



**Mesa County
Colorado
Voting Systems**

Report #4

Critical Indicators from the Grand Junction 2021 Election



Jeffrey O'Donnell
February 6 2025

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
PREVIOUS FINDINGS.....	8
CAST VOTE RECORDS – DEFINITION	8
INDICATOR ONE - PRE-ELECTION DAY RESULTS GENERATION.....	8
INDICATOR TWO – INCONSISTENT VOTING BEHAVIOR	10
WHAT IS “VOTER DEFECTION ANALYSIS”?.....	11
TOTAL VOTES PER CONTEST ANALYSIS.....	13
SUMMARY	14
APPENDIX A – COMMANDS FROM EMS USERLOG TABLE	15
BIOGRAPHY	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recently discovered evidence from the 2021 Grand Junction, Colorado Municipal election shows evidence that reports containing interim results for the contests in that election were generated 6 days before election day, allowing these interim results to be viewed and shared in direct contravention to Colorado Revised Statute § 1-7.5-107.5. The foreknowledge of these interim results (which constituted almost half of the eventual ballots cast) could be used to influence or change the final election results in a variety of ways and is an indicator of potential fraud in the election.

In addition, the evidence shows voting behavior which is wildly inconsistent with typical voting patterns both nationally and in Mesa County (in both prior and subsequent elections) which is another indicator of potential fraud in the election.

Both issues are serious and should be fully investigated by proper authorities to determine the individual or individuals involved, the methods used, and the overall effect on all contests.

BACKGROUND

The 2021 Grand Junction Municipal election in Mesa County, Colorado was held on April 6th, 2021, however mail-in ballots began being received and tabulated in late March. The election featured four City Council races as well as three ballot measures, including one involving the legal operation of Marijuana businesses in the city. Although the city council races were officially non-partisan, all four pitted a known conservative candidate (two of which had held chair or vice-chair positions in the Mesa County Republican Party) against four candidates whose views were mostly moderate to unknown.¹

¹ <https://annelandmanblog.com/2021/03/a-quick-summary-of-each-of-the-eight-candidates-running-for-grand-junction-city-council-in-the-april-6-2021-election/>

Mesa County, which includes the city of Grand Junction, is a heavily Republican/Conservative county, as demonstrated by their votes in the last four Presidential elections:²

2012	
Obama	33%
Romney	65%
2016	
Clinton	28%
Trump	64%
2020	
Biden	35%
Trump	63%
2024	
Harris	37%
Trump	61%

Of note is that the Democrat candidate in these elections never received more than 37% of the vote, even with the large amount of evidence of illicit manipulation in some of these elections.³

It has been argued by some that the city of Grand Junction may not reflect the overall political demographic of the entire county. To test this theory, I examined only the Grand Junction precincts in the 2020 Mesa County Cast Vote Record⁴. In the presidential election, these precincts favored President Trump over Joe Biden by 62% - 36%, only a single percentage point difference from the county results. Therefore, this theory is not correct.

In the 2021 Municipal elections, the four conservative candidates were all reported to have lost their elections. The reported results are:

² <https://www.mesacounty.us/departments-and-services/clerk-and-recorder/elections/election-results/election-results-mesa-county>

³ <https://fingerprintsoffraud.com>

⁴ <https://votedatabase.com/cvr/Colorado/Mesa/cvr.csv>

District A	Votes	%
McCallister	6,369	41%
Taggart	9,276	59%
District D	Votes	%
Haitz	6,975	46%
Simpson	8,226	54%
District E	Votes	%
Green	6,119	39%
Herman	9,391	61%
At Large	Votes	%
Andrews	6,179	40%
Reitz	9,138	60%

The shaded candidates are the Conservatives/Republicans. These numbers are alarming because they seem diametrically opposite of the traditional voting patterns of the County.

In November 2020, Tina Peters was elected as the Clerk/Recorder for Mesa County. As such, she was the chief election officer for the April 6, 2021 Municipal election and not acting under the control or authority of the Colorado Secretary of State (See Colorado Revised Statute 1-13.5 which has authority over state and federal elections). However, the election was conducted on the same devices used in the 2020 Presidential election.

Many members of the community, doubting these election results, contacted the Clerk/Recorder, and there was discussion with Mesa County commissioners regarding a hand recount of the 2020 General election and/or 2021 Municipal election – an idea which was supported by many national election integrity advocates. No recount was permitted.

