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# RECORDS AND EQUIPMENT REQUESTED BUT NOT PROVIDED AND REASON FOR REFUSAL 

Dominion Tabulators and Dominion Election Management System (EMS) Central Computer the Secretary of State threatened the County Commission with prosecution if they examined the tabulators for vulnerabilities or examined the EMS computer for evidence of tampering.

Poll Books and Routers - the poll books and routers are rented and returned to SERVIS and could not be obtained. This equipment is connected to the internet throughout the election and are a point of vulnerability but are impossible to examine or audit since they are not in the County's possession.

ERIC Reports, Contracts, and Correspondence - auditors were told by the Secretary of State that the ERIC reports are confidential. ERIC itself is not open to public documents request because it is a private company. The SOS delayed release of the contracts and correspondence for seven months, but finally provided limited financial statements in July 2022.

Additional Voter Roll Snapshots and the Digital Absentee Register - Otero County does not maintain historical snapshots of their voter rolls. Therefore, a complete list of voters from November 2020 could not be obtained. Additionally, the Secretary of State prevented auditors from acquiring the most recent version of the rolls and the digital absentee register for comparison to the July 2021 version. The Secretary of State claims as an excuse that voter data is private information and investigation for accuracy is not a valid use of the rolls. However, a NM federal district court has recently ruled against the Secretary of State on this position. ${ }^{5}$

When multiple rolls are compared to one another, impossibilities have been discovered in multiple states that reveal manipulation and fraud are occurring. Examples include registered voters with the same voter ID having their birthdates changed from record to record, backdating registrations, and registrants where party affiliations and addresses changing as often as once per month, as though they were being moved around to fill out set ratios for party affiliation in given precincts.
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## 1 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

In accordance with the resolution unanimously adopted by the Otero County Commission on November 18, 2021, a full audit of the 2020 General Election and a vulnerability assessment have been completed. The results of the analyses are included in this report.

The audit looked at all aspects of the election that were available for inspection. Some records were destroyed or were refused to be made available. The audit uncovered items that should be of great concern to the County Commission and County Clerk:

1. The state's voter registration database is not secure and is being manipulated on a regular basis. The voter registration database is hosted on a platform which also handles election management and election night reporting. When the voter registration database is compromised, all shared platforms are necessarily impacted and made more vulnerable.
2. The Secretary of State was caught sending sensitive election data outside her office directly to a Democrat operative and candidate. This data showed that the votes were being manipulated in impossible ways throughout election day.
3. The Ballot on Demand system does not comply with state law. State law clearly states ballots shall be numbered sequentially. There is no sequential numbering on ballots issued in New Mexico.
4. The documentary 2000 Mules released in May 2022, proves that a massive ballot trafficking scheme was deployed across the country. There are multiple nongovernment organizations (NGO's) operating in New Mexico that are affiliated with organizations which have been proven to be tied to ballot harvesting schemes in Arizona and Texas. The absentee ballot results in November 2020 were far outside historical norms. Statistical analysis shows that there was ballot stuffing in absentee ballots in some races. It is likely a ballot trafficking operation was at work in New Mexico.
5. Neighboring Dona Ana County was found to have massive irregularities in their chain of custody documentation for their absentee ballots. Over 8,000 ballots have no chain of
custody. For no legally discernible reason, 196 ballots were retained by the clerk's office until late morning on November $4^{\text {th }}, 2020$, when there is geographical reason why delivery could not have been achieved on Election Day. Additionally, 146 absentee ballots had no record of ever being turned in to Dona Ana County's absentee board, even though those same ballots were included in the Secretary of State's total absentee ballot count. These irregularities reveal gross negligence from election officials, or intentional wrongdoing. This is of great importance, as the State House District 53 race draws votes from both Otero and Dona Ana counties. That particular race was between Willie Madrid and Ricky Little, and was decided by only 38 votes. The election officials' lack of custodial record keeping, and unexplainable retention of ballots after Election Day has eroded public confidence in the outcome in the State House District 53 race.
6. The Otero County Clerk also has significant problems with chain of custody of absentee ballots. At least 850 ballots were cast with no record of where they came from, almost half of these on a single day. Otero County is also missing envelopes.
7. Every part of the election system from voter registration to election night reporting has serious vulnerabilities. None of these are being taken seriously, or even acknowledged, by election officials.
8. The Dominion Voting System has significant security vulnerabilities. Vulnerabilities include a printing feature which can mark voted ballots if malicious logic is present in the tabulators, as well as wireless capabilities which are standard in the EMS computer provided by Dominion. Otero uses the same Dominion tabulators that were found to have wireless capabilities in other jurisdictions, and illegal software that was installed on the EMS. This illegal software allows access to all election results and is not even password protected.
9. Election records from the 2020 election were destroyed on the central Election Management System (EMS). Records that were destroyed include the 2020 Project Files, the system log files for each tabulator, detailed cast vote records for each tabulator, and the original ballot images. Deletion of these files is a crime.
10. The Dominion Voting System and the ROBIS ePollbook system are not certified in accordance with the New Mexico election code.
11. The use of voting convenience centers makes sequential numbering of ballots impossible. This necessitates internet-connected ePollbooks, which introduces massive vulnerability into the voting process.
12. The Dominion Voting System does not meet state law requirements for accuracy. The Dominion tabulators had an adjudication error rate which was 15 times higher than allowed by New Mexico law in the November 2020 election.
13. Even the official, post-election Risk Limiting Audit performed by the SOS reports an error rate as high as 318 times higher than allowable by law. The Risk Limiting Audit itself is limited and flawed. The RLA is directed by the SOS and cannot be considered "independent." The accounting firm that performs the RLAs will not even attest to their effectiveness.
14. In-depth statistical analysis of the Cast Vote Record (CVR) for Otero County shows evidence of ballot stuffing in many races in the absentee ballots.
15. The Cast Vote Record (CVR) in Sandoval County and other counties across the country show evidence of digital manipulation as well as ballot stuffing in many races. Sandoval County shares statewide ballot races with Otero County.
16. The canvass revealed that a significant portion of the voter history appears to be digitally manipulated, a significant portion of the voter rolls are out of date, and it appears that a significant number of registrations are being fraudulently added to the database.
17. The canvass also revealed that significant numbers of "ghost votes" are being cast. Many ghost votes were cast in person. New Mexico must adopt voter ID to prevent this from happening.
18. The lack of production of vital election records and equipment for examination, and destruction of election records is grounds for the Otero County Commission to provide a vote of no-confidence in the election system, to withhold certification of post-election results, and to immediately cease and desist in the further use of the election system.

## 2 OVERVIEW OF THE ELECTION SYSTEM IN NM

The election system in New Mexico consists of several interconnected parts including the voter registration database, electronic pollbooks, ballot on demand ballot printing system, electronic tabulators, Election Management System (EMS) for each county, and a state-wide election night reporting system.

A simplified schematic of the election system in New Mexico is shown in Figure 1. A brief explanation of each component of the election system are contained in the following sections.


Figure 1. Simplified Schematic of New Mexico's Election System

### 2.1 VOTER ROLLS

The foundation for the election system is the voter registration database. The way the voter registration database is stored and updated has changed significantly in recent years to become more centralized and less secure. Storage for the voter registration database is now controlled by the Secretary of State, though county clerks still maintain some maintenance duties.

### 2.1.1 Apparent Voter Roll Manipulation

Private third parties have been given enhanced ability to monitor and make changes to the rolls. For example, New Mexico entered a contract with a private company, the Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC), in 2016. New Mexico originally entered this contract as a condition of receiving a \$75,000 grant from the PEW Charitable Trusts, a left-wing organization. ${ }^{6}$

ERIC is paid to monitor the registrants on the rolls, collect databases from the Motor Vehicle Department (MVD) and other state agencies in multiple states. They claim to compare these databases from state to state and alert states where it appears the same person is registered in more than one state. ERIC also provides lists of people who appear to live in a state but are not registered to vote so they can be solicited to register to vote.

ERIC was founded in 2012 by David Becker, an experienced Democrat election lawyer, and received funding from the Soros Open Society. ${ }^{7}$ The fact that a private third party with highly partisan origins has access to massive amounts of data about New Mexicans that could be used to influence our elections should not be tolerated. In January 2022, the State of Louisiana ceased their participation in ERIC. Their Secretary of State noted, "The announcement comes amid concerns raised by citizens, government watchdog organizations and media reports about

[^2]potential questionable funding sources and that possibly partisan actors may have access to ERIC network data for political purposes, potentially undermining voter confidence."8

The auditors submitted a request in January 2022 for the contracts, agreements between the State of New Mexico and ERIC to determine what agreements regarding privacy, use of data, and monetary compensation are in place. Auditors also requested reports generated by ERIC. The SOS delayed production of these documents for seven months, finally producing some limited financial statements, but ignored the remainder of the public documents request.

Database comparison and active cleaning of the rolls is a worthy goal. However, the responsibility for doing this should not be handed over to a partisan, private party with no accountability. ERIC's questionable background and lack of transparency, produces a self-evident appearance of impropriety that undermines confidence in our elections.

