



---

# MEMORANDUM

---

Date: August 2, 2010

To: The Honorable Chairman and Members  
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry  
County Administrator

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "CHH", is written over the printed name "C.H. Huckelberry".

Re: Election Integrity

I am enclosing a copy of a report we have obtained entitled *"Preliminary Report to the Pima County Democratic Party Election Integrity Committee, Subject: The Oro Valley Mayor Race of May 18, 2010 has some anomalies that must be looked into."* The report is dated Thursday, June 17, 2010; it is authored by John R. Brakey and Jim March.

The report is a continuation of false and misleading accusations regarding election integrity and the conduct of elections undertaken by Pima County. I have provided a copy of the report to the Democratic Party Chair. I have also asked the County Attorney for advice regarding an appropriate response. In addition, I will forward this memorandum and the report to the Election Integrity Commission for their review.

It is unfortunate these allegations and often old allegations that have been disproven in court and/or with the media present continue to be rehashed and restated by individuals who appear intent on casting doubt on the credibility of election activities in Pima County. These allegations have been proven to be false, and they will again be proven false. Unfortunately, allegations repeated often enough sometimes begin to be believed; hence, the need to refute and disprove each allegation when it occurs. This memorandum will refute the allegations regarding the mayoral race in the Town of Oro Valley that occurred on May 18, 2010.

Previously, allegations that the Regional Transportation Authority election was flipped have been disproven by an actual hand recount of all ballots cast by the Arizona Attorney General with the election outcome remaining almost precisely the same as when the election was canvassed by the Board of Supervisors in 2006.

Today, the County continues to be entangled in costly litigation regarding ballot destruction pursuant to statute from the RTA election. This ongoing litigation is a prime example of the unfortunate waste of the taxpayers' money, particularly when the allegations have been so thoroughly refuted by an actual vote recount by the Attorney General under the auspices of a criminal investigation. The public is being disserved by these continuing allegations.

The Honorable Chairman and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors  
Re: **Election Integrity**  
August 2, 2010  
Page 2

Since the preliminary report to the Pima County Democratic Party, authored by Messrs. Brakey and March, again raises questions of integrity among election officials, I had Dr. John Moffatt, Office of Strategic Technology Planning, perform an independent analysis of the Oro Valley election tabulation process related to the mayoral race. In his review, Dr. Moffatt utilized the following documents and logs, all related to the May 18, 2010 election, based on my request for his investigation dated July 20, 2010. These documents include:

1. Global Election Management System (GEMS), Statement of Votes Cast for May 23, 2010. This is the final report showing the detailed distribution of votes by precinct and is presented to the Board of Supervisors or other responsible election officials (in this case the Oro Valley Town Council) for the Canvass of the Election.
2. The First Summary Report for the May 18, 2010 election produced at 8:00 PM on May 18 – Election Day – per statute. This report reflects the early voting totals as of Election Night before any of the precinct votes had been downloaded to the GEMS system.
3. GEMS Audit Log for the entire election from the creation of precinct cards to be placed into AccuVote and TSx machines through the creation of the Statement of Votes Cast and Final Election Summary Report generated at approximately 12:21 PM on May 23, 2010.
4. Pima County Elections Counting Room Entry Log.
5. Pima County Department of Elections Exception Log, which identifies any unusual activities that needed to be performed, the cause, and the action taken. The log is signed by party observers involved in the exception handling process.
6. Pima County Voting Area Reconciliation Spreadsheet.
7. The *“Preliminary Report to the Pima County Democratic Party Election Integrity Committee”* dated June 17, 2010, authored by John R. Brakey and Jim March.
8. A number of blogs that appeared in a blog reportedly cofounded by Richard Furash and Art Segal. These include contributions by Brad Friedman, author of bradblog.com, as well as other contributors or bloggers.

In summary, the investigation by Dr. Moffatt concludes that there are no irregularities or anomalies in the Oro Valley mayoral election, and the results stand as posted by the Elections Department and certified by the Town of Oro Valley Mayor and Council.

Below is a list of allegations, as well as the County’s factual response to each.

