

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

December 8, 2017

Contact: Garland Favorito
(404) 664-4044

Mary Norwood to Be Denied Rights Twice in 8 Years Georgia Voting System Has No Ballot for Legal Recount

ATLANTA, GA – For the [second time](#) in 8 years Atlanta Mayoral Candidate Mary Norwood will be denied her legal right to a **real recount** of Georgia election results. In 2009 and again Wednesday morning, Mrs. Norwood found herself about 700 votes behind in well over 80,000 votes cast for a new Atlanta mayor. Each time her vote total was within 1% of the respective leaders, Kasim Reed and Keisha Lance Bottoms. That entitles her to a full recount under Georgia law. [\[O.C.G.A. 21-2-495 \(c\)\]](#)

Election officials will go through motions of reprinting electronic results again and announcing a winner. Media outlets will report a recount was conducted and most of Atlanta will be led to believe that the process worked once more. In reality, **Georgia's** direct recording electronic (DRE) system **cannot perform the recount required by Georgia law**. Instead, votes are “re canvassed,” a word not listed in English dictionaries.

Former Kennesaw State (KSU) Center for Election Systems Director, Ray Cobb, explained how a recount differs in a 2007 [deposition](#). “*It starts with the ballot rather than the card.*” A “re canvass” starts with a DRE internal memory card because **a DRE has no ballot that can be recounted**. Georgia code defines a ballot as “*the instrument by which an elector casts his or her vote.*” [\[O.C.G.A. 21-2-2\]](#) Touchscreens cast the votes that disappear when the ballot is cast. No ballot image is stored for manual recounts.

A “re canvass” can only reprint previous unverifiable results. Since it starts after the vote has been recorded on the card, it is only a portion of the full recount required by law [\[O.C.G.A. 21-2-2\]](#) A State Election Board (SEB) rule [\[183-1-12-02\(7\)\]](#) applied the old lever machine term to new DREs. **That SEB rule conflicts with Georgia recount law.**

DRE results cannot change with a recount. KSU Professor Emeritus, Britain Williams, who oversaw certification tests for the current system, admitted in his 2007 [deposition](#). “*There are two voting systems that will give you the exact same answer on a recount as they do on the original count and that's an electronic voting system and a lever machine.*” Such a meaningless process **subverts the intent of Georgia recount law.**

Mail-in vote recounts do not fare much better. The code allows election officials to rescan mail-in ballots without hand recounts. So **if the optical scan tabulator has an error that produces incorrect results, it will produce the same incorrect results for a recount.** Hand recounts that would expose any error are not required by Georgia law.