



A FOLLOW UP TO THE REVIEW OF CACHE
COUNTY ELECTIONS

OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
DEIDRE M. HENDERSON - LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

STATE OF UTAH
OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR



DEIDRE M. HENDERSON
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

October 10, 2025

Dear Cache County Clerk Bryson Behm:

I want to start this letter off by thanking you for your continued efforts to improve the administration of elections in Cache County. In December 2023, prior to your taking office, my staff conducted a thorough review of the Cache County municipal elections and issued a report titled "A Review of Cache County Elections." The report outlined a number of significant issues and violations of state law and gave recommendations for corrective action.

While these issues occurred before you took office, you and your staff have made outstanding efforts and meaningful progress in addressing the issues identified. These improvements demonstrate a strong commitment to your oath of office and responsibilities to administer elections in Cache County.

During the 2025 municipal election, members of my staff spent four days in Cache County observing nearly every aspect of your elections. They reviewed processes to see if and how the recommendations have been implemented. I am pleased to write that they were able to verify that every recommendation made in the report has been fully implemented. Their findings are detailed in the attached report.

We encourage you to continue fine-tuning your processes in the spirit of continuous improvement. Based on our observations, I have included a few suggestions that will support this continued improvement in your processes. With a solid foundation now in place, I encourage you to remain diligent in looking for new ways to strengthen Cache County Elections and to uphold your commitment to Utah election law, administrative rules and best practices.

I appreciate the hard work and the efforts your office has made to make Utah's elections more secure. My staff remains committed to support you with resources, training and guidance as you continue your work.

Sincerely,

Deidre Henderson
Lieutenant Governor

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Section One Findings and Recommendations:

Finding 1.1: *The county clerk's office failed to maintain an equipment maintenance log as required by statute.*

Recommendation 1.1 - The county clerk must create a maintenance log for each piece of equipment. This log should include the name and serial number at the top and the information required in the handbook and statute referenced above. These logs should be maintained in the area where the equipment is stored and updated each time that maintenance is performed.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Maintenance logs created for each machine; stored in equipment area and updated after every service.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the clerk's office fully implemented the recommendation. The LGO reviewed the maintenance log which was available for inspection at the ballot center. The maintenance log has been kept up to date with vendors signing in and logging their activity.

Finding 1.2: *The county clerk's office failed to update its precinct boundaries.*

Recommendation 1.2 - The county should review all of its precinct boundaries and splits to understand why each of them was created. Municipalities and special district stakeholders should be involved in the process. This will aid in preventing ballot error #3 from occurring.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Precinct boundary review completed & signed off by municipalities.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The clerk's office reported having met with both Cache and Logan City school districts and included GIS in order to ensure that all of the maps used by each entity are consistent and correct. The LGO reviewed correspondence between the clerk's office and the districts to verify that this recommendation has been fully implemented. After updating the maps for Logan City School District and the Cache Water District, the clerk's office reviewed the districts' websites for accuracy and noticed their online maps were not correct. The clerk's office followed up to ensure the correct maps are displayed to the public. This proactive approach sets a strong model for the rest of the state and should be adopted as a best practice ahead of every election cycle.

Finding 1.3: *The county clerk's office and municipal recorders failed to properly proof their ballots.*

Recommendation 1.3 - Develop written checklist(s) for ballot proofing that include sign-off and approval from other election officials who have races or propositions on the ballot. This checklist

should document approval from the vendor creating the ballots and the company who will be printing the ballots. The Lieutenant Governor's Office has already created and provided a basic checklist to all counties that they can refine and adjust to meet their needs.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Written proofing checklists and sign-off procedures adopted; double approval required.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The LGO observed that the clerk's office keeps a binder containing copies of each filing form, voter certificate, and logs of all communication with the city recorders regarding ballot proofing and approval. The county clerk's office has implemented a liaison program where each city is assigned to a staff member who coordinates with them regarding election matters. During the 2025 municipal election, one county staff member even drove out to a city that had not approved their ballot proofs.

Finding 1.4 - The county clerk's office improperly deleted candidates out of VISTA.

