



202 North Ave
Grand Junction, CO 81501

To whom it may concern,

Tactical Data Solutions performed a data audit of the voters who received ballots in Jefferson County Colorado. We began by using file CE068-20201114 from the Colorado Secretary of State which contained 423963 records of people who received ballots and returned ballots as of November 14, 2020. This file formed the basis of the data we analyzed.

Of the 423963 records 381360 records indicate ballots were returned or voted in person and 42603 records indicate no vote was made. The breakdown by party and by method is below (Figure 1).

Figure 1

| COUNTY | PARTY | VOTE_METHOD | CountOfVOTER_ID | Totals | Pct |
|-----------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|
| JEFFERSON | ACN | IN PERSON DRE | 83 | | |
| JEFFERSON | ACN | IN PERSON PAPER | 45 | | |
| JEFFERSON | ACN | MAIL | 609 | 737 | 0.19% |
| JEFFERSON | APV | IN PERSON DRE | 16 | | |
| JEFFERSON | APV | IN PERSON PAPER | 10 | | |
| JEFFERSON | APV | MAIL | 134 | 160 | 0.04% |
| JEFFERSON | DEM | IN PERSON DRE | 2428 | | |
| JEFFERSON | DEM | IN PERSON PAPER | 1141 | | |
| JEFFERSON | DEM | MAIL | 113615 | 117184 | 30.73% |
| JEFFERSON | GRN | IN PERSON DRE | 27 | | |
| JEFFERSON | GRN | IN PERSON PAPER | 30 | | |
| JEFFERSON | GRN | MAIL | 670 | 727 | 0.19% |
| JEFFERSON | LBR | IN PERSON DRE | 281 | | |
| JEFFERSON | LBR | IN PERSON PAPER | 181 | | |
| JEFFERSON | LBR | MAIL | 3747 | 4209 | 1.10% |
| JEFFERSON | REP | IN PERSON DRE | 5403 | | |
| JEFFERSON | REP | IN PERSON PAPER | 2449 | | |
| JEFFERSON | REP | MAIL | 92734 | 100586 | 26.38% |
| JEFFERSON | UAF | IN PERSON DRE | 5683 | | |
| JEFFERSON | UAF | IN PERSON PAPER | 2818 | | |
| JEFFERSON | UAF | MAIL | 149043 | 157544 | 41.31% |
| JEFFERSON | UNI | IN PERSON DRE | 24 | | |
| JEFFERSON | UNI | IN PERSON PAPER | 15 | | |
| JEFFERSON | UNI | MAIL | 174 | 213 | 0.06% |
| | | | 381360 | | |

To begin, TDS submitted the entire 423,963 file for data appends to include NCOA – National Change of Address which is maintained by the United States Postal Service. The data was also compared to a deceased screen suppression file which compares the file to the Social Security Administration's Death Master File as well as the

US Department of Commerce Limited Access Death Master File. Finally, this data was compared to a file of known prison and half way houses to identify prisoners who may be voting in the Jefferson County election.

National Change of Address Voters:

TDS performed a number of queries from the master file. The first query looked at the NCOA returns. Of the 423963 records, the NCOA comparison shows that 10,070 persons turned in some kind of change of address with the United States Post Office. 4,002 of the 10,070 did NOT vote but 6,068 did vote in the 2020 election. 6,336 of the voters in this file changed their address to an out of state address. Of the 6,336 records with change of addresses, 3,147 records show that they DID cast a vote. The table below shows how these votes were cast and which state their change of address was recorded.

A complete audit should include the inspection of the DRE machines and the scanner which scanned the ballots. There are multiple reports all over the country that Dominion Voting Systems has had problems keeping the vote tallies straight. These machines have the ability to be easily accessed and have votes removed or altered, presumably in order to correct errors while scanning or entering votes. This report does not include examination of the machines used to count ballots or record vote as they occurred in real time.

