

**Research Roundtable ~ Post-Midterms Regroup**  
**November 16, 2022**  
**CauseOfAmerica.org**

---

ASG: Welcome everybody to our research roundtable. This is for Wednesday, November 16th, 2022. And since we just had select--I mean elections last week, midterms, this is our regroup session. Towards the end of the call, I'll share with you kind of what I have planned for the next couple meetings. We have Colonel Shawn Smith on with us today. All right, so why don't we start? I would love to hear from people what your top research priority is right now. I realize for some people it may not have changed at all with the midterms, and that's OK, but maybe it has. Maybe you're digging on something else. Maybe you're working on FTX, maybe you're still working on Konnech stuff. But whatever it is, I would love to hear from you because I'm going to compile a list today while we're talking, to make it easier to connect people who are working on similar things, so that we can combine efforts and streamline processes and share information, which is really the purpose of these calls. So I see Lori has her hand up first. What's going on, Lori?

Lori: Yes. Hi, all. How are you doing?

ASG: Good morning.

Lori: We have a legislative workshop tomorrow with Senator Hall. So we are gathering affidavits and preparing a couple paragraphs about issues that we have experienced or would like to see incrementally improve. So that's kind of what we're working on today. We spent a lot of time in the 87th legislative session and wasted a lot of time in the 87th legislative session. So we're not spending a lot of time with the legislature or putting all of our eggs in that basket. We are trying to learn the process to initiate decertification of ES&S from the Secretary of State and the Office of the Attorney General. Both of those authorities have a letter of certification based off of Texas election code Chapter 122 and set forth 10 standards of certification. That says voting systems must meet every single standard to be able to be used for our elections. So we're trying to figure out what that process is from our understanding, from seeing letters of decertification of other voting systems, that it could be a paragraph in a pin, no investigation necessary type of decertification. If they're going to make it that easy. So we're working on that and then we're working on that with the office of the Attorney General and the Secretary of State General Counsel, I think his name is Andrew Bitter. And hopefully he will respond to that. We are also putting in a request with the Secretary of State General Counsel for a standard set of records for Travis, Dallas, Williamson, Boskey, Colin, Bell, Fort Bend and Bear County, all those systems are ES&S. Some have different precinct centralizers, but they're all operating on the voting system, the voting center model and on ES&S voting system, very close versions and we're going to get a standard set of records for that and then break it up with our county leaders and start performing a citizen audit on that on those records. I did have a question for Colonel Shawn Smith that I didn't get to last time. It's kind of a side project that we're trying to figure out. During the 2020 election we received, through our Public Information Act request, emails between our Election Department and 10X poll book software systems and

Julie Siple, the voter registration director. She sent an e-mail to 10X asking them if they could help her with an issue of duplicate voter ID showing up. And then the 10X guy responds back that no problem, I just wrote a script to make sure that those are cleared out before they go to live voter turnout. And this is a script that makes sure that any duplicates that pop up are immediately taken care of. And so we wanted to know: How? Where? Where are they writing that script? For where? In these duplicate voter ID's that she's talking about, 10X had an issue where it was giving an unknown number of voters the wrong ballot. It has a printer queue, so if you go up and something happens with the Internet and the poll worker hits the print button three times, your Ballot Choice card style is going to load up three times into this printer queue, and so the next three people are going to get that ballot style. That's what's going to come out. And so we had an unknown number of people that received a previous voters duplicated ballot and we believe that this e-mail is showing Julie Siple telling 10X that those duplicated voter ID's are showing up. And she wants to get him cleared out so that you can't see that these systems don't meet the standards of certification. That makes no sense.

SS: Yes. Where to start? There is no standard whatsoever for voter registration systems at the federal level. No standard, no certification, no testing, nothing. So this is the basis of a class action lawsuit. Citizens of the United States, the people versus the government, so the EAC. Actually, it wasn't EAC, it was National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS). Sorry, I'm gonna branch off this like 7 times. When you look at the federal statute that's now in Title 52, it used to be under a different title but basically what came out of is that it establishes the Election Assistance Commission Technical Guidelines Development Committee (TGDC). The TGDC is what advises EAC on technical standards, and it requires that NIST be the chair and the primary technical adviser to EAC, particularly when it comes to system security. That's right. In the statute, there's no provision whatsoever for securing or even ensuring the accuracy of the centralized statewide voter registration systems. No mechanism, no testing, no authority, nothing. And yet the statute requires that the systems centralize statewide voter registration systems, which are mandatory. And part of the grant funding profile that the states assure the federal government in order to get have a grant funds, which they've gotten tons. Texas has gotten tons, I don't know how much, probably hundreds of millions of dollars. The statute requires the centralized statewide voter registration system--actually, it requires that the secretaries of state, as the chief election officials, that they maintain those systems accurate and secure, but there is no enforcement mechanism whatsoever. There's no inspection, there's nobody who does it, nobody checks them, and theoretically as a result of the 2017 decision to place election infrastructure underneath the rubric of critical infrastructure protection as a sub sector of the government facilities sector says it has responsibility, but they have no authority and nobody does anything with them.

OK, now fast forward 10X is trying to solve a problem at the epoll book level in the in the polling centers. That is a problem that is not in the poll book. The problem is in the centralized statewide voter registration system. Texas has a hybrid system, I mean, it's a little bit different in each state. Most states are top down, a few states are bottom up. I don't understand that they're really bottom up. It's not legal anymore for them to get funds. Texas is hybrid, meaning

that the clerks or the county registrars, I guess. Who is it in Texas? Is it registrars that register voters?

Lori: Basically.

SS: OK, yeah. So the registrars and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State staff have the capability to modify records, to add records, delete records, edit records. So if you have two people, two voters with the same voter registration number, obviously the system's not accurate. Those cannot possibly be accurate information, right? It's either two different people, or it's a fake person and a real person, or two fake people. That cannot be what should immediately happen. There is an investigation of their entire data set, data structure, all the records, right? You have a problem, right? It'd be like if your bank account came up and showed you had a billion dollars suddenly in your checking account, the bank would be doing something about it. Not just saying ohh, let's manually change the account balance for that person, right? It's asinine. And yet they're not doing any of it and said all this stuff. They're hiding all this. Now what does this mean? We are going to need, and I'm going to try to convince some of the institutions to prepare and bring forth a class action lawsuit against the federal government and the state governments for not only failing to maintain accurate secure voter registration systems, but for failing to create and sustain an enforcement mechanism, thereby allowing the states or creating a situation where the states are violating the civil and voting rights of Americans. So we have no reason for--I mean the evidence is replete. Not only do we see everything up in Wisconsin with duplicate voters and things like that and voter registration, like more people registered than exist in the state, that kind of thing. But we have all these canvassing results from different States and now we have the results that are building and mounting from the project that Jeff Young on our side and then you know Russ and other people are working on with the NCOA project. They're basically doing comparisons between states, voter registrations, the thing that states ought to be doing, that ERIC says they're doing, that the Kansas Interstate Crosscheck said that they were doing and was doing before they were sued out of existence by the ACLU and other leftist groups is finding duplicate voters.