Recommendation 1.4 - The county should use the "candidate tools and status" in VISTA to manage candidates rather than deleting candidates and races.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Staff trained on candidate status tools; no deletions performed.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Candidates have all been entered into and remain in VISTA, with their status changed as they withdraw, are disqualified, or are otherwise no longer a valid candidate. This ensures there is a record of all candidates and the actions taken regarding their status.

Finding 1.5 - The county clerk's office failed to utilize the resources provided by the Lieutenant Governor's Office for ballot proofing.

Recommendation 1.5 - To prevent what happened in the general election from happening again, the county must review and utilize the resources the Lieutenant Governor's Office has provided, and develop processes and procedures internally to ensure that ballot proofing and exact reviews are performed properly.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – State-provided proofing templates integrated into internal workflow.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The clerk's office utilized resources and checklists to proof ballots.

Furthermore, the clerk's office created original checklists for each city recorder to complete as the cities proofread their ballots. The liaison program implemented by the county clerk ensured that there is active communication between each city and the clerk's office.

Section Two Findings and Recommendations:

Finding 2.1: The county clerk's office failed to perform a statutorily required L&A prior to election day. Falsified documents were presented to the Lieutenant Governor's Office in an attempt to certify the L&A had been performed.

Recommendation 2.1 - A full internal L&A must be completed and documented in accordance with the election handbook and 20A-4-104 before any ballots are processed.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Standardized L&A protocol; signed zero reports and verification logs required.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The LGO viewed documentation for an internal L&A and was present during a public L&A. The public L&A was properly done with two members of the public present. Part-time election workers led the L&A, briefly explaining each step in the process and then running the tests. The results of the L&A were presented in a single report which combined results from two scanners rather than in an individual report for each scanner

The LGO suggests that the clerk's office create separate reporting groups if the clerk wishes to have the ability to break results into different subgroups. This issue was minor in nature and did not affect the outcome of the L&A. The LGO spoke with one of the members of the public to see if they understood what the issue was. This individual expressed that they were comfortable with the test and its results.

Finding 2.2 - The county clerk's office failed to perform a statutorily required public L&A prior to election day.

Recommendation 2.2 - A public L&A must be completed and documented in accordance with the election handbook and 20A-4-104 before any ballots are processed.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Public L&A calendar posted; logs signed and archived for every election.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. See recommendation 2.1.

Section Three Findings and Recommendations:

Finding 3.1 - The county clerk's office failed to properly log or document ballot retrieval. Ballot retrieval was performed by a single individual.

Recommendation 3.1 - Ballot collection must be documented and involve two election officials in accordance with R623-8-5 and 20A-3a-401.1.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Chain-of-custody logs and QR- coded tracking used for all routes.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Cache County staff were observed logging each bag of ballots that was received in the ballot center. Ballots were consistently collected and delivered by teams of 2-3 workers and were transported from pick up location to the clerk's office in sealed bags. The LGO reviewed the log at the ballot center where each ballot delivery is logged in and signed for and found it satisfactory.

Finding 3.2 - *The county clerk's office failed to properly batch ballots or document ballot chain of custody on batch cards.*

Recommendation 3.2 - Ballots must be separated into batches when first received for processing and kept together in that batch for the duration of processing. When ballots are removed from a batch because they are diverted, or challenged, they must be logged and accounted for. The documentation must include the poll workers initials, date, time, and reason. No additional ballots should ever be introduced or commingled with ballots from another batch. At the end of processing, the number of ballots tabulated must be reconciled to the number of ballots that were initially in that batch (See 20A-3a-401.1(4)(5)).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Batch card system implemented; each step signed by two staff.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Cache County has made significant progress in the areas of chain of custody and batching, and has created a process to document each step in the process and who performed it. Each batch was created immediately after being removed from a sealed retrieval bag or from the post office. Election workers accounted for and signed for the ballots in each batch at every step in the process. When ballots were removed, they were logged and tracked. Batches were placed into mail trays and processed one batch at a time so they were never commingled with other batches. As ballots were scanned, the number of ballots scanned in the batch was reconciled with the known number of ballots. This ensured that all ballots were scanned and that no new ballots were introduced.

