



New Hampshire Election Integrity : Findings from the peoples audit NHVIG

Testimony B.Towne June 7, 2022

The power of many- Citizens Audit

- 350+ FOIA/ 91 A requests
- \$100K funds raised in 1 week
- 8000 followers on multiple platforms
- 400 active volunteers
- National Experts
- Thousand + hours dedicated to data collection, organization & analysis
- 1200 hours door knocking canvass- 400 hours desk canvassing



New Hampshire Voting trends through the 2020 election

Growth in Presidential votes cast by county by Party

Population
growth per
US census

Biden
Clinton
Obama

Rockingham				YtY growth			
	Republican	Democrat	TOTAL	Republican	Democrat	TOTAL	
2020	95,858	100,061	195,919	6.0%	25.1%	14.9%	2.0%
2016	90,447	79,994	170,441	2.9%	-0.2%	1.4%	2.1%
2012	87,921	80,142	168,063	7.3%	-4.3%	1.5%	1.0%
2008	81,917	83,723	165,640	-0.2%	11.0%	5.2%	
2004	82,069	75,437	157,506				

from 2010


Biden
Clinton
Obama

Hillborough				YtY growth			
	Republican	Democrat	TOTAL	Republican	Democrat	TOTAL	
2020	104625	123311	227,936	4.6%	23.8%	14.2%	2.1%
2016	100013	99589	199,602	0.0%	-2.7%	-1.3%	1.6%
2012	99991	102303	202,294	2.9%	-2.4%	0.1%	0.5%
2008	97178	104820	201,998	-2.6%	11.4%	4.2%	
2004	99724	94121	193,845				

from 2010

****Sources NH SoS & US Census**

New Hampshire Makes National Headlines



Foreshadow- from “Kill Chain”



<https://youtu.be/EZQ4IFl7uq4>




Windham

Overall Voter Party Affiliation* (9,968)




Mail-In* (3,001) 30%




Rockingham County




Walk-In* (6,967) 70%




PRESIDENT




REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS




GOVERNOR




STATE SENATOR



U.S. SENATOR




STATE REPRESENTATIVE



Now lets look at Merrimack's

Merrimack has three “1 in a million” machines.




The anomaly on machines 3, 6 and 9 is present in all down ballot voting

It is statistically improbable the machines could perform in this manner – out of bounds to the overall registration profile and even mail ins only.




Merrimack

Overall Voter Party Affiliation* (16,651)



Mail-In* (5,889) 35%



Hillsborough County



Walk-In* (10,762) 65%



U.S. SENATOR

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1		26	1,259
Mach. 2		33	1,856
Mach. 3		34	1,738
Mach. 4		12	912
Mach. 5		27	1,238
Mach. 6		12	1,052
Mach. 7		62	2,562
Mach. 8		82	3,237
Mach. 9		36	2,859
Combined		324	16,713


REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1		44	1,259
Mach. 2		64	1,856
Mach. 3		57	1,738
Mach. 4		30	912
Mach. 5		48	1,238
Mach. 6		24	1,052
Mach. 7		97	2,562
Mach. 8		131	3,237
Mach. 9		76	2,859
Combined		571	16,713



Merrimack

Overall Voter Party Affiliation* (16,651)



Mail-In* (5,889) 35%



Hillsborough County



Walk-In* (10,762) 65%



STATE SENATOR

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1		69	1,259
Mach. 2		128	1,856
Mach. 3		181	1,738
Mach. 4		45	912
Mach. 5		61	1,238
Mach. 6		61	1,052
Mach. 7		181	2,562
Mach. 8		221	3,237
Mach. 9		213	2,859
Combined		1,160	16,713

STATE REPRESENTATIVE

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1		1,615	10,072
Mach. 2		2,864	14,848
Mach. 3		2,640	13,904
Mach. 4		1,411	7,296
Mach. 5		1,736	9,904
Mach. 6		1,193	8,416
Mach. 7		4,257	20,496
Mach. 8		5,413	25,896
Mach. 9		3,674	22,872
Combined		24,803	#####



Merrimack

Overall Voter Party Affiliation* (16,651)



Mail-In* (5,885) 15%




Hillsborough County




Walk-In* (10,762) 65%




ALL RACES COMBINED




Voter Registered Party Affiliation



Independent Voter Affiliation Breakdown*



New Registrations Party Affiliation



	2008	2012		2016		2020	
Regular Ballots	14,292	13,582	-5%	13,917	2.5%	10,870	-21.9%
Absentee Ballots	911	1,302	43%	1,472	13.1%	6,005	307.9%
Total Ballots	15,203	14,884	-2%	15,389	3.4%	16,875	9.7%

*Calculated based on individual historic voting record

**NH Registration data can differ from the town registration data

***Machine tabulation information based on best information available from the towns

HAND COUNT MERRIMACK
BALLOTS and PROVE US
WRONG

What Does “Normal” Look Like?