State statutes provide laws and rules regarding preservation of records generated by the election equipment, and a Clerk/Recorder has a duty to preserve these records:

*“The designated election official shall be responsible for the preservation of **any election records** for a period of at least twenty-five months after the election or until time has expired for which the record would be needed in any contest proceedings, whichever is later.”* Colo. Rev. Stat. § 1-7-802 (emphasis added)

In May 2021, the month after the Municipal election, Dominion Voting Systems (in concert with the Colorado Secretary of State's office) announced that they would be installing a new "Trusted Build" of the election management systems in Mesa County. It was learned that installation of this "Trusted Build" would destroy all files which currently resided on the election management systems, which contained record of Mesa County elections back to 2019. Learning of this imminent destruction of her county's data – for which she was solely responsible - Clerk/Recorder Peters initially sought help in creating a complete forensic backup of the election systems but was refused by the county IT department (stating that they were not permitted to touch election equipment). Other attempts to receive assistance through "official channels" were unsuccessful.

With time to save the data growing short, Clerk/Recorder Peters arranged for a computer systems expert to make a forensic image⁵ of the Election Management Server and observe the installation of the "Trusted Build". For valid reasons (not deemed admissible at trial by the Judge), she chose to honor the expert's request to keep their identity confidential. The expert created the forensic images and clerk recorder Peters made a video of the "Trusted Build".

The state subsequently brought charges against Clerk/Recorder Peters, and she was convicted of some of them and sentenced to prison. The defense maintained that Clerk/Recorder Peters acted lawfully and was the subject of a vindictive and retaliatory prosecution, essentially claiming that she was prosecuted for preserving the election data, which was one of her most important duties under Colorado and Federal law.

In the end, she did preserve her election systems' data, and that data has proven extremely useful to analysts investigating election fraud across the country.

Sadly, all but two of the Colorado counties using Dominion Voting Systems had their critical election records destroyed by this "Trusted Build" – they had no Clerk who was aware of the danger and was willing to preserve the records.

⁵ A forensic image is a bit for bit copy of a computer's hard drive, saved in a manner in which authenticity and chain-of-custody is verifiable

PREVIOUS FINDINGS

My previous report, *Mesa County Report 3*⁶, details evidence of database manipulation occurring during the early-voting periods of both the November 2020 and April 2021 elections. The report *Mesa County Report 2*⁷, authored by Doug Gould, details the serious flaws in the security and recordkeeping found in the County election management server.

These findings create an environment where fraud should not only be possible - but expected.




CAST VOTE RECORDS – DEFINITION

Within the system software of most election machine vendors exists several tools designed to assist with post-election auditing. A Cast Vote Record is, in its simplest form, a text list of all ballots received in an election (in spreadsheet form). The ballots are listed sequentially as they were scanned during counting to create an auditable record of each individual voting transaction as it occurred, allowing the “replay” of any race vote by vote. They contain, at a minimum, the specific candidates or races which were counted and the selections chosen by a voter. Additional information about Cast Vote Records is available in the *Fingerprints of Fraud* report referenced above.

INDICATOR ONE - PRE-ELECTION DAY RESULTS GENERATION

“The election official in charge of the mail ballot counting place shall take all precautions necessary to ensure the secrecy of the counting procedures, and no information concerning the count shall be released by the election officials or watchers until after 7 p.m. on election day.” Colo. Rev. Stat. § 1-7.5-107.5

The Mesa County Election Management Server (EMS) system generated three separate Cast Vote Records for the Grand Junction 2021 Municipal election. They were generated at the date and time encoded into the filename.

 CVR_Export_20210331095511	3/31/2021 11:55 AM	Microsoft Excel Comma Separated Values File	1,325 KB
 CVR_Export_20210408114258	4/8/2021 1:43 PM	Microsoft Excel Comma Separated Values File	2,669 KB
 CVR_Export_20210415140223	4/15/2021 4:02 PM	Microsoft Excel Comma Separated Values File	2,674 KB

⁶ <https://fingerprinthoffraud.com/mesacountyreport3.pdf>

⁷ <https://fingerprinthoffraud.com/mesacountyreport2.pdf>

The first was 03/31 at 09:55:11, the second on 4/8 at 11:42:58, and the last on 4/15 at 14:02:23. Of concern is the Cast Vote Record report generated the morning of March 31st, during the counting of absentee ballots but before election day (April 6th). Coincidentally, March 31, 2021 at 9:55AM is the morning following the day of the database duplication/ballot reprocessing event detailed in *Mesa Report 3*. Nearly half of all ballots which would eventually be cast had been counted at this point.

