

VOICE 4/29/06
(919) 500-1110



InfoSENTRY Services, Inc. www.infosentry.com

Memorandum

To: Dr. John Gilbert, Chairperson; Mr. Dion Curry, Secretary; Mr. Tom Steed, Member; Ms. Cherie Poucher, Director

From: M. Glenn Newkirk, President *M. Glenn Newkirk*
 Certified Business Continuity Planner
 Certified Software Project Manager

Date: 24 January 2006

Re: **Recommendation for Voting System Option 1**

I base my recommendation for Option 1 on the following bases:

1. Indications from the State Board are that all of the options comply with State Law and have received certification from the State Board—including Option 1.
2. Of the options we have had time to study and for which we have received written information from the vendor and the State Board, Option 1 stands out as the one with the lowest initial and continuing, operational costs.
3. It is the least "experimental" option. It uses each piece of technology in a manner for which it was intended.
4. The Wake County Board of Elections staff has a greater potential to make this option work securely and with the lowest risk to providing confusing election results. It provides a verified voting paper audit trail for all voters.
5. Option 1 provides the least complex systems environment of the four non-experimental options—involving only three types of voting devices and only one base election management system software package.
6. Use of DREs in early voting sites is the option that has received the support in writing of the State Board of Elections and one of the vendor's spokespersons.

Optical endorsed by Glen Newkirk

Wake County Board of Elections: Preliminary Voting System Cost Estimates

TOTAL =

\$2,864,116

Poll Worker Training (Class size limited to 20 participants.) Assume 20 classes for DREs and 20 classes for M100 optical scan. At \$800 per course	40	\$800.00	\$32,000.00
Direct Recording Electronic (DRE): Ancillary Equipment			
iVotronic Printer Pack (One per Polling Location)	210	\$800.00	\$168,000.00
iVotronic Communication Pack (Replaces Printer Pack if Modem/ing Results from Polling Location)	210	\$1,000.00	\$210,000.00
iVotronic Supervisor Terminal (Minimum One per County) Includes:	4	\$2,250.00	\$9,000.00
Personal Electronic Ballot (PEB)	40	\$75.00	\$3,000.00
PEB Reader (Minimum One per County)	4	\$350.00	\$1,400.00
Compact Flash Reader/Writer (Minimum One per County)	4	\$30.00	\$120.00
DRE: consumable supplies			
Verified Voting Paper Audit Trail Paper Roll	0	\$5.75	\$0.00
Printer Pack Paper Roll	0	\$3.75	\$0.00
Rechargeable NiMH Battery Stick	0	\$162.50	\$0.00
128mb Flashcard	0	\$60.00	\$0.00
Lithium Battery	0	\$9.75	\$0.00
DRE with audio interface for non-visual access: consumable supplies			
Headset	250	\$15.00	\$3,750.00
Hygenic Headset Ear Cover (50 per precinct+each of the early voting sites)	10650	\$0.15	\$1,597.50
128mb Flashcard	0	\$60.00	\$0.00
Lithium Battery--spares	15	\$9.74	\$146.10
Precinct Count Optical Scan Voting Equipment: Ancillary Equipment			
Omni Drive (Minimum One per County)	4	\$6.00	\$24.00
Precinct Count Optical Scan Voting Equipment: Consumable Supplies			
Model 100 Thermal Paper Roll	0	\$3.75	\$0.00
Model 100 Fuse - 2 AMP AGC	0	\$0.75	\$0.00
Model 100 Battery - 12V	0	\$32.00	\$0.00
Model 100 Battery - 3V	0	\$5.00	\$0.00
Model 100 PCMCIA Memory Card	0	\$90.00	\$0.00
Model 100 Ballot Marking Pen (Box of 12)	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Secrecy Sleeve (Plastic): 2 per precinct times 300 for precincts, early voting sites, and spares.	0	\$8.00	\$0.00
Tabulation Equipment: Tabulation Hardware			

Preliminary estimates based on State Contract pricing and verbal discussions with Vendor representative.