But there's a lot more to it than that, right? You could have, let's say Texas could have 200,000 to 300,000 completely fake voters and as long as they don't register them in any other state and use the exact same names, you won't see them as duplicates. Jeff and the guys working on that have already under identified hundreds of thousands of duplicates and I don't think they've even got to 10% of the state vs. state comparisons. I mean they're up over 500,000 now I think. I don't know if anybody on this call is working on it. So OK, so now back to your 10X problem. You've got an e-mail that basically says 10X is going to solve the indicator for the county clerk or registrar, they're going to essentially hide the evidence that the voter registration system is wrong. That's what you've got. If two people have the same voter ID, they need to at this point--and you'll have to go back into your statute, but go back into your statute and see when they certify. Who is that clerk that you got the e-mail for?

Lori: Yeah, so I just dropped it into the chat. It is Julie Siple, and she's actually the voter registration supervisor. And we have emails showing that these 10X poll books were indeed

giving voters the wrong ballot choice card without them, you know, the only way that they could catch it is if the previous voter was from a different area in the county with a different lower ballot, down ballot race like the Independent School District and that's how it was being discovered. You had people that went and voted by where they work. So like let's say they lived in Round Rock, so Round Rock Independent School district races would have been at the bottom of their ballot, but they went over and voted by their work in Hutto and at the bottom of their ballot they had Hutto ISD races. And so they went home, checked it and then sent an e-mail to the election department saying hey, I got home and checked the candidates and measures that I was supposed to get and my ballot had Hutto ISD, not Round Rock. Well, so then they discovered that it's possible. And Christopher Davis, our election administrator, sends an e-mail out to everyone saying, guys, it is important that you check the voter's information because it's possible that something's happening, that the voter could be receiving the wrong ballot. Well, this is at the very beginning of early voting in person and there were many malfunctions, but this particular malfunction on a brand new, you know, recent voting system deployed county-wide on Election Day, I think it was the first time in 2020 that we had county wide voting centers in early voting in person and Election Day and these 10X poll books had some sort of printer queue in it that that glitched. If something was messed up with the Internet or the Wi-Fi or for whatever reason they would just keep hitting print. Like what's the matter? Why isn't it printing out right. Let me just hit print again and keep hitting print well every time their finger touch the print button, that voter's ballot choice card was loaded into this print queue. And so if you have three people online and it's the first voter of the day that voter's going to finally get their ballot, but the two people behind them are going to get that person's ballot first called as well. And potentially every single person in a voting center is receiving a previous voter's duplicated ballot. And so then we see Julie Siple send this e-mail to Matt Miller at 10X and she says #1 some of the records are missing the ballot style. She says, "I think we have a couple issues with the voter credit file we're getting from precinct Central console. Some of the records are missing the ballot style examples, voter number, blah blah blah. The second issue is that the voting unit and voting sub unit values are not correct. In the import file I attached the import layout that we're needing and a precinct voting unit cross reference tab delimited. There are leading zeros in some of those fields and #3, she said. The voter credit file also has some duplicate records, examples, and she gives some numbers I suspect, and so this is, she says, I suspect we don't operate on suspicion. I suspect that the voters were checked in on more than one touch pad before they synched up with each other, and that's how this happened. Is there any way to eliminate those before they go to the voter credit file? Or the live voter turnout page cycle voter registration supervisor." And then here's Matt Miller with 10X responds: "Hi Julie, I've corrected this is October 15th, 2 days into early voting in person ballots voting is in full swing—"

SS: Why don't we take this offline? But if you can, send me a copy of that. OK, if you don't mind forward me a copy of that. I think in this situation what I would say is you want to go right to the canvassing board in the county. And you probably want to inform other canvassing boards in the county, so maybe you want to go to the Secretary of State because this could affect the certifiability of the election, right? They need to investigate and find out whether they had anybody vote in elections, races or issues that they were not eligible to vote on. How many

duplicates there were? Were any of those counted? Because if they certify results with those open questions and they don't know, then effectively they're lying. Once you tell them look, your tallies may be incorrect, they may include erroneous information, you need to find out whether these problems were a Democrat across the state and how many instances there were. They could be outcome determinative and they should know that before they certify. That's what I would recommend. Does that make sense?

Lori: Yes, it does. Team. I mean, among all the other things that could be outcome determinative or fraudulent or inaccurate, this is 1. We've actually filed an election contest. We ran my husband for the county judge to try to get the top spot. I was denied access into central counting station. Our election completely failed. They were unable to generate the precinct level results by November 17th certification and they certified blank paper so that that's where we've been fighting since November 10th, 2020. I watched my election completely fail. I watched the recovery of that election completely fail. We still have no certified election results for the November 2020 election, and they're like, "let's just do better next time."

ASG: All right, thanks, Lori. So apart from the sidebar that you get to work on with Shawn, I've got you that you're working on decertification of the ES&S machines and obtaining records from multiple Texas counties so you can start that citizen audit. OK Holly you had your hand up.

Holly: Yes, ma'am. I'll go ahead and talk. Hi, everyone. Shawn, I had something that I was going to talk to you about. There's a couple of us and one of our groups that have stumbled across an anomaly with Campaign Sidekick and the candidates who are using Campaign Sidekick vs. the candidates who are using either i360 or Advantage or the popular ones on the Democrat side. So what we found is and we're still researching, we're still talking to candidates. I think we're up to about five states now across the country where we're seeing this in Arizona with Kari Lake and those guys they use Campaign Sidekick. Just to kind of give an example, Marjorie Taylor Greene, she did not use Campaign Sidekick, but we're seeing a trend here and we're doing some deep diving and researching on that. So I just kind of wanted to throw that out there so that y'all know what we were doing and if y'all hear of any candidates or know of any candidates right off, please let Amy know and she can get that information to me and we can compile it with our report.

SS: Holly, what is it, in a nutshell? What's the issue?

Holly: So we've not dug that far into it yet. I'm actually going to get a Campaign Sidekick login from somebody that I know very well that has access to it and she can give me access and I'm going to actually pass that on. I'm going to delegate that and let a computer geek dive into that and kind of, you know, see what they can find out on that end. What we are thinking is that in the state of Georgia, all of our stuff is preloaded with all the voter roll and voter information. It all goes back to the GOP, which in turn would be the RNC that would have access to it. And I know this is a theory and a long shot, but I'm almost wondering, what servers are housing this stuff? Who has access to it? How are they knowing? We know there's the machine sheet, we know there's the absentee sheet. We know that they know where they need to fill on ballots

and they're seeing the numbers. But every state is different and I think, I think kind of what our idea is, is that maybe they're cross referencing using this as a cross referencing data tool.

SS: Oh, between states you mean?

Holly: Within each state and yes, between states, I think so.