<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>1. Pima County has for years been illegally peeking and printing these results as soon as they start counting [Early Ballots] VBM.</p>	<p>A review of the Audit Log for the entire May 18, 2010 Election does not show any occurrence of the previewing or printing of a summary report during the counting of the early returns.</p> <p>Following the RTA Election and concerns raised regarding the use of summary reports, the County has not printed summary reports during the counting of early returns other than for audit batches.</p> <p>Following the RTA Election and concerns about Election staff inappropriately accessing the computer to “peek” at early returns, significant security measures have been instituted, including the sealing of the doors and sides to the GEMS Server once the election creation process has begun. Seal logs have been strictly adhered to, and election observers are <u>always</u> present in the room when the machine is accessed. The one exception, as Messrs. Brakey and March know, is the printing of summary reports for early returns required by State law to facilitate and verify hand count audits. The printing of these summary reports for early returns occurs under strict procedures with party observers present. There was no hand count audit of this election per instructions from the Arizona Secretary of State, Ken Bennett. Thus there was no printing of summary reports for early returns for the purpose of hand audit of the election results.</p>
<p>2. We suspect this election was gamed this is the only election we’ve ever seen that the spread between Early Ballots (VBM) which was 66.7% of overall vote is different by 9% to the precincts final results which was only 31.7%.</p>	<p>A detail analysis of the Statement of Votes Cast by Race by Precinct and the final summary report compared to the initial summary report for early returns clarifies that the early voting trend was very consistent. The percentages at 8:00 PM on May 18 were 46.3 percent for Hiremath and 53.3 percent for Zinkin as reflected on the first summary report for early returns. The final totals show that even though an additional 1,026 early ballots were counted after 8:00 PM on May 18, the percentages changed only slightly: Hiremath at 47.2 percent to Zinkin at 52.6 percent. Of the 1,026 votes counted after Election night, 531 voted for Hiremath and 495 voted for Zinkin, so there was no major swing in the Early Votes at the last minute.</p>
<p>3. In Pima County, it is easy to vote by mail, and hence the variances between the mail-in and the precinct votes tend to be even less usually</p>	<p>A comparison of voting areas (in this election some precincts were consolidated into voting areas) shows that it is important to carefully examine the details. Some voting areas clearly favored Zinkin (for example, in Voting Area 44, Zinkin received 80 percent of the vote), but it was a small precinct as far as turnout is concerned (the total was only 158). Contrast that to Voting</p>

<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>around 1-3% at most. That's why 9% should be setting off major alarms.</p>	<p>Area 178 where Hiremath won by 13 percent, where there were 2,766 voters in that area.</p> <p>The allegations fail to take into consideration that one of the candidates conducted a major push at the end of the campaign period.</p> <p>Finally, the allegations also fail to consider the difference in the Provisional votes for each candidate. The difference is 45 votes (142 for Hiremath versus 97 for Zinkin). The difference in the entire race was 30 votes. Had Messrs. Brakey and March investigated actual field election activity, they would have discovered that Hiremath supporters proactively obtained the names of the conditional provisional ballot voters and contacted many of these voters urging them to provide their credentials so their vote would count.</p>
<p>4. Question – was 79 undervotes turned into votes for Hiremath? – or additional ballots showed up?</p>	<p>We are not sure of the basis for the 79 undervotes, but if you compare the number of undervotes at 8:00 PM – (early voters only), the undervote was 634, or 6.7 percent of the voters that returned early ballots that had been counted at that point. On the Final Summary Report, there were 749 blank (since the vote was for one, a blank is an undervote) out of a total of 10,630 for an undervote of 7.0 percent. If the undervotes had then been voted, this number would have decreased, not increased. Undervotes for Mayor at the polls were 504 out of 5,201 or just under 10 percent (9.69 percent). The count of undervotes from the precinct machines did not change from the time the AccuVote and TSx machines were downloaded on May 19 at 2:19 PM to the final count; therefore, none of those ballots were converted into a vote for Mayor.</p> <p>Regarding the allegation that additional ballots were added, the total Polling ballot count did not change from May 19 at 2:19 PM to the Final Summary. The early ballots are subject to a rigorous tally process, beginning with the Recorder, and are tracked meticulously by Elections staff as well as the observers in the Counting Room when the early ballots are processed. The percentages for Hiremath increased only a fraction of a percent (0.9 percent), so the swing of early votes contributing to the win was negligible. Since this report is for the Democratic Party, it either calls into question the accuracy of the Democratic and Republican Party observers' tracking process if ballots were</p>