Emails between the New Mexico Secretary of State's Office and two left-wing non-government organizations (NGO) called Rock the Vote and Center for Civic Policy reveal that the Secretary of State agreed to change how registrations are entered into the state database to make it easier for Rock the Vote and their 1,198 partners to add voters to the database. ${ }^{9}$

In addition to ERIC and Rock the Vote, the Motor Vehicle Department (MVD) was given control over electronic entry of voter data into the system. Staff at the Otero County Clerk's office indicated that they noticed a strong uptick in registrations and changes to registrations when the MVD was given write-access to the rolls. The canvass performed as part of the audit revealed that there are people who are listed on the rolls who were unaware that they were registered, including a non-citizen who knew he was not eligible. There is evidence that people are being registered without their knowledge by the MVD, or bad actors have compormised one of the multiple electroinc access points to the rolls granted to the MVD in recent years.

State agencies have also implemented a policy that all applicants to income assistance programs must fill out a voter registration form. These applications are delivered to the Otero County Clerk's office at the rate of 10 to 20 per week. The clerk's office reported that the majority of these applications are duplicates of already existing entries indicating there is no attempt on the part of the state agencies to determine if people are already regsitered to vote before requiring

[^3]them to fill out another registration application. During the 2022 legislative session, the SOS supported legisation that would have given write-access to muliple additional state agencies, further exasperating an existing problem.

Figure 2 shows the daily registrations in Otero County going back to 2016. It is evident that the number of registrations and changes to the rolls increased significantly starting in 2018 as reported by the Clerk. Figure 3 shows daily registration patterns for four counties side by side. All New Mexico counties have the same shape and the same peaks. The numbers of registration appear only to be scaled for each county's population. The registration patterns also reveal that the voter registration database has not actually been closed during elections as required by law prior to 2020. ${ }^{10}$
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Figure 2. Daily Registration Count in Otero County since 2016


Figure 3. Daily Registration Count in All Counties Have the Same Shape

Figures 2 and 3 show the most massive changes were happening across the state in the voter registration database in the months leading up to and following the November 2020 election. This is alarming because the majority of registrations have come from the MVD system since 2018. However, the MVD was alrgely shut down across the state starting in March 2020 through

December 2020. ${ }^{11,12}$ In Otero County, the database shows that during these months that as many as 25 registrations were being processed each Sunday when all state and county offices are closed. In Bernalillo County, several hundred registrations were being processed on Sundays. This behavior is not consistent with natural, human behavior, historical patterns, or policy for entering registrations into the rolls - especially as the MVD should have been largely removed as a source of registrations due to the governor's shutdown. These consistent, unnatural patterns indicate fraudulent manipulation of New Mexico's voter rolls.

Other data sources support the assertion that manipulation has happened to New Mexico's voter rolls in recent years. The federal bureaucracy charged with overseeing the implementation of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) is called the Election Assistance Commission (EAC). The EAC collects the total number of registrations in every county in the country and reports the number of these registrations which are new, valid registrations. The EAC data for Otero County shows that 100\% of the registrations submitted between the 2014 and 2016 elections were valid registrations. However, from 2016 to 2020, less than $40 \%$ of the registrations received into the Otero County database were new, valid registrations, see Figure 4.

[^5]${ }^{12}$ www.tax.newmexico.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/MVD news release.pdf


Figure 4. Changes in Percentage of Valid Registrations ${ }^{13}$

The EAC reports that between the 2014 and 2016 there were only 4,159 total registrations received and they were all new and valid. Between 2016 and 2018, there were 6,651 registrations received, but only 2,344 of them were new and valid. Between 2018 and 2020 there were 16,338 registrations received, but only 5,892 of these were new valid registrations. The fact that the number of registrations coming into Otero County has quadrupled, and the registrations have gone from being all new and valid to mostly not new or valid in just the last six years is indicative of fraudulent manipulation. There is no corresponding population growth to account for these massive changes.

These changes are not limited to Otero County. From Figure 4, Prior to 2018, most registration applications that were received were new and valid in approximately half of the counties in New Mexico. Since 2018, most registrations received by every county are not new or valid.
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### 2.1.2 Unexplained Weekly Patterns and Correlation Between the Parties

Figure 5 shows nine weeks of registrations as they were coming in statewide and how those registrations were split between the parties and decline to state (DTS) registrants.


Figure 5. Regular Weekly Pattern and Correlation Between the Parties

The extremely regular and obvious weekly pattern of the total registration count in the figure is not consistent with random, human behavior. The consistent ratios between the parties is also alarming.

This unexplained correlation between the parties appears to have arisen only in recent years and now exists at the state, county, and even precinct level. In almost all counties, the majority party out registers the minority party every day, and the DTS voters consistently register in almost equal numbers with the minority party in almost all the counties.

For example, taking the weekly registrations processed in Otero County from June to December of 2020 reveals that Republican and Democrat registrations come in at consistent proportions, and the DTS and Democrat registration counts are almost identical every week (see Figure 6).


Figure 6. DTS and Democrat Weekly Registration Counts Match

There is no historical or logical reason why registrations between two unconnected parties should match this well. Because this phenomenon has only emerged in recent years, it is reasonable to conclude that it is due to artificial manipulation of the voter rolls. Not only are the DTS and minority party correlated by the numbers in which they are added to the rolls, but their numbers correlate down to the percentage that are registered in each precinct as shown in Figure 7.


Figure 7. Comparison of Registration Percentages by Party for all Precincts in 2012 and 2020

Figure 7 shows the total percentage of registrations taken up by each party in each precinct in Otero County in 2012 and 2020. In 2012, there was no discernible correlation between the percentage of people who chose to register as DTS and the other two parties. However, by 2020, the number of people who register as DTS has migrated to nearly match the numbers registered as Democrats in almost every precinct. This unnatural correlation is likely the result of many fraudulent registrations that could be used to hide the true distribution between the major parties and manipulate elections.

### 2.1.3 Sources of Registration Database Manipulation

The auditors requested several documents which were not provided that could help determine the cause of the massive influx of applications for registration and why so many of them do not end up being new and valid. For example, we requested the IP addresses of the computers that have accessed the voter registration database from the SOS to determine if sources outside of New Mexico are accessing the database. A similar investigation in the state of Colorado revealed that the voter registration database was being accessed by multiple computers all over the United States, Canada, Europe, South American and even Africa (see Figure 8). Access by foreign and out-of-state computers are a strong indication that attempts are being made to unlawfully access Colorado's database. It is possible, and even likely that the same thing is happening in New Mexico.

## IP Locations That Have Accessed SCORE (Not WebSCORE)



Figure 8. Locations of IP Addresses that Accessed CO's Voter Registration Database

The sources of registrations from a limited subset of 181 voters who show as having registration dates after election day 2020, but still show as having cast a vote on election day were provided. Of the 181 people on that list 140 were registered by the Motor Vehicle Department (recall that the MVD was shut down for another month following the election). Other sources include income support (12), mailed registration forms (8), walk-ins to the Clerk's office (6), and the Secretary of State's OVR platform (15). The auditors believe that the source of most unexplained behavior being observed in the rolls is most likely coming through the MVD system, or a bad actor who has compromised one of the many MVD locations that have access to the system.

The SOS and Otero County Clerk have refused to provide the full record of the source of registrations connected to the original registration dates and registration dates. This information was requested separate from the names and Voter ID numbers on the rolls so that personal identity could not be connected with the source of any given registration, and it could not be construed as voter data. The County Commission and citizens of Otero County should be concerned that the County Clerk and SOS have no interest in determining the source of the unexplained, suspicious behavior in their voter rolls and are blocking elected officials from having access to data which belongs to them. However, even with the limited information provided the evidence points strongly to a registration system which has been compromised through its connection with the MVD.

The auditors encourage the County Commissioners to take additional steps to compel the County Clerk and Secretary of State to prove that unauthorized or inappropriate access to the rolls is not going on through the MVD system, the OVR platform, , the state agencies overseeing incomesupport programs, Rock the Vote, or another unknown intrusion into the system.

### 2.1.4 Same Day Registration

Another serious cause for concern is the addition of Same Day Registration (SDR) which was passed by the New Mexico legislature in 2020 and made mandatory for all counties in 2021. Same Day Registration allows an unregistered person to walk into any polling place during an election, register, and vote all on the same day. Data collected by the EAC shows that an average of $2 \%$ of total registrations across the state were SDR's (see Figure 9).


Figure 9. Percentage of Same Day Registrations (SDR) ${ }^{14}$

This is very problematic for many reasons. SDR's take away the responsibility of the citizen to register in a timely manner for upcoming elections which are announced well ahead of time. They are an added burden to the Clerk's staff to have to process and approve registrations realtime while a voter is waiting to vote while they are also busy overseeing an election.

There are many indications that unauthorized access to the voter database is happening. We also know that sensitive election data is being passed from the Secretary of State's office outside her office directly to Democrat operatives (see Section 2.2). If ballot counts are being monitored, ballot harvesting is happening, or there is unauthorized access to the digital record, then there is no limit to the amount of fraud that could be injected in the election system in New Mexico even up to election day. SDR makes the problems already in the rolls even more unmanageable.