Figure 2:

| VOTE_METHOD | NCOA ST | CountofVOTER_ID | VOTE_METHOD | NCOA ST | ntofVOTER | VOTE_METHOD | NCOA ST | ntofVOTER |
|-------------|---------|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|---------|-----------|
| MAIL | AA | 6 | IN PERSON DRE | AR | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | AL | 1 |
| MAIL | AE | 105 | IN PERSON DRE | AZ | 9 | IN PERSON PAPER | AZ | 4 |
| MAIL | AK | 11 | IN PERSON DRE | CA | 1 | IN PERSON PAPER | CA | 5 |
| MAIL | AL | 35 | IN PERSON DRE | FL | 7 | IN PERSON PAPER | FL | 2 |
| MAIL | AP | 38 | IN PERSON DRE | GA | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | IA | 1 |
| MAIL | AR | 22 | IN PERSON DRE | IA | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | ID | 2 |
| MAIL | AZ | 214 | IN PERSON DRE | IL | 5 | IN PERSON PAPER | IL | 3 |
| MAIL | CA | 277 | IN PERSON DRE | IN | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | KS | 3 |
| MAIL | CT | 15 | IN PERSON DRE | KS | 4 | IN PERSON PAPER | MI | 1 |
| MAIL | DC | 25 | IN PERSON DRE | KY | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | MN | 1 |
| MAIL | DE | 4 | IN PERSON DRE | LA | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | ND | 1 |
| MAIL | FL | 173 | IN PERSON DRE | MA | 3 | IN PERSON PAPER | NE | 4 |
| MAIL | GA | 64 | IN PERSON DRE | MI | 3 | IN PERSON PAPER | NV | 1 |
| MAIL | GU | 1 | IN PERSON DRE | MO | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | NY | 2 |
| MAIL | HI | 47 | IN PERSON DRE | MT | 1 | IN PERSON PAPER | OK | 1 |
| MAIL | IA | 34 | IN PERSON DRE | NC | 3 | IN PERSON PAPER | OR | 1 |
| MAIL | ID | 32 | IN PERSON DRE | ND | 1 | IN PERSON PAPER | SC | 1 |
| MAIL | IL | 81 | IN PERSON DRE | NE | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | TX | 5 |
| MAIL | IN | 41 | IN PERSON DRE | NJ | 2 | IN PERSON PAPER | WA | 4 |
| MAIL | KS | 53 | IN PERSON DRE | NM | 3 | IN PERSON PAPER | WY | 3 |
| MAIL | KY | 12 | IN PERSON DRE | NV | 2 | | | 46 |
| MAIL | LA | 25 | IN PERSON DRE | NY | 1 | | | |
| MAIL | MA | 53 | IN PERSON DRE | OH | 1 | | | |
| MAIL | MD | 47 | IN PERSON DRE | OK | 4 | | | |
| MAIL | ME | 15 | IN PERSON DRE | OR | 2 | | | |
| MAIL | MI | 47 | IN PERSON DRE | SC | 2 | | | |
| MAIL | MIN | 24 | IN PERSON DRE | TN | 3 | | | |
| MAIL | MO | 62 | IN PERSON DRE | TX | 10 | | | |
| MAIL | MP | 1 | IN PERSON DRE | UT | 2 | | | |
| MAIL | MS | 11 | IN PERSON DRE | VA | 2 | | | |
| MAIL | MT | 53 | IN PERSON DRE | VT | 1 | | | |
| MAIL | NC | 80 | IN PERSON DRE | WA | 4 | | | |
| MAIL | ND | 8 | IN PERSON DRE | WI | 2 | | | |
| MAIL | NE | 69 | IN PERSON DRE | WV | 2 | | | |
| MAIL | NH | 6 | | | 96 | | | |
| MAIL | NJ | 25 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | NM | 58 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | NV | 37 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | NY | 119 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | OH | 50 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | OK | 58 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | OR | 78 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | PA | 37 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | PR | 2 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | RI | 10 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | SC | 45 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | SD | 21 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | TN | 51 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | TX | 211 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | UT | 71 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | VA | 108 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | VI | 9 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | VT | 17 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | WA | 126 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | WI | 34 | | | | | | |
| MAIL | WV | 47 | | | | | | |
| | | 3005 | | | | | | |

Deceased Screen:

The data was also compared to a deceased screen suppression file which compares the file to the Social Security Administration's Death Master File as well as the US Department of Commerce Limited Access Death Master File. This screen showed that 71 people who voted were also flagged as deceased according to the screen. Of the 71 screened the following grades were determined:

46 are considered grade B1. 25 are considered match grade C1. The data includes the YOB provided by the voter file. And, we were able to get a Date of Birth of the deceased in order to provide a higher quality match.

Figure 3 includes non-voters as well as those who voted. Figure 4 describes the match grade.