Berlin

Overall Voter Party Affiliation* (4,139)



Mail-In* (848) 20%



Walk-In* (3,291) 80%



PRESIDENT

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1	52% 45%	17	893
Mach. 2	52% 45%	20	2,306
Mach. 3	52% 44%	15	928
Combined	52% 45%	52	4,127

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1	54% 38%	41	893
Mach. 2	55% 39%	72	2,306
Mach. 3	55% 38%	36	928
Combined	55% 39%	149	4,127

GOVERNOR

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1	32% 62%	31	893
Mach. 2	33% 61%	58	2,306
Mach. 3	35% 61%	20	928
Combined	33% 62%	109	4,127

STATE SENATOR

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1	43% 50%	56	893
Mach. 2	47% 48%	121	2,306
Mach. 3	48% 46%	54	928
Combined	46% 48%	231	4,127

U.S. SENATOR

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1	58% 37%	32	893
Mach. 2	59% 36%	48	2,306
Mach. 3	59% 35%	21	928
Combined	59% 36%	101	4,127

STATE REPRESENTATIVE

		Blank Votes	Total Votes
Mach. 1	26% 40%	462	2,679
Mach. 2	29% 38%	1,065	6,918
Mach. 3	28% 37%	509	2,784
Combined	28% 38%	2,036	12,381




Berlin

Coos County



Overall Voter Party Affiliation* (4,139)



Mail-In* (848) 20%



Walk-In* (3,291) 80%




ALL RACES COMBINED

Mach. 1	39%		40%
Mach. 2	41%		40%
Mach. 3	42%		39%

Voter Registered Party Affiliation



Independent Voter Affiliation Breakdown*



New Registrations Party Affiliation



	2008	2012		2016		2020	
Regular Ballots	4,185	3,931	-6%	3,750	-4.6%	3,285	-12.4%
Absentee Ballots	388	329	-15%	315	-4.3%	863	174.0%
Total Ballots	4,573	4,260	-7%	4,065	-4.6%	4,148	2.0%

*Calculated based on individual historic voting record

**NH Registration data can differ from the town registration data

***Machine tabulation information based on best information available from the towns



NH Voter Age Distribution

General Election - November 3, 2020



Berlin

Coos County

Count Method Machine

Total Voted 4,139

Total Registered 4,953

Turnout % 84%

Eligible Voters 8,124

Elig. Voter


Turnout % 51%

Same-Day Reg 421

% Reg Increase 9%

Population
Registered %
Total/Eligible 61%

Voters by Age - 2020 General Election**



VoteView® Software
Copyright 2021
Dale D. Ames

*Report excludes 873 registered voters who have not voted in any of the previous 4 National Elections

**Graph excludes 300 registered voters with unknown ages

***Report based on most accurate voting records info that is publicly available

United States[™]
Census
Bureau


This product may use the Census
Bureau Data API but is not endorsed
or certified by the Census Bureau.

Sources

-US Census 2019 Data
-NH county census data interpolated by Dr. Douglas Frank
-NH Voter Registration data


July 21, 2021


Turn Out of Eligible Voters Vs % of Absentee Ballots



183 towns had more then the historical average of eligible voter turnout

Voter Growth from 2016 by Town for the 2020 election





On 10/7/2021 the SoS purged ~230,000 voters from the NH registered voter list.

