



REPORT ON
**THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION
IN MICHIGAN**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Senator Edward McBroom – Chair

Senator Lana Theis – Majority Vice Chair

Senator Jeff Irwin – Minority Vice Chair

Senator John Bizon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER FROM THE CHAIR - SENATOR EDWARD McBROOM	3
I. INTRODUCTION	5
II. ACTIONS AND OBJECTIVES	5
III. SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ALLEGATIONS	5
IV. INVESTIGATION AND FINDINGS.....	6
V. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION	33
VI. APPENDIX	

LETTER FROM THE CHAIR **SENATOR EDWARD McBROOM**

When I agreed to begin investigating the election, rumors and uncertainty were rampant. Allegations of markers bleeding through ballots, voter intimidation, dead voters, mystery ballot dumps, foreign interference, and ballot harvesting were just a few of the issues during the first days following the November 2020 election. Emotions and confusion were running wild across the country. Fears and hopes were had by every person, including myself.

On one hand was the hope some had to overturn the election. That hope was necessarily coupled with a dreadful reality that our elections were unsound. On the other hand was hope the election was accurate, coupled necessarily with those who feared the direction the victor would take the country.

I made it clear at the start that the investigation effort would be taken with a firm commitment to truth and a goal to reassure the citizens of this state that their votes counted. Within a few weeks, the State Board of Canvassers also unanimously requested the Legislature conduct a serious investigation into the election.

I believe the people deserve to know all the truth and to see their representatives seeking answers. People were understandably confused by new laws, practices, orders and determinations from the governor and secretary of state and it is right and proper for them to demand answers. This right and obligation was unfairly and unfortunately discounted by many on my own side of the aisle after the 2016 election when the other party lost and felt sure some illicit or improper actions must have taken place. When they did regain power, they were quick to utilize all of it to spend two years chasing every conspiracy and specious allegation. I pray my own party will not repeat this mistake for the next four years.

Digging into the mechanics of the election was labor intensive, but very revealing. We found both real vulnerabilities and resiliency to the systems. We also discovered the extent to which our elections officials go to facilitate our elections. The report goes into considerable detail on many of these issues and I hope readers will be reassured by the security and protections in place, motivated to support reforms that are needed, and grateful to our fellow citizens that do the hard work.

The greater challenge to this effort has been seeking the truth amid so much distrust and deception. Our present times are full of reasons for citizens to distrust their government, politicians, and leaders. The last year has seen so much amplification of this distrust. Perhaps it has never been more rampant and, certainly, modern communication helps to fan the flames of lies and distrust into an unquenchable conflagration.

“All politicians lie” is the popular axiom. Unfortunately, lies and deceit are not exclusive to politicians. Throughout our investigation, members have been actively following and engaged with various persons and reports. We have collectively spent innumerable hours watching and listening and reading. Some of these people and reports are true. Unfortunately, many of them are not, either because of a misunderstanding or an outright deception. As is often the case, the truth is not as attractive or as immediately desirable as the lies and the lies contain elements of truth.

Regardless of my status as a chairman, senator, politician, Christian, or human, I do not expect or desire my words in this report to be simply accepted. Instead, I ask all to simply put into

(Continued)

LETTER FROM THE CHAIR
SENATOR EDWARD McBROOM

their determinations the same particular guidance all persons ought to consider when weighing evidence. We must all remember: “extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof” and “claiming to find something extraordinary requires first eliminating the ordinary.” Also, sources must lose credibility when it is shown they promote falsehoods, even more when they never take accountability for those falsehoods.

At this point, I feel confident to assert the results of the Michigan election are accurately represented by the certified and audited results. While the Committee was unable to exhaust every possibility, we were able to delve thoroughly into enough to reasonably reach this conclusion. The strongest conclusion comes in regard to Antrim County. All compelling theories that sprang forth from the rumors surrounding Antrim County are diminished so significantly as for it to be a complete waste of time to consider them further.

Most of the rigorous debate over additional audits comes from fears surrounding the technology used and its vulnerabilities as allegedly demonstrated in Antrim County. Without any evidence to validate those fears, another audit, a so-called forensic audit, is not justifiable. Michigan’s already completed post-election audit and risk-limiting audit are also far more substantive than Arizona’s standard audit. However, I am keeping a close eye on the legislatively initiated forensic audit in Arizona and will continue to ask questions regarding other election issues I feel are not settled. If genuine issues are shown in Arizona’s audit or from continued investigation here, I will not hesitate to ask the Committee to consider recommending an audit or amending this report.

I must acknowledge and thank my staff that spent so much of their work and personal time on this report. I also want to thank my current Committee members, along with those that participated and served during these hearings last term, Sens. Lucido, MacDonald, and Santana. Staff from those offices, the Senate, and the Committee’s clerk all went above and beyond to facilitate these hearings in very difficult situations and deserve sincere thanks. Finally, as the report says in its conclusion, I want to thank the citizens of this state. Whether or not one agrees with the report or even the conducting of the investigation, those opinions were shared with myself and the Committee. An active and passionate public is critical to maintaining our republic and your participation is reassuring that attribute is alive and well.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ed McBroom". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Sen. Ed McBroom, Chair

I. INTRODUCTION

Beginning on Nov. 7, 2020, the Senate Oversight Committee (the “Committee”) commenced an inquiry into claims of election fraud and impropriety. Chair McBroom made clear that the purpose of this inquiry was not to change the outcome of the election for President of the United States. Rather, the goal of the Committee was to provide elected officials and Michigan residents a better understanding of where the administration of elections can be reformed and strengthened, ensuring that Michigan citizens can have confidence in our election processes. This report contains findings and suggestions developed from 28 hours of testimony from almost 90 individuals spanning nine committee hearings, the review of thousands of pages of subpoenaed documents from multiple government entities, hundreds of hours of Senate staff investigation, and countless reviews of claims and concerns from Michigan residents. A detailed examination of all evidence presented to the Committee established an undeniable conclusion; while there are glaring issues that must be addressed in current Michigan election law, election security, and certain procedures, there is no evidence presented at this time to prove either significant acts of fraud or that an organized, wide-scale effort to commit fraudulent activity was perpetrated in order to subvert the will of Michigan voters.

II. ACTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

The Committee’s primary objective was to produce an informative and actionable report by undertaking the following actions: 1) Investigate claims of impropriety, fraud, error, and mismanagement of certain election processes; 2) Determine whether any of the claims brought forward were substantiated by evidence; and 3) Identify areas of Michigan election law where reform or an updating of the statute may be required in order to ensure transparency and confidence in the election process. The Committee made it clear that first-person accounts reporting alleged improprieties were given higher value as evidence to address these claims, in addition to professional and expert testimony regarding the technical operation of state and local election procedures and vote tabulation.

III. ISSUES AND ALLEGATIONS

- 1. Deceased and Non-Residents Voting**
- 2. Unsolicited Absentee Voter Ballot and Application Mass Mailings**
- 3. 3rd Party/Private Funds Used for Public Election Activities and Equipment**
- 4. Rights and Duties of Poll Challengers/Watchers Improperly and Unlawfully Restricted**
- 5. Antrim County Results**
- 6. Operating Issues with Tabulators and Precinct Computers**
- 7. Signature Verification Process**
- 8. Jurisdictions Reporting More Than 100% Voter Turnout**
- 9. Absentee Ballots Tabulated Multiple Times**
- 10. Thousands of Ballots “Dumped” at the TCF Center on Election Night/The Next Morning**
- 11. Vote Totals Abnormal Compared to Past Presidential Election and Other Vote Count Irregularities**
- 12. Additional Issues**
- 13. Audits**

IV. INVESTIGATION AND FINDINGS

OVERVIEW OF INVESTIGATION

The Committee received many complaints of election fraud throughout the state in the days following the 2020 election. The Committee reviewed these claims through several avenues, including but not limited to the manners outlined below:

- Engaged with local and county election officials to discuss the procedures utilized to administer the election, in addition to confirming certain vote totals where alleged misreporting occurred.
- Researched the claims of deceased individuals having a vote cast in their name by reviewing obituaries, various online databases, social media posts, as well as speaking with individuals who made the claims or were the subject of those claims.
- Called individuals who were said to have received unsolicited absentee ballots through the mail.
- Subpoenaed and reviewed documentation of communications from the secretary of state's office regarding pre-election mailings.
- Subpoenaed and reviewed documents and communications from the Livonia and Detroit city clerks related to election activities and vote tabulation.
- Received testimony from Kent County Clerk Lisa Lyons, Ingham County Clerk Barb Byrum, Lansing City Clerk Chris Swope, and Grand Rapids City Clerk Joel Hondorp, regarding the election processes in their respective municipalities and any reforms they would recommend.
- Received testimony from Antrim County Clerk Sheryl Guy, detailing the events that led to the reporting of incorrect, unofficial vote tallies which cascaded into accusations of vote switching and machine tampering in Antrim County.
- Received many hours of first-hand testimony regarding the events that transpired at the TCF Center on and around Election Day. This testimony was in addition to the more than 200 sworn affidavits submitted by first-hand and second-hand witnesses that were reviewed by the Committee.
- Received testimony from Chris Thomas, the Senior Elections Advisor for the city of Detroit at the time of the November 2020 election and former Michigan state director of elections, who was stationed at the TCF Center.
- Received testimony from Dominion Voting Systems CEO, John Poulus, on the company's role in providing voting equipment to several Michigan municipalities and whether they played a role in the reporting of incorrect results in Antrim County. Testimony was also received from officials representing Dominion competitors, Election Systems & Software (ES&S) and Hart InterCivic regarding those same issues.
- The chair and individual committee members researched additional claims of election fraud or impropriety made by individuals in Michigan and from across the country.

