- including tactile marks, such as punched holes, to guide blind voters where to sign; and
- establishing a workgroup or task force made up of representatives from voting and disability rights communities to explore and recommend additional accessibility improvements that are secure.

Other jurisdictions are innovating solutions to ensure access to all voters. San Francisco County, the State of Arizona, and the State of Vermont offer in-person accessibility assistance in voters' homes – and we would be happy to provide you with more information about those programs.

**We are very interested in working collaboratively and creatively with you to improve voting accessibility in ways that do not create risk to our elections.**

We would welcome the opportunity to provide you – or other lawmakers – further information about the technical aspects and unavoidable and severe inherent risks of electronic ballot return. We would also welcome the opportunity to collaborate

---

<sup>6</sup> *Promoting Access to Voting*, available at <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.1273.pdf>

with you on implementing accessibility improvements that do not present security risks.

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne Antoine  
Executive Director  
Common Cause Maryland

Yanet Amanuel  
Public Policy Director  
ACLU Maryland

Rebecca Wilson,  
CoDirector, SAVE our Votes  
Secure, Accessible, Verifiable Elections for Maryland

Lawrence Norden  
Director, Elections and Government Program  
The Brennan Center for Justice

Susan Greenhalgh  
Senior Advisor on Election Security  
Free Speech for People

Alexandra Chandler  
Policy Advocate  
Protect Democracy

Aquene Freechild  
Co-Director, Democracy Campaign  
Public Citizen

Pamela Smith  
President  
Verified Voting

# **Daniel Broder Testimony.pdf**

Uploaded by: Daniel Broder

Position: INFO

I hope this legislation will seriously consider adding an amendment to ensure that it is fully and completely compliant with NIST and EAC cyber security standards and that the RFP contained within the legislation will be limited to the scope of a pilot project to ensure that the state can get some test data prior to fully implementing online voting. I am not an Election Denier or a conspiracy theorist but I believe that given the threat landscape and the willingness of foreign actors to interfere with our elections, we should seriously consider making security the hallmark of this legislation.