

A message from the Colorado Republican Party

[View this email in your browser](#)



Ladies and gentlemen of the State Central Committee (SCC) and fellow Republicans,

Thank you for serving our party, our candidates, and our ideals. I am writing you to add some needed truth, clarity, and context to the discussion regarding our recent leadership elections and to frankly defend the party, our staff, and our dedicated volunteers against claims made by one of the losing candidates, State Representative Susan Beckman.

I address each issue she raised in her earlier email to you in my comments below. For those of you who attended the meeting, much of this is review: you went through the credentialing process, voted on the agenda and rules, witnessed the way the meeting was conducted, and had personal experience with the voting devices (“clickers”).

There were several elements in place to ensure election integrity and that proper processes were followed. Elements employed at the SCC meeting included the following:

1. Many SCC members understand Roberts’ Rules of Order, SCC Bylaws, SCC standing rules for meetings, and have experience attending and running these types of meetings; you act as watchdogs.
2. Having honest, capable volunteers in all positions, especially in key chairmanship or leadership positions. Our Credentials Committee and Tellers Committee in particular were staffed by competent, dedicated

volunteers, and they were led by two of our party's most accomplished and respected leaders.

3. Allowing and encouraging candidates to have knowledgeable, detail-oriented observers throughout the process. Rep. Beckman had Matt Crane, one of the state's most respected county clerks, as a key observer who has been engaged in all aspects of this review as well.
4. Having legal and parliamentary expertise to advise the Chairman and ensure adherence to rules and process. We were blessed to have one of the state's premier election attorneys and CRC Legal Counsel, Chris Murray, and a registered parliamentarian, Gregory Carlson, who also previously served as Fremont County Chairman, ensuring compliance.
5. Having the ability to raise protests or concerns at any time prior to meeting closure. We had several motions from the floor that were respectfully addressed, and Rep. Beckman had the same opportunity throughout the day.
6. Our voting system—clickers and data processing system—were run by an outside contractor with no known ties to any candidate; additionally, they were observed by Tellers Committee members and candidates' observers.
7. Public access to CRC Bylaws and proposed rules prior to the meeting.

Those safeguards being employed as described, Rep. Beckman and her advisors have chosen to make public accusations of incompetence and impropriety that we have previously addressed with her. Rep. Beckman states that results of her post-election analysis are "troubling." I believe it is the error and ignorance of her analysis that are truly troubling. **I will address each of her seven issues, and at the end I believe you will agree that voting conducted on 30 March 2019 was fair, conducted with accuracy and integrity, and that procedures and bylaws were followed.**

ISSUE #1: More "clicker" voting devices activated and voted than SCC members credentialed.

Rep. Beckman's confusion appears to stem from a lack of differentiation between clickers issued versus votes cast and not accounting for fractional voting. It is a question of fractions and simple math. Each county party is allocated three votes, one each for Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary. However, some counties have multiple Vice Chairmen or Secretaries, so their

votes are split proportionally, e.g. two Vice Chairmen get 0.5 votes each. Each SCC member present, either physically or by proxy (members carrying proxies received more than one clicker), received a clicker, but their vote was adjusted according to their fractional vote if appropriate.

Those 412 clickers represented 383 whole votes and 29 fractional votes. Fractional votes plus whole votes accounted for a total vote potential on the floor that day of 395.97 votes. **This explains why we had 412 clickers issued, but they only registered 396 votes.** No election that occurred that day exceeded these numbers. The four round Chairman's vote totals were as follows: Round 1- 381.61 votes; Round 2 -386.61 votes; Round 3- 384.61 votes; and Round 4- 386.61 votes.

Rep. Beckman's team, Mr. Crane, and ultimately Rep. Beckman, were notified of these numbers, and Mr. Crane was in the Tellers room. He confirmed to me, to her, and to Steve House that these numbers were correct. In ISSUE 4 on Rep. Beckman's list (below) she sent to you, she provided a spreadsheet view with numbers circled; that spreadsheet was created by her representative, Mr. Crane, and all numbers on that sheet add up correctly. This information, including vendor spreadsheets that clearly showed sources of final vote totals, was previously presented to Rep. Beckman and reviewed with her multiple times by multiple individuals.

