

## Dwight Shellman

---

**From:** Dwight Shellman  
**Sent:** Friday, December 11, 2015 4:46 PM  
**To:** Larry Moore [REDACTED]; Bill Murphy [REDACTED];  
Steven Bennett - Dominion Voting Systems, Inc.  
[REDACTED]; Bryan Hoffman - Election Systems & Software  
[REDACTED]; Kathy Rogers [REDACTED] Justin Morris  
**Cc:** Judd Choate; Hilary Rudy; Jessi Romero; Danny Casias; Jerome Lovato; DJ Davis; Loree  
Karr; Steven Ward; Edward Morgan  
**Subject:** Additional information to include in your narratives to be submitted on 12/15 by 5PM  
**Attachments:** Hall 20151210\_Redacted.pdf; Pitkin County UVS Input 20151209.pdf

Dear UVS Providers:

At its meeting today, the Pilot Election Review Committee requested me to ask each system provider to supply additional information in the narratives I requested you to submit on December 15<sup>th</sup> by 5:00PM:

1. For all components used for in-person voting at Voter Service and Polling Centers, please provide:
  - a. State the weight of the component;
  - b. State the physical dimensions of the component (height, width and depth);
  - c. To the extent applicable, please also state the weight and depth of any cases or trunks in which the component is packed for purposes of transport;
  - d. Please be sure to include this information for all components of the ballot-on-demand system you offer (which, in Colorado, technically is not a part or component of a voting system).
2. Please use the 12/15 narrative to “make your case.” Why is your system better than the others? Please identify the strengths of your system, and the shortcomings and limitations of the others.

In addition, in a separate email to [pilot.elections@sos.state.co.us](mailto:pilot.elections@sos.state.co.us), and to the extent you have not already done so, please respond in writing to the questions raised in the attached emails from the Clerks and Records of Boulder and Pitkin Counties.

Finally, we have asked all counties to supply us with any remaining questions they have regarding the competing voting systems. We will compile them and share them with you as much in advance of the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting as possible. We respectfully request each provider to have sales and technical personnel available at the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, as we expect to devote substantial time in having each provider answer the outstanding questions. Appropriate representatives may participate in the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting in-person or remotely via conference call and webinar. Please let me know if you want to participate remotely, so that I can send you the appropriate login credentials.

The public notice and agenda for the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting will be formally issued on Monday, December 14<sup>th</sup>. For present purposes, please be advised the meeting will be conducted in the Blue Spruce conference room located on the second floor of the Secretary of State’s office at 1700 Broadway in Denver.

Thank you all for your continued willingness to provide the committee with the information it desires to make a final recommendation to Secretary Williams.

Dwight Shellman

County Support Manager | ACP Voter Registration Coordinator  
Elections Division | Colorado Department of State  
1700 Broadway | Suite 270 | Denver | CO | 80290  
Phone 303-894-2200 x6313 | Mobile [REDACTED] | Fax 303-869-4861  
[dwight.shellman@sos.state.co.us](mailto:dwright.shellman@sos.state.co.us)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual(s) named. Pursuant to the Address Confidentiality Program Act, section 24-30-2108(10), C.R.S., this message shall not be a public record subject to inspection pursuant to the provisions of part 2 of article 72 of title 24, C.R.S. (CORA). If you are not an intended recipient you are not authorized to disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system.

## Dwight Shellman

---

**From:** Hall, Hillary  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 10, 2015 7:11 PM  
**To:** Dwight Shellman  
**Subject:** Questions for the meeting tomorrow

Hi Dwight

I have a few questions for the PERC meeting and cannot attend in person. I am sending these for you all to consider tomorrow as part of the review, I do not expect an answer back on these items from you or the committee.

Do you know if any system can do a 11by 17 page ballot. We have had to use an 11 by 17 in ballot in most even year elections.

How does the audio and print database fit together? Do you have to have the audio completed before you can finalize the database? Can you create a separate database for the accessible voting with audio and the paper database and easily combine the results? For long ballots, having to wait for audio in the already very tight timelines can cause significant delays in the process

Can any of the systems scramble ballot images upon export? If they can, scrambling the images would increase anonymity and reduce cost in make exporting the images for public.

For all systems how is the image tied to the ballot? Seems like most rely on keeping them in order

What are the projected lifespans for each of the systems?

Can images be exported to use in any BOD system?

Can ballot name be custom edited to include district style and precinct in all systems? We name the styles in a way to make it very easy for judges to tell what ballot they are giving a voter

Thanks for all your work on this project.

Hillary Hall  
**Boulder County Clerk and Recorder**  
303-413-7700  
1750 33<sup>rd</sup> Street, Boulder. CO 80301

“As trusted stewards of Boulder County’s future, we provide the best in public service.”

Honorable Secretary Williams and Pilot Election Review Committee:

On behalf of the Pitkin County Election Staff and myself, the following comments are submitted for your review and consideration in the State of Colorado Uniform Voting System vendor selection process. First, comments identify concerns regarding big-picture business processes when considering a UVS; the second and third group of comments share questions in reference to technical processes and past experience with one vendor, respectively.