Prior to 2020, the law in New Mexico was that the registration database was to close during elections. This safeguard would have prevented last-minute manipulations to the voter registration database that might be used to swing elections. The Secretary of State's own data shows that election law was being violated because the rolls were never actually closed during

[^7]elections (see Figures 2 and 3 ). Changing election law to weaken standards by providing more ways to subvert elections is the wrong direction to take the state and it undermines confidence.

### 2.2 ELECTRONIC POLLBOOKS

When Otero County voters arrive at a polling place, they are checked in to the system using an AskED electronic poll book (ePollbook) system provided by ROBIS. The poll books are all networked and connected to the internet. Internet connected ePollbooks came into effect when counties opted to use Voting Convenience Centers rather than requiring voters to vote in polling locations in their precincts. Since voters can now vote outside their precinct, all polling locations require access to the full voter roll. To prevent voters from voting at more than one voting location, New Mexicans are told that the pollbooks must be internet connected and constantly updated to prevent voters from casting ballots at more than one polling place.

However, to gain a little convenience, New Mexico has accepted a massive vulnerability into their elections by allowing internet connection of the pollbooks. The SOS makes the likelihood of election subversion virtually guaranteed by publishing lists of who has requested absentee ballots or cast an early vote several times per day throughout the early voting period. The list is provided to the major parties and candidates.

It was reported by an Otero County Republican Party official that a significant number of mailers sent to the names on the lists of voters who had requested absentee ballots were returned undeliverable even though they were mailed to the current mailing address on the voter rolls. It is uncertain if these voters were legitimately registered, how these voters would have received their absentee ballots, or even if they really requested them. The online form for requesting an absentee ballot requires the voter to verify their registration information before they can request an absentee ballot. This makes it unlikely that genuine voters would request their absentee ballot be sent to an invalid or outdated address.

The recently released documentary 2000 Mules revealed that there are well-organized NGO's all over the country that illegally stuff ballots to swing elections. Arrests and convictions have taken place in Arizona and Texas because of the evidence provided by the investigation. Some of the organizations who have been implicated in the ballot-stuffing scheme include the left-wing NGO,

UnidosUS, which has affiliates in New Mexico. ${ }^{15}$ It is likely that the scheme is being played out here as well. Access to either the ePollbooks or the SOS's reports of who has cast a ballot would make the job of undermining our elections easy.

The auditors uncovered that five "vote count" reports were passed out of the Secretary of State's office throughout election day directly to Katharine Clark, a Democrat official who was running campaigns for candidates at the same time she was on the ballot for County Clerk of Santa Fe County. ${ }^{16}$ These reports likely originated with the ePollbook system or the election night reporting system - which share a platform (see Section 2.5).

NMSA 1-1-1.1 states the purpose of the election code is "to secure the secrecy of the ballot, the purity of elections and guard against the abuse of the elective franchise." NMSA 1-5-22.C states that any...officer...who commits unlawful distribution of a voter file is guilty of a fourth-degree felony." NMSA 1-20-15 states "...uniting or agreeing with any other person to omit any duty or commit any act...would by the provisions of the Election Code constitute a fourth-degree felony." It is the belief of the auditors that the SOS, the highest-ranking election administrator in the state, is colluding with highly partisan third parties to give an unfair advantage to one party over the other through enhanced access to the voter rolls, voter data, and real-time ePollbook data.

The reports from the SOS to Katharine Clark showed impossible behavior in vote counts in several counties. Figure 10 shows the data that was contained in the vote count reports plotted as percent of the total election day vote that were cast at $8 \mathrm{am}, 11 \mathrm{am}, 3: 18 \mathrm{pm}, 3: 30 \mathrm{pm}$, and 7 pm in all the counties on election day.
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Figure 10. Percent Increase in Election Day Ballots

From the figure, we see impossible behavior in Santa Fe and McKinley Counties as the votes in these counties were over half cast by 11 am on election day. Then Santa Fe's votes disappeared completely and all but 20\% of McKinley's votes disappeared by 3 pm . Then the votes in these three counties showed back up in the record by the close of the polls. Also, Grant, Lea, Luna, San Miguel, and Torrance County had jumps in votes between 6 and 20\% in the 12-minute period between the 3:18 pm and 3:30 pm reports. It is nearly impossible that so many votes could have been processed in these counties in such a short period of time. DeBaca County shows zero votes throughout election day for an unknown reason - perhaps DeBaca did not connect their pollbooks to the internet.

The reports sent to Katharine Clark also included absentee vote counts for all the counties. The vote counts as a percentage of the total for six counties that behaved oddly are shown in Figure 11.


Figure 11. Percent Increase in Absentee Ballots

From the figure, both Santa Fe and McKinley Counties lost absentee votes during election day, and then gained them back again by the close of the polls. Four additional counties, Curry, Lea, Los Alamos and Quay, all saw large jumps in absentee ballots in the 12-minute period between the 3:18 pm and 3:30 pm reports.

After the close of the polls on election day, votes continued to grow or decrease. Table 1 shows the total numbers of ballots claimed to have been cast when the polls closed on election day versus the total number of votes claimed to have been cast in the SOS's official election results.

Table 1. Votes Growing and Decreasing After Close of Polls

|  | Official Canvass |  |  |  | Percentage of Poll Books |  |  |  | 7PM VOTE COUNT REPORT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Absentee | Early | Election Day | Total Voted | Absentee | Early | Election Day | Total Voted | Absentee | Early | Election Day | Total Voted |
| All | 328,792 | 456,493 | 142,887 | 928,172 | 100.9\% | 100.05\% | 111.8\% | 102.0\% | 325,936 | 456,260 | 127,826 | 910,022 |
| Bernalillo | 140,892 | 145,326 | 32,981 | 319,199 | 100.1\% | 100.03\% | 101.4\% | 100.2\% | 140,809 | 145,281 | 32,519 | 318,609 |
| Catron | 560 | 1,007 | 771 | 2,338 | 101.8\% | 100.20\% | 101.4\% | 101.0\% | 550 | 1,005 | 760 | 2,315 |
| Chaves | 3,771 | 14,972 | 3,759 | 22,502 | 100.1\% | 100.03\% | 105.6\% | 100.9\% | 3,767 | 14,967 | 3,559 | 22,293 |
| Cibola | 2,006 | 4,106 | 2,831 | 8,943 | 102.5\% | 99.98\% | 117.0\% | 105.4\% | 1,958 | 4,107 | 2,420 | 8,485 |
| Colfax | 2,170 | 1,931 | 1,958 | 6,059 | 100.0\% | 100\% | 103.3\% | 101.0\% | 2,171 | 1,931 | 1,895 | 5,997 |
| Curry | 3,354 | 8,875 | 2,923 | 15,152 | 100.7\% | 99.98\% | 104.3\% | 100.9\% | 3,332 | 8,877 | 2,803 | 15,012 |
| De Baca | 193 | 499 | 221 | 913 | 100\% | 100\% | - | 131.9\% | 193 | 499 | 0 | 692 |
| Dona Ana | 27,806 | 40,239 | 14,908 | 82,953 | 102.0\% | 100\% | 101.6\% | 100.9\% | 27,274 | 40,239 | 14,680 | 82,193 |
| Eddy | 3,682 | 15,888 | 3,722 | 23,292 | 101.6\% | 100.02\% | 104.3\% | 100.9\% | 3,624 | 15,885 | 3,568 | 23,077 |
| Grant | 4,342 | 8,275 | 1,904 | 14,521 | 100.2\% | 99.99\% | 103.3\% | 100.5\% | 4,332 | 8,276 | 1,844 | 14,452 |
| Guadalupe | 938 | 696 | 575 | 2,209 | 101.7\% | 100\% | 130.1\% | 107.2\% | 922 | 696 | 442 | 2,060 |
| Harding | 169 | 217 | 125 | 511 | 100\% | 100\% | 101.6\% | 100.4\% | 169 | 217 | 123 | 509 |
| Hidalgo | 595 | 711 | 689 | 1,995 | 101.0\% | 100\% | 106.2\% | 102.4\% | 589 | 711 | 649 | 1,949 |
| Lea | 2,762 | 14,077 | 4,140 | 20,979 | 100.2\% | 99.98\% | 105.5\% | 101.0\% | 2,757 | 14,080 | 3,926 | 20,763 |
| Lincoln | 2,613 | 5,981 | 1,754 | 10,348 | 100.7\% | 100.64\% | 104.2\% | 101.3\% | 2,594 | 5,943 | 1,683 | 10,220 |
| Los Alamos | 5,148 | 6,090 | 1,163 | 12,401 | 101.0\% | 100.03\% | 101.5\% | 100.6\% | 5,097 | 6,088 | 1,146 | 12,331 |
| Luna | 2,187 | 4,620 | 1,356 | 8,163 | 100.1\% | 100.02\% | 104.4\% | 100.7\% | 2,185 | 4,619 | 1,299 | 8,103 |
| McKinley | 3,785 | 13,489 | 9,352 | 26,626 | 105.6\% | 100.02\% | 224.6\% | 125.4\% | 3,583 | 13,486 | 4,164 | 21,233 |
| Mora | 739 | 1,084 | 892 | 2,715 | 101.2\% | 101.78\% | 110.4\% | 104.3\% | 730 | 1,065 | 808 | 2,603 |
| Otero | 5,991 | 13,022 | 4,651 | 23,664 | 101.3\% | 100.02\% | 109.9\% | 102.1\% | 5,913 | 13,020 | 4,233 | 23,166 |
| Quay | 776 | 2,138 | 986 | 3,900 | 100.5\% | 100\% | 103.8\% | 101.0\% | 772 | 2,138 | 950 | 3,860 |
| Rio Arriba | 4,386 | 7,122 | 5,202 | 16,710 | 100.6\% | 100\% | 105.6\% | 101.9\% | 4,358 | 7,122 | 4,926 | 16,406 |
| Roosevelt | 1,166 | 4,123 | 1,338 | 6,627 | 100.3\% | 99.98\% | 104.1\% | 100.9\% | 1,162 | 4,124 | 1,285 | 6,571 |
| San Juan | 10,698 | 31,845 | 9,947 | 52,490 | 100.3\% | 99.997\% | 100.7\% | 100.2\% | 10,666 | 31,846 | 9,877 | 52,389 |
| San Miguel | 5,326 | 3,881 | 2,386 | 11,593 | 100.2\% | 100.34\% | 112.6\% | 102.5\% | 5,318 | 3,868 | 2,119 | 11,305 |
| Sandoval | 29,721 | 37,329 | 9,756 | 76,806 | 102.0\% | 100.02\% | 100.7\% | 100.9\% | 29,129 | 37,323 | 9,686 | 76,138 |
| Santa Fe | 39,223 | 34,697 | 8,636 | 82,556 | 102.0\% | 99.997\% | 237.3\% | 107.5\% | 38,438 | 34,698 | 3,640 | 76,776 |
| Sierra | 1,628 | 3,189 | 1,163 | 5,980 | 100.9\% | 100\% | 102.2\% | 100.7\% | 1,613 | 3,189 | 1,138 | 5,940 |
| Socorro | 1,940 | 3,222 | 2,046 | 7,208 | 100.5\% | 100\% | 109.4\% | 102.6\% | 1,931 | 3,222 | 1,870 | 7,023 |
| Taos | 5,863 | 8,032 | 3,366 | 17,261 | 103.1\% | 100\% | 118.6\% | 104.3\% | 5,686 | 8,032 | 2,837 | 16,555 |
| Torrance | 2,086 | 3,425 | 1,821 | 7,332 | 100.6\% | 100.03\% | 102.7\% | 100.8\% | 2,074 | 3,424 | 1,773 | 7,271 |
| Union | 325 | 1,001 | 473 | 1,799 | 100.9\% | 100\% | 103.7\% | 101.1\% | 322 | 1,001 | 456 | 1,779 |
| Valencia | 11,951 | 15,384 | 5,092 | 32,427 | 100.3\% | 100.67\% | 107.2\% | 101.5\% | 11,918 | 15,281 | 4,748 | 31,947 |