Secure,
Accurate,
Accessible &
Fair
Electronic Voting



Because Everybody's Vote Should Count

April 20, 2004

Re: Proposed Legislation on Electronic Voting

Dear Member of Congress:

As a newly-formed coalition of civil rights advocates, election officials, academics, voting equipment experts, and other concerned citizens we are opposed to current bills that would require that all Direct Record Electronic voting systems produce a contemporaneous paper replica ("CPR"), euphemistically referred to as a "voter verified paper record." In particular, we urge you to **OPPOSE** H.R. 2239 (the Holt Bill) and S. 2313 (the Graham/Clinton Bill). Because we understand that a well-financed and aggressive lobbying campaign is now being mounted to support these bills, we are writing to explain the reasons why such legislation should be rejected.

While the signatories to this letter represent diverse constituencies, we share the goal of promoting secure elections in which all citizens may participate equally with confidence that their votes will be counted. The proposed legislation to require a CPR is antithetical to this goal. The CPR is an experimental concept that has not yet proven either workable or effective in improving election integrity. In the few jurisdictions that have even experimented with implementing this device, the CPR has caused serious problems due to printer jams, voter confusion and other operational difficulties.

The effect of legislation to require a CPR would be to prohibit the use of state-of-the-art electronic voting systems that provide enormous advantages for all voters – and especially for traditionally disenfranchised voters such as people with disabilities, non-English proficient citizens, and racial minorities. To require implementation of the CPR by 2004, as these bills would do, is a recipe for yet another election-day disaster.

Rather than passing legislation to require an unproven device in an overheated election-year climate, Congress should allow the mechanisms created by the Help America Vote Act of 2002 ("HAVA") to address all voting system concerns scientifically and systematically. As you are aware, HAVA created the Election Assistance Commission ("EAC"), the responsibilities of which include the development of guidelines for secure electronic voting equipment. As you are also aware, HAVA's four principal co-authors (Sen. Dodd, Sen. McConnell, Rep. Ney, and Rep. Hoyer), have written a joint letter asking that this process be allowed to function as HAVA contemplates. (<http://www.house.gov/cha/dearcolleaguemarch3-04.htm>.) We share their view that HAVA should be given a chance to work, and also agree with them that requiring a CPR would "undermine" and "subvert" the goals of HAVA.

For all these reasons, as supported and detailed in the pages that follow, we urge you to oppose H.R. 2239 and S. 2313. Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Re: Proposed Legislation on Electronic Voting

April 20, 2004

Page 2

Sincerely,*

Jim Adler
 Founder
 VoteHere, Inc

Beverly B. Kaufman
 Clerk
 Harris County, TX

Connie Schmidt, CERA
 Election Commissioner
 Johnson County, KS

Kathy Dent
 Supervisor of Elections
 Sarasota County, FL

Scott O. Konopasek
 Registrar of Voters
 San Bernardino County, CA

Ted Selker
 Associate Professor
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Jim Dickson
 Vice President, American Association
 of People with Disabilities
 Co-Chair, Leadership Conference on
 Civil Rights Election Reform Task
 Force

Linda H. Lamone, Esq.
 Administrator of Elections
 State of Maryland

Daniel P. Tokaji
 Assistant Professor
 Ohio State University
 Moritz College of Law

Denise Lamb
 Director, Bureau of Elections
 State of New Mexico

Mischelle Townsend
 Registrar of Voters
 Riverside County, CA

Kathay Feng
 Voting Rights Program Director
 Asian Pacific American Legal Center

Conny McCormack
 Registrar-Recorder/County
 Clerk
 Los Angeles County, CA

Hugh Gallagher
 Managing Director
 Election Systems Acquisition &
 Management Services

Glenn Newkirk
 President
 InfoSENTRY Services, Inc.

George Gilbert
 Director of Elections
 Guilford County, NC

Kathy Rogers
 Director of Elections
 Administration
 Georgia Secretary of State

* This letter expresses the personal and professional opinions of the signatories and does not necessarily represent the views of our employers, organizations or institutions.