Post Office Divided by Voting			
1993			
2016	%	2020	%
Minnesota	69.4%	1 Minnesota	74.8
Maine	69.4%	2 Maine	74.2
New Hampshire	69.1%	3 New Hampshire	72.2
Wisconsin	66.2%	4 Wisconsin	71.9
Vermont	65.1%	5 Vermont	71.8
Montana	64.6%	6 Montana	70.9
Colorado	62.3%	7 Colorado	70.9
Michigan	62.0%	8 Michigan	70.4
Oregon	61.7%	9 Oregon	69.7
Massachusetts	61.1%	10 Iowa	69.3
Pennsylvania	61.0%	11 Pennsylvania	67.9
Washington	61.0%	12 Washington	67.3
North Carolina	60.8%	13 North Carolina	66.3
Virginia	60.8%	14 Virginia	66.3
New Jersey	60.2%	15 New Jersey	65.4
Massachusetts	59.6%	16 Massachusetts	65.2
Alaska	59.5%	17 Alaska	65.2
Ohio	59.3%	18 Ohio	64.8
Nebraska	59.2%	19 Nebraska	64.7
Delaware	58.8%	20 Delaware	64.5
Connecticut	58.3%	21 Connecticut	64.2
Maryland	58.3%	22 Maryland	64.2
Utah	57.4%	23 Utah	63.5
Missouri	57.3%	24 Missouri	63.1
Florida	56.9%	25 Florida	63.1
Idaho	56.8%	26 Idaho	62.7
South Dakota	56.6%	27 South Dakota	62.6
North Dakota	56.3%	28 North Dakota	61.9
Wyoming	56.1%	29 Wyoming	61.8
United States	56.1%		61.1

The actual turnout for NH 202 election would have been

$$\frac{804,991 \text{ Voters}}{870,014 \text{ Total Registered Voters}} = 92.5\%$$

had the rolls been cleaned up before the 2020 election.

This is a very visible issue and warrants investigation.



The Windham Audit?

Windham Audit

- 4 machines
- 10,006 ballots
- scanned 4x

**Not 1 machine
matched**

NEW HAMPSHIRE

There are over **200** voting machines in New Hampshire.

The same machines are used in **137** towns.

4 MACHINES WERE CHECKED

The same **10,006** ballots were scanned by **4 machines**.

# WRITE-IN ***** ST.REP.ROCKINGHAM 7 RACE # 1700 BLANKS 5628 KRISTI ST. LAURENT 4323 HENRI AZIBERT 2781 VALERIE ROMAN 3411 IOANA SINGUREANU 2756 JULIUS F SOTI 4718 MARY E GRIFFIN 5529 BOB LYNN 5027 CHARLES E McMAHON 5490 # WRITE-IN 41 *****	ST.REP.ROCKINGHAM 7 RACE # 1700 BLANKS 5785 KRISTI ST. LAURENT 4341 HENRI AZIBERT 2776 VALERIE ROMAN 3407 IOANA SINGUREANU 2754 JULIUS F SOTI 4674 MARY E GRIFFIN 5488 BOB LYNN 4983 CHARLES E McMAHON 5447 # WRITE-IN 41 ***** SHERIFF ROCKINGHAM RACE # 2380	REGINA BIRDSELL 5696 # WRITE-IN 6 ***** ST.REP.ROCKINGHAM 7 RACE # 1700 BLANKS 5627 KRISTI ST. LAURENT 4329 HENRI AZIBERT 2780 VALERIE ROMAN 3409 IOANA SINGUREANU 2755 JULIUS F SOTI 4727 MARY E GRIFFIN 5541 BOB LYNN 5038 CHARLES E McMAHON 5501 # WRITE-IN 41 *****	# WRITE-IN 6 ***** ST.REP.ROCKINGHAM 7 RACE # 1700 BLANKS 5696 KRISTI ST. LAURENT 4326 HENRI AZIBERT 2778 VALERIE ROMAN 3407 IOANA SINGUREANU 2754 JULIUS F SOTI 4701 MARY E GRIFFIN 5512 BOB LYNN 5009 CHARLES E McMAHON 5472 # WRITE-IN 41 *****
5628	5785	5627	5696
4323	4341	4329	4326
2781	2776	2780	2778
3411	3407	3409	3407
2756	2754	2755	2754
4718	4674	4727	4701
5529	5488	5541	5512
5027	4983	5038	5009
5490	5447	5501	5472
41	41	41	41

This is just in Windham. What about the other

HUNDREDS OF THE SAME MACHINES?

Contact the New Hampshire Legislature and Attorney General

DEMAND A STATE-WIDE FORENSIC AUDIT

Hacking Democracy

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t75xvZ3osFg&t=14s>

Affidavit Harri Hursti- Lead Windham Auditor describing election machine “hack” in a Wisconsin court case.

AFFIDAVIT OF HARRI HURSTI

I declare under penalty of false swearing under the law of Wisconsin that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I am physically located outside the geographic boundaries of the United States, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

1. In 2005, I developed the Hursti Hack(s), a series of four tests in which I demonstrated how voting results produced by the Diebold Election Systems voting machines could be altered.