INITIAL REPORT ON **THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN**

- Received testimony from Republican and Democratic party officials regarding election training for volunteers and workers, and how that training, or lack of, impacted the events at the TCF Center and other polling places.
- Received testimony from Monica Palmer, Chair of the Wayne County Board of Canvassers, on what she experienced during the canvassing process in the 2020 election and how it could be improved.
- Met with other canvassers from around the state to understand their process and receive their observations.
- The chair and individual committee members met with various clerks around the state to discuss problems, allegations, and solutions.
- The chair and committee members spent countless hours watching and reading documentaries, news stories, and presentations regarding election issues.
- The chair and committee members examined the testimony provided by witnesses in front of the House Oversight Committee.
- The chair followed many allegations to specific sources and involved parties to ascertain the veracity or feasibility of such allegations.

FINDINGS

1. Deceased and Non-Residents Voting

The Committee researched these claims and concluded that most were false. There were two claims of deceased individuals casting votes that were found to be true; one was a clerical error while the other was a timing issue. The Committee concluded that none of these constituted fraudulent election activities or manipulations. The Committee also received claims of citizens who no longer live in the state of Michigan but had allegedly voted in the state's elections. These claims proved to be false upon researching each incident brought to the Committee's attention. An example of some of the claims are detailed below (the names of the individuals have been omitted to respect their privacy).

A widow from the Grand Blanc/Burton area claimed her husband, who passed away in 2013, had voted in the 2020 election. Senate staff searched the state database with the information provided by the individual and were not able to find her husband in the database. This would indicate that he had been removed from the voter database and his identity could not have been used to vote in the 2020 election.

A husband and wife, formerly of Jackson County and now living in Louisiana, claimed they saw documentation online that they had voted in Michigan during the 2020 general election. After researching the claim, it was discovered that they were mailed an absentee ballot application and are still registered to vote in Michigan. However, the state website shows that the local clerk did not receive returned and completed absentee ballot applications in these voters' names.

The Committee was also provided a list of over 200 individuals in Wayne County who were believed to be deceased yet had cast a ballot. A thorough review of individuals on that list showed only two instances where an individual appeared to have voted but was deceased. The first individual was a 118-year-old man whose son has the same name and lives at the same residence. The Committee found there was no fraud in this instance but was instead a clerical error made due to the identical name. The second individual was a 92-year-old woman who died four days before the November 2020 election. Research showed she had submitted her completed absentee ballot prior to the November 2020 election and prior to her death. Notably, research showed the secretary of state and clerks were able to discover and remove approximately 3,500 absentee ballots submitted by voters while they were alive but died before Election Day, which is a commendable accomplishment.

The Committee recommends county clerks be given the ability to assist in removing deceased voters from the Qualified Voter File (QVF). The Committee also recommends the secretary of state research and pursue methods, including statutory changes, that would prevent and identify those voting in multiple states.

2. Unsolicited Absentee Voter Ballot and Application Mass Mailings

Citizens across the state were left confused and frustrated by the arrival of applications for long deceased family members, those who have moved to other states, or persons never present at that address. It appears the lists chosen by the secretary of state's Bureau of Elections were often older and previously purged. Local clerks were also frustrated as the applications duplicated some of their work and caused citizens to call on them for answers. Finally, the original mailing appeared to be not set up to return to the secretary of state to at least inform them of undeliverable applications.

The Committee subpoenaed the secretary of state for communications related to pre-election mailings. While a court ruled that the Secretary of State was permitted to send these mass mailings, there were significant communications between the department and Rock the Vote, a group which tends to target young persons and those with more left of center political leanings.

During the review of these communications, the Committee was simultaneously researching claims made in testimony and in court filings related to the absentee ballot process. Many court filings and individuals highlighted a data spreadsheet by an individual who claimed to have worked with "experts" to determine whether individuals had received an unsolicited absentee ballot. The spreadsheet indicated that "289,866 illegal votes" had been cast. This figure came from the Voter Integrity Project. To arrive at this number, the group used a methodology where they called 1,500 voters and asked if they had received a ballot without requesting it, something that would be illegal although not specifically indicative of fraudulent voting. The number of affirmative answers were then extrapolated out to 289,866 voters statewide receiving these ballots which are defined as "illegal ballots." The repeated use of the terminology "illegal ballots" is misleading and causes significant confusion as it implies fraudulent votes or votes received that do not come from legitimate sources or should not be counted. However, while it may not be lawful to send ballots without first receiving an application, voting this ballot is not an illegal action by a lawful voter and it is not indicative of fraudulent or illicit behavior of the voter nor of an illegitimate vote.

The Committee called forty individuals from this list at random. Only two individuals reported having received an absentee ballot without making a proper request. One of the two individuals is labeled as a permanent, absentee voter within the state's QVF file, indicating that they had, at some point, requested to be placed on that list. The other individual voted via an absentee ballot in the August primary election, and it is possible they checked the box to vote absentee in the subsequent election and simply forgot they had chosen this option. Throughout discussions with these individuals, as well as others who claimed they had received an unsolicited ballot, it became clear that many equated receiving an absentee ballot application with receiving an absentee ballot. These are separate steps in the absentee voting process, with receiving an absentee ballot requiring that an application be completed and submitted by the voter. **There was no evidence presented to the Committee indicating that hundreds of thousands of absentee voter ballots were mailed to Michigan voters without previously being requested.**

INITIAL REPORT ON **THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN**

Further inquiry conducted by the chair and committee members with county and local clerks confirmed how difficult it would be for a citizen to attempt to fraudulently utilize the ballot of another, if the stolen application addressee voted at their actual, present location in Michigan. While the act of obtaining and submitting the ballot of another individual is not impossible, committing voter fraud in this manner undetected is unlikely, as the Qualified Voter File would immediately have a notation of the vote for the voter and the second attempt to request a ballot or to vote would not be allowed without investigation and explanation. Whether the real voter or the fraudulent

The Committee concludes this demonstrates a clear vulnerability for fraud that may be undetected, if the actual voter does not vote at all. If the actual voter does vote, it will create turmoil and draw attention from state and local officials. However, the lack of any such incidents or turmoil in the November 2020 election creates a clear probability that no such efforts were committed to any significant extent. The chance of encountering the attempted double vote scenario is so statistically unlikely as to make impossible even a small effort to do so.

Additionally, the mailing of unsolicited applications allows for two other related vulnerabilities. Applications sent to the former Michigan addresses of those moved out of state and applications sent to the new addresses of former Michigan citizens now registered to vote in another state constitute a real and virtually undetectable potential for fraudulent activity. The Chair's research into this topic, as well as a review of testimony provided by the secretary of state's director of elections to the Senate Elections Committee in October 2020, make it clear that there is essentially no mechanism in place to prevent counting votes from those who may be also registered and vote in another state, whether done by themselves or the recipient of an application at their former Michigan address. As there are no efficient or established procedures to confirm or detect this, it is not possible for the Committee to report on any occurrences or to have confidence no such actions occurred. However, with mass mailings of absentee ballot applications being mailed across state lines to many who no longer reside or vote in Michigan and to thousands of former addresses in Michigan, the situation must be addressed to ensure that those individuals are voting only once in an election, are doing so only in the state of their residence, and that no one is impersonating them at their old address.

The serious, potential outcomes of these vulnerabilities versus the minor effort to request an application make a strong and compelling necessity to not provide such applications without a request from a voter - as was standard practice until this past year. **Therefore, the Committee recommends the Michigan secretary of state discontinue the practice of mailing out unsolicited applications. The Committee also recommends only the current QVF being utilized by the state or locals when making mailings to registered voters of any nature.**

There were several reports of nursing home bound parents or other family members with dementia having a record of voting. **While the Committee was unable to reach any conclusions regarding the extent of such claims, additional training and clear instructions to caretakers or facility staff ought to be provided in such circumstances to clarify how and when such voting assistance is appropriate. The Committee also recommends pre-filled out applications from any source be disallowed as well.**

3. 3rd Party/Private Funds Used for Public Election Activities and Equipment

A summary of the work and findings on this issue is not finalized at this time and may be amended to this report at a later date.

4. Rights and Duties of Poll Challengers/Watchers Improperly or Unlawfully Restricted

The Committee received claims that challengers from the Republican party were discriminated against and removed from polling locations without cause. There were also claims that challengers were not allowed to return to counting rooms and were supposed to sign in and out of the room but had not received that instruction. They were frequently required to stand six feet or more away from tables and workers in the normal exercise of their duties, despite a court settlement that ensured their right to monitor election procedures, within six feet when necessary. The Committee also received testimony that contradicted some of these statements and provided a different viewpoint. Volunteers and workers from both the Republican and Democratic parties made claims of hazing, rudeness, bigotry, racism, and other offensive behavior occurring while election activities were still underway. Several of the issues, such as the management of the official record of challengers allowed in or out, may have been simply driven by the situation with COVID-19 and will not be relevant again. Reports were heard of calls to citizens, ostensibly made by Republicans, informing them to come and vote on Wednesday rather than Tuesday. While many accusations will remain just that, one thing is perfectly clear: the rights and duties of poll watchers and challengers must be better understood and reinforced in their respective training and must be protected equally by election officials. This is an area in need of much reform and greater clarification in election law.

Additionally, there is significant evidence that the recruitment of Republican poll workers for Wayne County encountered significant obstacles. Many witnesses testified to volunteering but not hearing back from the county or being told there were already enough workers. Others testified to a particular moment at the TCF Center when workers were surveyed for party affiliation and only a few there raised their hands as Republicans. The Committee understands the logistics of recruiting Republicans for Wayne County and the city of Detroit can be difficult but finds the repeated reports of volunteers not being accepted or not having their emails returned troubling. Obtaining the proper ratios of partisan workers is of critical importance, especially ones from the local area.