Figure 3

Deceased Data Suppression Report - 6

Match Type by Confidence Code

| MATCH TYPE | CONFIDENCE CODE | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | CONFIRMED BY DEATH CERTIFICATE (P) | | CONFIRMED BY RELATIVE (V) | | MATCHED TO OBITUARY DATA (O) | | DATA NOT AVAILABLE | |
| | QTY | % OF TOTAL DECEASED | QTY | % OF TOTAL DECEASED | QTY | % OF TOTAL DECEASED | QTY | % OF TOTAL DECEASED |
| A1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| A2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| B1 | 23 | 11.86 | 60 | 30.93 | 49 | 25.26 | 13 | 6.70 |
| C1 | 8 | 4.12 | 25 | 12.89 | 12 | 6.19 | 4 | 2.06 |
| C2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| C3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| D1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| D2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| D3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| D4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 31 | 15.98 | 85 | 43.81 | 61 | 31.44 | 17 | 8.76 |

Dec page 7

Figure 4

Job Number: 11252020
Date: 11/25/2020
Client: TACTICAL DATA SOLUTIONS
Control#: 91290

Deceased Data Suppression Report - 1

Summary and Control Report

| | | |
|---|----------|---------------------|
| Total Records Read | QUANTITY | % OF INPUT |
| Total Number of Matches | 212757 | 100.00 |
| Individual Matches (A1-C3) | 15869 | 7.46 |
| Household Matches (D1-D4) | 206 | 0.24 |
| Number of Records Not Matched (I & N) | 15353 | 7.22 |
| | 196888 | 92.54 |
| Match Type Statistics | QUANTITY | % OF TOTAL DECEASED |
| A1 - Exact match by SSN, First Name, Last Name | 0 | 0.00 |
| A2 - Weighted name (Close to exact name) match by SSN | 0 | 0.00 |
| B1 - Exact match First Name, Last Name and Address | 29 | 1.37 |
| | 249 | 1.47 |
| C1 - Address exact match / Name near-exact match | 257 | 1.62 |
| C2 - Name Exact match / Address near exact match | 220 | 1.39 |
| C3 - Near-exact match on both Name and Address | 0 | 0.00 |
| | 304 | 1.92 |
| Subtotal - B | 1 | 0.01 |
| Subtotal - C | 15853 | 96.81 |
| D1 - Exact Last Name / Exact Address (Household level match) | 15019 | 94.64 |
| D2 - Exact Last Name / Address near-exact match (Household level match) | 39 | 0.25 |
| D3 - Exact Address / Weighted Last Name match (Household level match) | 304 | 1.92 |
| D4 - Weighted Last Name / Near-Exact Address Match (Household level match) | 1 | 0.01 |
| Subtotal - D | 15853 | 96.81 |
| Non Matched Type Statistics | QUANTITY | % OF INPUT |
| I - Insufficient Data to match (Key address elements (street name, city, state or zip) missing) | 1 | 0.00 |
| N - No match (excludes "I" records) | 196887 | 92.54 |
| Subtotal - I & N | 196888 | 92.54 |
| Flagged Record Statistics | QUANTITY | % OF TOTAL DECEASED |
| Only one record could be genderized (code G) | 6 | 0.04 |
| One record had only an initial in First Name (code I) | 0 | 0.00 |
| Only one record had a Maturity Title or Generational Discrepancy (code M) | 195 | 1.23 |
| Only one record could be genderized and one record had a Maturity Title or Generational Discrepancy (code L) | 0 | 0.00 |
| One record had an initial in First Name & only one record had a Maturity Title or Generational Discrepancy (code Z) | 0 | 0.00 |
| Only one record could be genderized & one record had an initial in First Name (code Z) | 16 | 0.10 |
| All 3 conditions exists among the matched records (code A) | 3 | 0.02 |

Prison Screen:

The prison screen shows that 34 ballots were cast from a prison or a facility controlled by the justice system, including halfway houses or other incarceration facilities. The following table gives us the breakdown (Figure 4).

Figure 5

| PRIS_MATCH | PARTY | Count | Pct |
|------------|-------|-------|--------|
| P1 | APV | 1 | 2.94% |
| P1 | DEM | 12 | 35.29% |
| P1 | GRN | 1 | 2.94% |
| P1 | REP | 3 | 8.82% |
| P1 | UAF | 17 | 50.00% |
| | | 5 | |
| | | 34 | |

You may want to double check with authorities if these people are legally allowed to vote.

Additional queries:

Query 1:

This query did not yield any specific name change problems as I discovered in other counties. There are 13 people that have the exact same middle name as their first name but it didn't yield any people who changed them around to defraud the voter registration system. I included the result below - but this doesn't show anything worth worrying about. This query was looking for duplicate people who just switched their first name to middle name and vice versa. I may do a first initial on both later just do check if they reduced the middle name to an initial.