The questions raised by the existence of this early Cast Vote Record report include "Why was it generated?" and "Was it then shared outside of the Mesa County Elections Office?". In addition, it must be asked whether it was generated intentionally by a county employee or covertly generated by the EMS system.

In addition to the Cast Vote Record, entries in the EMS User Log Table show that, at the same time, Election Night Reporting files were generated. The only purpose of these files is to transmit them to Clarity Elections/Scytl. There is no valid reason why these files would be generated before election day, and if they were in any way disseminated it is a violation of the above statute. The commands to generate these report files were issued under the "RTRAdmin" account, which is linked to Sandra Brown in the EMS database. However, this account shares a common password with the following accounts with access to the Mesa County Election Management computers:

Username	First	Last
Techadvisor	John	Smith
RTRAdmin	Sandra	Brown
Admin	Sandra	Brown
Tsealey	Tiffany	Sealey
RTRTsealey	Tiffany	Sealey
Bbantz	Brandi	Bantz
RTRDcoulter	Daniel	Coulter
RTRBbantz	Brandi	Bantz
Dcoulter	Daniel	Coulter

It is possible that a remote user or even rogue software processes within the EMS system initiated the generation of these reports. The above-referenced *Mesa Report 2* provides evidence of dozens of Wi-Fi capable devices within the Mesa County Election network, and *Mesa Report 3* provides evidence of a “rogue application” making changes to the data without the knowledge of the election personnel.

The laws against releasing election results before the end of an election exist to prevent anyone wishing to commit fraud in an election from knowing how many added or changed votes are needed to produce a desired result. The fact that these results were generated six days before election day is a serious indicator of potential fraud.

Appendix A contains a list of the commands and actions performed related to the CVR and ENR file creation.

INDICATOR TWO – INCONSISTENT VOTING BEHAVIOR

The discovery of the 2021 Cast Vote Record⁸ provided, for the first time, the ability to examine individual ballots to determine the voting patterns from that election. The file was located on the image of the “NAS” (Network Attached Storage) device created on May 24th, 2021.

All residents of Grand Junction had the opportunity to vote for all candidates and measures, regardless of their home district. This allowed the comparison of individual ballots to determine if voters significantly split their votes between the conservative candidates and the others. As the final numbers show less than an 800 vote difference between the conservative candidates, it was not expected that there was significant “ticket splitting”.

However, my Voter Defection Analysis of the Cast Vote Record data tells a different, and difficult to explain, story.

⁸ https://votedatabase.com/cvr/Colorado/Mesa/Mesa%2021021%20CVR_Export_20211111152138.csv-2022-7-30%200.31.17.csv

WHAT IS “VOTER DEFECTION ANALYSIS”?

Official numbers detailing how many people split their tickets between parties are not easy to find. The AI assistant “Grok” gives the following response when asked what percentage of voters split their votes between different party candidates.⁹

- **Recent Trends:**

- By 2012, only 26 out of 435 House districts (about 6%) split their votes between the presidential and House candidates.
- In 2016, not a single state voted for a different party for their senator than their presidential pick.
- During the 2020 election, this phenomenon reached an all-time low, with only 7.1% of voters casting different party ballots for the Senate and the presidency.

- **Specific Figures:**

- In the 2020 presidential election, approximately 1.9% of Republican voters in battleground states who supported Republican candidates for both Congress and state legislative seats split their ticket by voting for Joe Biden. Conversely, about 1% of Democrats who voted for lower-office Democrats split their ticket for Donald Trump.

- **General Estimate:** Given the steep decline, an overall estimate across all elections would place the percentage of ticket-splitting voters much lower in recent years compared to historical norms. However, exact percentages vary by election cycle, with a clear trend towards polarization reducing split-ticket voting to under 10% in recent presidential and congressional elections.
-

⁹ <https://x.com/i/grok/share/O1AFdrLs1vSYbFr3l2Xp7ouPR>

Using data from millions of races over multiple elections, I developed a method of calculating the amount of “ticket splitting” which occurred – defined as the voters who voted for candidates of different parties in one election, by candidate - and my findings put the average of this at approximately 5%, with more than 10% being an outlier. This matches well with the above analysis. I named the metrics I developed “Voter Defection Analysis”.