SS: I know we had a couple counties in Colorado that kind of initiated canvassing and how we did it from USEIP back when we were starting that up is we got the state centralized statewide voter registration system downloads and then Jeff did his data work. Jeff did his data work and separated those massive files into consumable county levels. But the people who started off trying to use Sidekick, they were using different datasets and I think it's a little bit like you have a pasta maker in your house, and it's like your kid comes in and they look at it and they say, hey look, it's a play-doh fun factory and they jam some play-doh into it, it'll come out looking like pasta, but it won't be pasta. So I think the datasets going in are really critical and not all states allow the full data set to be downloaded. And then some of them are dated or aged, like trying to think of where they want to charge somebody. I think was Alabama that they charged Mike 20 grand or something to get the data sets that Colorado is paying \$1000 for statewide and which no state should be charging anybody for since it's already supposed to be public information. I mean it's insane right? It would be like your bank charging you to know how much was in your account. But anyway, yeah, we're we'll be interested in that. And I don't want to sign Jeff up in analytics, up for more work. But I know they'll be interested if you find that there are issues in datasets like between state voter histories or voter registration systems.

Holly: The other thing we're doing is, we've got a team that's working on the NCOA stuff as well. So that's completely different from what we're doing. I've actually not even thought about tying in and looking to see what the comparison is, but that's a whole other avenue Shawn, thank you for that idea.

SS: Counties also sometimes have different data sets than the state, which is weird and shouldn't happen, right? Should that happen? That is happening in the state of Georgia. Every county's data set information is completely different from the Secretary of State. Because we purchased all of those about every three to four months, it's actually by county, and then we get them by county, and then we purchase the statewide, too. If a county certifies an election result to the state, and the state looks at that and says you've got a different voter list than I have for you, they shouldn't certify a statewide result until they resolve that discrepancy because they could very easily have people voting, or voters or votes cast that don't correspond. They should be resolving that. Nobody's doing any of that. The whole thing is just this incredible kabuki theater. It's unbelievable, right? It's like organized by morons.

Holly: Alright, that was all I had.

ASG: Thanks Holly. So I'm putting you down for Campaign Sidekick and then also teams in Georgia doing NCOA work.

Holly: Yeah. All right. Thank you.

ASG: All right, who's up next? Tell us what your what your primary focus is right now for research so we can help you connect with others doing similar work. Also I want to tell you guys, Terry Putnam in Texas had a dental appointment or something and couldn't be here today, but he let me know that he is working on ERIC with intention to withdraw Votech in Williamson County and Dallas County. So what he said is: "I'm still working on gathering information about ERIC to convince our Texas Legislature to direct the SOS to withdraw. I'm also looking at the Votech election management and compliance system used in Williamson County, Texas as poll watchers observed new registrants being added to the poll books during early voting. Similar things were reported in Dallas County." So that is what Terry's working on. Anybody else want to share what their main focus is right now for research?

SS: One of the things I'm working on right now is trying to put something together for an attorney team. So you guys are aware of the whole issue I'm sure with election records, right? The federal statute that Title 52 USC 20701 requires preservation of election records for 22 months following any election involving a candidate for federal office, and then there's 2021's post election audit guidance publication from the Department of Justice that establishes that digital records are election records and confirms the purpose of preserving the election records is to preserve an audit trail that will support the successful and comprehensive investigation to determine whether or not any voting or civil rights related to voting and elections have been violated. When you combine that with the voting system standards, in particular the 2002, which are most explicit, voting system standards, but also the voluntary voting system guidelines and NIST, other publications recording regarding the requirement for comprehensive log file preservation for the purpose of using them for audit trails and with any kind of knowledge whatsoever of cyber security and the necessity of log files for the ability to forensically evaluate what's actually taking place on a computer based system, you come to an undeniable conclusion that all of the records that can be generated as logs on computer based voting systems which should be generated, should be preserved, should be immutable, should be kept safe by election officials who are charged with the requirement. Under federal law and in many state laws too, they should be preserving those log files from their computer based voting systems. And yet none of them are not a single jurisdiction in the entire country as far as I can tell is actually preserving --they're not even generating because the voting system vendors have gotten away with this very small set of logging and then they're overriding the logging. It's literally part of their certified configuration because the EAC is so corrupt and incompetent. And so we're fighting against this because we've asserted that the secretaries of state and the election officials are not doing their legal duty, that they're violating the statutes by destroying and not preserving the log files that they should have. And we got the deputy Secretary of State in Colorado to admit in a court that they are destroying log files. But he asserted that those log files are not necessary. The ones that they're destroying are not necessary.

So our next step is to show and prove in a court with a court ruling that they are necessary. And if we can get that done, this is going to have nationwide implications because everybody will be

able to cite it and say, look, a court said these are necessary and yet you're not preserving them. So in Washington state and Oregon and Georgia and Maryland and everywhere where Harry Fursty overwrote those cards in New Hampshire. All of that will shift the entire landscape because right now they're not preserving the records. So all of the claims like oh, there's no fraud, prove there's fraud, where's your evidence? They're destroying the evidence on a daily basis and they're not creating the evidence they're required to. And then they destroy it and then they say there's no evidence. So anyway, that's one of the things that we're working on. And then also, there's so much, do you ever see those videos of where there's like a flash mob riot where everybody goes in and is stealing stuff at Target or whatever? That's what the election looks like. There's so many people running in different directions and so many things wrong. Like you don't even know which color to grab. So anyway, do what you can with what you've got, where you are. Reach out to other people who've got expertise and collect evidence and try to convince public officials. I mean, it's not like they don't know what's going on. You still hear a lot of people unfortunately saying, oh, the elections are fine, whatever. But there's so many more people waking up, right between the machine issues and between the completely unnatural results. Like Fetterman? I mean, come on. So anyway, don't get discouraged.

ASG: I'd love for them to put Fetterman up for president, really.

SS: That guy, anyway, he wasn't bright before, right? Anyway, I was kind of wondering about the whole Fetterman thing. We've proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that Biden is a dementia patient and he can't string any words together. He can barely read a prompter. But I don't think that's dumb enough so let's bring in Fetterman. Yeah. There we go. That that'll put icing on the cake.

Marty: I think they're just rubbing it in our faces. It's like yeah, you know what? We know the elections are corrupt. We know we have, you know, these sock puppets in positions of power that are being run by other people, obviously. But, you know, we don't think we've rubbed your nose in it too much. So let's bring up Fetterman. Man, that guy is an idiot.

SS: Yeah, fact.

ASG: We've fact checked your statement and find it to be true. On that note Shawn, about preservation of election records including log files, I wanted to let everybody know there are there are now a ton of log files in the library. They're all from Georgia because one day Data Jeff said ohh, Amy, I have these log files for you. I said great. I'll put them on the pile of things that need to go into the Library. And Jeff said well people have been asking, they want to know what they look like, etc. So I said, OK, I'll do them now. There's like thousands, just for Georgia. So it's a lot. It's a lot, but there's now a ton in there. So if you go in the library and you just type SLOG, S-L-O-G, a bunch of those will come up in case anybody wanted to see kind of what they look like or what an example is. So those are in there. OK, Linda Rantz.