Some increase between the number of ballots on the books at the close of the polls and the final number of ballots is to be expected since all the absentee ballots that were delivered on election day might not yet be entered into the system and provisional ballots still must be dealt with.

However, there is no known reason why the number of ballots should decrease after the close of the polls as they did with early ballots cast in Cibola, Curry, Grant, Lea, Roosevelt, San Juan, and Santa Fe Counties.

The number of provisional ballots that get accepted is usually a tiny percentage - in Otero County there were four provisional ballots accepted that were cast during early voting ( $0.03 \%$ of all early ballots) and four provisional accepted that were cast on election day ( $0.09 \%$ of all election day ballots). There were several counties that showed larger-than-expected increases from the number of early ballots recorded at the close of the polls and the final official tallies. For example, little Mora County had 19 ballots added to the early vote pile, Lincoln County added 38 ballots, and Valencia County added 103. Cibola, McKinley and Taos Counties had increases in absentee ballots exceeding $2 \%$ of the total, which is also higher than expected.

The biggest cause for concern in the "vote count" reports provided to Katharine Clark compared to the official totals are the large changes in election day ballots cast in most counties. The total number of votes increased by 237\% in Santa Fe County, 225\% in McKinley County, and 130\% in Guadalupe County. These numbers are much too high to be explained away by straggling absentee and provisional ballots.

### 2.3 BALLOT ON DEMAND PRINTING SYSTEM

After voters have checked in to the AskED ePollbook system, a ballot is printed from a pdf template on the spot. The voter does not have to present anything to the poll worker to prove who they are - they only state a name and address that is on the rolls.

The vast majority of American support voter ID laws. Such laws are often touted as "racist," even though non-white voters favor voter ID laws at higher rates than the overall population. ${ }^{17}$ However, New Mexico's SOS argues that a voter ID law would "discriminate against elderly and low-income voters" ${ }^{18}$ However, voter registration cards are mailed free of charge to every voter

[^9]when they register or get redistricted. There is no excuse not to have to provide at least a voter registration card to vote.

The ballot on demand printing system does not comply with state law because it has not been properly certified (Section 4.3) and cannot provide consecutively numbered ballots (see Section 4.4).

### 2.4 ELECTRONIC TABULATORS

The paper ballots fall into three main categories - absentee ballots (delivered to county clerks through the USPS or drop boxes), early in-person ballots, and election day ballots. Each ballot type is processed on dedicated Dominion tabulators. Ballots cast in person are fed into a tabulator by the voter or the county clerk's staff in the case of absentee ballots.

The tabulator contains a duplex scanner that creates an image of the front and back of the ballot, and tabulation software creates a record of the votes cast on each individual ballot. This record is appended to each individual ballot image and is entered into the Cast Vote Record (CVR) database. The tabulation software also tabulates the running totals for each candidate on the ballot. Visually impaired voters can use a feature called the Audio Tactile Interface (ATI) which uses audio prompts and a ballot marking device which is incorporated into the ICE tabulators.

At the end of the election, tabulator tapes are printed from each tabulator that show the number of ballots cast and the number of votes received by each candidate who was on the ballot. The tabulator tapes are long, paper receipts. The tabulators also have a digital removable media drive with the results of the tabulation, system logs, and ballot images stored on it.

When the election is over, the removable media from each tabulator is taken to a central location in the county where it is uploaded to the central Election Management System (EMS). The results for each ballot in each tabulator are stored in a combined CVR database. The results are also transferred to the SOS over the internet.

The statewide results are transferred real-time on election night to the SOS's website, SCYTL, and Edison which are used by media outlets to report on the progress of the election. The Official SOS Election Canvass is published by the SOS after a reconciliation process.

Otero County uses Dominion Image Cast Evolution (ICE) tabulators for all electronic tabulation. Larger counties in New Mexico also have Image Cast Central (ICC) tabulators with attached Adjudication Stations for processing absentee ballots. The vendor AES provides some services for the tabulators, including performance of logic and accuracy testing in some counties. But employees of AES represent that they are not qualified to service the machines in the event of a system or tabulator error - Dominion handles those types of issues.

### 2.4.1 Integrated Printer in ICE Tabulators

As stated, ICE tabulators have a feature called ATI which allows a visually impaired person to fill out a ballot without assistance by listening to audio prompts. The ICE tabulator fills out the ballot using a printer which is integrated into the tabulator. Dominion has a library of thousands of handmade looking ballot marks making it impossible to tell the difference between a mark that the tabulator has printed versus a mark filled out by a voter on the low-quality Dominion-created ballot images (see Figure 12). The printed marks do have a distinct appearance when viewed inperson or in a high-resolution scan.


Figure 12. Tabulator is an Integrated Printer, Printed Marks Look Handmade

While the ATI feature is touted as being needed for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), there is no good reason that it should be integrated into the tabulator in such a way that all ballots that are inserted into the tabulator must pass through a printer before being dropped into the storage bin. This integrated design caused alarm to the New York State Board of Elections in 2019 who commissioned an investigation into the vulnerabilities posed by this design.

SLI Compliance was hired to review the likelihood that the printing function could be misused to improperly mark ballots. ${ }^{19}$ The conclusion of SLI Compliance was that malicious software could

[^10]be installed on the tabulators with sufficient access to the tabulators, but they felt it was unlikely that it could happen if sufficient security were in place to prevent access to the machines.

Through observance of a tabulator logic and accuracy test and interaction with an employee of Automated Election Services (AES) who was administering the test, the auditors discovered that the username and password to all tabulators is the same in most counties throughout the state and are both extremely low-security and guessable.

The SOS claims that Dominion tabulators cannot connect wirelessly to the internet and the port that would allow wired access to the internet is covered with a sticker seal. The auditors requested access to the physical tabulators to determine if wireless capability was present in the tabulators as it is an advertised as a feature in Dominion tabulators. However, the SOS threatened the Otero County Commission with criminal prosecution if they looked at the hardware installed in their own tabulators.

Since the password protection on the tabulators is extremely weak, if wireless technology is present inside the tabulators, then the vulnerability that malicious software could be installed on the tabulators to print on ballots without the knowledge of the voter is high since the tabulators would always be accessible to hackers.

Section 3 discusses that a high ballot reversal rate was observed throughout the country in November 2020 and the possibility that these ballot reversals were happening after tabulators had printed on the ballots without the knowledge of the voters. A ballot was discovered in Dona Ana County that had a mix of handmade and machine-printed marks on it. Figure 13 shows this ballot. The circled votes in the figure show marks with an appearance identical to those printed by the ICE tabulators. The other votes were filled out with a ballpoint pen. It is possible these printed marks were made without the knowledge of the voter who cast the ballot.