The Committee encourages the Wayne County Republican Party and officials in the county and city clerks' offices to work together to obtain the correct number of workers for each election. Further, the Committee asks the Bureau of Elections to investigate and provide to the Committee an evaluation of partisan poll worker recruitment in Wayne County and the city of Detroit.

These issues were clearly reflected in the activities that occurred at the absentee counting board at the TCF Center. At one point, an audio recording was released of an apparent election training session in the city of Detroit where workers were instructed to maintain six feet between challengers and poll workers, due to COVID-19 precautions. Prior to the election, a court settlement ensured poll challengers could monitor election activities within six feet when necessary. After the settlement, clerk staff, like other election staff across the state, were to be informed of the ruling and how it would affect their activities on Election Day. Testimony was received by the Committee indicating that the settlement, which was reached after many workers completed their training, was not well known among the workers at the TCF Center. It is easy to see how

INITIAL REPORT ON THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN

this led to significant confusion and conflict, particularly as many workers had genuine fear and concern over their proximity to persons during the pandemic.

Contributing to the confusion and hostility of poll watchers and challengers was the differing opinions regarding the actual rights and duties of those individuals. These conflicts were only amplified by the partisan and ideological nature of the volunteers, despite some not affiliating with a political party. Multiple days of testimony from Republicans and Democrats made it clear that Republican challengers were committed to ensuring that challenges were issued and recorded when information was presented to indicate a voter was not, or may not be, eligible. Representatives of Michigan Democrats, however, indicated in testimony before the Committee that their specific training regarding the duties and obligations of challengers is to not ever challenge any ballots. While it was clear they recognized the legal reasons for challenging, they also called the law “archaic” and affirmed they train their challengers to not issue any challenges. They believe their obligation is to assure no vote is disqualified. One Democrat official even noted their reason for being there was to keep an eye on Republicans, not to challenge ballots. This significant difference of opinion and action contributed to some of the misunderstandings and tensions that occurred at the TCF Center, as each partisan observed the other failing to comprehend their duties or felt their duty was specifically to confront the other side.

The concern of partisan volunteers cloaked as Independent challengers through non-profit or third-party entities only added to the accusations of an unfair or unbalanced election environment. The Committee heard testimony and saw evidence that independent observers and challengers were frequently operating for one of the two major parties making their labels as Independents confusing and unhelpful.

It is apparent that the environment at the TCF Center became intolerable and the reactions to it must be understood in this light. While mistakes were clearly made by officials on all sides, it must be acknowledged that many of them were attempting to simply do their job during a time of increasing confusion and distrust. It is impossible for the Committee, or any legal entity, to sort through all the events or persons at fault. However, it appears obvious and reasonable to conclude that confusion, fear, misunderstanding, and even chaos occurred at the TCF Center to varying degrees on Nov. 3 and 4. The environment and those emotions were compounded by a lack of proper recruitment and/or training of election workers on the part of the clerk, as well as a failure of the Republican party to verify recruitment and training, supply an adequate number of election attorneys, and to properly train and counsel some of their volunteers and challengers.

Republican officials, along with some ostensibly Independent challengers, furthered the crisis by putting out the call to other members and citizens to descend on the location to stop what was described and presented as a stealing of the election. The descent into disorder with so many extremely concerned citizens elicited responses from poll workers that seemed necessary to them at the time, such as covering windows, calling police, denying lawful challenges, and removing challengers. Those actions by both sides were not always lawful or wise, and increased the angst and fears of the untrained challengers and observers, as well as the many in the public who did not understand what was shown to them by the media. **Despite these mistakes and, potentially, illegal**

actions, the Committee found no evidence fraudulent activities were undertaken or that such actions led to irreparable harm to ballots or vote counting. Numerous safeguards, particularly the partisan make up of the election boards themselves, were not lost, despite these actions.

Therefore, the Committee recommends updating the requirements for challengers including the tasks and duties they are to preform, standards of conduct, and party affiliation. Additionally, clerks and parties need to be held to recruiting adequate workers, providing appropriate and uniform training including any recent law updates, and being able to instruct law enforcement in lawful responses to workers or volunteers creating a disturbance in the process of carrying out their duties. Officials need a clear chain of command in place for making decisions and being accountable, particularly if a crisis arises and if one of the leaders has left the premises. Finally, the Wayne County Republican Party and other, independent organizations, ought to issue a repudiation of the actions that created a panic and had untrained and unnumbered persons descend on the TCF Center. Both clerks and the parties need to take seriously their responsibilities of having properly trained and adequate personnel in place and the training ought to be uniform, regardless of party.¹

5. Antrim County

Antrim County became the focal point of multiple theories and concerns surrounding the Nov. 3 election, as the unofficial results reported at the end of the tabulation for the county were later discovered to be in error. The common claim surrounding this mistake was that the votes for Donald Trump were switched with votes for Joe Biden, providing Biden with a win in heavily-Republican Antrim County. However, this claim is inaccurate and was explained before a joint hearing of the Senate and House Oversight Committees in November 2020 by the Antrim County Clerk, Sheryl Guy.

Due to a series of errors made within the county clerk's office, the unofficial votes received from polling places on election night did not transfer into their respective spreadsheet columns correctly. This shifted the vote totals over a column for several races across the ballot. These mistakes began months earlier when several late items were ordered onto the ballot in certain townships. Unfortunately, new logic and accuracy tests were not performed, as required by law. Programming at the clerk's computer was not updated to reflect these changes; however, tabulators in the precincts were updated and had no problems processing ballots on Election Day. Tally sheets printed at the close of polls never reflected the errors reported in the clerk's unofficial results. On the morning of Nov. 4, once it became clear that the unofficial results were inaccurate and did not match the official votes printed by the tabulators, efforts began to discover the cause of the errors. The clerk and her staff made several attempts to re-tabulate and resolve the problem before understanding the cause. This resulted in additional, incorrect vote counts being reported. Once the cause was isolated, ballots were re-tabulated and the correct results, which matched the original tabulator sheets from Nov. 3, were posted. Multiple checks were easily able to rectify the situation and later, **a complete hand recount validated the original, official results as accurate.**

¹ The "more votes than voters" theory, repeated by President Trump's attorney, Rudolph Giuliani, was based on an affidavit from the ASOG co-founder that cites several Michigan counties where there were allegedly more votes than registered voters. However, the affidavit cited several townships in Minnesota, not Michigan. Even if the document referenced the right state, the claims regarding the Minnesota townships still were not accurate, according to data from the Minnesota Secretary of State.

INITIAL REPORT ON THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN

A prime example of a misrepresentation of facts that then mislead citizens is found on a chart on page two of Allied Security Operations Group’s (ASOG) Antrim County Forensic Report. The chart, shown below, and the accompanying information, led citizens to conclude the election results were suspiciously changing for over a month after the election. It also could lead one to believe election officials and the Dominion tabulators were dishonest in their work by not representing the source of the specific numbers shown, even though the information is readily available to the authors of the report. Further, the authors also chose to present only some of the information, leaving out specific data that would evidence something besides a massive conspiracy or computer hack created the problem.

Date	Registered Voters	Total Votes Cast	Biden	Trump	Third Party	Write-In	TOTAL VOTES for President
Nov 3	22,082	16,047	7,769	4,509	145	14	12,423
Nov 5	22,082	18,059	7,289	9,783	255	20	17,327
Nov 21	22,082	16,044	5,960	9,748	241	23	15,949
Dec 17	22,082		5,959	9,759	244	20	15,962

This second chart fills in relevant and critical information about the data and provides additional data points to provide greater context to the observer. This data was available to ASOG and others utilizing the previous chart, yet they chose not to provide the context nor the additional data.

	Date	Registered Voters	Total Votes Cast	Biden	Trump	Third Party	Write-In	TOTAL VOTES for President	Note
1.	Nov. 4	22,082	16,044	5,960	9,748	239	23	15,970	Tabulator tapes-official results (Not reported on election night).
2.	Nov. 4	22,082	16,047	7,769	4,509	145	14	12,437	Clerk’s computer-unofficial results (publicly reported).
3.	Nov. 5	22,082	18,059	7,289	9,783	255	20	17,347	First attempt to rectify discrepancy.
4.	Nov. 6	22,082	16,044	5,960	9,748	241	20	15,969	Completion of re-tabulation.
5.	Nov. 16	22,082	16,044	5,960	9,748	241	20	15,969	Official Vote report.
6.	Nov. 21	22,082	16,044	5,960	9,748	241	20	15,969	Canvass/certification
7.	Dec. 17	22,082	16,044	5,959	9,759	244	20	15,982	Hand Recount

INITIAL REPORT ON THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN

Row one shows the vote totals shown on the tabulator tapes at the close of the election. These numbers are critical as they demonstrate, when coupled with the hand recount, that no tampering or pre-installed, illicit programming ever took place on the tabulators. It also shows that no fraudulent ballots were added to the ballot boxes to cover up such hardware/software malfunctions. The minor changes from the first tabulation to the final canvas and hand recount are well documented by election staff and result from several spoiled ballots that were not able to be processed in subsequent runs and from ballots that could not be electronically processed but could be hand counted.

Row two contains the vote count reported by the Antrim County clerk's office on election night, which was the unofficial vote count. As is detailed in this report, these results were incorrect because the programming to receive the data had not been properly updated after changes were made to the official ballots in certain townships. The result was what amounts to a spreadsheet having its fields improperly aligned with the incoming data. This would have been caught by logic and accuracy tests. The discrepancies with the tabulator tapes should have been discovered before these results were reported.

Row three shows the struggle faced by the clerk's office to determine what went wrong and how to correct it. These results show a series of urgent but mistaken attempts to address the errors that led to double counting of some precincts and absentee ballots. The contemporary poll books and worksheets are clear proof of what was happening, showing handwritten notes and commentary. The records also show who was there trying to figure out how to solve the issue.