When selecting a vendor, please consider the following business process points:

- Experience with multiple county implementations and the ability to assure successful outcomes
- Proven record with customer service efficiencies and effectiveness
- Organizational strength, not only fiscal, but also human resource capital. Does the vendor have seasoned and tenured staff, is there assurance of reliability into the future, etc.
- Flexibility and capability to address Colorado's innovative spirit and continuous improvements in moving elections forward by promoting a collaborative culture and can-do attitude
- Fair pricing strategies
- Simplicity and ease in utilizing the system; i.e., programming, set-up and tear-down, the ability for judges to address point(s)-of-failure, report generation, etc. Especially, when taking into consideration small and medium-size counties that experience a minimal judge pool and staffing resources that may not provide strength in technical and software skillsets
- Security, accuracy and transparency
- Proven success record implementing training strategies regarding a conversion, in addition to effective training materials for staff and judges
- Flexibility and capability to address small, medium and large county VSPC set-up/configuration; i.e., Pitkin County still has VSPC's that process between 400 – 600 voter on Election Day, and over 10% of voters still vote a flat ballot in person. Simplicity in operations is essential when working with limited human resource capital –both judges and county personnel, and limited space with VSPC's and storage

Questions in reference to technical operations (some concerns may have been answered, yet others may shed light on questions that may have not been asked):

- Ease in handling SCORE data integration with the system, and working with excess information from SCORE. Is the ballot style naming flexible with SCORE, especially with Everyone Counts.
- Programming precinct based elections versus style based.
- Ease in layout capability; i.e., editing, spacing between columns, no candidates for a listed race and does the race look similar on the ballot vs. ADA voting device, allow space/characters text for endorsements (candidates pledges to run only one term), are there character limits, can ballot footers be customized or removed, ability to edit again once generated, etc.
- Can a nonpartisan primary ballot be programmed? (Home Rule Charter)

- Does the ADA compatible equipment offer flexibility in programming the template features of the audio ballot; including, the ability to speed up, slow down, and pause the audio as the voters needs necessitate.
- Provisional ballot programming and processes.
- How does the system handle multi-page ballots in an election; i.e., scanning, images, audits, etc.; and, what is the largest ballot paper size that can be produced.
- Suppressing outcomes during tabulation due to death or withdrawal.
- What stopgaps are in place to prevent reprogramming of the election database after media has been downloaded; and, stopgaps to separate the upload of media and tabulation of results.
- Does the system provide various levels of administrative restrictions for authorized user.
- Capability in extracting various types of reports.
- Scanning equipment - does the system assure issues are resolved before judges proceed, therefore assuring elections balance.
- Safeguards to assure judges program the correct ballot style.

Past experienced with vendor:

In particular, these comments pertain to Election Systems and Software, and Pitkin County's experience with contracting their services. Based on our experience with utilizing ES&S as a vendor, we recommend to the committee and to the Secretary, that if ES&S should be selected, that at minimum a second alternate vendor also be offered to Colorado clerks for procurement of a voting system.

Pitkin County has utilized Diebold/Premier voting system equipment since 2001, with the addition of DREs in 2006 for ADA compliance, prior to the acquisition of this company by ES&S. The Accuvote equipment and GEMS election management system have performed as workhorses, and their time for replacement has come. Our support needs from ES&S have been typical and minimal, involving biannual maintenance visits, onsite training and support, and distance support from staff in ES&S's Omaha office.

The support has primarily been provided by one technician, Cory Dukarski. Cory has always provided prompt and exemplary service to Pitkin County. He however, is the sole point of contact for our legacy voting system. This raises significant concerns for our staff regarding ES&S's commitment to institutional knowledge, client support that is both broad and deep, and the confidence to rely on the detailed and potentially time consuming attention that our county may require during deployment of a new system.

Also relevant for your consideration when deciding ES&S's suitability to deploy new equipment is our attempt to work with ES&S on use of a signature capture and ASR machine. Again ES&S had one technician who possessed knowledge about this new piece of equipment known as the AccuVote Envelope Scanner (AVES). While sufficient training and documentation were provided for the equipment, it was not properly configured to work with SCORE and therefore would never be a suitable option for our county or others. This did not become clear until we were attempting to deploy it with the technician. We were provided with assurances that the proper files would be uploaded to us in order to integrate the equipment with SCORE; however, they were never provided in a timely manner,

and the equipment sits in our office, having never been used and despite multiple requests for ES&S to remove it from our limited workspace.

Finally, we additionally decided in 2015 to utilize a new print vendor for our mail ballot run. Pitkin County had selected ES&S through an RFP process in 2013. We encountered multiple setup errors and confusion with the ballots even though they were produced by their voting system. We had a debriefing phone call after 2014 with the company's leadership and were assured that better project management calendars and points of contact would be implemented. When it became clear in August of 2015 that they were not following through on these assurances, we switched vendors.

Our best experience with ES&S has been through their audio services department which has always provided prompt and accurate service.

Based on the above illustrations, we believe we have had thorough involvement with ES&S. It is our preference to not continue a working relationship with them for such an integral piece of election administration. Given the value of the contract for the State of Colorado, we kindly suggest that the committee provide considerable weight to a vendor who provides greater customer service and support.

Lastly, all vendors' systems and operations possess various strengths and weaknesses; and ultimately, the vendor selected to provide a uniform voting system for the State of Colorado should be the best fit to accommodate Colorado election processes and laws, now and into the future.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Vos Caudill  
Pitkin County Clerk and Recorder