Finding 3.3 - *The county clerk's office failed to separate batches of ballots as required by law (Utah Code, 20A-3a-401.1(5)(a)) and Administrative Rule R623-8-6.*

Recommendation 3.3 - Ballots that are in Group 1 stage of signature review should be placed in a colored tray that is different from other ballots and stored in a location where they cannot be confused with other batches that have been reviewed (Utah Code, 20A-3a-401.1(5)(a), Administrative Rule R623-8-6)

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Color-coded trays and controlled storage used.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Election workers use colored dots on the batch cards to differentiate what step in the process the batch is. The processes observed at the ballot center adequately and properly addressed the concerns of finding 3.3.

Finding 3.4 - Ballots were processed in two locations: the county clerk's office and the ballot center.

Recommendation 3.4 - Ballots should never be removed from the ballot center for any reason.

Undeliverable ballots and challenged ballots should be processed at the ballot center. This may necessitate the purchase of additional computers to perform those functions on site.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – All processing is centralized in the ballot center with locked cages.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Ballots are processed and stored only at the ballot center. They are never taken back to the main office.

Finding 3.5 - Diverted ballots were not properly batched and handled according to statutorily required chain of custody procedures.

Recommendation 3.5 - The process for handling diverted ballots should be documented with clear chain of custody and reconciliation procedures. Diverted ballots should be logged in new batches with new control numbers while maintaining the ability to trace them back to their original batch if necessary. They should never be added or commingled with the ballots of an existing batch (See 20A-3a-401.1(4)(5)).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Diversion logged on batch cards; Diverted ballots logged & tracked.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Ballots that were diverted or removed from their initial batch were logged and tracked through the process. Ballots that were cured or reintroduced for counting are placed into a new batch that is tracked and initialed by election workers through each step in the process.

Finding 3.6 - The county clerk's office used a Google Sheet rather than VISTA to track challenged ballots. This exposed personal information and created greater potential for errors.

Recommendation 3.6 - Use the built-in VISTA reporting tools to track and send challenged ballot notices instead of using a Google Sheet. If the sheet is used, access and security should be reviewed to ensure proper usage and control.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – All challenges processed through VISTA.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Ballots were tracked through VISTA and on an internal spreadsheet. The internal spreadsheet is not accessible by temp workers, nor is it accessible outside of the ballot center.

Finding 3.7 - Ballots were improperly separated from their original batches and repeatedly handled by one election worker, violating statutorily required chain of custody procedures.

Recommendation 3.7 - Ballots must remain together with their original batch. Two election workers should work on a single batch at a time as they prepare them for scanning (See 20A-3a-401.1(5)(e)).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Dual-control enforced for all processing steps.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Ballots were kept in individual batches with proper documentation. Furthermore, election workers were observed working in pairs or in areas with other election workers. While election workers never handled ballots alone, the process for removing ballots from their envelopes could be strengthened. The area currently used is small with tables that face 4 foot high partitions. The LGO recommends ballots be removed from their envelopes in an area with more space where tables could be placed in a manner that workers could work next to each other at the same table or at tables that face each other.

Finding 3.8 - Ballots were damaged when stored because the rubber bands used were too small. The ballot batches were improperly labeled when stored.

Recommendation 3.8 - Use larger rubber bands or card stock to divide the ballots in storage boxes. Each batch should be clearly labeled and separated in the box. This will organize the ballots without damaging them.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Large bands and divider cards now standard; clear labeling applied.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Large rubber bands have been purchased and are used to keep scanned ballots together without damaging them. Batches were also observed being separated by cardstock divider cards.

Finding 3.9 - The county clerk's office failed to perform statutorily required reconciliation when processing ballots.

Recommendation 3.9 - The number of ballots in a batch should be reconciled with the number of ballots counted by the tabulation machine.

No batch should be finalized until the difference between the number of ballots in a batch and the

number of ballots tabulated is zero. When the batch fully reconciles, the batch card should be signed and then retained with the other election materials.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Mid-day and end- of-day reconciliations required; logs signed.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. After each batch was scanned, the election worker compared the number of ballots scanned with the known number of ballots in the batch to ensure that all ballots were counted and that no new ballots were introduced to the batch. The staff had a button that they would push to announce to the entire ballot center when they reconciled. This added an element of fun for the workers and staff.