Allegation	Response
	<p>added, since Elections staff would not have been allowed to proceed without the crosschecked totals tracking exactly to the Elections ballot count. The observers from all of the parties are very precise in their process and tracking to the batch numbers received from the Recorder on early ballots.</p> <p>A review of the exception logs indicates that <u>none</u> of the voting areas that had the Oro Valley Mayor office on the ballots had any kind of exception handling or reloading of the ballots. These processes are closely watched by the observers in the room, and when one occurs, it is documented in detail and signed by Elections staff as well as the observers from each party and retained for analysis such as this.</p>
<p>5. Continuing allegations related to running early summary reports (covered earlier) and this item adds the implication that Bryan Crane could copy the database and open it on another computer that has GEMS on it. This implies he could then edit the Audit Log and since we do not find any evidence of Summary Reports being run inappropriately, he must have done so.</p>	<p>The allegations fail to include the fact that many of the changes that would prevent these types of activities by Mr. Crane or any of the other Elections Staff have been in place since the Primary and General Elections of 2006 and are continually improved upon to tighten security even further; yet Messrs. Brakey and March, who have full knowledge of the changes implemented, continue to make these allegations with many new and sometimes expensive processes and equipment in place.</p> <p>Examples include the GEMS Server cabinet seals matching the logs signed by party observers, full video on the server from more than one camera, the removal of system administration capability from the Elections staff to a two-person team from Information Technology, and displaying all cables connected to the GEMS server in clearly defined colors in ladder racks in clear view of observers inside and outside the Counting Room.</p> <p>Comparing the Counting Room Entry Log to the Audit Log, it is clear that observers were in attendance at all times when votes were being processed.</p>
<p>6. By counting 6 days out give plenty of time to reprogram the 11 or 12 memory cards. It's as if someone flipped the names on the precinct optical scanners memory cards or something like that. The other races in</p>	<p>The Audit Log indicates the last cards for the AccuVote and TSx voting machines were programmed prior to the Logic and Accuracy Test that occurred on May 5, 2010. There are no further entries in the GEMS log as to reprogramming or reloading any voting area.</p> <p>A comparison program has been written by Pima County that compares all of the parameters in the Central Count System across the entire election to insure they were not "flipped" in the</p>

Allegation	Response
Oro Valley look normal.	<p>middle of the election.</p> <p>As part of this comparison process, the audit logs and numerous other logs and copies of the databases are provided to the political parties or the entities involved in the election. None of the participants or observing parties, when asked, indicated they wished to receive these materials.</p>
7. Printing Summary Reports	<p>This topic has been addressed many times, including in this document. Significant security changes initiated in 2006 prohibit and prevent this type of activity going forward, yet it is referenced as if it continues to occur.</p>
<p>8A and 8B. Computer manipulation.</p> <p>A. "Chester Crowley, an election department employee, testified at trial that the election computer had in the past been connected to Bryan Crane's computer in his office and he believed Mr. Crane had printed unofficial tallies on his office printer directly from the election computer."</p> <p>B. Robbie Evans is quoted as testifying that Bryan Crane took backups of the Elections Server home every Friday night on a CD as described on Page 6 of the Brakey – March Document. Yet Mr. Evans testimony as found on page 23 of the same transcription file – 87-120507 – Trial Day Two.</p>	<p>Here and below is Mr. Crowley's testimony as taken directly from the Official Transcript of the Trial, labeled 87-120507 Trial Day Two, beginning on Page 32 – Line 12. This clarifies the allegations on connectivity:</p> <p><i>Q. And do you know whether or not his computer was connected with the central count computer?</i></p> <p><i>A. <u>No.</u> (emphasis added)</i></p> <p><i>A. I'm aware of him taking backups home.</i></p> <p><i>Q. Yeah.</i></p> <p><i>A. I didn't see the data. I don't know exactly what was on the data, what was on the disk.</i></p> <p><i>Q. Did you know that Bryan Crane would take backups of the administrative -- the office administrative system home?</i></p> <p><i>A. I've never seen the data loaded. I don't know exactly what was on there, other than the word "backup" was used. That's all I remember, "backup."</i></p> <p><i>Q. So it could have been something other than an election on</i></p>