I submit this Affidavit in support of a hand recount of all ballots in Wisconsin.

2. I have been a consultant and a co-author of several studies commissioned or funded by

Attacks on Precinct Scanners

6. Optical scan voting machines can be manipulated by attackers who are able to modify the election-specific settings on the memory card (sometimes called the “mobile ballot box”).

Manipulation of the memory card can either be persistent or “one-time”, meaning that if the card is reset but not reprogrammed, the card will be “clean” and the hack will not work until the card is reprogrammed again.

vulnerabilities. My qualifications and experience are further detailed at the following website:

<https://nordicinnovationlabs.com/team/harri-hursti/>.

Opinion

3. Many of the models of voting machines and other election infrastructure used in Wisconsin were previously analyzed by state-sponsored security reviews, including the EVEREST report (<http://hursti.net/docs/everest.pdf>) commissioned by the Secretary of State Ohio, and were shown to be vulnerable to demonstrated attacks. Due to the shortness of time, I have not been able to verify which of these attacks are feasible on the systems used in one or many of the Wisconsin jurisdictions. It is possible that critical parts of the election infrastructure are processed with equipment which has never been submitted for certification.

4. Optical scan machines can be hacked in a manner that changes election results, and such

testing. If the
result in the same
e scanners is to recount

- potential hacking

are able to modify the
the ballot box").

meaning that if the card
not work until the card

is reprogrammed again.

19. When the scanner is directly connected to the central tabulator, at least one vendor uses special bar codes on the ballots which are commands to the tabulator. Typical commands are “begin batch”, “end batch”, and “override precinct code”. These commands can be transmitted to the machine by ballots that appear under casual human inspection to be normal votes. If an attacker injects them into the set of ballots to be scanned, this can cause real ballots to not be counted, or to be reported in an incorrect jurisdiction.


Attacks on Central Tabulators

20. Central tabulators are normal PCs and are subject to a wide array of attacks, including vote-stealing malware.

21. Tabulator software typically has many features to adjust the vote totals, and these software interfaces can be manipulated by malicious software to alter the reported results.


22. For all these reasons, optical scan votes face a serious threat of being hacked in ways that can alter the outcome of an election. Ballots that are recounted using optical scanners face most of the same threats. The only way to reliably detect such attacks on the election results is to recount the ballots manually, without reliance on potentially hacked election equipment.

Executed on the 28th day of November, 2016 in Helsinki, Finland.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Harri Hursti', written over a horizontal line.

HARRI HURSTI

Windham Selectman meeting 2021 – LHS CEO confirms cards can be backed up to preserve election data & this is the intention





[HACKING DEMOCRACY - NEW HAMPSHIRE \(rumble.com\)](https://www.rumble.com/HackingDemocracy/NewHampshire)



LHS Manual used as the source of an impartial 3rd party audit? **Where is the separation of duties?**

Images of the Windham Machine Tapes

All machines were
reset

no back up was made

All election data was destroyed

```

01 TOT REPORT06:30
02 UNT START07:01
03 ON START 20:27
04 11/03/20
05 RESTARTED20:27
06 CARD 20:27
07 COUNT START20:27
08 COUNT END 20:27
09 ION START 20:30
10 E: 11/03/20
11 SION START 10:51
12 E: 05/12/21
13 TOT REPORT 10:52
14 PERVISE MODE 10:53
15 PERVISE MODE 10:53
16 M CARD RESET 10:53
17 SESSION START 10:54
18 DATE: 05/12/21
19 REP FOR ELECT 10:54
20 CLEAR COUNTERS 10:54
21 SESSION START 10:56
22 DATE: 11/03/20
23 ZERO TOT REPORT15:17
24 BAL COUNT START15:37
25 SESSION START 11:41
26 DATE: 11/04/20
27 COUNT RESTARTED11:41
28 BAL COUNT START11:41
29 1 ENDER CARD 12:50
30 2 BAL COUNT END 12:50
31 3 TOTALS REPORT 12:52
32 44 SESSION START 12:52
33 DATE: 11/05/20
34 45 TOTALS REPORT 12:55

