

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
Contested Materials Collection
Folder List

| <u>Box Number</u> | <u>Folder Number</u> | <u>Document Date</u> | <u>No Date</u> | <u>Subject</u> | <u>Document Type</u> | <u>Document Description</u> |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---|
| 8 | 26 | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Campaign | Other Document | Document appraising the effectiveness of various campaign polling outlets and related companies. 2 pgs. |
| 8 | 26 | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Campaign | Other Document | Document appraising the effectiveness of various campaign polling outlets and related companies. 2 pgs. |

The performance of each vendor is appraised:

CompuGraphics is headed by Terry McCarthy and has close ties with the Cuyahoga County Republican organization through William Bennett. This firm maintains the Cuyahoga County Voter Lists. This firm performed very poorly and should not be considered for any future business. They underestimated the jobs and did not have the technical management talent to accomplish the tasks. One of the Committee's staff was sent to Cleveland to direct the project.

C. Howard Wilson Company is headed by C. Howard Wilson. This company also did a very poor job. Data was in many cases 30 or more days late. Failure to check outputs for correct precinct structure in California caused numerous re-runs, cost the Committee more than \$10,000 and delayed delivery of a usable product more than four weeks in some areas. Technical management was poor. Mr. Wilson left the project to attend to other business. Numerous counties had to be removed from Wilson and given to other vendors because of his poor performance. One of the Committee's staff was sent to California to direct the project.

Although Premier Printing and Mailing had responsibility for only one county, Harris County, they were unable to perform the job and the county was sent to another vendor for conversion. This firm is operating in the dark ages of automation and should not be considered for any work of this type.

Ed Nichols Associates is headed by Edward Nichols and performed creditably for the Committee. Most of the work which was taken from other vendors was sent to Nichols. As the volume of work increased, the quality of the output went down. Nichols was not sufficiently staffed to handle the greater volumes. Second, Nichols made certain promises to Pennsylvania Republicans to allow them access to the data in exchange for their cooperation in obtaining the source data. This was done without Committee approval and against his specific instructions.

A.R.A.P. converted the data for New Jersey and wrote the Committee's edit programs. They subcontracted all programming and computer work to Automated Data Research (ADR), also of Princeton. The A.R.A.P. group was headed by Evan Gray and the ADR programmer was Robert Wickendon. Because A.R.A.P. subcontracted all programming, it is difficult to assess that aspect. However, the technical management at A.R.A.P. was not good. Wickendon was the only person who understood their software. After the last shipment, Wickendon left for a prolonged vacation and no one was available for more than two weeks to correct several problems that developed in their last shipment.

Cambridge Opinion Studies converted voter data for Connecticut. The project was headed by Richard Hochhauser. All the work was from hard copy source data. A major error was made in the position of the telephone number, which caused only the first six digits to be shown on manuscripts. Cambridge regenerated these lists for each one affected.

Cohasset Associates is headed by Bob Williams. All work was done on a subcontract basis. Work was delivered on time. The only complaint is that Williams does not stand behind his work. When errors were detected in precincting the data, causing a re-run, Williams originally agreed to cover the cost of correcting the error and regenerating the manuscript. He later reneged on this agreement.

One other vendor was used during the primary -- Compass Systems of San Diego, California. Compass was contracted to convert California data for the primary election. Tom Hoefeller was Project Manager. The firm did a very poor job -- delivering data for only 20 of the 31 counties required.

In summary, no firm which converted voter registration data did an outstanding job. Some, such as CompuGraphics, Wilson and Premier, did extremely poor jobs and should not be used in the future. Others, such as Nichols, Cohasset, A.R.A.P. and Cambridge did average jobs. In choosing any firm, three criteria must be weighed: technical experience, sufficient manpower and political backing. The greatest single fault with all of the firms with which we dealt was lack of technical management and lack of sufficient resources to do the job. It appears that the companies with political experience in data processing are so small that they lack the means to do the job properly. Similarly, the larger firms, such as UCC, do not have the political experience to handle the jobs.

DATA EDIT AND STANDARDIZATION

A standard computer edit program was developed and supplied to each of the state vendors and to UCC. The purpose of this program was to validate the data in the original county files prior to submission to UCC. The edit was designed to be run as a final processing step by the state vendors after all data had been converted into the standard format. It was also to be run by UCC to validate that the correct data has been submitted by the state vendor. The edit program was designed to validate input data, not correct errors. Thus, it was designed to display real or potential problems for manual checking rather than attempting to correct them.