Figure 13. Dona Ana County Ballot with Mix of Handmade and Printed Marks

During our review of the paper ballots, it was discovered that many voters left the back of the ballot containing the constitutional and bond questions unvoted. This may be because the constitutional and bond questions are often worded vaguely without enough information to make an informed decision. The propensity for there to be large numbers of blank votes on these issues leaves an opportunity for malicious software to mark ballots for the voter.

The auditors found dozens of ballots in Otero County where it appears that two different types of ink were used to mark ballots. On these ballots, votes from the front of the ballot bled through onto the back of the ballot and are clearly visible. However, the votes from the back of the ballot did not bleed through onto the front of the ballot (see Section 5.5). For these ballots it is likely
that a different type of ink was used on the back of the ballot than on the front, and it is possible that these votes were printed and not made by the voter.

The auditors believe that the possibility that the interior printer on the tabulators could be used to fraudulently mark ballots should be taken seriously. At a minimum, standard practice should be that the ink cartridge in the tabulator should be removed and only installed long enough to mark a ballot at the request of a voter who desires to use the ATI function at a polling place.

### 2.4.2 Vulnerabilities of ICC Tabulators

ICC tabulators were not used in Otero County, but they were present in seven other counties throughout New Mexico. These tabulators could indirectly affect Otero since the county shares statewide ballot races with those seven counties. The ICC tabulators are an off the shelf highspeed scanner which are networked to an attached desktop computer with Dominion tabulation software installed (see Figure 14). The Dominion software processes the images captured by the scanner and has the "adjudication" function where an election worker can "adjudicate" a ballot in the event the tabulator is unable to read the ballot. Dominion built into their adjudication software the ability to batch-adjudicate ballots without careful examination of each ballot. Why would a feature like that exist?


Figure 14. Photo of Dominion ICC Tabulator System

ICC Tabulators are much faster than ICE tabulators, but they have the disadvantage of incorporating an off-the-shelf scanner where it is possible that an election worker could scan the same ballots multiple times. One New Mexico county clerk reported to the auditors that she refused to use the ICC tabulators in her county because the election workers are able to see the votes on the ballots they are processing, and there may be a temptation if the worker favored a certain candidate to run ballots for that candidate multiple times through the machine and the system would never know.

This clerk's worries were not unfounded because video surveillance footage of the State Farm Building in Fulton County, Georgia caught election workers named Ruby Freeman and Shaye Moss pulling boxes of ballots out from under a table and scanning the same batches of ballots multiple times in the middle of the night after counting had supposedly shut down during the

November 2020 election. ${ }^{20}$ It is possible for election workers to scan ballots more than once even with the ICE tabulators as explained in Section 5.3.3.

### 2.5 ELECTION NIGHT REPORTING

Election night reporting is a subject that has come under much scrutiny since the November 2020 election when votes being reported on television were observed to switch between candidates, large injections of votes for only one candidate, and total numbers of votes cast would decrease without explanation. Because of this, several experts across the country have made a careful study of the election night reporting provided by Edison and noted impossible behavior of vote switching, ratio control in batches of ballots being added, fractionalized votes, disappearing votes, and votes inexplicably being changed from in-person to absentee multiple times over several days.

New Mexico uses a company called KnowINK to handle election management, election night reporting, and voter registration with a software platform called BPro (see Figure 15). Given the evident manipulation that is happening on New Mexico's voter registration system, it is probable that similar manipulation is happening in New Mexico's election night reporting and election management.
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Voter Registration (VR), Online Voter Registration (OVR), Election Management (EM), Election Night Reporting (ENR), Online Absentee Application (OAA), Ballot Marking (BM), Campaign Finance (CF), Central Voter File (CVF), Online Candidate Filing (OCF), Online Absentee Application (OAA), Ballot Marking (BM), Campaign Finance (CF), Central Voter
TotalAddress (TA), Voter Information Portal (VIP), UOCAVA Portal (O-Sea), ePollbooks (ePB),

## KNOWiNK

| STATE Listed | KNOWiNK |
| :---: | :---: |
| Hawaii | Poll Pads = 9, (Jurisdictions $=1$ ), |
| Washington | NONE |
| Oregon | NONE |
| California | Poll Pads $=14,586$ (Jurisdictions $=15$ ) |
| Idaho | NONE |
| Nevada | NONE |
| Montana | NONE |
| Utah | Poll Pads $=709$ (Jurisdictions $=19$ ) |
| Arizona | Poll Pads $=563$ (Jurisdictions = 5) |
| Ariona (ront |  |
| New Mexico | Poll Pads $=709$ (Jurisdictions $=19$ ) |
| Northuakota | Poil Pais = = 990 (junisaltions = state) |
| South Dakota | Poll Pads $=6$ (Jurisdictions $=1$ ) |
| Nebraska |  |
| Kansas | Poll Pads $=2,528$ (Jurisdictions $=67$ ) |
| Kansas (Cont) | Poll Prints $=30$ (Jurisdictions $=1$ ) |
| Oklohoma | Poll Pads $=3$ (Jurisdictions $=1$ ) |
| Texas | Poll Pads $=3,710$ (Jurisdictions $=124$ ) |



Figure 15. Same Company Controls Voter Registration, Election Management and Election Night Reporting ${ }^{21}$

Figure 16 shows when election night reports were processed through the Edison database in all New Mexico Counties. The number of ballots being added and subtracted by the election night reporting system in each county can be found in Appendix A.

[^12]
## New Mexico－－ 2020 General Election Election Night Reporting and Beyond

|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { 荅 } \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 告 } \\ & \text { 荅 } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{-}$ $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{0}$ O － | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 봉 } \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | 出 <br> N <br> N <br> O <br> 8 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{H}{3} \\ & \stackrel{y}{N} \\ & \hline 8 \\ & \hline 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 品 } \\ \text { 另 } \\ \text { N } \\ \text { O} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 爫 } \\ \text { 合 } \\ \text { O} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 営 } \\ & \text { 品 } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { ò } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \hline \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{H} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \hline \\ & \hline 8 \end{aligned}$ | $$ |  | 芯 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{u} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{u} \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | 6 0 3 3 3 |  |  | 6 0 0 0 3 | 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 8 <br> 3 <br> 3 |  | H <br>  <br> 0 <br> $\vdots$ <br> 3 | $\infty$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 3 <br> 3 |  |  | $\infty$ <br>  <br>  <br> 0 <br> 3 <br> 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{s} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{2}{3} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\ddot{0}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\Delta} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{3} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{O}{N}$ $\stackrel{N}{N}$ 0 0 3 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Catron | X | X |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chaves | X | X | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cibola | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colfax | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curry | X |  |  |  | X |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| De Baca |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Doña Ana | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| Eddy | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grant | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guadalupe |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harding | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hidalgo | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |
| Lea | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lincoln |  | X |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Los Alamos |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Luna | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| McKKinley |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | X |  | X |
| Mora | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Otero | X | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quay | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rio Arriba | X | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt |  | X | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sandoval | X | X | X |  |  |  | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Juan | X | X | X |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| San Miguel | X | X |  |  | X |  | X |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Santa Fe | X | X |  | X |  |  |  | X |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sierra | X | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Socorro | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taos | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |
| Torrance | X | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valencia | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |

Note：The distribution of Edison Releases indicate it came from the New Mexico SOS Office and not directly from the various Counties of updating typically allowable for curing and resolution of Provisional \＆UOCAVA

Figure 16．Election Night Reporting Updates Long After Completion of Canvass

It is expected that most votes will be reported on election night，but that more reporting must still take place to account for the ballots that must be hand－tallied，the last delivery of absentee
ballots, and processing of provisional ballots. However, Figure 16 highlights dates where 13 New Mexico counties, including Otero, that had election night report updates outside of the time allowed by statute. NMSA 1-13-13 requires all returns to be delivered to the SOS between 6 and 10 days from the date of the election for small counties and between 6 and 13 days from the date of the election for counties with 150,000+ voters. Therefore, the latest the SOS should have received any returns was November $13^{\text {th }}$. Some of the December updates can be explained by a recount that took place on December $3^{\text {rd }}$ which affected Otero, Dona Ana, Luna, and Hidalgo Counties. But there is no explanation why McKinley and San Juan Counties were updated in December.

### 2.6 MAIL-IN VOTING

Review of election data for New Mexico indicates that absentee voting was extremely anomalous when compared to historical norms. Some increase in absentee voting was expected due to COVID. However, this alone cannot account for the massive surge in absentee voting or the statistical anomalies that are present in the data.

### 2.6.1 Drop Boxes

Absentee voting is already the least secure form of voting and the most prone to fraud. The problem was exacerbated by last minute changes in the Secretary of State's rules which allowed millions of dollars of funds from the Center for Tech and Civic Life, a private non-government organization headed by Mark Zuckerberg, to be used to install unsecure drop boxes in every county throughout the state.