GRAND JUNCTION 2021 VOTER DEFECTION ANALYSIS

I must note that because specific party affiliations were not listed on the ballot, the rate of “defections” may be higher because of lack of information for the voter. However, according to local sources familiar with the campaigns, the platforms and affiliations of the candidates, particularly the conservative candidates, were well known. That, taken with the established conservative bias of the county and city, we should not expect a significant deviation from the averages above.

This table shows, according to the Cast Vote Record, how many voters who voted for any of the four conservative candidates (in the left column) did *not* vote for the conservative candidate listed across the top. The Marijuana measure (votes for “no” considered the “conservative” choice) is included for comparison.

The table can be read as per this example: 6,369 voters voted for McCallister. 1,896 (29.8%) of those voters voted for Hartz’s opponent. 1,752 (27.5%) of them voted for Green’s opponent, and 1,599 (25.1%) voted for Andrews’ opponent. (The numbers appear twice because this analysis separates votes for any other candidate from votes for the specific opponent, and there were no third-party candidates in these races).

All						
REPUBLICANS		Candidate (% voters selected a different candidate on top, % voters selected the Democrat on bottom)				
Candidate (voted for)	Votes	Mark McCallister	Greg Haitz	Jody Green	Kraig Andrews	No
Mark McCallister CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT A	6,369		29.8% (1,896)	27.5% (1,752)	25.1% (1,599)	39.5% (2,515)
			29.8% (1,896)	27.5% (1,752)	25.1% (1,599)	39.5% (2,515)
Greg Haitz CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT D	6,975	36.6% (2,556)		38.7% (2,700)	36.4% (2,536)	44.4% (3,097)
		36.6% (2,556)		38.7% (2,700)	36.4% (2,536)	44.4% (3,097)
Jody Green CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT E	6,119	25.2% (1,545)	29.9% (1,829)		25.6% (1,565)	40.0% (2,448)
		25.2% (1,545)	29.9% (1,829)		25.6% (1,565)	40.0% (2,448)
Kraig Andrews CITY COUNCIL AT-LARGE	6,179	26.2% (1,619)	30.2% (1,869)	28.8% (1,781)		40.1% (2,477)
		26.2% (1,619)	30.2% (1,869)	28.8% (1,781)		40.1% (2,477)
No CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION REFERRED MEASURE 2B	7,063	38.5% (2,721)	36.8% (2,601)	39.6% (2,798)	38.0% (2,683)	
		38.5% (2,721)	36.8% (2,601)	39.6% (2,798)	38.0% (2,683)	
DEFECTION %		32.1%	31.8%	34.0%	31.6%	41.1%
DEM %		32.1%	31.8%	34.0%	31.6%	41.1%

The bottom line shows the overall defection away from the four candidates, 32.1%, 31.8%, 34%, and 31.6% respectively.

This was not the expected outcome. I have personally analyzed hundreds of counties across the country in 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2024 elections, and have never encountered this amount of seemingly random ticket splitting. If we are to use our “common sense”, the likelihood of these numbers occurring naturally is very remote indeed and is a serious indicator of potential fraud.

TOTAL VOTES PER CONTEST ANALYSIS

Comparing the raw vote totals for the seven races discloses another anomaly in this election. The following are the total votes cast for each race:

CITY COUNCIL AT-LARGE	15,319
CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT A	15,646
CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT D	15,202
CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT E	15,512
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION REFERRED MEASURE 2A	16,575
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION REFERRED MEASURE 2B	16,841
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION REFERRED MEASURE 2C	16,200

The measure with the least number of total votes (2C) has over 550 more votes than the highest City Council total (District A). It is difficult to understand why more people were more interested in the ballot measures

than the candidates representing them in City Council. While 2B, the Marijuana measure, did have a lot of public interest, the greater interest in 2C, which dealt with a zoning issue, than in City Council is puzzling.

SUMMARY

Based upon the above findings, I suspect it highly likely that these results show manipulation of the votes by a computer algorithm which would have switched votes and then apportioned them without taking care to “balance” changes made to one race with changes made to other races. As the 2021 races do not show evidence of the “Mesa Pattern” seen in 2020, it is my opinion that a new algorithm or technique was used in this local election, possibly because the methods available in the general election were not available in this local election.