The edit routine consisted of the following:

1. A set of error-checking sub-routines

The performance of each vendor is appraised:

CompuGraphics is headed by Terry McCarthy and has close ties with the Cuyahoga County Republican organization through William Bennett. This firm maintains the Cuyahoga County Voter Lists. This firm performed very poorly and should not be considered for any future business. They underestimated the jobs and did not have the technical management talent to accomplish the tasks. One of the Committee's staff was sent to Cleveland to direct the project.

C. Howard Wilson Company is headed by C. Howard Wilson. This company also did a very poor job. Data was in many cases 30 or more days late. Failure to check outputs for correct precinct structure in California caused numerous re-runs, cost the Committee more than \$10,000 and delayed delivery of a usable product more than four weeks in some areas. Technical management was poor. Mr. Wilson left the project to attend to other business. Numerous counties had to be removed from Wilson and given to other vendors because of his poor performance. One of the Committee's staff was sent to California to direct the project.

Although Premier Printing and Mailing had responsibility for only one county, Harris County, they were unable to perform the job and the county was sent to another vendor for conversion. This firm is operating in the dark ages of automation and should not be considered for any work of this type.

Ed Nichols Associates is headed by Edward Nichols and performed creditably for the Committee. Most of the work which was taken from other vendors was sent to Nichols. As the volume of work increased, the quality of the output went down. Nichols was not sufficiently staffed to handle the greater volumes. Second, Nichols made certain promises to Pennsylvania Republicans to allow them access to the data in exchange for their cooperation in obtaining the source data. This was done without Committee approval and against his specific instructions.

A.R.A.P. converted the data for New Jersey and wrote the Committee's edit programs. They subcontracted all programming and computer work to Automated Data Research (ADR), also of Princeton. The A.R.A.P. group was headed by Evan Gray and the ADR programmer was Robert Wickendon. Because A.R.A.P. subcontracted all programming, it is difficult to assess that aspect. However, the technical management at A.R.A.P. was not good. Wickendon was the only person who understood their software. After the last shipment, Wickendon left for a prolonged vacation and no one was available for more than two weeks to correct several problems that developed in their last shipment.

Cambridge Opinion Studies converted voter data for Connecticut. The project was headed by Richard Hochhauser. All the work was from hard copy source data. A major error was made in the position of the telephone number, which caused only the first six digits to be shown on manuscripts. Cambridge regenerated these lists for each one affected.

Cohasset Associates is headed by Bob Williams. All work was done on a subcontract basis. Work was delivered on time. The only complaint is that Williams does not stand behind his work. When errors were detected in precincting the data, causing a re-run, Williams originally agreed to cover the cost of correcting the error and regenerating the manuscript. He later reneged on this agreement.

One other vendor was used during the primary -- Compass Systems of San Diego, California. Compass was contracted to convert California data for the primary election. Tom Hoefeller was Project Manager. The firm did a very poor job -- delivering data for only 20 of the 31 counties required.

In summary, no firm which converted voter registration data did an outstanding job. Some, such as CompuGraphics, Wilson and Premier, did extremely poor jobs and should not be used in the future. Others, such as Nichols, Cohasset, A.R.A.P. and Cambridge did average jobs. In choosing any firm, three criteria must be weighed: technical experience, sufficient manpower and political backing. The greatest single fault with all of the firms with which we dealt was lack of technical management and lack of sufficient resources to do the job. It appears that the companies with political experience in data processing are so small that they lack the means to do the job properly. Similarly, the larger firms, such as UCC, do not have the political experience to handle the jobs.

DATA EDIT AND STANDARDIZATION

A standard computer edit program was developed and supplied to each of the state vendors and to UCC. The purpose of this program was to validate the data in the original county files prior to submission to UCC. The edit was designed to be run as a final processing step by the state vendors after all data had been converted into the standard format. It was also to be run by UCC to validate that the correct data has been submitted by the state vendor. The edit program was designed to validate input data, not correct errors. Thus, it was designed to display real or potential problems for manual checking rather than attempting to correct them.

The edit routine consisted of the following:

1. A set of error-checking sub-routines