Linda: Hi there. Linda in Missouri, for those who don't know me. OK we do not win the award for the worst state. We have some pretty good laws that help protect us. But it also makes everybody say, you know, the fraud's not too bad here, so why should we worry? So we have a couple things that we're focused on right now. One is just flat out get rid of machines and we have a state senator who is drafting legislation and he's going to file it on December 1st, and he put together a task force of a couple of us. Marianne, who's not on the call, is also on that task force. She's usually on this call, but. It's basically going to say get rid of machines. He's going to say withdraw from ERIC. It's a pretty big step and I hope he knows who's all going to come at him as he files it. But you know it's a step and so if anything, it'll raise some awareness from our perspective and we're trying to go county by county. So I am working on the hand count process. And we have statutes, so we're so fortunate. We actually have statutes that allow us to hand count. It has the procedure in there. They can start counting and hand counting earlier in the day. They don't even have to wait till the polls close. So there's all kinds of things we just have to prove to the clerks and we have a lot of small counties. So my own county, which is small, the clerk is happy to talk to me and I'm thinking if we knock down a couple counties, so the hand count process information to get them. I've spoken now six times to groups since the election. So just since last Tuesday I've been out speaking six times. And I actually bring a motherboard with me and some other electronic props actually, because you say "motherboard" to people who don't know and they're like it means nothing, but you show them. And Shawn, I used that little screenshot from your "Enemy Inside the Wire," and my husband actually recreated it on a piece of board with the number 2 pencil and he put a little thing on there to show the size of that chip. And we say here look at this, can you find that chip on this board? So we sort of do the show and tell.

The second thing that we have going on is that in asking for CVRs, which everybody followed through, one of our county clerks who was the President of the association, he filed a lawsuit against a citizen for filing a sunshine request asking for CVRs. And it's for the purpose of getting what I think he thought he would get a default judgment, that she would not do anything, she'd be terrified by the lawsuit, and that he could get a default judgment saying that CVRs cannot be given to us because we are one of those states where we can't get them because of a statute that says all election data is protected not only for the 22 months, but you just can't get it without either a court order or a legislative action. The senator who's fighting filing that bill is also going to include something to open that up and say that citizens are entitled to their election data. But again, I don't have tons of faith in the legislature, but that lawsuit is really important because I have been told by a couple of lawyers it can't be dismissed on standing because the clerk filed it. So even if he tries to withdraw it the defendant can then counter sue and say no, you brought this up and take it through to say we're entitled to see the our data. So it's a big push. So now the one thing that the defense attorney has asked us and we've spoken with Doctor Dougherty about it and he sent some information but nothing that was super helpful. But it's where our CVR data is used for other purposes other than just auditing an election, so say university research, other applications so they can show that it does get used, it has other purposes and it should be released. So that's a big one for us. So and then Marianne, a lot of our researchers, I mean they're into ERIC, they're into all these other places. But I see

those as far as, you know, maybe our core group, what we're trying to chase down and raise awareness and get people to understand that you can't just trust a machine.

SS: That's excellent. If you guys need any help with any kind of citations or anything like that on the lawsuit, with respect to the access. I mean the real answer is not, gosh, these could be used for lots of purposes. It's that these belong to citizens, period. End of story. The election belongs to us. It's literally in the Constitution.

Linda: Yeah. We're fortunate that this attorney, he runs Missouri Freedom Center, he's a pro bono attorney. People go to him all the time to try to get his help. But he came to us when he saw this lawsuit, which, by the way, has about 7 or 8 paragraphs in it about Mike Lindell and Linda Rantz being instigators and telling people to go out and get CVR's. So, yeah.

ASG: You're such a rabble rouser, Linda. (laughs)

Linda: I know. You know, I'm trying, but this guy, and I think he's probably even libertarian, you don't know, right? That's what I love about him. You don't know his political leanings, but he has actually from what I understand is the only lawyer who has taken an elections case to the Supreme Court of Missouri and won an elections case at the Supreme Court. So he actually, when he saw the lawsuit, contacted me and said, do you know this defendant, I need to represent her. So he sees it as a Constitutional right. So it's great. When I need something, I'll get it to Michele or Amy because I know I have a couple emails to you and they're in that 1700 deep pile you have. I'll let them ask you directly for me.

ASG: Alright, awesome. Thank you, Linda. Shawn, wouldn't the CVR data be used for counties to determine like how many polling centers they need and where? I feel like I saw that somewhere for our county in Colorado, for Douglas County that it was what determined where they needed more dropboxes or which polling centers were open or that kind of stuff.

SS: You could use it that way, but they could also use, in theory, the voter registration data because they'll have the information by voter and precinct. What you're talking about is like looking at counts to see, OK, how many machines do we need, how many poll workers do we need? What's our throughput expected in different precincts or for different counties. So you could do it from that. But really the CVRs don't stand alone. So this is another thing. Back to the log files, it's just like hashes, right? So the EAC and the voting system standards have all this language and the election officials are all indoctrinated into this language like, oh, we have hash files. Therefore, if you don't have the log files to go with the hash files, they don't mean anything. They mean nothing. Like I could give you a hash file for the address for this call. It's not like it's human readable. And also the hash file verifiers on ES&S machines in particular were demonstrated and this was in a report out of California Secretary of State. It was actually the Craft Freeman, McGregor anyway, I'm confusing the people who do the question document examination instruments with the actual cyberpeople in California. So anyway, they actually explained the app that reads the hash file or that reports the hash file from the software within the machine is controlled by the voting system vendor. It means nothing. You could put

anything in there you really need external anyway. But the point is with that, with that hash file, without the log files that went along with the creation and go along with the reading so you can verify it really is the hash file that is the certified one and it's on the basis of that actual software and the hash file that matches what's on the system. With that same basis, it means nothing and the CVRs are the same. If you don't have the log files that show those, the CVR's just a digital file. I could create a CVR that shows that everybody here voted in Oregon, right? Or in Idaho. It means nothing but if they're authentic, then they are part of the chain of evidence that links the paper ballots to the reported tallied result out of that machine without both the CVRs and the log files. And the CVR has different meanings and different systems and states. What it's supposed to be is the record of the ballot and the ballot choices. The ballot image can technically be part of the cast vote record, but if the system is reading and tallying marks, then that individual record in a database that relates or correlates to that specific paper ballot and that specific scan and the log files that show at this time on this scanner, a ballot was scanned. These were the vote choices that were on it. That's the cast vote record. So without it you have no indication or evidence whatsoever that the result off the machine actually correlates to voter inputs. Which means if you don't have the log files and the cast vote record, and if you haven't compared them that so that they match and verified that they match, like the right number of ballots, the right number of choices, et cetera, you should never certify that result. They should ignore everything off the machine and go back to the paper and count it. That's what they should do. But of course nobody's doing that, so. That was a little bit of a tangent, I apologize for that. I don't think I have short explanations.

ASG: Alright. Thanks, Linda. So let's go to Russ and Pablo and Shawn, there's a comment for you in the chat from Lori. Go ahead, Russ.

Russ: Oh yeah, actually, I wanted to bring something else up here, too. I'm working with a county, and I can't say which one it is or where it's at, but they got the data from their county auditor as to what was mailed out in the 2022 election. And then through a FOIA request they got the data from the mailers and printers that they had printed up and mailed out, and they've now found about 25,000 more in the printer data than they have in the auditor's data and they still haven't gotten all of the information from the mailers. They're giving it to them in chunks.