Allegation	Response
	<p><i>that stuff?</i></p> <p><i>A. Yes, I would have no clue.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Straub: I have no further questions.</i></p> <p>The detail that is lost in these continual references to Bryan Crane taking Elections databases home on a CD is that the Elections Servers in 2006 were backed up on <u>tape</u> as exemplified in another factor of the case where the backup <u>tapes</u> sent to the Secretary of State's Office and then were mysteriously lost. The Administrative Computer in Elections had the CD backup system. Bryan Crane was taking home Administrative records "In case the building burned down" not Election files. And he did it weekly because he had payroll and other information on the computer and there was no other offsite backup process available through the County at that time. There is a big difference between a "tape" and a "CD." The testimony above does not support the allegation that Bryan Crane took Election data bases home. The Plaintiff's attorney put those words into the witness's mouth.</p>

While the numbers in the Oro Valley mayoral race may be surprising to some, the facts support the outcome. More importantly, the transparency and new controls and procedures developed by Pima County internally, as well as in conjunction with the political parties, enhance our ability to analyze the process of operating an election as well as the outcome. Accurate reporting is critical to understanding and developing public confidence in elections. Inaccurate reporting and misrepresentation of facts or theories is damaging to public confidence in the electoral process. Increased awareness through responsible presentation of reliable information should be the goal of everyone involved in the elections process.

CHH/mjk

Attachment

- c: Berryl Baker, Co-chair, Green Party of Pima County
- David Nolan, Chair, Pima County Libertarian Party
- Jeffery Rogers, Pima County Democratic Party
- Kent Solberg, Co-chair, Green Party of Pima County
- Robert Westerman, Chair, Pima County Republican Party
- Pima County Election Integrity Commission
- Dr. John Moffatt, Office of Strategic Technology Planning
- Brad Nelson, Elections Director

## Chuck Huckelberry

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 14, 2010 2:33 PM  
**To:** Chuck Huckelberry  
**Subject:** OV election anomalies

Per our discussion:

Preliminary Report to the Pima County Democratic Party Election Integrity Committee

**Subject: The Oro Valley Mayor Race of May 18, 2010 has some anomalies that must be looked into.**

Thursday, June 17, 2010

By John R Brakey and Jim March

The Oro Valley Mayor race has some anomalies that must be looked into.

Here are the facts:

Vote By Mail (VBM) made up 66.68% of the overall vote in Oro Valley. One thing Jim March, others and I have learned over the years from studying VBM results is that it is a very good pollster and that Pima county for years has been illegally peeking and printing these results as soon as they start counting VBM.

We suspect this election was gamed this is the only election we've ever seen that the spread between Early Ballots (VBM) which was 66.7% of overall vote is different by 9% to the precincts final results which was only 31.7%. By taking the VBM percentage and comparing them to precinct result the differences is 9% which is unheard of in Pima County. Note that the South Carolina fiasco unfolding in the last weeks involves an election where the variance between VBM and precinct votes is 11%, and that's being considered an

utter impossibility. Here, the difference is 9%. In SC it's somewhat difficult to vote by mail, it's reserved for special cases, so the difference in the number of votes between VBM and precinct is quite high. In Pima County it's easy to vote by mail, and hence the variances between the mail-in and precinct votes tend to be even less usually around 1% to 3% at most. That's why 9% should be setting off major alarms.

We've gone back and have studied two major elections (General Elections 2006 and 2008) and can find nothing bigger than one case of a 5.9% spread between mail-in and precinct voting and that some what explainable.

At 8:04 PM Election Night the results with VBM showed Mike Zinkin leading by 600 votes:

*NO  
Someone  
did a  
good  
job of  
convincing  
those voters  
who  
waited  
and  
went to  
polls.*

TOWN OF ORO VALLEY MAYORAL			
		Early/Mail	%
Mike Zinkin Satish Hiremath			
As reported on the Pima County Elections Department website at 8:04 p.m. on Tuesday, Zinkin had 53 percent or 4,701 votes.	Zinkin (D)	4701	53.25%
	Hiremath	4101	46.45%
	Write-in Votes?	26	0.29%
Hiremath trailed by 600 votes.		600	
Total votes counted in Mayor race at 8:04pm Election-night		8828	100.00%
Or could this have been flipped because they knew the results 6 days out?		Polling	%
	Hiremath	2624	55.87%
	Zinkin (D)	2056	43.77%
Write-in Votes	Write-in Votes	17	0.36%
Hiremath pickup with polling / precincts votes counted 568 votes more than Zinkin and has close the vote gap to		568	
After Polling location (precincts) report in Zinkin lead drops to only		32	
Total votes counted in Mayor race at polling location Election-night		4697	100.00%
Counted from May 19 <sup>th</sup> thru 22 <sup>nd</sup>		Rest of Early/Mail	%