The SOS assured voters that drop boxes would have security protocols in place that prevented misuse of the boxes. However, the SOS was sued when it was discovered that multiple counties were not implementing even the minimal security measures initially promised. It is unclear whether the issues were ever resolved in these counties. None of the drop boxes were required
to have video surveillance and no video surveillance was available for the drop boxes installed in Otero County. ${ }^{22}$

The recent documentary 2000 Mules used cell phone tracking and video surveillance to show how absentee voting was thoroughly abused in 2020. Figure 17 is a photo from the documentary where a ballot mule is fanning out illegal ballots to snap a picture for payment before he places the ballots in the drop box.


Figure 17. Surveillance footage of ballot mule taking picture of multiple ballots before placing them in dropbox

The number of illegal ballots quantified in 2000 Mules that were put into the system by paid ballot trafficking mules just through the drop boxes was more than enough to award the presidential election to the wrong candidate. The investigators have identified vote trafficking

[^13]organizations all over the country and it is very likely that drop boxes were abused in New Mexico as they have been proven to be abused in the swing states.

Figure 18 shows the numbers of absentee ballots that were delivered each day through the drop boxes in Otero County through the early voting period.


Figure 18. Drop Box Records from Otero County

From the figure, October $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ were the peak days in the record with 188 and 225 ballots delivered, respectively. An additional 327 ballots were received by the county on these two days with no chain of custody (see Section 5.6.4). October $6^{\text {th }}$ was the first day that ballots could be mailed out, it seems unlikely that the peak days could have occurred when there was barely time to receive and return a mailed ballot. Records were not kept by the County Clerk as to how many
ballots were delivered each day by the USPS. However, mail delivery was able to be reconstructed through analysis of the absentee ballot envelopes discussed in Section 5.6.

### 2.6.2 Deviations from Historical Norms

The data indicates that bad actors were taking advantage of the expected increase in mail-in ballots to inject fraudulent ballots into the system. According to the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) which collects self-reported data from all voting jurisdictions across the United States, there were 95 absentee ballots rejected state-wide in 2016. In 2020, this number grew to 17,008 absentee ballots - a 1,800\% increase (see Figure 19). Reasons for rejection include late return, no signature, unofficial envelope, missing ballot, voter deceased, already voted in-person, and no ballot request. The enormous increase in rejection of absentee ballots indicates a concerted effort to subvert the few checks that exist on absentee voting and insert fraudulent ballots into the election.

In Otero County, 5,991 absentee ballots were cast in 2020, where only 996 ballots were cast in 2016. There was a $600 \%$ increase in absentee ballot voting, but the absentee ballot rejection rate did not follow the statewide trend and went down in Otero County from $0.3 \%$ in 2016 to only $0.1 \%$ in 2020.


Figure 19. EAC Data Shows 1,800\% Increase in Rejected Absentee Ballots Statewide ${ }^{23}$

Not only were the number of absentee ballots submitted very anomalous, but the distribution of votes was not consistent with historical norms. When examining data going back to 2004, results of absentee voting was consistent with the in-person results and never consistently favored either party.

Table 2. Historical Bias of Absentee Ballots in Otero

| Election <br> Year | ABSENTEE <br> Republican <br> Votes/Democrat Votes | TOTAL <br> Republican <br> Votes/Democrat Votes | Variance Between Total <br> Result and Absentee Ballots |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | 1.9 | 2.2 | $14 \%$ |
| 2008 | 1.5 | 1.5 | $0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 2.1 | 1.8 | $17 \%$ |
| 2016 | 1.8 | 1.9 | $5 \%$ |
| 2020 | 0.66 | 1.7 | $61 \%$ |

[^14]Table 2 shows that historically results of absentee voting never varied more than $17 \%$ from the final results for the county and varied from 1.5 to 2 votes for the Republican candidate for every vote for the Democrat candidate. However, in 2020 these ratios were flipped and there were approximately 1.5 votes for the Democrat candidate for every vote for the Republican candidate in the absentee ballots, even though the in-person voting strongly favored Republicans. More on this topic is found in Section 6.

### 2.6.3 Public Perception and Erosion of Public Trust

The University of New Mexico Department of Political Science published a report titled, 2020 New Mexico Election Administration, Voter Security, and Election Reform Report published on the SOS's website. ${ }^{24}$ From the report:
> "We gave voters a list of possible illegal election activities and asked, 'Which of the following situations did you personally observe in the 2020 general election?' Over three-quarters (77\%) of NM voters indicated they did not personally witness any of these election fraud or irregular voting activities. $21 \%$ indicated they saw one or more election problems and $3 \%$ gave no response. Of these illegal activities, the highest response was for unsolicited absentee ballots that did not belong to anyone in the household arriving at the voter's residence. This occurred $7 \%$ of the time, a surprisingly high frequency."

The SOS is aware that one out of five voters in New Mexico reported having witnessed what they believed to be fraudulent or irregular activity during the 2020 election, yet she has done nothing but shut down all discourse on election integrity and even push to make our already permissive voting laws even more lax during her rule-making process and the 2022 legislative session. The SOS tried and failed to convince the legislature to pass measures that would make drop boxes mandatory, open access to the voter registration database to additional state agencies, and allow 16 and 17-year-olds to vote.

[^15]The fraudulent activity reported by the public most often was the large number of unsolicited absentee ballots arriving for voters who did not live in the households. One witness told the auditors that she received at least six absentee ballots for people who did not live at her residence. Two of these ballots were for the same person with their name spelled slightly differently on each ballot. Figure 20 shows these two of the six unsolicited ballots received by this voter. The name has been redacted for privacy, but original photos can be provided to government officials upon request.


Figure 20. Absentee Ballots Sent to Voters who Do Not Live in the Household

Public documents requests revealed that frustration was expressed by several county clerks at the number of absentee ballot applications being sent out by a third party called Center for Voter Information (see Appendix B). They found this interference created massive confusion and duplicate absentee ballot requests which caused problems for the clerk's offices. The data presented by the EAC in Figure 19 indicates that there was a large injection of illegally delivered absentee ballots which may be directly related to this interference and confusion and fraud caused by these third-party mailers.

### 2.6.4 Absentee Ballot Processing

In 2020, voters were required to sign their outer absentee ballot envelopes and in write the last four digits of their social security number in the designated places. In New Mexico, immediate family members are allowed to return ballots for their relatives, but they must fill out the "delivery person" section of the absentee envelope. After checking this information is properly filled out, election workers open the outer envelope and separate the inner envelope that contains the ballot from the outer envelope to protect voter anonymity. If the envelope is not properly filled out, the voter is contacted by the clerk's staff and given a chance to "cure," or correct, their ballot.

Note that requiring the last four digits of registrant's social security number was a temporary measure which has expired. Absentee ballots are typically submitted with only a signature, which is not matched against any example of the voter's verified signature, and the voter's year of birth, which is listed on the voter rolls and easily obtainable. This complete lack of verification of the identity of voters in absentee voting is a recipe for fraud. The statistical analysis in Section 6 shows that fraud in absentee voting is not just a possibility, but it did in fact occur. Significant problems with chain of custody and confirmation of dropped votes found in the canvass were also found and explained in Section 5.6.

### 2.6.5 Dona Ana County and the Representative District 53 Race

Bad actions of other jurisdictions affect the voices of the citizens of Otero County wherever races are shared - whether it is fraud in other states affecting the presidential race, or ballot stuffing in other New Mexico counties affecting down-ballot races.

State Representative District 53 is shared with Dona Ana County and was decided by only 38 votes after a recount. The auditors did some investigation of records in Dona Ana County because signs of fraud in absentee ballots were found in 2018 during an independent audit of the

United States $2^{\text {nd }}$ Congressional District. ${ }^{25}$ The 2018 audit found unlikely distribution of votes in the absentee ballots (which occurred state-wide in New Mexico in 2020), signs of fraudulent ballot applications, and significant problems with chain of custody documentation.

The auditors reviewed the chain of custody documentation for the absentee ballots for the 2020 election in Dona Ana and Otero Counties and found massive irregularities which certainly could have affected the outcome of District 53 House race. According to the public records, over 8,169 ballots in Dona Ana County and 850 ballots in Otero County have no chain of custody which is a violation of NMSA 1-6-6(8) (see Figure 21 and 45).

ABSENTEE BALLOTS IN DONA ANA COUNTY
_Cumulative Number of Ballots Received by Clerk's Office
Cumulative Number of Ballots Transferred to Absentee Board


Figure 21. Missing Chain of Custody for Absentee Ballots in Dona Ana County

[^16]The Republican Candidate, Ricky Little, was leading by a handful of votes on Election Night. However, the auditors discovered that there were 196 ballots which were not delivered to the absentee board for counting until late on the morning of November $4^{\text {th }}, 2020$ which is a violation of NMSA 1-6-14.G (see Figure 22). By the completion of counting these late delivered ballots, the Democrat candidate had edged out his opponent and taken the lead.


Figure 22. Late Delivery of Absentee Ballots to Canvassing Board

This late delivery of absentee ballots to the absentee board is reminiscent of the 2018 U.S. Congressional race where the Dona Ana County Clerk made an announcement in the middle of the night that approximately 4,000 absentee ballots were "discovered" after the close of the polls and a slim margin for the Republican candidate was erased as almost all of these found ballots were for the Democrat candidate.