The generation of the March 31st Cast Vote Record and Election Night Reporting files is, at the very least, a clear violation of procedures and, at the worst, evidence of criminal action.

It is troubling that the decision to update Mesa County’s election software was made soon after this election, as this operation deleted all of the data on the existing servers, completely destroying any ability to detect the findings shown above. Once again, the only reason that we have detailed information from the 2020 or 2021 election in Mesa County and Grand junction is that Tina Peters made sure it was preserved.

These issues require immediate attention and investigation by proper authorities. An altered or illegally added vote in any election disenfranchises every legal voter in that election, and public confidence in our elections will only be restored by complete transparency and full legal enforcement of our election laws.

Furthermore, it is my opinion that these findings vindicate Clerk/Recorder Tina Peters’ actions, as her instincts were correct when they told her that there were serious problems in Mesa County elections, problems that would have been forever hidden had she not taken quick action to preserve the election system data.

APPENDIX A – COMMANDS FROM EMS USERLOG TABLE

User	Action	Timestamp
RTRAdmin	User initiates the Cards Cast Report activity	3/31/21 9:53:13AM
RTRAdmin	Started synchronization of reporting data.	3/31/21 9:53:15AM
RTRAdmin	User initiates the Export Type activity	3/31/21 9:54:27AM
RTRAdmin	Started synchronization of reporting data.	3/31/21 9:54:31AM
RTRAdmin	Preparing data	3/31/21 9:54:31AM
RTRAdmin	Started creation of export reports.	3/31/21 9:54:31AM
RTRAdmin	Started sending results at 3/31/2021 9:54:47 AM	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Started getting report Batches Loaded Report.xml from NAS.	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Started getting report Colorado Export by Portion.csv from NAS.	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Number of transfer points to process: 2	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Sending results to local drive/network share: \\Emsserver\NAS\2021 City of Grand Junction Municipal Election	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Sent successfully 1/1	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Successfully processed: 2	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Errors while processing: 0	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Sending results to local drive/network share: C:\Users\emsadmin01\Desktop\City of Grand Junction Municipal Election 2021 Files\Exports	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Sent successfully 1/1	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Finished sending results at 3/31/2021 9:54:47 AM	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Started sending results at 3/31/2021 9:54:47 AM	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Number of transfer points to process: 2	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Sending results to local drive/network share: \\Emsserver\NAS\2021 City of Grand Junction Municipal Election	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Started getting report Daily Balancing Report.xml from NAS.	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Send completed	3/31/21 9:54:32AM
RTRAdmin	Sending results to local drive/network share: C:\Users\emsadmin01\Desktop\City of Grand Junction Municipal Election 2021 Files\Exports	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Sent successfully 1/1	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Send completed	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Errors while processing: 0	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Successfully processed: 2	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Started sending results at 3/31/2021 9:54:47 AM	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Finished sending results at 3/31/2021 9:54:47 AM	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Sending results to local drive/network share: \\Emsserver\NAS\2021 City of Grand Junction Municipal Election	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Number of transfer points to process: 2	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Sent successfully 1/1	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Errors while processing: 0	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Finished sending results at 3/31/2021 9:54:47 AM	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Sending results to local drive/network share: C:\Users\emsadmin01\Desktop\City of Grand Junction Municipal Election 2021 Files\Exports	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Successfully processed: 2	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Send completed	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Sent successfully 1/1	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	Sent successfully 1/1	3/31/21 9:54:40AM
RTRAdmin	User initiates the Export Type activity	3/31/21 9:54:53AM

BIOGRAPHY

Jeffrey O'Donnell is a Full Stack software and database developer and analyst. He holds Bachelor's degrees in Computer Science and Mathematics from the University of Pittsburgh.

Over the last 42 years, Mr. O'Donnell has worked and consulted for numerous private sector corporations, including Rockwell International, Westinghouse Electric Nuclear, General Defense, U.S. Steel, Mellon Bank, IOTA 360, and the Penn State Applied Research Laboratory. For several years he also delivered and created computer science curriculum for the Community College of Allegheny County.

For the last two decades, Mr. O'Donnell has developed numerous "big data" analysis systems, including systems to provide short-term stock market investors with new types of research and predictive analytics.

Since 2021, Mr. O'Donnell has produced and delivered numerous reports detailing his analysis of election data and state registration rolls.

He currently is Chief Information Officer of Hughes Technology Group.

Thank you to Col. Shawn Smith for assistance in preparing this document.