By end of week the rest of the Early/Mail (VBM) is counted which is	9881	1053	
As you can see the trend changes on VBM	Hiremath ♦	531	50.43%
	Zinkin (D)	514	48.81%
	Write-in Votes	8	0.76%
The trend in vote by mail changes and Hiremath picks up more votes than Zinkin by 17 votes (very strange)		17	
This drops Zinkin lead to 15 votes		15	
Total Early / Mail votes counted after election night		1053	100.00%
<b>Question! Was 79 undervotes turned into votes for Hiremath? Or additional ballots showed up?</b>			
The provisionals looks to have been counted on Sunday, this needs to be verified.		Provisional	%
	Hiremath ♦	142	58.92%
	Zinkin (D)	97	40.25%
	Write-in Votes	2	0.83%
Hiremath with provisionals picks up 45 more votes than Zinkin		45	
On Sunday the final results with Provisionals are reported and Zinkin lead of 15 votes is now he loses by 30 votes and due to AZ law of 1/10 of 1 percent there will be no recount.	-30		
		241	100.00%

	Polling	%	VBM	%	Prov	%		
HIREMATH, SATISH	2624	55.87%	4632	46.88%	142	58.92%	30	8.99%
ZINKIN, MIKE	2056	43.77%	5215	52.78%	97	40.25%		-9.01%
Write-In Votes	17	0.36%	34	0.34%	2	0.83%		0.02%
	4697	100.00%	9881	100.00%	241	100.00%		

<b>Total Votes percents</b>	<b>4697</b>	<b>31.70%</b>	<b>9881</b>	<b>66.68%</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	

Here is what we theorize the rest of VBM should have been if not gamed.

The way to possibly tell is to see what the stats look like for undervotes from VBM.

Hiremath ♦	452	46.41%	-42
Zinkin (D)	514	52.77%	47
	8	0.82%	
	974	100.00%	89
Undervotes?	79		442

This is what we theorize should have been the result base on VBM result.

Hiremath ( R )	6,751	45.96%
Zinkin (D)	7,936	54.04%
	14,687	100%

What I think happened:

- The Election Department started counting VBM on May 12<sup>th</sup>, 6 days before the election, once again we suspect their some how running Election Summary Report Results of who winning and losing again as they done for many years. I don't think we'll find this on the GEMS audit log. But it would be easy for Bryan Crane to copy the database and open it on any computer that has GEMS on it.
- By counting 6 days out give plenty of time to reprogram the 11 or 12 cards memory cards. It's as if some one flipped the names on the precincts optical scanners memory cards or something like that. The other races on the Oro Valley ballot look normal.
- By the time the precinct vote came in which was 31.7% of the overall vote and the rest of the Early VBM the election tighten up to where Mike Zinkin lead was only 32 votes.
- As the rest of the VBM is counted which was 1063 ballots Zinkin lead is now only 15 votes.
- Zinkin winds up losing the election after the 241 Provisional ballots are counted on a Sunday giving Hiremath the republican candidate the win by 30 votes.

**We need to file an extensive public records request.**

Note: We suspect that if we check the undervotes in the VBM counted after election night that they may be lower than what was counted before the election. The only way we will know that this is the case is by getting all the daily backup databases.

#### **Past History Pima County and Oro Valley**

The Oro Valley's town consolidation races of May 2006 were also on the ballot with RTA and in 22 precincts in that election one race was decided by 4 votes and we only found 4 of the 22 polltapes (18 are missing) and three out of the 4 existing polltapes do NOT match the Diebold/GEMS database by 34 votes in 3 precincts.