Row four shows the vote count after the errors were properly identified and ballots were re-tabulated. Clearwater Township was still experiencing issues and had to be added in by hand. Again, contemporary documents and worksheets are clear proof of the situation and work being done.

Row five is the official vote report filed with the state before the certification.

Row six contains the certified election results. These were certified Nov. 21 by the county board of canvassers. The results are virtually the same as the tabulator slips produced on election night with the discrepancies identified and explained in the minutes of their meetings.

Row seven is the results of the complete hand recount conducted on Dec. 17. When a hand recount is done, ballots that were previously unable to be tabulated electronically are sometimes able to be added. These changes are, again, well documented by the workers' notes made during this process.

The Committee states that the data this chart summarizes, coming from the actual election artifacts in Antrim County, clearly and concisely shows that ideas and speculation that the Antrim County election workers or outside entities manipulated the vote by hand or electronically are indefensible. Further, the Committee is appalled at what can only be deduced as a willful ignorance or avoidance of this proof perpetuated by some leading such speculation.

INITIAL REPORT ON **THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN**

There were many groups and persons from around the country that focused their attention on Antrim County as the most central point in their arguments and speculation. The county was mentioned by officials at the White House, in media, at rallies, and in several, substantial online documentaries. The Committee investigated the claims made by some of the more prominent groups and individuals.

The Allied Security Operations Group (ASOG) obtained access to the Antrim County voting tabulators and purported to perform a forensic audit. (ASOG and its co-founder were purveyors of the “fractional vote” and “more votes than registered voters” theories!). ASOG’s audit described stolen computer files, machines designed to provide incorrect results, manipulated software, and cyber-attacks. Utilizing the difference between the unofficial vote count and the final, official count, ASOG claimed the machines were inaccurate 68% of the time. However, ASOG never provided an explanation for how the official vote was accurately obtained on the tabulator slips in the same physical count as the incorrect unofficial results on which they focus. ASOG did not make any attempt to invalidate the claims of the clerk by demonstration. ASOG also claimed a loss of files regarding auto-adjudication, a method of curing absentee voter ballots that Antrim County does not utilize as further evidence of fraudulent activity. ASOG claimed the machines had “ranked-choice” balloting turned on when this is not possible on Michigan machines. Other entities (CyberNinjas and Halderman) showed this claim was untrue. ASOG ignored that the simple and most effective way to verify the results is to simply count all ballots by hand. Even after a hand recount verified the results in Antrim County, ASOG refused to retract its assertions.

Attorney Matthew DePerno was retained by an Antrim County resident to pursue legal action against the county and the state regarding the results of the election. Mr. DePerno has subsequently released various reports, videos, and statements regarding the election results, presenting the ASOG report, as well as work by Dr. Douglas Frank and Jeff Lenberg, as primary pieces of evidence. The Committee closely followed Mr. DePerno’s efforts and can confidently conclude they are demonstrably false and based on misleading information and illogical conclusions. In one recent video, Mr. Lenberg demonstrated how a hacked machine will incorrectly count ballots (reporting it on the official results printout) and how a hacked computer will show inaccurate results. However, neither of these demonstrations shows the explanation given by the clerk is untrue, nor do they explain how the actual official results sheet *did not* match the inaccurate unofficial results. Most critically, it does not explain how the hand recount verified the official results reported by the tabulators on election night. They simply proved hacked machinery will perform incorrectly. This is not evidence machines were hacked, and it is certainly not evidence that machines that performed correctly were hacked.

Further, the insinuations made depend on the tabulators being hacked *after* the logic and accuracy tests. Mr. DePerno, and others, insisted this was possible because the Dominion machines in Antrim County have modems or wireless chips installed. However, this is indisputably false. Antrim County did not utilize modems or any internet or wireless network to transmit voting results *ever*. This incredibly conclusive fact, along with the hand recount of the ballots, serve as the irrefutable bulwarks against all allegations. The cited proof of modems is from a quote for purchasing received by the county from Dominion, not an actual purchase receipt or physical sighting of any modems.

INITIAL REPORT ON **THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN**

Mr. DePerno's lawsuit, Exhibit 6, highlighted by former state Sen. Patrick Colbeck in a web post dated April 9, 2021 and entitled "Modem Chips Embedded in Voting System Computer Motherboards," feature a voting machine that is not used by Antrim County. Yet the suit draws the connection that the existence of such a machine, one that is not in Antrim County and not manufactured by Dominion at all, is evidence that the Dominion tabulators in Antrim County have the same technology. Committee members and others have been frequently approached by constituents who have been convinced that this is true of the Antrim County machines and all Dominion machines in general.

On June 11, internet and social media sources proclaimed the newest announcement from Mr. DePerno about Antrim County. However, the information provided appeared to be already available, but simply presented in a different light. The first allegation related to evidence of the clerk's Election Management System (EMS), a software package installed on her computer to manage the election. This is the same program that incorrectly reported the results on election night because it had not been properly updated with the late changes to ballots from certain precincts. **EMS is not connected to the tabulators.** The allegations focused on how the clerk's computer and the program were remotely accessed in the days following the election. This should not surprise anyone as the clerk, secretary of state, and the software company sought to determine what went wrong and how to fix it. At no time would this connection or activity have had an impact on the tabulators. More relevant, it could not have changed the tabulator slips, shown in the second chart, line one.

The June 11 video from Mr. DePerno also included what he concluded was dramatic evidence about specially made ballots, sent to Republican areas, that would more frequently fail in the tabulators. He then said such ballots would be sent to adjudication, where someone could determine them as Biden votes, even if they were not. This pronouncement is simply more blatherskite. Adjudication takes place with both Democrat and Republican workers, observers, and challengers present (Antrim County had no concerning or reported issues related to their challengers). Also, Antrim County did not have a high incidence of adjudicated ballots. Most important is the now repeated point of lines one and seven on the second chart above: the original tabulator slips and the hand recount match with only a few documented and easily explained ballot differences, dispelling any legitimacy to speculation of massive vote stealing by human or computer means.

The Committee finds such actions to be misleading and irresponsible, diminishing the overall credibility of those asserting this conclusion.

Dr. Frank has also worked independently of Mr. DePerno, appearing in various other reports and programming. He claimed his findings of patterns in voting demographics and results, along with disparities between census, registration, and ballot totals in given areas were conclusive evidence of a complex computer hack and conspiracy to manipulate vote counts around the nation. This theory, like Dr. Shiva's, alleged the installed "algorithm" switches or steals votes just enough to succeed while not being enough to raise suspicions. However, Dr. Frank's conclusions are not sound for several reasons. Census data is not recent, and people do not only move away (as he frequently contends) but others do move into an area. Coupled with same day registration,

the notable red flags he spotted in the data are easily explained, e.g. young people do not vote as readily as older citizens, people's movements create disparities between registrations and the census, etc. The patterns he sees are not unexpected or unusual to elections or human behavior in general. His theories depend on the ability to hack into the tabulators before or during and/or at the end of the election. Many of the counties he and others identified as having been hacked do not even have modems or make any online connection to submit results. Those that do, do not connect the modem, which is physically separate from the Dominion tabulator, until *after* the polls are closed and the tabulators have printed the official results.

Events in Antrim County sparked a significant amount of concern about the technology used to count ballots. This concern led to much speculation, assumptions, misinformation, and in some cases, outright lies meant to create doubt and confusion. The many hours of testimony before the Committee showed these claims are unjustified and unfair to the people of Antrim County and the state of Michigan. It has also been unfair to people across America. The simple answer to all of this remains the most reasonable conclusion: human error and lack of training are the factors that contributed to inaccurate unofficial vote counts. These errors were quickly discovered and rectified by the protective and redundant systems our state has built to verify and protect election integrity, *including re-countable, paper ballots*. Even more significantly, the official vote count was never in doubt and was validated several times, including during a complete, hand recount.

While extremely disappointed and frustrated with the obvious avoidable errors, the Committee commends the efforts of the Antrim County clerk, staff, and many volunteers that corrected these errors and gave their time for the canvass and hand recount. The Committee also recommends legislation strengthening the law regarding the conducting of logic and accuracy tests prior to the election, including penalties for failing to do so. The Committee recommends the attorney general consider investigating those who have been utilizing misleading and false information about Antrim County to raise money or publicity for their own ends. The Committee finds those promoting Antrim County as the prime evidence of a nationwide conspiracy to steal the election place all other statements and actions they make in a position of zero credibility.

6. Operating Issues with Tabulators and Precinct Computers

Speculation and theories of fraud in the election appear most prevalent in the areas concerning voting tabulators, computers, software, hardware, and cybersecurity. In the testimony and information reviewed by the Committee, claims ranged from something as simple as "spikes" in the vote count that exceeded the physical capacity of the tabulators to machines that were simply inaccurate. However, more complex claims also emerged, claiming that tabulators were intentionally designed to manipulate the tally through fractional voting or swapping by hand, through software, or by cyber attacks that based their manipulation on the votes necessary to overcome candidate Joe Biden's early deficit to President Trump.

Dominion Voting Systems, Election Systems & Software (ES&S), Hart InterCivic

Michigan utilizes tabulators and election services provided through three different vendors, with the individual counties determining which vendor to use. All vendors must meet the specifications of the state's election laws which requires vendors to meet guidelines provided by the United

INITIAL REPORT ON **THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN**

States Election Assistance Commission (EAC). The EAC has rigorous standards regarding construction, material and code sourcing, reviews, and independent auditing conducted by certified third parties.

The Committee interviewed, under oath, the CEO of Dominion Voting Systems and the vice president of systems security & chief information security officer from ES&S. Hart InterCivic submitted written testimony. Despite many public denunciations of their collective testimony as inaccurate, no individual has provided any evidence to the Committee of such perjury or has filed any action in a court of law asserting such.