SS: What state Russ?

Russ: Washington state.

SS: OK. Yep.

Russ: Are you working with them, Shawn?

SS: No. But I know he's working with some different people around the country and they are trying to file lawsuits. Russ by the way, if everybody doesn't know, Russ is the NCOA guy, Data Jeff has nothing but high praise for you.

Russ: Ohh, thank you. Yeah. Well, another thing I wanted to bring up to you, Shawn, is I'm working with a gentleman named Rick Weible. He wanted to get in touch with you, but just basically said you were too busy for that stuff right now. But he had a meeting yesterday, it was yesterday with the Brookings County Commission and he shot him in the dirt, just right into the ground. It was unbelievable. But I'd like to share that YouTube link with you if possible.

SS: Yeah, that'd be great. Thank you. Do you want to throw it in chat or do you need to send?

Russ: Actually, I don't think I have access to the chat here. How do I get it in the chat? I guess that's not available to me. I'm probably doing something wrong when I log in.

ASG: No, I think it's still something in the way that I set it up.

Russ: Yeah, he wants to put it out because you could see the expressions on the Commission's faces when he basically said you're committing felonies and this is why. He was reciting constitutional laws, state constitutional laws, the works.

ASG: Yeah. Russ, will you e-mail it to me real quick? [asg@causeofamerica.org](mailto:asg@causeofamerica.org).

Russ: OK, I'll get that over to you right now.

ASG: Awesome. Guys, some people still don't have access to the chat for whatever reason I keep messing that up so I will include that in the follow up message later this week when I sent out the replay.

Russ: One thing I'd like to say is he starts talking at about 7 minutes and 40 seconds. Go about that far in and you'll see Rick, he's got the white shirt and is the security expert.

ASG: OK, great.

Marty: Are you going to be putting that video up in the shared area so that we can all bask in the Commissioners being gobsmacked?

ASG: I mean, why wouldn't I? Of course I will. (laughs) Alright. OK, good. So thanks Russ. I'll make sure to share that link. Alright, let's go to Pablo next and then Eddie and then Sharon.

Pablo: Hello everybody. First time on this call probably because it's at 9:00 in the morning. But I have a few questions, Shawn, now that I have your ear and actually can talk to you kind of in person. First and foremost down in Arizona, it feels that they are a lot less prepared for what happened than it seems. I've reached out via [? name] and she has the ear of Kari Lake offering help, whatever we can do, whatever that may be. And going back to Monday night's call with Rick, that dude is phenomenal. Wow. It was the first time I ever heard of any of this stuff too, which is really weird. But he has some information and some methodology that we could probably incorporate or share with Kari team to help them out. So I really feel all hands on deck

with this right now, time's running out and just whatever we can do it at a grassroots level and with the data team I have on Telegram, you know, just any suggestions that you have would be greatly appreciated as to what we can do for them. We sent a message out this morning an e-mail to their people. Saying GAIL has some good ideas about getting the envelopes from the ballot or the mailing ballots and trying to see how many of them actually have signatures. Trying just whatever we can with the envelopes that is a good source of evidence and info that I haven't thought of that one either, but anyway, I'm rambling so with that, but one more question. So here in New Mexico, we are not able to get CVR data until 45 days after certification. Have you heard anywhere in the country where candidates are privy to the CVR data?

SS: The basis of their access is going to be under recount or challenge. So when they recount or challenge, then they get access. But normally you gotta watch them like a hawk, right? You saw it happen in Colorado. We had candidates in the primary fund recounts who challenged, they funded recounts and the Secretary of State just ignored the state law, literally just ignored the state law and directed a recount that was a Logic and Accuracy Test followed by a machine recount. Well, what the State Statute explicitly required is the selection of a random tabulator scanner or some number of random selected tabulator scanners in each jurisdiction in which recount was occurring, which would have been all counties for the statewide races. And then they were required to hand count the ballots that were scanned through those Tabulators during the primary election and then compare the counts. And only then, once they'd compared them and found no errors were they allowed to do a machine recount. She just went directly to machine recount and a court wouldn't hear the evidence. So you've got to watch them like hawks. You may go to a court and the court may not do the right thing and follow the law. So it's the same everywhere. We're surrounded, we're immersed in a sea of corruption and lawlessness, and we're fighting against it. But there's no cause for being discouraged. I mean, in the end we win. It's just a matter of what we go through between now and then. So, no, I'm not aware of a state, but I haven't read all the statutes. I have to caveat that there could be something in the code somewhere, and I'll give you an example.

In Colorado during the course of a recount, it's the canvassing board in Colorado, for example, that that does the recount. They're the ones who conduct it. And there's this little hook in the statute in Colorado that says--and they've never exercised this authority. The canvassing Board essentially has access at their own request to any documentation related to those votes. Anything. They can go get any records, including video from drop boxes, voter registration, modifications made to the voter registration system, the information on all poll workers and judges, how many signature verifications are--they can get anything. And so you really have to dig into your statutes and look for those kind of hooks that you can exercise. But I'm not aware of anything that just says blanket "candidates have authority," but there could be something in a statute. This is where we need everybody to read their own state statutes, like the way the way the corrupt people do, looking for loopholes. So look for things that you can use to your advantage.

Pablo: Awesome, right on. And as far as Arizona goes, have we been participating in anything down there?

SS: Yeah. So Kurt, is really lead attorney for a lot of things, does a lot of coordination. He's got so many balls in the air. But anyway he is directly assisting Kari Lake. So if he needs additional assistance, he can reach back into us and we can reach out to everybody, if they need more data or they need help doing something and I'll be talking to him today. I know he's slammed, but they're for sure working on the challenge there. And it's obvious, right? I mean, where do you start again in Arizona? Where do you start with all of that nonsense? The user settings? Are you \*\*\*\*\* kidding me? Come on. This should show down there for sure beyond.

Pablo: So yeah, that's cool. I feel a lot better. Just sounded like that they were fishing and not really ready for all this stuff. But still we would like to offer our help.

SS: You know it's not me it's many people like Russ, Jeff, Draza, the whole team of data people whenever we can do it.

Pablo: And Rick on Monday brought up like I said, I tried to rewatch it last night but I fell asleep. It's long but he has some really good ideas about challenging because it's challenging certifications. Because of lack of data and the certification being legal on that on that basis I forgot the specifics. Like I said I tried to watch but fell asleep. But I appreciate everything you do Shawn. It's always awesome to talk to you and if you could pass that on we at a grassroots level we have a team that will do anything for you so.

SS: Will do. Thanks. Pablo by the way--when we had to go up on stage, the whole thing at the symposium in South Dakota was like you know kind of rolling modifications changes. It was very Semper Gumby. Pablo was the only person that we had go up on the stage. Draza and Mark and I were there and we needed somebody we trusted because you know, there were a bunch of saboteurs in the symposium and we needed somebody to be trusted to watch the mock election equipment. So it was Pablo so thank you, man.

Pablo: Yeah, I'll never forget that, it was the craziest 3 days ever.