```

```

DATE: 11/03/20
26 SESSION START 12:29
DATE: 11/05/20
27 SESSION START 11:46
DATE: 05/12/21
28 AUDIT REPORT 11:47
29 INCORRECT PIN 11:48
30 SESSION START 11:48
DATE: 05/12/21
31 SUPERVISE MODE 11:49
32 SUPERVISE MODE 11:49
33 MEM CARD RESET 11:49
34 SESSION START 11:50
DATE: 05/12/21
35 PREP FOR ELECT 11:50
36 CLEAR COUNTERS 11:50
37 SESSION START 11:52
DATE: 11/03/20
38 ZERO TOT REPORT 16:04
39 BAL COUNT START 16:08
40 ENDER CARD 13:31
41 BAL COUNT END 13:31
42 TOTALS REPORT 13:33
43 SESSION START 13:33
DATE: 11/05/20
44 TOTALS REPORT 13:36

```

```

14 SESSION START 11:34
   DATE: 10/26/20
15 SESSION START 11:35
   DATE: 10/26/20
16 SESSION START 10:37
   DATE: 10/26/20
17 CLEAR COUNTERS 10:37
18 BAL TEST START 10:37
19 ENDER CARD 10:38
20 TOTALS REPORT 10:42
21 PREP FOR ELECT 10:43
22 CLEAR COUNTERS 10:43
23 SESSION START 11:12
   DATE: 10/26/20
24 SESSION START 06:18
   DATE: 11/03/20
25 ZERO TOT REPORT 06:22
26 BAL COUNT START 07:08
27 ENDER CARD 20:02
28 BAL COUNT END 20:02
29 SESSION START 20:06
   DATE: 11/03/20
30 SESSION START 10:44
   DATE: 05/12/21
31 SESSION START 10:44
   DATE: 05/12/21
32 AUDIT REPORT 10:46
33 SUPERVISE MODE 10:46
34 SUPERVISE MODE 10:47
35 MEM CARD RESET 10:47
36 SESSION START 10:48
   DATE: 05/12/21
37 PREP FOR ELECT 10:48
38 CLEAR COUNTERS 10:48
39 SESSION START 10:51
   DATE: 11/03/20
40 ZERO TOT REPORT 15:17
41 BAL COUNT START 15:33
42 ENDER CARD 12:36

```


Lead Auditor Philip Stark on a PODCAST
speaking@ Machine hacking & Windham



So How do you know if a hack was removed?

Once the machines are reset, the physical hand count on the day of the audit **will be closer in total to the reset counts created by the machines** then they are to the counts on the day of the election when a hack was present.

This is what happened in the Windham audit.

The following slides show the machine totals which are from the NH SoS website.

ORIGINAL SCAN TO HAND COUNT COMPARISON

Audit Machine 1**CANDIDATE****ORIGINAL SCAN**
11/3/20**AUDIT MACHINE #1**
5/14/21**HAND COUNT**
5/21**BLANKS**

6643

5628

5581

[D] Kristi St. Laurent

4429

4323

4355

[D] Henri Azlbert

2763

2781

2808

[D] Valeria Roman

3389

3411

3442

[D] Ioana Singureanu

2742

2756

2782

[R] Julius Soti

4453

4718

4776

[R] Mary Griffin

5262

5529

5591

[R] Bob Lynn

4757

5027

5089

[R] Charles McMahon

5225

5490

5554

2242
DIFFERENCE**409**
DIFFERENCE

ORIGINAL SCAN TO HAND COUNT COMPARISON

Audit Machine 2**CANDIDATE****ORIGINAL SCAN**
11/3/20**AUDIT MACHINE #2**
5/14/21**HAND COUNT**
5/21**BLANKS**

6643

5785

5581

[D] Kristi St. Laurent

4429

4341

4355

[D] Henri Azibert

2763

2776

2808

[D] Valeria Roman

3389

3407

3442

[D] Ioana Singureanu

2742

2754

2782

[R] Julius Soti

4453

4674

4776

[R] Mary Griffin

5262

5488

5591

[R] Bob Lynn

4757

4983

5089

[R] Charles McMahon

5225

5447

5554

1884
DIFFERENCE**731**
DIFFERENCE

ORIGINAL SCAN TO HAND COUNT COMPARISON

Audit Machine 3

CANDIDATE	ORIGINAL SCAN 11/3/20	AUDIT MACHINE #3 5/14/21	HAND COUNT 5/21
BLANKS	6643	5627	5581
[D] Kristi St. Laurent	4429	4329	4355
[D] Henri Azibert	2763	2780	2808
[D] Valeria Roman	3389	3409	3442
[D] Ioana Singureanu	2742	2755	2782
[R] Julius Soti	4453	4727	4776
[R] Mary Griffin	5262	5541	5591
[R] Bob Lynn	4757	5038	5089
[R] Charles McMahon	5225	5501	5554