Mr. John Polous, Dominion CEO, denied multiple rumors regarding the company and provided references to verify his testimony that the company was not involved in elections in Venezuela and had no connection to Hugo Chavez, Nancy Pelosi, Diane Feinstein, or George Soros. He also denied the existence of Dominion servers in Spain and Germany, emphasizing that ballots remain local, are counted locally, and are not moved over state lines, let alone overseas.

Mr. Polous explained in detail how the operations of the Dominion machines are not compatible with the various theories being promoted, and that any of the accusations regarding counting ballots multiple times or scanning surplus ballots would easily be uncovered due to the poll books being unbalanced. Further, ballots that required auto-adjudication or duplication are accounted for in the poll books and create a computer log that is checked to prevent or detect double counts. Damaged ballots that require duplication are logged and could not be accidentally tabulated due to the damage that required the duplication.

Fractional Voting

The early allegation of fractional voting was supported by a few photographs which appeared to be screen shots from computer screens running the Dominion software. The chair specifically called for this information during public testimony as its existence would have been a profound demonstration of proof. However, despite numerous, repeated requests from the chair and assurances from those making the allegation, no proof, whether by demonstration or verifiable citation, was ever offered to or obtained by the Committee.

Internet Connections

Many observers insisted the vote tabulators at the TCF Center were connected to the internet. Chris Thomas, who served as the senior elections advisor for the city of Detroit, has asserted that this is simply not true. Other individuals who were at the TCF Center, such as former state Sen. Patrick Colbeck, insist that they were. It is true that every tabulator was connected to a local area network (LAN), which would create the same icon on a computer screen indicating a network connection as is shown by an internet accessible network. This may be a source of some of the confusion. Computers at the central control center, which were not connected to each precinct's LAN, were connected to a network that was connected to the internet, which may have also contributed to the confusion. Regardless, no evidence has been offered that the tabulators were connected beyond each LAN, and, in fact, the results from the tabulators at the TCF Center were transmitted to the clerk's office via flash drives, not electronic or cellular connection. Furthermore,

and more importantly, there has been no evidence provided that such a purported connection led to alterations to machine programming, hardware, or the tabulated results or could have led to such changes. Finally, logic and accuracy tests are conducted on each tabulator prior to the election to confirm that pre-election procedures were followed properly. During the post-election audits, clerks verify that those tests were performed and that the machines and their programming were not tampered with during the election.

Many theories and speculation regarding tabulators not at the TCF Center also include a component that necessitate an internet connection. It is particularly important to note that Dominion voting machines that are not part of an absentee voter counting board do not have built in modems or wireless internet. Reports to the contrary are false, with some falsely labeling non-Dominion machines as Dominion machines to make it appear as if they do have wireless internet capabilities. The secure cellular modems some clerks use to transmit the unofficial results to the county clerk are not even turned on or connected to the tabulators until *after* the official results are printed by the individual machine.

Tabulator/Software Integrity

There is no link in the election process chain more susceptible to unprovable and un-refutable speculation and suspicion than those involving the invisible lines of code and panels of circuits. These vulnerabilities can include tampering with machine code on site, via cyber attack, or by malicious programming by the proprietors of the machines.

There are many theories as to how compromising the integrity of the machines and software could have taken place, making it impossible to delineate each one separately. However, the answers and evidence against nearly all theories is generally the same. Reasonable deduction and logic stand to refute nearly all possible outcomes of a hack or attack, including the following theories: whether files including ballot images were hacked, a malicious algorithm was installed to switch votes, or a hostile, foreign force obtained a connection into a tabulator before, during, or after the election. In all of these situations, a simple recount or re-tabulation by the machine, after a logic and accuracy test, or by hand would demonstrate the theory to be consistent or inconsistent with the facts. This has been undertaken in multiple jurisdictions, both those in question and those not, all providing verification of the original, official results. Not one of these efforts demonstrated a problem with the tabulators or the software. There is no evidence to suggest the original, official results reflected anything but what was marked on the ballots.

Videos and reports of the ease of hacking current Dominion voting machines from outside of Michigan, e.g. Georgia, never demonstrated a vulnerability of the vote counting software or the tabulators. The chair contacted various officials from Georgia to understand the testimony and events in question there. Particularly, the testimony of Jovan Pulitzer, which purported to have on-the-spot access to manipulate voting files and vote counts, has been demonstrated to be untrue and a complete fabrication. He did not, at any time, have access to data or votes, let alone have the ability to manipulate the counts directly or by the introduction of malicious software to the tabulators. Nor could he spot fraudulent ballots from non-fraudulent ones. Notably, Georgia did conduct a complete, statewide, hand recount that validated the tabulators' official results.

INITIAL REPORT ON **THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN**

Many of the theories surrounding cyber attacks were consolidated into the visuals and narratives included in the “Absolute Proof” video series first presented in January 2021 and continuing into June 2021 by Mike Lindell (the video relied heavily on the situation in Antrim County and the report from ASOG). In summary, Mr. Lindell claims that attacks by foreign and domestic enemies were successful in obtaining access to the computers containing results at local and county clerks’ offices, as well as the secretary of state. In some cases, the supposed access included the actual tabulators.

However, this narrative is ignorant of multiple levels of the actual election process. Upon completion of the election, tabulators print the final results on paper. Clerks then connect a modem and transmit by secure, cellular connection or transfer by flash drive the unofficial results to the county clerk.² County clerks then report these unofficial results both locally and to the secretary of state. The secretary of state releases the unofficial results to media and their own page. Clarity, a Spanish based company, also takes in these unofficial results from the county or the state. This company, which is based in Spain and has servers in Europe, makes the unofficial results available to multiple users, especially media subscribers who utilize the unofficial results in their election night prognostications. ScytI and others are companies that provide similar services. All of these activities, especially due to media inquiries, constitute a significant explanation for much of the cyber activity across the country and the globe on election night.

Terminologies about the equipment used in elections leads to much of the confusion, particularly when used carelessly. Various documents, emails, and manuals discuss connectivity and servers. Certain persons have used these as proof that tabulators were connected during the election. However, the capabilities of the machines do not denote all of those options were operating during the election itself. Server connections and vulnerabilities, even errors, at clerk’s offices are not indicative that tabulators themselves were vulnerable or hacked. The presence of IP addresses do not prove votes were altered or programming was hacked. Servers have nothing to do with regular tabulators during the election.

While the clear and constant presence of cyber criminals is real, the exchange of “packets” of information between two computers speaking to each other is not evidence of successful hacking or changing of data. Moreover, it is not possible for anyone to now determine what might have been in those packets of information unless granted specific access to one of the two computers involved in the transaction. All the while, the official results remain on a printed piece of paper at the local clerk’s office and are not alterable to any reverse cyber attack. Most importantly, the paper ballots in the box are available for re-tabulation or recount at any time. Where this was done, no evidence of hacking or attack was ever shown. Nor did any official representative of the losing party call for a hand recount in any precinct so to prove an instance of such. If the losing party had been so confident of any of these cyber attack theories or software-based vote switching, simply asking for several hand recounts or re-tabulations in the various precincts would have demonstrated a genuine hack had happened and that there was necessity for additional recounts and investigations.

² ES&S and Hart InterCivic tabulators have internal modems, but not Dominion. However, they are not turned on until the polls are closed and tabulation has concluded. It is worth noting that these machines will likely have to be recertified, depending on whether they have 4G or 5G capabilities when the technology changes.

Further, the graphics and charts in various videos claim very specific access and vote count changes in specific counties across Michigan but do not provide any references or evidence to demonstrate how that information was acquired. As mentioned above, once the data is transmitted, there is no way to know what was sent without access to a computer on either side. No clerk or election official in any of these counties was informed how these numbers were calculated or known (except the numbers shown for Antrim County, which mirror the numbers shown to have occurred by human error). While showing these numbers is compelling, there is no source provided, but the viewer is led to believe Mr. Lindell's experts have received access to each of these counties' or precincts' computers and discovered a connection and hack occurred along with exactly what data was transmitted. No such activities took place at any of these locations with which the Committee had contact.

The chair spoke with clerks in several of the counties listed by Mr. Lindell's experts. These clerks had no explanation for numbers his reports show as being flipped votes, nor had they had any interaction with any persons making these allegations. Moreover, clerks in these counties performed random hand recounts in various precincts or townships and found zero change to the official, canvass results. Other clerks did full county re-tabulations and found zero change. For these actions to not contradict Mr. Lindell's allegations would mean all the clerks surreptitiously or incidentally chose precincts or townships that were not involved with the hack his experts claim occurred or allowed their tabulators to be compromised. The Committee finds this is beyond any statistical or reasonable credulity.

Canvassing and Out of Balance Precincts

The canvassing process that is conducted at the county level in each of Michigan's counties always serves as the check on most irregularities that may occur during the initial tabulation. If paper ballots are significantly unbalanced when compared with the number of votes reported in poll books, this constitutes a clear indication that something went wrong. Often, the imbalance arises when workers do not immediately account for the necessity of copying overseas ballots or damaged absentee voter ballots. It also occurs when a voter decides to leave the polling place without correcting a spoiled ballot or submitting their ballot. Other causes come from empty absentee voter ballot envelopes, or couples including both of their ballots in one envelope.

Some of the highly out-of-balance precincts at consolidated Absentee Voter Counting Boards (AVCB) were likely from mistakes made with the high-speed tabulators, something that several citizens swore to have witnessed in affidavits and other testimony. When these imbalances appear after Election Day, it is the board of canvassers, or in Wayne County, their chosen agent, the clerk, that can make the decision to perform a further review to correct any irregularities that are discovered. Re-tabulation of the paper ballots and a thorough examination of the poll books are critical parts to the canvass process, allowing the books and ballot boxes to reach balance.