CONCLUSION: Fractional voting accounts for differences between total clickers issued and total votes cast, and at no time did the number of votes cast exceed the proper number.

ISSUE #2: Teller Committee added voting members without SCC amending credentials.

This is improperly stated. There was a discrepancy of how fractional votes added up in initial credentials discussions that changed it from 394 votes (not voters) to 395.97 votes; however, all four candidate teams knew what was happening, including Rep. Beckman, and everyone accepted the fact and final conclusion that the number was 395.97 total votes.

CONCLUSION: Despite initial miscalculation of fractional votes, the final correct number was agreed to by all parties, was used during all

elections, and did not negatively impact election outcomes. I recommend that in future meetings the Credentials Chairman should use a standardized reporting template to log and communicate in-person, proxy, fractional votes, and clickers issued to improve SCC member and candidate understanding.

ISSUE #3: Proxies were accepted after meeting “Called to Order.”

Rep. Beckman asserts there were 27 “illegal” proxies, and she quoted CRC Bylaws Article VIII Section D in her report. However, she failed to quote Rule 12 of the Standing Rules that were adopted at the meeting. It states: “A proxy of an absent member must be submitted by the proxy holder in person to the Credentials Committee before the meeting is called to order; however, this requirement may be waived by the Credentials Committee in special circumstances. (Art. VIII, § D3.)” Because of the inclement weather, poor road conditions, long distances traveled by many members, and the desire to not deny any member the opportunity to participate (including those who gave traveling members their proxies), we agreed to keep credentialing open. Furthermore, because of the long list of speakers

(elected officials, staff members, and officers) on the agenda, I elected to start the meeting without further delay.

CONCLUSION: The Credential committee has the option to waive the requirement “in special circumstances.” They did so given the poor weather and drive time variations, in coordination with the Chairman, and when they reported amended credentials reports they were accepted unanimously.

ISSUE #4: Total SCC voting membership calculated incorrectly.

I agree that the correct number of maximum votes eligible to be cast was 458, and that implies that the maximum number of clickers able to be issued was higher than 458 because of fractional voting explained above. I recall a number of “459” being initially reported, and there may have been a hearing or transcription error because at no time was “469” ever considered to be a relevant number. It is more significant that neither the total number of clickers nor the total number of votes exceeded the lower number of allowable votes.

This issue is addressed above; a spreadsheet of vendor-supplied voting data was analyzed by Mr. Crane—this is the one with circled numbers Rep. Beckman sent out—and the numbers add up properly. I performed an independent analysis of the same data and reached the same conclusion, and I sent that spreadsheet to Rep. Beckman in a previous email. Some confusion may have resulted from the Credentials spreadsheet that listed members and their authorized votes, regardless of whether they were there in person or by proxy. As an example, an elected official gave me his proxy, but he is listed on the sheet as being entitled to one vote and being present with one vote; similarly, I was shown as being entitled to one vote and being present with one vote. That “votes present” column was the one that was summed to show the total votes present as 395.97.

CONCLUSION: The maximum number of eligible votes allowed to be cast was 458. At no time was this number exceeded, and initial errors appear to have been corrected before votes were cast.

ISSUE #5: Vote totals reported in percentages, not number of votes.

I was informed by the vendor that the display of number of votes would take a (non-specifically) longer time to calculate and display on the screen than just percentages. I made the decision to show only percentages to expedite voting. Final vote totals as well as percentages were provided by the vendor in spreadsheet form, and observers were present in the Tellers room throughout. The display mode did not change election outcomes nor was there any evidence of a problem.

CONCLUSION: Percentages displayed were correct. In future elections, the SCC should pre-coordinate with their vendor to ensure vote totals are displayed concurrent with percentages. Chairman Buck is requesting a bylaws change in the September meeting to address this.

ISSUE #6: Meeting records requested by Beckman campaign prior to Meeting were “lost.”

There was no known written request from her prior to the meeting, and if there was she should have produced it in this report. There are no stipulations in statute, in CRC Bylaws, in standing rules, or in Roberts Rules of Order to retain

or re-examine election data after the meeting is over or to provide them to candidates. The nature of these types of meetings is that once they are completed and the final gavel falls, they are over. The time to protest is during the meeting. Having said that, CRC officers and staff did their best to accommodate Rep. Beckman's requests and did so within two weeks of the election.