ASG: It was definitely fast-paced, right? Pablo, did you have any specific area of focus that you wanted to share so people could connect with you who are also working on that? Like a focal point for research right now.

Pablo: No, right now I'm just all over the freaking place. So here we have candidates on board for the first time that are willing to do whatever it takes statewide and state house. But I want to focus on one of the State House races because it's a district in Albuquerque here. So the population density is good and we have again a candidates on board to let us use whatever data you can. I want to do a canvassing using all the tools that you guys have developed over the past two years, I just need to get real quick, Shawn, as far as the voter roll data, what would

be the ideal set age mean? Would you like to have two different sets from different times? And what would those time periods be to try to obtain?

SS: So you should be able to correlate the voting history in a particular election with the voters that the state says were registered. And then you have to know whether your state allows same day registration, that kind of thing. I mean, there's a lot of different ways to approach the data. You can look for people like that kind of errata that people have searched for. You can set it up for canvassing to verify whether those are really people and really addresses. You can also look for other red flags or indicators. Like where the voter registration data has changed during periods where it shouldn't be, or where it was suddenly added, or where people vote and then all of a sudden are set inactive again, we've seen all of that. We've seen sort of the warehousing of what appeared to be completely phantom or duplicate voters in counties where the clerks are either not curious or are corrupt and don't say anything about these extra voters. And then those voters are moved into other counties in a period around the election where they vote and then they're moved back out. So there are all kinds of patterns like that that you can look for. I know Jeff has been looking for those. They've looked for them up in Wisconsin. There's a whole other issue there. I could talk about the Jay Valentine show—

ASG: But Shawn, we have a bunch of people waiting with questions, though.

SS: Yeah, OK. And I know we've only got a few minutes left, so let's stick to our conversation today about research. This is the Research Roundtable, so we want to hear what your focal point is for research right now so that we can connect you to other people who are doing similar research across the country, because I know we can easily fill 90 minutes with Q&A for Shawn, but let's stick with our topic for today.

Pablo: Sorry about that.

ASG: That's OK. Alright. So Edie, you're up next and then Sharon.

Edie: Hi everyone. So a couple of things going on here. We kind of took the NCOA ball and ran through a company called Easy NCOA who runs lists against the USPS database, all of the registered voters in our fifth Congressional District because we had an election integrity woman running against Katherine Clark who's the assistant speaker of the House on the Democratic side and she's she was actually our speaker at the moment of Truth summit. And so we found a bunch of people in her district, 30,000 people who have moved and are not legally eligible to vote and her district is about 9% of the state's registered voter population. So out of the 23 cities and towns in her district, 19 of those residents were brave enough to file complaints. You know, if it was like for Cambridge, Maynard, Melrose; and Shawn, you may know some of these because you were sort of ex Massachusetts; Wellesley, and all of them were dismissed by the Townsend clerks even though they were filed within the appropriate time frame. Now granted, the time frames were very close to the date of the election, but we kind of just thought of even doing this after we saw some publicity by I think that guy, Mark Brainard said his name, said America. It's some organization and it got a little press where I think he did this for—

SS: Matt.

Edie: Matt, yeah. So anyhow, they were all dismissed. So now we are waiting to get data from like OK, we know who is registered to vote, who is not statutorily authorized to vote with. I got my first file in of a voter activity file, most cities and towns are saying you're not going to get it till after we have certified the election, which is going to be I think on November 23rd is the date that's been floated by a couple of people and then they will give us who the voters were. But one town actually did give it to me. I'm pretty sure he probably made a mistake to give it to me, and I have found 12 people who have moved who are unauthorized. So I've reached out to a couple of the states now; to New Hampshire and to Virginia. So I'm working with them because now we have people that voted. I've also reached out to New Hampshire just to give the list of people who are on our registered voter file so that New Hampshire can look and see if they're also registered to vote there. So we're doing what we can and I've given all of this, the registration data to Data Jeff also in addition to a couple of bigger cities that are part of Massachusetts like Lawrence and Springfield, where I did have registration data, I've given that to Data Jeff, I'm waiting to hear back from him regarding what his findings are, because I'm really curious to see what he comes up with.

And the other thing we're working on is there's a bunch of us who are in a group on Telegram from the New England States and we've been dialoguing, I think we've had four conversations now with Eric Cardell, who's part of the Thomas More society. He's an attorney and he is very hot on getting ERIC out of registration systems. So I think he has filed already in Wisconsin, I think he's filed in Pennsylvania and in fact next week has a two day hearing that's going to be able to be viewed online and he's asking those of us in New England if we will file similar suits, except for us it's an administrative complaint saying that being part of ERIC violates HAVA. So I am going to be signing that complaint. We're looking for a second person and they're looking for a local attorney, and I think we have the local attorney who I think would sign it. He hasn't looked at the draft yet, which still needs a little bit of work. So this is for Massachusetts and the other New England states but it probably won't happen until after sometime in December or January. Unfortunately for Massachusetts, you filed to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of State appoints somebody within his office to review the complaint, and then that person within his office makes a recommendation and he's the one who decides whether to accept the recommendation. So the expectation is it's kind of not going to go anywhere.

SS: You're talking about the requirement to have a complaint filed under Administrative Procedures Act so that you have that complaint registered and then you have standing for a lawsuit.

Edie: Yeah. We talked it through a little bit on a call yesterday. I think the next step would be to go to the State court and then if that went nowhere, like the state Supreme Court, then it would go to federal courts.

SS: This dovetails by the way, it's not exactly the same kind of APA vs. civil. I want to get the civil rights lawsuit because organizations on the corrupt side have been using Civil Rights Act, Voting Rights Act for all kinds of court nonsense for a long time and we haven't really been defending civil rights with it. It's the basis of accusations that led to consent decrees and orders and agreements all over where they allowed failure to verify signatures or even require signatures even though the state law said they had to have them on affidavits for absentee ballots. Last week I talked to Judge Gableman and Thomas More Society about this and I think we have a sort of a rough framework of a plan but I'm interested in that other attorney Eric Cardell you said with Thomas More?

Eddie: Yeah. In fact, Gableman was also listening in, he didn't speak, but he was on that call yesterday as well. So it sounds like it's all getting coordinated kind of nicely.

SS: We'll see. There are institutions who have raised a lot of money off "We do election integrity." I want to see them. Not Thomas Moore, but some other institutions. I want to see them actually get in the fight.

Eddie: Yeah. Project Veritas comes to mind, I feel like they are promoting, wanting to do a lot of work, but I haven't seen much there that's been that meaningful.

SS: So they do a lot of investigatory and less with the lawsuits. Judicial Watch has more lawsuits, but they don't have the tactical background. And then there are some other organizations that that apparently do neither, but they've raised lots of money. That's who Judge Gableman and I talked about wanting to get involved. Either that or we just start saying that they're not actually fighting, they're just taking the money, right?

Eddie: Right, right, right. And then I, I did have a question. Early in the call you talked about the class action lawsuit, which that's the other thing we've been starting to dabble with a little bit because like probably every state we know that the machines are not certified or certifiable. So where, where is that, where are you in that lawsuit? I'm just a little bit more curious to learn more about that because we feel like we, what we've talked about is gee, we need to understand the those certification laws really, really well and then we really need to understand really, really well what machines we have, what version of them, and how and why don't they comply? And it just feels like a huge undertaking. But if it's being done already by some group, it's not being done.