Technically, the imbalances that remain after the canvass could exist due to fraudulent activity. Unbalanced precincts are unfortunate and are something that should be addressed in the future. However, the unbalanced precincts in Michigan counties were marginal and, in no way, would have impacted the outcome of the Presidential election. There were fewer precincts with an imbalance

in this election than in previous ones. **Developing best practices and training election workers on how to maintain balanced precincts is recommended. There is much discussion on allowing some out-of-balance precincts to be eligible for recount but testimony the Committee heard from several clerks indicated they did not support this. Therefore, the Committee makes no recommendations on this issue.**

The Committee did learn during testimony that Wayne County’s Board of Canvassers operates differently than most other counties, shifting the actual canvass responsibilities to the county clerk and their staff. Once the canvass is complete, the board receives a report, that is unusually anemic in its details of how imbalances were rectified. This is unfair to those serving on the board, as well as the voters of Wayne County, despite being permitted by law. A transparent canvass, overseen by those not responsible for the actual election process, allows citizens to understand how imbalances occurred and how they were rectified while having confidence that there was not a conflict of interest for those performing the canvass.

Canvassers ought to be intimately involved in the process and the law should be changed to provide consistency and transparency in the canvassing process. Furthermore, it would be wise to allow for larger boards in higher population areas and to provide additional time to complete the canvass to rectify any irregularities.

7. Signature Verification Process

The Committee was made aware of claims that election workers at the TCF Center in downtown Detroit were instructed to not match signatures on envelopes and furthermore were instructed to “pre-date” the received date of absentee ballots. To the contrary, these processing steps — signature matching and verification of the date received — occurred at another location and were completed by other employees prior to the time the ballots were sent to the TCF Center for counting. Workers at the AVCBs are to check for the clerk’s signature and time stamp as well as making sure the voter signature is present. However, the validation of the voter signature by the clerk’s office is indicated by the clerk’s signature and stamp. As for the “pre-dating” allegation, Detroit Senior Election Advisor Chris Thomas explained this date field is necessary for processing the ballot. Without the voter present, there is no way to have that date, which was recorded into the QVF by the official who took the same day registration at another location. Since the poll books at the AVCB are not connected to the QVF during Election Day, there is no way to check what was entered at the site where the voter registered. Therefore, a “placeholder” date is entered, and the poll worker assumes the official accepting the registration did their due diligence.

Kent County Clerk Lisa Lyons, and Ingham County Clerk Barb Byrum, both testified regarding the possible requirement of a “real time” signature when applying for an absentee ballot, indicating it would be highly preferred rather than performing the application process online. In addition to the preferences of election officials, the Michigan Court of Claims struck down Secretary of State Benson’s guidance on signature matching, which required workers to presume the validity of signatures, ruling that the required presumption of validity is found nowhere in state law and mandating such was a direct violation of the Administrative Procedures Act.

INITIAL REPORT ON THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN

After reviewing these facts and receiving the testimony of experts and clerks, it is abundantly clear that the signature verification process is one of significant importance. With new policies in place due to the adoption of Proposal 18-3, current election procedures do not require a new voter to, potentially, ever make face-to-face contact with an election official or staff throughout the process of registration, requesting an absentee ballot application, or completing and submitting their ballot. Therefore, requiring a voter to confirm their identity at some point during the process is imperative. Whether providing a “real time” signature, a government-issued photo identification card, or other unique personally identifying information, like a driver’s license number or a state identification number, requesting that a voter provide one of these easily-accessible identifiers will go a long way to strengthen the integrity of our system, while supporting the new, more efficient way of administering our elections.

Therefore, the Committee recommends that the secretary of state begin the process of establishing actual rules for examining and validating signatures consistent with a ruling of the Michigan Court of Claims. The Committee also recommends that statewide measures be put in place to ensure eligible voters are not unreasonably denied access to vote if there is an issue with their signature. Finally, the Committee recommends that reasonable measures be put in place to ensure voters can easily and properly identify themselves when exercising their right to vote.

8. Jurisdictions Reporting More Than 100% Voter Turnout

The Committee received and heard claims that jurisdictions had more than 100% of registered voters voting. Here are some of the local municipalities that had claims of a higher voter turnout than there were actual registered voters:

<i>Municipality</i>	<i>Claim</i>	<i>Actual</i>
Oneida Township	118%	Approximately 80%
Zeeland Township	460.51%	Precincts ranged from 74.46% - 84.80%
Spring Lake Township	120%	Precincts ranged from 66.74% - 84.15%
Gladwin Township	215.21%	67.23%
Summit Township	Over 100%	71%
Detroit	More Votes than Voters (Trump Claim)	250,138 votes = Under 50% of registered voters in the city and only 37% of the total population.

9. Absentee Ballots Were Tabulated Multiple Times, Increasing Vote Total

Some individuals claimed that many ballots were counted multiple times when they were re-submitted through the high-speed tabulation machines. The Committee heard from several persons and read many affidavits claiming to have first-hand knowledge that this issue occurred. Investigation does show it is possible to cycle a completed stack through the tabulator multiple times as long as no errors occur. Bundles of ballots go through the tabulator so quickly that a simple jam or other error necessitates the entire bundle being restarted. Workers cannot restart the stack unless they first clear the partial count and start from zero by pressing a button.

If ballots were counted multiple times, this would have created a significant disparity in the official pollbook. This was the testimony of several witnesses, including Chris Thomas and Monica Palmer, Republican chair of the Wayne County Board of Canvassers. Specifically, the pollbook would show that many more votes were cast than the number of people obtaining a ballot. This was the case at several counting boards at the completion of the original tabulation. However, the actual imbalances that remained after the canvass show this problem was rectified. Rectifying precincts where this mistake happened is usually not difficult to do and involves taking the ballots out of the box, counting the total number to see if it matches the poll book, and processing all the ballots through the tabulator again. The balanced poll books and the remaining imbalances do not indicate this problem any more, showing it was corrected. Remaining imbalances are likely connected to some of the other reasons addressed in finding number six, namely, empty envelopes, ruined ballots, etc.

The Committee recommends that tabulator companies develop machines that place tabulated ballots into a box that has no access for poll workers while placing uncounted ballots in another tray to be checked and placed in the tabulator when ready. This would assure such an error cannot occur and that no reset and restarting of a full stack is necessary.

10. Thousands of Ballots Were “Dumped” at the TCF Center on Election Night/The Next Morning

Several individuals testified and claimed that tens of thousands of ballots were “dumped” at the TCF Center on election night, when reported vote tallies showed that President Trump was still in the lead. They allege this occurred between 3 - 5 a.m. and that they were brought onto the floor to be counted. Chris Thomas, the senior elections advisor for the city of Detroit, stated he estimated 16,000 ballots were delivered to the TFC Center around that time. Some other persons and media speculated it was nearly 100,000, but most reported about 30,000-45,000. These ballots were submitted throughout Election Day at different locations, such as drop boxes, in the mail, and at the clerk’s main and satellite offices. After the ballots were compiled and processed at the clerk’s office, after the closing of polls at 8 p.m., they were brought to the TFC Center for counting. These ballots were not brought in a wagon as alleged, but via delivery truck and then placed on carts. A widely circulated picture in media and online reports allegedly showed ballots secretly being delivered late at night but, in reality, it was a photo of a WXYZ-TV photographer hauling his equipment.

Others claimed that the TCF Center security camera footage around the same time showed some type of “ballot dump.” While the video in question confirms that a number of ballots were delivered at the time alleged, it provides no evidence of fraudulent or wrongful conduct. In the video, the van arrived around 3:30 a.m. and unloaded the absentee ballots. Once unloaded, the van left around 3:55 a.m. to go back to the satellite office where the processing was occurring. The van arrived back once again around 4:30 a.m. to unload the final ballots.

This theory, like many of the other theories proposed as evidence of fraud, does not constitute actual evidence on its own. Those drawing such conclusions in their affidavits and testimony were asked to provide proof that something illegal actually occurred but no proof that ballots were fraudulent was provided or found by the Committee in testimony or in subpoenaed records. However, this situation does raise issues with the delayed and cumbersome process of obtaining absentee ballots from drop boxes on election night, when many other activities and processes are also ongoing. **The Committee recommends that drop boxes not be utilized or be closed earlier than 8 p.m. on Election Day so that the time taken to collect such ballots will not, by necessity, extend processing and tabulating of such a large volume so long into the night. At the least, appointed staff should be on-hand to immediately collect ballots from drop boxes at 8 p.m. Additionally, the process of transferring ballots from the clerk’s office to other locations must be done with greater security and manifests so that there can be an accounting for each ballot sent and received between the two locations, establishing a chain of custody.**

11. Vote Totals Were Abnormal Compared to Past Presidential Elections and Other Vote Count Irregularities

Several claims were made regarding the voter turnout in the November 2020 election in which the statistical data was cited as a source to show widespread election impropriety. Comparing historical results casts serious doubt over any claims of widespread impropriety in the Michigan 2020 election. In fact, turnout in 2020 increased less in Wayne county (11.4%) than in the rest of the state (15.4%) and President Trump won a greater percentage of votes there than he did in 2016 (30.27% vs 29.3%).

Additionally, the data suggests that there was no anomalous number of votes cast solely for the President, either in Wayne County or statewide:

2020

Statewide

President: 5,539,302

Senate: 5,479,720

Difference: 59,582 (1.08% difference)

Wayne

President: 874,018

Senate: 863,946

Difference: 10,072 (1.15% difference)

2016

Statewide

President: 4,799,284

Congress: 4,670,905

Difference: 128,379 (2.67% difference)

Wayne

President: 782,719

Congress: 754,560

Difference: 28,159 (3.60% difference)

Other Irregularities

Several published reports, particularly “Case for Michigan Decertification” presented charts of vote sub-totals and totals that were adjusted during the night and sometimes subtract votes from previous totals. The report also shows the increase in absentee votes tabulated was greater than the usual amount able to be processed in the given time frame. These reports require partial or incremental vote counts and totals. Finally, the report included final vote counts that include enormous spikes of final votes with a very high percentage for one candidate. Attempts by the chair to acquire the sources and citations of this data from the author were not able to be fulfilled. The author insisted that he cannot answer the questions about the origins of these data points, which he uses as evidence, without others investigating the issue or granting him access to a wide range of materials.