There were only 10 ballots in drop boxes from the farthest polling places from the Dona Ana Clerk's office. This large, late delivery of absentee ballots cannot be explained by the drop box ballots getting turned in after counting had stopped for the night.

Additionally, the SOS reported a total of 27,806 absentee ballots cast in Dona Ana County, but the chain of custody documents showing transfer of ballots to the absentee board only account 27,660 ballots, leaving 146 ballots with no prior record of having existed.

It is likely that some of the ballots lacking chain of custody in Dona Ana County came from the non-official drop box pictured in Figure 23. This locked, metal box was observed to be stuffed full of absentee ballot envelopes during the early voting period outside the Dona Ana County Election Warehouse. The warehouse is located on the edge of Las Cruces in an industrial area.


Figure 23. Ballots Stuffed in Obscure Locked Box

Based on the size of the box, the auditors estimate it contained between 3,000 and 5,000 absentee ballots when this picture was taken. What was this unattended box was doing here? How was chain of custody handled for the ballots in this box since it clearly was not an official election drop box? Who put these ballots in this box located in an obscure building on the edge
of town? How do we know these ballots were handled properly and were not compromised? When these questions were asked of the Dona Ana County Clerk by the auditors, she asserted that she did not recognize this box even though it is labeled as belonging to her office.

NMSA Section 1-6-9 states the requirements for drop boxes, called "secured containers." The statutes are very clear that secured containers must meet certain requirements, such as contain signage informing voters that "it is a violation of law for any person who is not an immediate family member to collect and deliver a ballot for another person...electioneering is prohibited within one hundred feet of the secured container...and the dates and approximate time the ballots will be collected." The unofficial drop box shown in Figure 23 met none of these requirements and the ballots should not have been accepted, or at a minimum, they should have been cured prior to acceptance.

The sloppy record keeping from the Dona Ana County Clerk's office "lost" chain of custody for more ballots than are even cast in many New Mexico Counties. Late delivery of almost 200 ballots when there was a race being decided on an incredibly close margin, and the acceptance of several thousand ballots delivered completely outside of legal methods should infuriate every voter. These massive irregularities and omissions on the part of the Dona Ana County Clerk constitute a violation of the election code by officers which is a fourth-degree felony and sufficient cause for removal from office according to NMSA 1-20-23. This wrongdoing very likely affected the outcome of the State House District 53 race between Willie Madrid and Ricky Little which was decided by only 38 votes.

### 2.6.6 Election System Cost and Funding

The election system used in New Mexico is extremely expensive. According to state records, New Mexico paid \$1.4 million dollars to Dominion just for maintenance, software licenses, and supplies for the machines in fiscal year 2022. Another \$2.7 million went to Ink Impressions to simply rent the ballot on demand printing system and same day registration equipment (see Appendix J). A combined expenditure of $\$ 4.1$ million per year simply for operation and maintenance costs, not including the massive capital cost of the machines themselves is multiple
times more than what it would cost to run a hand-counted, paper-based election with paper poll books. A hand-counted election would also provide jobs to thousands of New Mexicans.

New Mexico was reported to have paid $\$ 52$ million dollars to Dominion Voting Systems. ${ }^{26}$ This averages to $\$ 5.8$ million dollars per year since the beginning of the contractual relationship in 2013. This figure does not include the millions of dollars paid to other vendors for ePollbooks, election night report, voter registration, and election management. Both the injection of money from left-wing sources, such as the grant from the Pew Charitable Trust for New Mexico's initiation into ERIC, and the disbursement of state funds directly to left-wing NGO's are another cause for concern. It was discovered that over $\$ 150 \mathrm{k}$ dollars was distributed to the Center for Civic Policy from the money allocated to New Mexico through the federal CARES Act. Why does a left-wing organization that was involved in helping Rock the Vote obtain special access to inject registrations into the voter rolls also receive state money for COVID relief? \$1.2 million was paid to Ink Impressions out of CARES Act funds for "election supplies and related services to accommodate COVID-19 measures."

[^17]
## 3 ELECTION SYSTEM VULNERABILITIES

Vulnerabilities exist in all parts of the election system. These vulnerabilities are getting more serious and potentially catastrophic the more each part of the election moves toward centralized processes and electronic, internet-connected machines. The existence of vulnerabilities does not necessarily mean they are all exploited in every county in every election. However, every honest elected official who has any responsibility in the election process should do everything they can to monitor and minimize these vulnerabilities.

When made aware of the vulnerabilities and unexplained, impossible behavior in the election data, the response from the New Mexico SOS and many county clerks has been to ignore or demonize everyone who has questions or evidence of election fraud. This irresponsible, unprofessional behavior on the part of New Mexico's election officials has eroded public confidence in elections to an astonishing degree.

The auditors worked with nation-state vulnerability expert, Jeff Lenberg, to examine the election in Otero County. Mr. Lenberg had a decades-long career working for Sandia National Labs to evaluate national security implications of vulnerabilities in national systems and infrastructure. He is also one of the most knowledgeable election equipment experts in the country and has significant experience with investigations of election fraud going back to the 1990's. Mr. Lenberg was involved in the in-depth examination of election equipment in Antrim County, Michigan and Maricopa County, Arizona from the 2020 election.

The New Mexico SOS threatened Otero County Commissioners with prosecution if machinery was touched by the auditors, so inspection was limited to what could be observed while Otero County Clerk staff were operating the election equipment. The equipment used in Otero County is largely the same as that used in Maricopa and Antrim Counties, so Mr. Lenberg was able to use his prior knowledge to fill in some of the gaps of what the SOS withheld from inspection. Mr. Lenberg's full expert report can be found in Appendix $C$.

Mr. Lenburg shows that serious vulnerabilities exist in all parts of our election system. Evidence suggests that some of these vulnerabilities have been exploited to manipulate the registration database and elections. A summary of the types of bad actors, goals of a bad actor, and the vulnerabilities in the election system that could be exploited are in the following sections.

### 3.1 TYPES OF BAD ACTORS

There are many people and groups who could have an interest in subverting elections from local operatives or candidates up to foreign enemies. The types of bad actors fall into three categories:

- Level 1 - Bad actors at this level carry out what is commonly known as voter fraud. It involves a bad actor acting on their own or part of a non-government organization to illegally go to multiple locations and vote several times, or fraudulently cast multiple absentee ballots. These bad actors may be individuals stuffing ballots to help a relative get elected, or something more organized like the nationwide ballot trafficking operation exposed by 2000 Mules.
- Level 2 - These are bad actors in a position of trust who are committing fraud at the county or state level by either electronically or physically manipulating the election. For example, these bad actors can be poll workers, election administrators, county clerks, or voting machine technicians, third-party subcontractors who are manipulating the election. This can include scanning batches of ballots multiple times, improperly following procedures, or falsifying election returns.
- Level 3 - These are bad actors that carry out nation state level attacks to subvert elections. This can be done by modifying the system in such a way to modify the votes being processed on the machines, or by taking advantage of one of the many vulnerabilities built into the system to alter and change election results. This level of attack does not require anyone at the local or state level to even be aware that it is going on.

Any county could have fraud introduced into their elections by one of these methods or by more than one of these methods.

### 3.2 Setting the Stage

For use as a backdrop to the observations that came out of the limited review of the Otero election processes and equipment, the goals of a bad actor who would subvert elections at different stages are as follows:

1. Voting Equipment Design: Inject vulnerabilities in the design of the system hardware and software that could be subverted by design or through access by bad actors after manufacture.
2. Voting Equipment Certification: Create a process of equipment certification that appear to be effective but, in fact, provide security holes. Limit and control certification entities who have detailed access to all election hardware and software.
3. Election Programing: Access election programming through company insider or by breaking into the programming server. Each election equipment provider has essentially a single programming package, which, if subverted, could affect every location throughout the country from a single source.
4. Registration Database: Inflate the registration database with people who appear to be real but are unlikely to vote. A bad actor would want a large number of people not registered to either of the two major parties. This would allow alteration of the voter turnout to appear to match the results in the favor of either major party.
5. Ballot Preparation: The desire of the bad actor is to have blank ballots that have no chain of custody which can be made, filled, and inserted into the election process at various stages.
6. Logic and Accuracy Testing (LAT): Use the LAT to appear to validate correct operation of a machine while priming the machine to miscount during the actual election process.
7. Early Voting: Use early voting to track voter turnout and project and interject additional ballots as needed to achieve a specific modified result.
8. Early Counting: Access voting tallies during the Early Voting stage to project the election results and arrange additional election manipulation measures to get a desired outcome.
9. Election Day Counting: Modify some of the vote tallies to give desired results.
10. Election Night Reporting: Control the flow of the election results being reported to fit a narrative crafted and promoted ahead of the election.
11. Internet Connected Poll Books: Access poll book information to keep track of who has voted and by what method to modify voter history to approximately reflect modifications that were made to election turnout results.
12. Election Auditing: Keep genuine audits from being triggered by making requirements for an audit extremely stringent. Encourage the use of useless risk limiting audits.