SS: No, the class action I was talking about was with respect to the voter registration systems. There is also I think cause for a class action lawsuit with respect to the certification standards that they don't actually adequately, they're not adequate, they're not adhered to, and they don't protect voters rights to suffrage, basically to have their vote counted, counted accurately and not diluted by ineligible voters. That seems pretty straightforward but we haven't embarked on that yet. It's been a state by state fight. So I think probably and this is again, you know, finding attorneys that have the spine and then actually getting them up to speed. And you know, because they're doing it on their own dime and because of the way the lawfare

groups and the leftists and the media are going after anybody who joins the fight, they have to either be retired or they have to recognize they're never going to get regular work again. Like the 65 Project has gone after Kurt Olsen and Bill Olson, trying to get them disbarred or sanctioned by their bar associations. It's ludicrous. It's unethical, but that might as well be their subtitle for the organizations "ludicrous and unethical." So anyway, we're working on it, but it's on the pile, it's on the giant pile of stuff we're working on. Everybody's bandwidth-limited.

Edie: One of the things I had wondered is, and I kind of feel like the answer is everyone of them, but is there maybe there's a list somewhere of every machine we know is not legal because it's not certified and then we can check and see if we use those machines. But I think what I'm hearing you say is basically it's every machine but there is not certified like none.

SS: So the certification is a state by state, right? There's the EAC certification, which essentially is a conformance certification, saying this conforms to whatever standard it was tested to, and then there are state certifications by whatever the chief election official is, typically Secretary of State, for use in those states. Those are really two separate certifications, and we should describe them separately. The EAC certification is not required by law. They're permitted. It's required by some state statutes, but the state certifications by state don't necessarily all require EAC certification. Some of them require conformance to the standards. Then there's a federal statute requirement for federal elections and there's stuff that's related to the requirement under HAVA that if you have electronic voting machines you have to have the ADA capable with assistive technology and any of those machines that you use must meet the federal standards. So it's a very complicated web, but a lot of the machines are inappropriately certified where they have been certified where they're required under the state statute standards. To meet the EAC's either FEC 2002 voting system standards or subsequent voluntary voting system guidelines. They don't actually meet those guidelines and the evidence we have of that is not only that the lab wasn't accredited for three years while they were signing off on these test reports, but also that Clay Parikh confirmed what we were suspicious of, which is that the systems do not actually meet the standards and the vulnerabilities he identified and non compliance he identified as the contract security tester for Wyle, then NTS, then Pro V&V for 9 years--they never came back for mitigation, they certified them anyway. That should already have blown up except that our EAC is so corrupt.

Edie: OK, thank you for explaining all that. That's very helpful.

ASG: All right. Thanks, Eddie. OK, so we have about 13 more minutes, so we have several more hands up. So we're gonna try to get to everybody sharing: Marty, George, Russ, and Marlene, but before we do that we're I'm going to tell you guys this real quick. For the next meeting which is on November 30th I have a guest speaker coming. Thank you to everyone who filled out the survey, the two question survey that I had sent out about what do you want out of these meetings like what would be most helpful, and several of the comments were about presenting your findings. Like, how do you talk to people about what you learned and get them to listen? How do we turn people into allies and make an approach where people are open to hearing what you have to say and how to present that. So next week I have a guest speaker,

Kathleen Chandler from the Independence Institute. She's very entertaining but also very informative. And I've also specifically heard her presentation on how to talk to somebody who may not necessarily be on the same page with you. She's going to frame all that in the context of sharing your research and your findings. So I think that's going to be really good. We will be recording that. So if you can't make it live on November 30<sup>th</sup> don't worry because we'll have a recording. But of course, if you come live, then she'll take questions at the end. She's good, I think you're gonna like her a lot. She's based here in Colorado. I'm also working on lining up two other speakers, pulling people that I know fit what you guys want, what you shared that you want in the survey. So we just have one meeting in December, I think that's on the 18th and we're not going to meet between Christmas and New Year's. And details on the data, I know you guys were interested in having someone kind of explain how to look at data when we're looking at these CVR's and different graphs and whatever and how to explain those kind of in lay people's terms. So that's what we're working on.

The other thing is I want to give a shout out to Erica in Washington, because she has been putting together these awesome, educational, fun format things. I don't know if you guys have seen them, but Erica, Melody shared your Telegram group with me. And so I'm going to start pulling those things into the library, if that's OK with you, because I noticed you don't have any attribution on it whatsoever, but I think they can really go a long way in presenting this to people who aren't in our world, they're not living and breathing election issues 24/7. They're just going, hmm something's weird. And then here's a tool that you can hand them, right? So she did like a little crossword puzzle about election issues, she's done a bunch of different things. And when we're talking to people, we have to kind of meet people where they're at, and if they're not at our level, we don't want their eyes glazing over just to get them to our level of talking about things. So I think these are really useful, really helpful. So you'll be able to find those and as well as some of the things that we've put together with Cause of America, you know, top 10 reasons to vote in person, those types of things. If you want to find those in the library, you can just put in "COA education". Education and resources are two tags that I'm putting on those types of things. If you want to see what's in there that might be helpful to other people and if you guys put anything together like a one pager or whatever feel, please feel free to send it over to [asg@causeofamerica.org](mailto:asg@causeofamerica.org) so I can get that added to the library. OK. So those were the only announcements that I had. So Sharon, you're up next. Tell us what you're working on.

Sharon: OK. I will do that. Thank you very much. First of all, Colonel Smith, Frank Limpus, who is with Tennessee Voters of Election Integrity, Melody may have mentioned to you that we're hoping to patch you through if you're available for maybe a 4-5 minute thing that we're presenting, doing a presentation to the Election committee prior to their RFP process to actually purchase the ES&S machines here in Williamson County, Tennessee. We do have your video already in the event you aren't going to be able to do that for us. So we have a video where you're telling another, I'm assuming it's an Election Commission, why they should not have the voting machines. So I just wanted to put that in there really quick so you know what we're talking about. And I'm very sorry, our Election Integrity summit kind of fell apart because General Flynn, we found out, is having a Renewing America event in TN on the same day. So

we're just still trying to regroup around all of that and see if we can work our people in maybe to some of what General Flynn's group is doing here in Tennessee. So we have just today finally launched our petition, this is a statewide petition to get rid of the voting machines we are using some of the language in our state constitution to say they have to put us back to voting in precincts rather than these voting centers because we are to vote where we live according to our state constitution. And I'll send this petition to you, Amy, so that you can have that so you can see what Tennessee has. But we have some legislators that are friendly to us. We're hoping that we can get vast numbers of signatures on this petition and then be able to present it to them by the time of the general assemblies beginning in January so that we will be ready to get them to move on the legislation. Then as I said, we are coming up very soon against deadlines in our own county here where I work for the RFP process for ES&S machines and that's what basically I'm working on. We have an Election Commission meeting this Friday to certify our election and I am planning to speak on that. Just, you know, actually I'm really bringing something that I feel is very basic because in poll watching we witnessed such huge lines, huge lines, you know, two hour waits and it was for the ballot marking devices because they are the choke point we had. We didn't have a very long ballot this time and they are definitely a choke point and this was a beautiful day. What if we had storms? Would anyone have even bothered to stand in line and vote? I really wonder. So I'm kind of bringing that because they're forcing us into these voting centers rather than precincts, rather than having lots of precincts. And I want to bring this before them and accuse them that the way they're administering our elections is forcing us to have these ridiculous lines. And, you know, it's not a voter friendly process. So I'm just hitting on something very basic right now, but we're, we're trying to go at it from all sorts of angles. So anyway, I just wanted to let you know that and I'll get off of here so others can have their time. Thank you so much.