The reports containing these impossible mathematical counts rely on partial or incremental vote counts which are not available from any county or state official. Detroit does set up its own, unofficial vote reporting site. Incremental vote counts are reported during the process at the TCF Center. This additional level of complexity for reporting and handling, along with corrective actions that may be occurring onsite after an incremental data dump, can lead to multiple inaccuracies and discrepancies. There is additional confusion about counts and potential increases or decreases as the city merges actual precinct votes with AVCB votes. **Allowing Detroit to announce partial or incremental vote counts when no other community does, does not promote a uniform, statewide system. Further, not aligning each AVCB with each precinct creates an additional, complexity leading to an unnecessary vulnerability for errors in the unofficial, election night vote reports.** Finally, media outlets frequently make substantial errors or propagate the errors of others and then must adjust and retract data.

Large spikes in the vote count are not necessarily unexplainable or unusual. They do not alone constitute evidence of fraud and can be reasonably expected. Large precincts, particularly with the highest absentee voter turn out ever, took much longer to complete and then reported all their results at once. Further complicating this issue is that the absentee voter ballots counted at a consolidated counting board had to be merged with the votes submitted on Election Day at the corresponding, in- person voting precincts. This makes the spike larger than just the final count from the AVCB. No evidence has been presented to refute this as the legitimate reason for the dramatic jumps in vote counts seen in Michigan.

Regardless, the Committee can only speculate on this because the author of the referenced report cannot provide sources that the Committee can pursue. Without provision of a source to investigate from the author, and as no confirmation of these numbers was provided nor can be ascertained, the Committee does not believe a wide-ranging, blanket allowance to search materials is justifiable or responsible, particularly in light of the extent of the post-election state audit performed and the of lack red flags from the final results in Detroit or Wayne County.

12. Additional Issues

Ballot Box Construction

Testimony was heard from Monica Palmer regarding the roll of boards of canvassers in verifying the construction of ballot boxes. Her board made significant efforts to require repairing or replacing poorly constructed boxes. **This effort is commendable and ought to be extended to the construction of drop boxes, as well. Testimony was also shared that boxes disallowed by the Wayne County Board of Canvassers and labeled to not be used were still being used on Election Day. This is not acceptable, and the Committee asks the secretary of state or the attorney general to investigate who is responsible for this serious breach.**

Modem Usage on Tabulators

Testimony was given regarding the wisdom and necessity of modems for vote tabulators. There was not consensus amongst the clerks and the Committee makes no recommendation at this time. However, the external, detachable modem does provide a reassuring and genuine physical barrier to cyber attacks during the voting process.

Ballot Harvesting

Testimony and allegations of ballot harvesting were made, although no evidence of such was presented. Ballot harvesting has been caught at times in the past, but none was in this election. Drop boxes and prepaid postage do present a greater vulnerability to ballot harvesting. Others have made the argument that prepaid postage might also reduce the likelihood of an individual waiting for someone to collect their ballot. It is worth noting that ballot harvesting, while illegal due to its vulnerability to fraud, is not necessarily indicative of fraudulent voting.

Allegations of Illegal Votes

Testimony and reports of illegal votes, out of state votes, non-residents voting, and deceased voters are prolific, and the numbers included are substantial and compelling. However, no source or reliable method for determining these numbers is presented. References to “317 voters also voting in other states” do not come with explanation or source. Other numbers reported as evidence of fraudulent addresses or issues with residency fail to consider the complications and realities of same day registration (a real problem in its own right, but one voters created through adopting Proposal 3 in 2018). These same day registrations, also addressed earlier in this report, necessitate methods to enter voters into the database while also flagging them for additional checks and verifications later. This is particularly true at the AVCBs as they do not have access to the QVF and their electronic poll books are disconnected during the election. New registrants need lines filled in, but also must be flagged to be connected with the actual entry made in the QVF by the clerk’s office prior to issuing the ballot. Impossible, and obviously contrived, birthdates serve as a rational and simple method for flagging these voters.

Many of the reports and allegations of illegal votes or fraudulent votes conflate issues of illegal or improper process with fraud or illegal votes. Many of these claims ignore the specific and legally required partisan makeup of the election workers and immediately assume that illegally removing watchers and challengers means fraud is occurring and that all ballots should be disqualified.

Not only would this disenfranchise thousands of legitimate voters by no fault of their own, but it demonstrates a significant leap of logic and an unjustified mistrust of the bipartisan poll workers themselves. The outcome alleged to have occurred during these improperly supervised moments, namely the addition of tens of thousands of prepared ballots, would require a conspiracy of immense proportions: individuals at multiple levels and locations, massive resources of ballot production and pollbook manipulation, and an outcome that does not contain a final number count outside the realms of believability. All of this under the noses of hundreds of bipartisan workers and watchers (as not all were ever dismissed) and without a whisper from the huge pool of people who would know. And all of this to theoretically run up the Biden total in a precinct where he traditionally should have expected better than 90% of the vote but received 88% amidst a relatively unremarkable turnout. **The Committee finds these postulations strain credulity and are simply preposterous. The Committee also notes this theory would directly conflict with the idea the machines were tampered with to miscount the ballots.**

Suspicious Communications

Communications with Dominion to local clerks have been utilized to cause additional fear and mistrust of the company, its equipment, and the election results. While the Committee has not examined or received every document, a small sampling of the most often cited communications are only troubling if considered with the pretext that Dominion is part of a conspiracy to defraud voters. One email after the August primary regarding not saving images is highlighted as evidence of a cover-up. The context in the email, to make electronically transmitting the results after the election with the attachable modem function better, makes the instruction to turn off transmitting the image a reasonable instruction when coupled with there being no law in Michigan to save the images. Emails and communications with Dominion to Antrim County after Nov. 3 are also reasonable as the clerk and others attempted to determine how the tabulators correctly counted the ballots while the clerk's computer showed them incorrectly. **(The saving of ballot images so the ballots can be publicly examined by digital means may be an issue Michigan should consider. Other states are doing this with success.)**

Chain of Custody and Election Material Security

Frequent demands to decertify all or a portion of the vote are accompanied by high sounding language regarding the "chain of custody." This verbiage evokes images of evidence utilized in trials, such as sealed envelopes and locked evidence rooms with sign-out sheets. However, investigating the claims regarding problems with the chain of custody usually finds highlights about the handling and transmission of the unofficial vote counts and the computer systems used to handle them. While concerns about these systems may be justified, it is incredibly misleading and irresponsible to imply this holds any danger to the official vote counts, the tabulators, or the ballots themselves. Similarly, unfair allegations have been leveled against the secretary of state and county and local clerks regarding the instruction to, and deletion of, e-poll book data. The letter instructing this and the action itself is a standard practice, ordered by the federal government and carried out shortly after every election. The law and the letter sent also provide specific instruction not to do so should there be an ongoing legal action regarding the data. All evidence the Committee found shows the law was followed. **The Committee finds insisting this is evidence of a cover up, "Destruction of election artifacts prior to end of 22-month archival requirement," is incredibly misleading, demeaning, and irresponsible.**

Confusing Terminology

Many of the allegations simply utilize semantics and the confusing, technical nature of elections to drive up doubt. Claims such as “fake birthdays,” “unsupervised ballot duplication,” “system manuals explicitly refer to internet and ethernet connectivity,” and “unsecured and illegal ballot boxes” are just a sampling of the terminologies used. However, each of these has legitimate explanation. The birthday issue is explained elsewhere in this report and involves same day registrations on Election Day. “Unsupervised ballot duplication” is referring to times challengers were unable to watch or were prevented from watching (which were not legal actions) but is misleading because the bipartisan election inspectors/workers were still watching and verifying each other’s work. “System manuals” refer to connectivity because the machines are specifically designed to be connected to transmit the unofficial results and to be connected for other functions – this is not proof they were connected during tabulation. “Unsecured and illegal ballot boxes” refers to the transporting of absentee ballots to the counting board in postal trays. Sealed ballots have never been considered to need to be in a secured and approved container because the envelopes are still sealed. **The Committee recommends this practice be made more secure with manifests and a record of custody**, but it is wrong to accuse anyone of violating the law that was written to address open ballots, *not* those in sealed envelopes.

Blank Ballots and Military Ballots

The presence of blank ballots also provides significant confusion, despite being necessary for the duplication of military ballots and damaged absentee voter ballots. It is noteworthy that attempting to utilize these ballots for any significant level of fraud would require perfectly matching precincts to voters, manipulating poll books with fake dates for requests and receipts of the ballots, voter’s signatures, and the clerk’s signature and time stamp.

One witness testified that none of the military ballots at her table being duplicated were for President Trump. However, upon questioning, the witness recounted she only witnessed a few dozen ballots. This is a very reasonable outcome given the overall performance of the candidates in these precincts and the amount witnessed, which is not statistically significant.

13. Audits

The demand for audits regarding the election began soon after the November election and has continued until now. Several entities have undertaken to conduct audits, sometimes referring to their efforts as “forensic audits.” One of these is detailed earlier in this report, particularly in Finding 5. Several lawsuits regarding audits have been filed.