Disposal of some proxy forms before meeting end by some well-intentioned volunteers was a mistake, but Mrs. Banberger was able to re-capture and verify all but five proxy forms, a number within the margin of victory.

CONCLUSION: Despite the lack of requirements to do so, the CRC provided Rep. Beckman with information she requested within two weeks of her requests and made every effort to explain processes and perceived discrepancies. Chairman Buck has proposed records keeping and chain of custody changes for the September meeting as well, and the credential process will be reviewed for process improvement and standardization.

ISSUE #7: Relevant documents withheld from Beckman campaign until after SOS filing deadline.

Again, there are no stipulations or requirements in statute, in CRC Bylaws, in Standing Rules, or in Roberts Rules of Order to retain or re-examine election data after the meeting is over; neither was there any withholding of information from Rep. Beckman.

There is a requirement to submit the final list of SCC members to the Colorado Secretary of State within 30 days of the organizational meeting, but that requirement is irrelevant to this discussion.

Mr. House and Mrs. Banberger worked diligently to compile information she requested, and they were delivered to her within two weeks of the election. She could have contested anytime during that period if she or Mr. Crane had concerns.

CONCLUSION: No documents or data were withheld from Rep. Beckman, even though there is no requirement to audit, revisit, or examine election results after the meeting is concluded. I have recommended to Chairman Buck that they develop and institute either policy or proposed bylaw

changes to require the CRC to improve chain of custody and retain pertinent data for a reasonable amount of time to perform audits or accommodate requests such as these.

My final comments on this matter:

You should be confident that the SCC meeting and elections were conducted with fairness, integrity, and accuracy, because they were. We did not achieve perfection, and there have been several recommendations for improvement that the current CRC team will act upon, some of which will require your concurrence. Even if they actually occurred, which I do not believe they did, the sum total of errors raised by Rep. Beckman were less than the margin of victory.

Rep. Beckman makes repeated references to requests she made to current and former CRC Leadership. Neither my fellow officers, Mrs. Banberger, nor I received any of these requests prior to the meeting. I have never received an email from Rep. Beckman on any subject, and I only recall two substantive conversations I have ever had with her, both involving my offer and encouragement for her to use GOP Data Center and our walk/call apps during her campaign. I have no knowledge as to whom these nebulous “leadership” discussions or requests were made.

She also references herself as a non-establishment candidate: “It is important to note that during the election day there is a great deal of responsibility placed on the non-establishment candidate to watch for anomalies that would cause the campaign to challenge the election--on the spot.” This is a laughable, disingenuous comment from someone who has been in elected office for 17 of the past 20 years.

She also impugns the character and competency of our dedicated volunteers and staff when she accuses us all of “...flagrant abuse and violation of CRC Bylaws, Standing Meeting Rules, best practices and transparency.” I hope I have demonstrated to you that her accusations, beyond being insulting and divisive, are incorrect, illogically drawn, or irrelevant or inconsequential to the outcome of the election.

There are right ways to resolve controversies within the CRC Bylaws, including

appeals to the CRC Executive Committee, followed by an appeal the SCC to reconvene. Rep. Beckman's efforts to accuse her fellow Republicans of dishonesty and incompetence and try them in the court of public opinion and through emails only serves to diminish her stature in a failed attempt to tarnish the credibility of the previous administration and undermine that of the legitimately elected Chairman Ken Buck.

I hope we can all move forward with a positive spirit of teamwork and commitment to the significant work ahead. May God bless you all, the Republican Party, our beautiful state, and the greatest thing ever created by mankind, our United States of America.

Earnestly and respectfully,

Jeff Hays

Former Chairman, Colorado Republican Committee.



Paid for by Colorado Republican Committee. Not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee. www.cologop.org



Colorado Republican State Party

5950 S. Willow Drive, Suite 210
Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111

This message reflects the opinions and representations of the Colorado Republican Party. You are

receiving this email because you signed up as a member of the Colorado Republican Party's online community. If you would prefer not to receive future emails from the Colorado GOP, click [here](#).

*Copyright © 2017 - Colorado Republican Party
All rights reserved.*

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)