We know that from the testimony of Robbie Evens in the court trial and in depositions

Video testimony: <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=3065842076090526996>

That explanation of Robbie Evans contradicted Bryan Crane earlier sworn testimony that he had printed the tallies in order to write down a ♦cards cast number♦ and within ♦seconds♦ would shred the tallies on an office shredder. That ♦explanation♦ further contradicted the testimony of his assistant, Robbie Evans, Jr., see video.[1]

Prior to their interview of Mr. Bryan Crane, the Attorney General's office had been given the name of Mr. Crane's assistant of four years, Robbie Evans Jr., and were informed that he would explain that such tallies were regularly printed so that the election department would know who was losing and who was winning. The Attorney General's investigators chose not to speak to Mr. Evans.

At the ♦database♦ trial, Mr. Evans testified under oath that the Pima County Election Division printed pre-election tallies so regularly that Pima County paid for a rubber stamp to be made to stamp them as ♦unofficial tallies. ♦ He further testified that the Pima County Election Director regularly came in to obtain his own copy to take back to his office. Other copies were kept at a table in the computer room. His testimony cannot be reconciled with the unexamined explanation accepted by the Attorney General.[2]

Chester Crowley, an election department employee, testified at trial that the election computer had in the past been connected to Bryan Cranes♦ computer in his office and he believed Mr. Crane had printed unofficial tallies on his office printer directly from the election computer.[3]

Mr. Crane♦s assistant for some four years, Robbie Evans, Jr., testified that Mr. Crane regularly took home during elections a compact disc (CD) of election data.[4] Isabel Araiza, perhaps the election division♦s senior employee and the office manager prior to Brad Nelson being hired, testified that she had discussed with Brad Nelson the security problem of Bryan Crane taking election data home with him during live elections.[5] Mr. Nelson did not object to the practice and did not instruct Mr. Crane to cease that practice. The GEMS system has a well-known security defect known as ♦the back door♦ whereby data can be changed using Microsoft Access without knowing or using a password.[6] The GEMS audit log is not separate from the data itself. That means that election data can be changed and then the audit log itself can be amended to erase any history of the changes having been made.

The audit log for the RTA election shows evidence consistent with just that kind of manipulation and inconsistent with the normal operation of the GEMS software.[7] Since Bryan Crane operated the GEMS software for ten years before the RTA election his normal style is known.



Jim March and I know that VBM is the best pollster you can have. Better than any pollster in the United States and again with 66.7% of the vote coming in by VBM it♦s almost impossible to have a different result with the lead Zinkin had.

On a strange note!

Diebold change their name to Premier and then sold to ES&S. However, do to antitrust laws the sale was canceled. Now they were sold to another company and will be called, get this! ♦DOMINION VOTING♦  
What a name.

You can read about this on Brad Blog.

John R. Brakey Jim March

[1] contradicted the testimony of his assistant, Robbie Evans, Jr., see video.

[2] At the Database trial, Mr. Evans testified under oath that the Pima County Election Division printed pre-election tallies so regularly that Pima County paid for a rubber stamp to be made to stamp them as unofficial tallies[2].

[3] Crowley testimony at trial <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-8269488968037938855>

[4] Evans testimony at trial <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-3065842076090526996>

[5] Araiza testimony at trial <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-5509349780776531096>

[6] New York Times article dated May 12, 2006

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/12/us/12vote.html?partner=rssnyt&emc=rss> David Bear, a spokesman for Diebold Election Systems, said the potential risk existed because the company's technicians had intentionally built the machines in such a way that election officials would be able to update their systems in years ahead.

[7] Tucson Citizen article dated Jun 7, 2007 <http://www.tucsoncitizen.com/daily/opinion/53903>

John Brakey, co-founder of AUDIT-AZ (Americans United for Democracy, Integrity, and Transparency in Elections, Arizona) & Co-Coordinator of Investigations Velvet Revolution

<http://www.velvetrevolution.us>

My web site with Arizona Election Integrity News <http://audit-az.blogspot.com>

Tucson, AZ 85706

520-578-5678

New Cell 520 339 2696

John's [AUDITAZ@cox.net](mailto:AUDITAZ@cox.net)

EDA & AUDIT-AZ's Mission: to restore public ownership and oversight of elections, work to ensure the fundamental right of every American citizen to vote, and to have each vote counted as intended in a secure, transparent, impartial, and independently audited election process.

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world.

Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has." Margaret Mead

"Make yourself sheep and the wolves will eat you." – Benjamin Franklin

There is no safety for honest men except by believing all possible evil of evil men. –

Edmund Burke