Proposal 18-3, which was approved by the voters of Michigan and amended the state constitution, guarantees every Michigan elector the right to request an audit, stating that each “elector qualified to vote in Michigan shall have...(t)he right to have the results of statewide elections audited, in such a manner as prescribed by law, to ensure the accuracy and integrity of elections.” The central clause, “in such a manner as prescribed by law,” has resulted in the dismissal of demands of citizens to execute this provided right because the audit performed by the Michigan secretary of state was determined to satisfy this right. Much has been made by several persons that the hand recount in Antrim County was not truly an audit. This is, and was, admitted by the secretary

INITIAL REPORT ON THE NOVEMBER 2020 ELECTION IN MICHIGAN

of state's office as true in that it was not a precinct audit, but a risk-limiting audit with a risk limit of zero, because all of the ballots were recounted and not just a sample. Furthermore, this does not diminish the profound value of hand recounting every ballot and race in the county as evidence against fraud or other illicitness. However, the actual, mandated audit detailed below was eventually conducted in Antrim County as it was in all Michigan counties.

The audits performed by the Michigan secretary of state and facilitated by county clerks and local officials has faced significant derision by citizens, lawyers, and activist leaders. The accusation is that the secretary of state has a conflict of interest in the result as it is her role as chief election officer which is being judged. However, such allegations demonstrate a significant lack of understanding regarding the rigor and depth of the audit performed, especially its decentralized nature. Auditing of the results is undertaken and administered by the county clerks, with aid and assistance provided by the local city and township clerks, and is another step removed from the secretary of state. The clerks at each of these levels, excepting municipal, are partisans from both major parties.

The extent of the audit is also critical to understanding its dependability and credibility. There are 66 steps clerks are instructed to undertake in the process. The "Post-Election Audit Manual," available online at www.Michigan.gov/sos/post_election_audit_manual_418482_7.pdf, lays out several critical points as to purpose and goals. Notably, they include pre-Election Day and Election Day procedures' fidelity to law and rules. Precincts and races are selected randomly in each county across the state. The audit examines notices, appointments and training, e-Pollbook security, test deck procedures (logic and accuracy testing), military and overseas applications, poll books, and ballot containers. The audit checklist contains 66 points of examination to meet these goals and includes the hand counting of the randomly selected races in randomly selected precincts. Pictured is a completed audit for East Grand Rapids Precinct 5. Citizens can obtain these audit results across the state from their county clerks.

Post-Election Audit Checklist

NOTE: All discrepancies should be explained on the reverse side of this checklist.

County: KENT Jurisdiction: East Grand Rapids Regular Precinct AV Precinct
Precinct: 5 Audit Date: 12/10/2020

Pre-Election Requirements: 1. Notice of Registration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 2. Election <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 3. Public Accuracy Test <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 4. Weekend Hours in GVF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Election Inspectors: 5. Appointed by Election Commission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 6. At least 1 R & 1 D <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 7. Apps available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 8. Proof of Training <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 9. Proof sent to parties <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No e-Pollbook: 10. Encryption Password: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A 11. Unique User/Password: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 12. PrivacyZone Active: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 13. Discs Saved: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 14. Date of Download: 11/2/2020		Poll Book & Statement of Votes 37. Clerk's Preparation Certificate completed and signed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 38. Election Inspectors Preparation Certificate completed and signed by inspectors present when polls opened <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 39. All inspectors (including chair) subscribed to the Constitutional Oath of Office <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 40. Oath administrator signed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 41. All election inspectors that signed the oath were appointed by the Election Commission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 42. All spoiled, affidavit, envelope, challenged, and AV ballots noted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 43. Challenges recorded (if necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 44. Wins-in votes totaled (if necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 45. Totals tape signed by inspectors present when poll closed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 46. Number of ballots tabulated on totals tape matches the number of voters listed in the pollbook <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 47. Ballot summary is completed, balanced, and totals are accurate <input type="checkbox"/> Remark <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 48. Certificate of Election Inspectors completed and signed by inspectors present when polls closed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 49. Ballot container seal number is properly recorded in pollbook <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Voting System & Test Deck: 15. Test Deck Sealed: SN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 16. Seal # Recorded: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 17. Test Deck & TAB Certification Seal # Match: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 18. Tab Seal # Match w/T&S Certification & Pollbook <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 19. Tab Serial # Match w/T&S Certification & Pollbook <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 20. EC Affidendum <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 21. Pre-printed TD-HM <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 22. Prelim Test Date: 10/15/2020 23. Public Test Date: 10/26/2020 24. Test Deck Properly Created: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Diff Totals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 25. Tab Tape & Predetermined Results Match: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 26. Zero Tape Printed: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 27. Test Deck Reopened: SN <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Program Container Certificate 50. Seal number properly recorded: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 51. Signed by one election inspector of each major political party <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Provisional Ballot Forms 52. Affidavit Question 3 PB form marked Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 53. Envelope ballot Question 3 PB form marked No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 54. Envelope ballots were processed appropriately <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 55. Affidavit & Envelope Voters were registered <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 56. Counted envelope ballots sealed in an approved container <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Voter Asset Terminal 27. Test Certification Form: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 28. Tested before Election: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 29. Tested on Election: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Number of VAT voters: 0 Applications to Vote Review: 30. # apps to vote matches # of voters: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No # of Voters on List of Voters: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 31. Apps to vote properly completed: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 32. Number of ID Affidavits: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> 0 33. Military/Overseas Apps: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 34. Ballots sent on time: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 35. AV ballot posting: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 36. Receiving Bd checklist: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Ballot Container & Voted Ballot Hand Count Audit: 37. Certificate signed by one inspector of each major political party: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 38. Properly Sealed: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 39. Container Approved: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 40. Number of spoiled ballots matches Pollbook <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 41. Duplicated ballots properly duplicated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 42. Actual Seal: 73144 43. Re-sealed AFTER AUDIT: 8385 44. Number of ballots matches number of ballots tabulated: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 45. Electronic ballots properly Duplicated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Race 1	Contest Candidates or Y/N	Hand Ct	Conv. Total	Race 2	Contest Candidates or Y/N	Hand Count	Conv. Total
President of the US	Biden	138	138	US Senator	Peters	118	119
	Trump	142	142		James	172	171
	Jorgensen	10	10		Willis	0	0
	Blankenship	0	0		Squier	1	1
	Hawkins	1	1		Dern	0	0
	De La Fuente	0	0		WI	1	1
Overvotes	0	0	Overvotes	0	0		
Undervotes	1	1	Undervotes	1	1		

Notes:
#31, One application to vote missing signature, one missing address

After completion of the above, replace the Poll Book and Statement of Votes into the appropriate envelopes and initial and seal with a red paper seal. Then sign below.

The undersigned member(s) of the Audit Board hereby certify the completion of the items checked above.

[Signature] County/State Audit Inspector
NA County/State Audit Inspector

The Committee concludes these audits are far from the worthless exercises they have been castigated as being. Many of those criticizing them are misleading concerned citizens to believe the only audit done is the “risk limiting audit.” The risk limiting audit is also performed on top of the major, statewide county audit detailed above. Its purpose is to perform an *additional* spot check on the accuracy and function of the tabulators, but it is not the main audit done.

The Committee recommends providing live video feed and recordings of the audit procedures. The public should have access to view the audit in person when possible and results should be posted online. The Committee also recommends that the Legislature fulfill the commitment of Proposal 2018-3 to guarantee an audit upon request of any elector.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Recommendations

- Place in statute the rights and duties of challengers and poll watchers, requiring they be uniformly trained and held accountable.
- Ensuring combined AVCBs can have more than one challenger per party, with the ability to replace challengers who exit the AVCB location after the sequester is lifted.
- Allow for bipartisan election inspectors for all audits and require the process be open to the public.
- Prohibit the unsolicited mailing of absentee voter ballot applications from the secretary of state to limit the potential for non-Michigan residents voting in elections.
- Establish signature verification requirements via the administrative rules process or statute in order to provide clarity and uniformity to election workers on the proper way to ensure signatures match.
- Require video security on all drop boxes and require all drop boxes be emptied and secured immediately or earlier than 8 p.m. on Election Day to help expedite the processing and tabulation of ballots.
- In order to ensure more accurate voter rolls, allow county clerks greater authority when removing deceased individuals from the Qualified Voter File.
- Allow for the continued pre-processing of absentee ballots the day before Election Day, so long as stringent security measures are kept in place. Pre-processing must occur on the site of tabulation.
- Consider allowing tabulation, which is more secure, to begin in the week preceding Election Day as long as results may not be released until polls are closed on the completion of Election Day.
- Require that best practices for maintaining a balanced precinct on Election Day be part of the necessary training for all precinct workers. Establish a public, published record of all clerks who fail to provide the appropriate training or continuing education to themselves or their employees.
- Reform the canvassing processes by requiring canvassers be present during the canvass activities, expanding certain county boards where population requires it, and provide for additional time for the process to be completed.

Conclusion

The Committee can confidently assert that it has been thorough in examination of numerous allegations of unlawful actions, improper procedures, fraud, vote theft, or any other description which would cause citizens to doubt the integrity of Michigan's 2020 election results. Our clear finding is that citizens should be confident the results represent the true results of the ballots cast by the people of Michigan. The Committee strongly recommends citizens use a critical eye and ear toward those who have pushed demonstrably false theories for their own personal gain. We also conclude citizens should demand reasonable updates and reforms to close real vulnerabilities and unlawful activities that caused much of the doubt and questionability to flourish and could, if unchecked, be responsible for serious and disastrous fraud or confusion in the future.

Further, we commend the innumerable clerks, canvassers, staff, workers, and volunteers across Michigan that make the enormous complexity of elections operate so smoothly, so often. The complexity of the work and the dedication we discovered are astounding and worthy of our sincerest appreciation. We also commend the diligent citizens that took time to report problems and concerns they saw because they want and value fair and free elections above party or personal gain. If all citizens remain vigilant and involved, we will emerge stronger after any challenging time.