Query 2:

This query compares duplicate records who share the same first name, same birth year, same address and same gender but have different voter ID's. Query 2 yielded 107 people who have the same first name, the same year of birth, the same gender and they live at the same address. They all have different voter ID's and received a ballot for each voter ID. Some have the same middle name and some have different middle names. These records deserve further inspection to be sure they are not different people.

Query 3:

This query compared duplicate records who share the same first name, same middle name, same last name, same gender, same year of birth and also live at the same address. This query yielded 24 records that have different voter ID's but also received 2 ballots. Upon closer inspection none of the duplicate ballot holders in this query voted both of them.

Query 4:

We ran a report by residential address with the highest number of voters per household by party. This may indicate multiple voters voting from the same address and it may also indicate large buildings where the unit numbers are not indicated. These addresses should require further inspection to find out if each person is a legitimate voter.

Figure 6

| RES_ADDRESS | RES_CITY | RZip5 | PARTY | CountOfVOTER_ID |
|--------------------|----------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| 8787 W ALAMEDA AVE | LAKEWOOD | 80226 | REP | 37 |
| 8787 W ALAMEDA AVE | LAKEWOOD | 80226 | UAF | 31 |
| 12750 W 63RD AVE | ARVADA | 80004 | UAF | 11 |
| | WHEAT | | | |
| 6270 W 38TH AVE | RIDGE | 80033 | UAF | 11 |
| 8755 W 14TH AVE | LAKEWOOD | 80215 | UAF | 11 |
| 1685 EATON ST | LAKEWOOD | 80214 | DEM | 9 |
| 2901 FORD ST | GOLDEN | 80401 | UAF | 9 |
| 10339 W 81ST AVE | ARVADA | 80005 | REP | 8 |
| | WHEAT | | | |
| 11600 W 44TH AVE | RIDGE | 80033 | REP | 8 |
| 1625 CARR ST | LAKEWOOD | 80214 | DEM | 8 |
| 1655 YARROW ST | LAKEWOOD | 80214 | DEM | 8 |
| 1685 EATON ST | LAKEWOOD | 80214 | REP | 8 |
| 8850 W 50TH AVE | ARVADA | 80002 | REP | 8 |

Query 5:

This query we looked for duplicate people with the exact same name, same gender, same year of birth and who have the same address by Residential address compared to NCOA. This query yielded 4

Query 6:

This query we looked for duplicate people with the exact same name, same gender, same year of birth and who have the same Mailing Address compared to NCOA. This query yielded the same 4 as Query 5. Sometimes we find differences which is why we do both types of queries.

Query 7: This query we isolated the Out of State Registered voters which we discussed above see Fig. 2

Query 8:

This query we searched for any voters that voted with a year of birth greater than 2002 in order to find anomalous records of those who would be under the age of 18. This query yielded = 0

Query 9:

This query isolated persons living in prison or incarceration facilities detailed in the above report.

Conclusion:

Jefferson County is the largest county in Colorado and represents about 11.5% of the State's voters who received a ballot. We have found areas that need attention, specifically, voters who have moved out of state or to other parts of Colorado and to remove them from the voter roles. Those who have not voted and are inactive voters should be removed and those who turned in change of address forms should be investigated further to find out if these are permanent moves or temporary moves. By paying attention to NCOA Jefferson can reduce the opportunity for voter fraud.

One type of potential fraud we are not able to uncover, are voters who may have registered at a different address in another county and then re-registered at their new address in Jefferson County as well. If we were able to NCOA the entire state we would certainly find voters who received ballots at their old address and their new address in Jefferson County. Due to budgetary constraints we were unable to run such a report as completing the entire state of Colorado's 3.7 Million people who received a ballot would cost funds beyond the scope of this report.

Cleaning up the voter roles in Jefferson County should focus on people who have left the county and still receive a ballot. The deceased voters which are flagged need further review to determine if they are indeed deceased and an investigation should focus on their returned ballots to determine what their signatures looked like. It should be noted that Judicial Watch has a pending lawsuit against the Colorado Secretary of State to enforce the removal of inactive voters. You can read more about that suit here:

<https://www.judicialwatch.org/press-releases/co-voter-rolls/>

The voter's flagged can be verified against the master voter file which will tell you when a person registered to vote and if they are active or inactive. The master registered voter file we are providing is as of November 1, 2014.

Regards,



Tom Bjorklund

CEO Tactical Data Solutions, Inc.

PS We may find other anomalies as we review the rest of Colorado, we reserve the right to amend this report as necessary in order to provide a service to Jefferson County.