Finding 3.10 - The county clerk's office failed to properly label and store ballots after processing was complete.

Recommendation 3.10 - Scanned ballots should be prepared for storage, placed in a storage tote, and sealed. Each county was offered sealable storage totes through Help America Vote Act (HAVA) grant funds available through the Lieutenant Governor's Office. The clerk's office should purchase these totes and seek reimbursement through the grant program. The totes should be clearly labeled with the batches, quantities, date processed, election, and destroy date. Once properly labeled, it should be sealed and securely stored for 22 months (Utah Code, 20A-4-202(1)).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – All ballots sealed in HAVA- approved totes with destroy dates.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. After scanning was complete and the paperwork signed, ballots were rubber banded together in their batch and placed in a tote for storage. The tote had a label that indicates which election it is for, the retention period, and the contents. Once the tote was full, it was sealed and stored in the secure storage area at the ballot center. The LGO walked through the storage area and totes were observed from previous elections with seals in place and proper labels were on each tote.

Finding 3.11 - The county clerk's office failed to perform a statutorily required reconciliation after ballot processing was complete.

Recommendation 3.11 - After each scanning session a reconciliation must be performed by the clerk to ensure that the number of individuals that received vote credit, the number of ballots prepared for scanning, and the number of ballots scanned match. This reconciliation was a point of failure during the primary election. As part of our review, the Lieutenant Governor's Office requested a copy of the reconciliations performed by Cache County; they were not sent in a timely manner and were incomplete. These reconciliations are paramount to ensuring that each verified ballot was scanned and that no batches were scanned multiple times (Utah Code, 20A-4-109).

Statute requires that these reconciliations be publicly available. A final reconciliation is required as part of the canvass report (20A-4-304(2)(g)).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Final reconciliation published in canvass report.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Reconciliation is done at various points during processing and after ballots are scanned as required by statute. The staff has a button that when pushed signals to everyone that the reconciliation matched. The reconciliation of vote histories given exactly matched the number of ballots counted as reported on the Standardized Ballot Statistics Report which was submitted to the LGO following the 2025 Municipal Primary Election.

Finding 3.12 - County election staff were observed performing multiple tasks at the same time. This created unnecessary confusion and opportunities for error.

Recommendation 3.12 - Each process should have a dedicated staff member assigned to oversee that process. These staff members should be free from other responsibilities and distractions while the process they oversee is performed.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Role-specific assignments & ‘teams’ enforced; supervisors verify compliance.

LGO Review:

The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Cache county assigns a staff member to oversee each process. The staff members are able to provide assistance and direction to election workers and are free from other distractions. Staff was able to help election workers and answer questions as needed.

Finding 3.13 - Based on observations during the review, the county election’s office may be inadequately staffed and undertrained.

Recommendation 3.13 - Cache County should review their election staffing plan to determine if more staff are needed, and whether more time should be dedicated to elections to build institutional knowledge and increase employee capacity to oversee processes.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Full & PT staff expanded; seasonal staff trained extensively.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. Staffing during ballot processing was adequate. There was permanent staff available to manage processes, help workers, and collect ballots. The staff was knowledgeable, understanding how to best perform their duties and why the processes they employed were best practices. Perhaps more importantly, this understanding was shared by the election workers and seasonal help.

Section Four Findings and Recommendations:

Finding 4.1 - The county clerk's office failed to perform statutorily required signature audits as outlined in Utah Code.

Recommendation 4.1 - Conduct signature audits regularly during ballot processing and complete these audits before separating any ballot from its envelope (Utah Code, 20A-3a-402.5).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – 1% audit per batch conducted by separate supervisor.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. During observation, signature audits were performed in real time before ballots moved on to the next step. The signature audits were performed by a staff member who was trained and had not done signature review or reviewed challenged ballots.

Finding 4.2 - When signature audits were performed, the individual performing the audit was auditing their own work.

Recommendation 4.2 - Never allow an individual to conduct an audit on their own work (Utah Code, 20A-3a-402.5(2)).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Audits assigned only to staff not involved in initial review.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. See recommendation 4.1

Finding 4.3 - The county clerk's office has not submitted their audit policy to the Lieutenant Governor's Office.