2276
DIFFERENCE

363
DIFFERENCE

ORIGINAL SCAN TO HAND COUNT COMPARISON

Audit Machine 4**CANDIDATE****ORIGINAL SCAN
11/3/20****AUDIT MACHINE #4
5/14/21****HAND COUNT
5/21****BLANKS**

6643

5696

5581

[D] Kristi St. Laurent

4429

4326

4355

[D] Henri Azibert

2763

2778

2808

[D] Valeria Roman

3389

3407

3442

[D] Ioana Singureanu

2742

2754

2782

[R] Julius Soti

4453

4701

4776

[R] Mary Griffin

5262

5512

5591

[R] Bob Lynn

4757

5009

5089

[R] Charles McMahon

5225

5472

5554

2092
DIFFERENCE**553**
DIFFERENCE




CANVASS
New Hampshire
Progress



What did we do?

- Selected 2 target towns
- Created canvas walk lists that reflected the actual town checklist
- Knocked on doors in 2 Towns
 - small team of independent citizens
 - met resident voters
 - Overwhelming response was gratitude for the work.
- All Votes which were cast in an inappropriate way generated an AFFIDAVIT by the canvasser
- Took what we learned and built upon it!

What did we find



Team knocked on 904 doors

444 people were home.

10% were NOT VOTED by a legit Voter.


1% of the Affidavits were for Same Day voters

3% were voted as absentee when it was a vote in person or vice versa

Many were votes cast by people who sold their home and no longer were residents where the vote was cast.

Total Affidavits = 13%

Desk Canvass- Findings from home sales in a prior to the election



With some team effort, we found **950+** prior owners who had votes cast in the 2020 election from their past addresses in 30 towns. In total we have **~1100** examples of voting discrepancies.

The prior owner canvass discrepancies represent ~10% of the home sales canvassed

We have several towns still being desk canvassed and have identified 200+ more to be added to our list.

What do you need to know

- **We don't believe that our elections are free from interference**
 - *We have evidence that needs to be acted upon*
 - *You have been presented evidence.*
 - *We have problems with separation of duties, have outsourced the machine programming and management without the consent of the people to a sole source, and have ever had an audit of the integrity of our process. NO BUSINESS ON THE PLANET WOULD DO THIS.*
- **Our politicians and leaders in NH have ignored the voice of the people**
 - 50 LSRs & only 1 bill sits on the governors desk. The rest were effectively killed.
 - The chair of election law says
 - Elections are not a closed loop process (?!)
 - Election law already knows where the problems are so an audit is a waste of time
 - There are no funds to pursue failure to follow process or audit
- **We expect New Hampshire to follow its constitution AND the law**
 - Voting machines do not follow the NH constitution which clearly outlines individual town officials as the parties to count our votes.
 - NH has destroyed election evidence within the 20 month federal requirements window

What do we want in response?

TRANSPARENCY

If our politicians can get the registrations for \$25 in excel, why not us?

Why no digital copies of ballots? This information should be readily available: with Cell phones & 2000 Mules the argument someone could sell a ballot by marking it is ludicrous.

Election data readily available in auditable digital format

REFORM

Remove the machines and move to hand count.

Canada, England, Germany, Switzerland, France and many others hand count every ballot! Why not New Hampshire?

Never move to Poll books which open NH another vulnerability – easily hacked!

AUDITS

Sample audit 2020

Random- statistical audits after all election to validate results.

Clean the voter Rolls & Keep them clean

purge inactive voters after 2 federal elections of inactivity

Audit town rolls for deaths & moves before each election

Make voter rolls & checklists available in excel format

Consequences & Enforcement

Introduce significant consequences for failure to perform by our elected officials and any who participate in the election process.

Create a budget/ process for enforcement

Breach of oath

Timeline for consequences documented in SoS policy and enforced legislatively within a specified timeline

Definition of Fraud

1a: DECEIT, TRICKERY *specifically* : intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to part with something of value or to surrender a legal right *

If New Hampshire officials & politicians knowingly allow a broken election process to remain unaddressed, disenfranchising legal NH voters, while publically asserting New Hampshire has “secure elections”, are they willingly and knowingly participating in fraud?