ASG: Thank you, Sharon. I love that voter suppression line, how you turned it around. "Your lines are too long. It's voter suppression." All right. Next up, we have Marty in Oregon. Go ahead, Marty.

Marty: Hey, what do you know? So the things that we got going on right now, we've got 2 lawsuits in flight. One of them is about adjudicated ballots from the 2020 election where we said, hey, we want the adjudicated ballot images. And they said, oh, that'll be \$3000. We said, fine, here's some money. And then they said, oh, you know what, hard drive crashed eight months ago. We actually don't have it. And I said, yeah, you could have told us that eight months ago, but they were just trying to scare us off by setting up a high dollar amount and the Coos County Republican Party said, OK, here's, here's some money, go after him. And then they said, oh, we don't have it, hard drive crash, blah, blah, blah. And I said OK, well, you have to have these images. It's part of the law. You have to retain them. And basically the lawsuit is ongoing. Basically, we're forcing them to rerun the election because the only way to get adjudicated ballot images in Clear Ballot systems is to run all the ballots through because only Clear Ballot can tell you which ballots were adjudicated, and they're obviously having an issue with that, but we'll let you know how that goes on. We have a second lawsuit going on because the county clerk was appointed as an interim county clerk because when we brought up the thing and they told us the hard drive crashed, the county clerk quit. So they appointed a new

county clerk, which used to be the head of the Democratic Party in Coos County. And we said, so the two Commissioners that are running for reelection appointed the new clerk? That's not really kosher. So we've got that lawsuit in flight right now as well. One of the tools I've been using is the United States Postal Systems Address Verification API, which basically allows you to run addresses through the API to see if there's a valid address. When we ran all 49,000 registered voters in Coos County through the thing, it came out with 2500 addresses that were invalid and could not be used for mail in ballots. When I went to the county clerk and I said, hey, how many ballots were returned, she said, Oh, 1600 and I said no, hold on. I came up with 2500 and that's just addresses that are invalid. That doesn't count, people that have moved, people that have died, etcetera, etcetera. And she had no answer for that. So there was a 707 hundred number difference, just you know, at the start of that. And oh, and then I've been questioning the county clerk and the two people that are election workers that are running the machines. They said, hey, so who runs these machines? And you know, they said, oh, it runs on Clear Ballot. I don't know what's underneath it, you know, is it Windows 7? Is it Windows 10? Is it Ubuntu? They're going, Oh, we don't know any of that information. We don't get into those systems that way. I said so you don't actually log into these systems, you just run the Clear Ballot software. Oh yeah, that's what you know, I said OK, county clerk, you must be able to get admin access to this thing so you can prove that these systems are secure, right? She's going, No, I don't have that. I think the IT guy, the county IT guy does it. So I went to the county IT guy. I said, hey, do you do this? He's going "ohh, I don't touch the election. Because that's just the danger zone. You never touch those machines. I only reboot them. That's it. If they get wedged." So I went to the county counselor and I asked him. I said, well, OK, go get me the Clear Ballot number. Give me the Windows version, give me the Ubuntu version. He said OK, he'll get it to me. But the practical upshot of this is that nobody in the county has access, admin access to these machines. So how can they verify that they are secure? Well, the short answer is: they can't. So it could be on a wireless network, it could be on a cellular network, it could be hooked to whatever. They would never know. I'm trying to create, you know, I'm trying to position this so that they're afraid that they're going to get thrown under the bus. And I'm like, oh, no, no. If you play along with me, I'm going to make sure that you guys aren't complicit. You guys aren't going to be in this problem, I'm going to make sure that you guys aren't thrown under the bus. But you got to help me out here because it's either run by the state or it's run by Clear Ballot. I said who? Who does the updates? Their ballot has to be, you know, these Windows machines and these Ubuntu machines have to have security updates, like daily. And they're going, oh, well, clear ballot does that. I go, well, they dial in to do it. No, they walk in to do it. I'm going. There's only 11 counties in Oregon that have Clear Ballot. You're telling me a Boston company is sending somebody in on a weekly basis to make sure they're updated? Yeah, try again. So that's what's going on here in Coos County. Oh, and the we've been getting a lot of hits on the "Curious Case of Coos County" video. If you haven't seen it on Rumble, they'll look it up basically. And then audit oregon.org is where we have all the curious case articles that kind of basically lay out all the weirdness that's been going on. So, you know, check all those things out and if anybody needs any help computer wise, you know, with the NCOA stuff or whatever, let me know because I'm retired computer guy, that knows a lot of stuff, so that's all I have to say. Thanks for the time.

ASG: All right.

SS: I love Coos Bay by the way. It's been a long time since I've been there, but I love it.

Marty: Yeah, Coos Bay is great and Bandon is really nice. The whole South Coast is really nice and. You know, we figured we can't do anything at a national level. We can't do anything at a state level. It's been mail in ballots since 2000, which means we're basically hosed. But we can do things at a county level. Right now we have a guy who's running for County Commissioner that currently is ahead by 160 votes, but they stopped counting on Election Day and they haven't updated the count and they haven't updated the ballots received because they said there is, I guess there's another lawsuit going on that I don't know about. And so they said we won't be able to give you those numbers until at least November 30th. And I'm going, come on, what is wrong with you people? So anyway, if Rod Taylor gets to be Coos County commissioner, that's one less brick in the wall that we have to take out.

ASG: Alright, so unfortunately we're out of time. We're actually a couple minutes overtime. Real quick I did want to share with you guys: Kevin Moncla sent me a detailed e-mail. In summary, what he wants to know is they've been documenting an issue with Georgia's Dominion ICP tabulator specifically, when the voter scans the ballot, it's being reversed or kicked back to the voter at a rate of about 20% across the state from 2020 general through the recent primaries. He said they started looking into it because similar things were happening in Williamson, Tennessee with the QR code signature mismatch error thanks to the great work of Mr. Frank Limpus so what he, Kevin, wants to know is if that is also happening in your state or your county, he would like to be connected. So if that's something you're seeing in your state or county, go ahead and shoot me an e-mail and I will connect you with Kevin Moncla.

Alright guys, I'm sorry we didn't get to all the questions. Definitely there was a lot to share, everyone has a lot going on and we'll see you on November 30th for how to talk to people about exactly what you learned. So have a great day everybody. We'll see you next time. Thank you all.