Recommendation 4.3 - Submit a written policy to the Lieutenant Governor's Office on randomly selecting signatures to audit in accordance with the Lieutenant Governor's Audit Policy - Signature Verification Audit Policy (4).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Signature Audit Policy filed with LG's Office.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The Cache County Clerk has a written policy that was submitted to the LGO as required by the LGO's Audit Policy.

Finding 4.4 - The county clerk's office failed to properly document the signature audits performed.

Recommendation 4.4 - Document each signature audit that is performed. The log should include the date, time, ballots audited, who performed the audit, the findings of the audit, and remedial action. (20A-3a-402.5) and the Lieutenant Governor's Audit Policy.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Detailed logs for each audit including date, batch, and findings.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The clerk's office maintains a log of each ballot that was selected for auditing and recorded the audit finding for each ballot.

Finding 4.5 - *The county clerk's office failed to properly batch envelopes after ballots were removed from them.*

Recommendation 4.5 - Once ballots are separated from an envelope, the envelopes should be bundled in batches that correspond to the ballot batches and stored for 22 months.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Envelopes batched and labeled to match ballot batches.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The clerk's office kept envelopes separated by batch. Once all of the ballots were removed, a zip tie was placed through the hole ensuring that each batch of envelopes remained intact. Completed envelopes were stored in sealed totes that are labeled with contents, election, and retention period on them. Once they were sealed, they were placed in the secure storage area.

Section Five Findings and Recommendations:

Finding 5.1 - *The instructions placed on the ballot explaining how a voter can remedy a mistake on their ballot may cause confusion.*

Recommendation 5.1 - The county should revise the instructions placed on the ballot explaining how a voter can correct an error or mistake.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Updated ballot instructions for clarity and compliance.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The LGO reviewed the updated instructions that are included with the ballot. The instructions are clear and well designed.

Finding 5.2 - *The adjudication log used by the county clerk's office does not comply with statute. Adjudications performed by the county were not properly logged.*

Recommendation 5.2 - The county must create and use an adjudication log that is signed by the workers who performed the adjudications. The log should be stored where it is accessible and can be reviewed by the public (R623-8-6).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Logs signed daily and stored for public access.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. While there was no adjudication to observe while the LGO was in the ballot center, the LGO did review the adjudication logs in binders next to the adjudication station.

Finding 5.3 - The Clerk's election staff may not have reviewed the voter intent guide before the election.

Recommendation 5.3 - Workers performing adjudication should be required to review the voter intent guide before each election. A copy of the voter intent guide should be placed at each adjudication station.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Training checklists & state training(s) mandated before adjudication.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The voter intent guide is stored at the adjudication station and staff reviews it with workers prior to performing adjudication. Election workers took the required training provided by the LGO prior to adjudicating ballots as required by law.

Finding 5.4 - The county clerk's office failed to use the replication log created by the Lieutenant Governor's Office as required by statute.

Recommendation 5.4 - Begin using the replication log provided by the Lieutenant Governor's Office in accordance with Utah Code, 20A-4-104(3).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Replication log maintained; staff trained.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The LGO observed the log for ballot remakes at the ballot center.

Finding 5.5 - The county clerk's office was unable to provide the replication log when requested during the review, but did so later.

Recommendation 5.5 - Maintain the replication log where it is available to election workers, and to the public. At the end of each day, a digital copy of the log should be stored and maintained for 22 months 20A-4-104(3)(c).

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Logs scanned daily and archived.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. See recommendation 5.4

Section Six Findings and Recommendations:

Finding 6.1 - The county clerk's office failed to store ballots in accordance with Utah Code and administrative rule.

Recommendation 6.1 - Store scanned ballots in sealable totes. These totes should be clearly marked

with the batches, dates, and retention period. The totes should then be sealed and stored for 22 months following the canvass.

Updated response from Cache County Clerk:

Fully Implemented – Ballots sealed, labeled, and locked for 22 months.

LGO Review: The LGO agrees that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The ballot center has a locked ballot storage area where totes of ballots and envelopes are stored with seals in place. The area is organized and well-labeled.