### 3.3 Potential Vulnerability Issues Observed in Otero County

The limited observation of the election equipment that was allowed revealed vulnerabilities that would allow each of the 12 goals listed in the previous section to be achieved. These vulnerabilities are listed below:

## 1. Voting Equipment Design:

a. Tabulators are designed to print votes on blank ballots for those with disabilities using the same slot used for tallying votes. A vote printing machine should never be combined with a vote tallying machine. This feature could easily be subverted to fill in votes for any race the voter chose not to vote or add votes to a race that had been voted to cause overvotes that would invalidate the voter's choice.
b. A previous version of the software installed on tabulators in Otero County was proven to have a feature that allowed additional tabulator tapes to be printed any time after the originals with modified results and yet appear to be the originals from election night. The paper tapes are the primary method of verification of the election.
c. The EMS desktop computer used to program the removable media for the tabulators and tally the results from the tabulators has capabilities that are far beyond what is required for the simple tasks it is required to do. The computing capability required to program the removable media and to tally results could be performed on a modest laptop, yet the EMS has the included or optional capabilities of great concern:

- Ability to block going to sleep or to be awakened from sleep using wake on USB or wake on LAN (local area network)
- Equipped with Intel Ready Mode Technology (RMT) in which the operating system is fully functional with the screen OFF
- Intel Active Management Technology (AMT) provides persistent out-ofband connectivity that operates independently of the operating system, allowing fixes to a wider range of system issues even when operating system is down.
- Ability to do a secure erase at the BIOS level using AMT mentioned just above.
d. The EMS computer was observed to have Microsoft SQL Server Management Studio 17. This program was accessed without a password. This tool set allows all function specific software to be easily bypassed and allows complete manipulation of the underlying database which is used to store essentially all aspects of the election data. There is no need for this advanced tool set to be present on the EMS computer for the simple media programming and tallying functions and this software is not listed in the software "certified" for use on this model of voting machine.


## 2. Voting Equipment Certification:

a. During the Otero County audit, there were those claiming it was not valid because it was not being done by an organization approved by the Election Assistance Commission (EAC). This is absurd because there are only two organizations that have been approved by the EAC to test/certify voting equipment. Both have "certified" parts of the election system used in New Mexico (see Section 4.3 for the serious issues surrounding the certification of New Mexico's election equipment). Using either of these two organizations to audit an election would be an obvious conflict of interest. Auditors must be truly independent.
b. How was the election system certified in the first place when the major vendors of voting equipment provide functionality that should never be allowed in voting equipment including:

- Internal or external cell modems in tabulators
- Ability to fill in votes that appear to be hand voted on blank or partially filled ballots on a tabulator
- Ability to manipulate tabulators to reprint paper tapes that appear in every way to be originals from election night
- Election Management System desktop computers that have very significant remote access options.

Vulnerability assessments by the two certifying organizations should have highlighted these issues and required removal of these capabilities prior to certification.

## 3. Election Programming:

a. Election programming is provided by a third party which is either the voting machine vendor or a company closely associated with them. The encrypted election files are provided to the county via a single Project File for the 2020 election. While election files were located for other past elections, the entire Project File for the November 2020 election was deleted from both the EMS computer and a backup copy made by the County. Why was this file removed? And by whom?
b. While looking for the Project Files, results for the 2020 election were recalled from the database. The Result Tally and Reporting (RTR) software application clearly showed the that results including images had been read into the EMS from the removable media for each tabulator. However, the raw results and images files could not be located on the EMS. Why were these files removed? And my whom? And why?

## 4. Registration Database:

a. ERIC (Electronic Registration Information Center, a third-party, private, nongovernment organization) received complete New Mexico MVD data and complete New Mexico voter registration rolls and sends back to the counties lists of eligible voters who are not registered. What if this process is misused?
b. The three years prior to the 2020 election, there were abnormal numbers of registrations throughout the state which occur in a suspiciously weekly-consistent rate (see Section 2.1). This seems to have started at the same time that the New Mexico MVD was directly linked to the New Mexico voter registration system. It is possible that the results from ERIC are being injected directly into the system in a controlled pattern to bulk up the rolls that can be manipulated in the voter rolls.
c. Otero County receives a flow of voter registration forms on a weekly basis from state agencies. Many these are duplicates of existing registrants with minor misspellings.
d. The canvass performed by the auditors showed there were large numbers of nonvoters marked as having voted and voters marked as not having voted. This is required to make the percentages make sense when votes are manipulated within the machines.

## 5. Ballot Preparation:

a. Unencrypted PDF files of all the ballot types for Otero County were on the EMS. Anyone who gains access to these PDF files can make ballots that are indistinguishable from official ballots. If blank ballot images are not secured and the paper ballots have little or no accountability it opens the door for a bad actor to relatively easily stuff the ballot box with absentee ballots or add batches of ballots during early voting. Ballots should be produced in limited numbers with a numbered removable tab with full accounting for every single ballot used and left over.
b. If blank ballot images are not secured and the aper ballots have little or no accountability it opens the door for a bad actor to stuff the ballot box relatively easily with absentee ballots or add batches of ballots during early voting. There is a big hole in chain of custody of ballots prior to ballots being voted.
6. Logic And Accuracy Test (LAT): The same company that provides tabulator programming also provides test ballots for the LAT. It has been demonstrated that programming for the tabulators can be subverted to give electronic results and paper tape results that agree with each other but do not agree with the paper ballots. The thing that stands in the way
of this argument is the LAT would show the subversion. However, if a bad actor had managed to subvert the voting machine software, then the Lat could serve as an event that enables the subversion while not triggering it during the LAT. What if a certain number of ballots is required to trigger the subversion? What if the act of re-zeroing the polls enables vote modification when the polls are subsequently reopened?

## 7. Early Voting:

a. The SOS issues turnout by party throughout early voting. Statistical analysis combined with polling allows a bad actor to project how well the election is going for their preferred candidates. This allows a calculation of what additional measures need to be taken to ensure their candidate will win.
b. Once early voting tabulators have been opened, they are not closed until the end of the election and the security features of the voting locations and tabulators are easy to defeat. Anyone with private access to those machines could easily run hundreds of additional ballots through the machines undetected.

## 8. Early Counting:

a. Prior to 2020 it was standard procedure to not start closing machines and getting the results prior to election day. However, in 2020 that changed in many locations. For example, in Maricopa County, AZ, 1.6 million of 2.1 million ballots had been tabulated with the results being available to those who might have wanted to be bad actors. With that many ballots already counted, the results of the Maricopa County elections were already known on October $30^{\text {th }}$ with time to make adjustments before election day. Early counting of vote tallies should never be allowed. Votes tabulated in Otero County used only slow speed tabulators and results were not known until the polls were closed on election day unless the equipment employed hidden modems could provide on-going results of the election.
b. While it is known that Otero County did not order modems for their tabulators, the machines of this class typically have a place for an internal modem. The only way to tell for sure if a modem is installed is to open the machine. One tabulator was observed to have a USM connector and an RS45 connector behind a seal. This
would indicate that there was circuitry installed at that location on the motherboard inside the case which was shown in similar tabulator models to have connectors for an internal modem.
9. Election Day Counting: As mentioned previously, there is a huge vulnerability put in place by the voting machine company by the adding the ability to print on ballots inside the tabulator. The printing function works by inserting a blank ballot, selecting the desired votes, the printer fills in the votes with handmade looking marks (see Figure 12), and reverses the ballot out of the machine for checking. It was noted in multiple counties throughout the country that use similar models of tabulators as Otero County that there were abnormal number ( $20 \%$ to as high as $80 \%$ ) of reversals of ballots on the first try, which were then accepted on the second and third try. What if the disabled voting feature was subverted so that a ballot that was already voted had additional votes added in races that there had been no vote cast? There are a large number of people who do not vote on down ballot races. Subverted software could detect the unvoted races, print the desired result, reverse the ballot. The attendant would immediately resubmit the ballot per standard procedure without noticing additional votes may have been added. This would be the perfect crime because even a hand recount would not detect the vote had been subverted.

## 10. Election Night Reporting:

a. The EMS has a function that allows the manual inspection and approval processes to be bypassed such that results are automatically published, or added, to the totals for the county. This feature should not exist because a simple quality check would preclude gross errors from occurring as were reported in Antrim County, Michigan.
b. Summary results, detailed cast vote record, log files, and images that would have been on the removable media from each tabulator should have been downloaded onto the EMS. However, all these tabulator files were missing from the Otero County EMS for the 2020 election. Who deleted these files, when were they deleted, and why were they deleted?

## 11. Poll Books using the Internet:

a. Electronic poll books are connected to the internet. This opens huge vulnerabilities as some electronic poll books have been observed to allow access to random internet websites in addition to the registration database. This would allow a bad actor to get access to the poll book system and gather information in the central database and reflect back into the official voter history to approximately match the manipulation of the votes that was performed during an election.
b. Poll book information is essential to be able to recreate what happened and when for auditing purposes. However, this information is not made available and in some cases it is deleted.

## 12. Election Auditing:

a. New Mexico has enacted regulations that specify exactly when and how recounts will occur. The recounts are not manual recounts but use the same machines that were used in the election. The recount procedures restrict testing of the machines being used such that they would not meet a trigger level if a bad actor has subverted the machines using a trigger level to enable vote modification. Why would such restrictive procedures be written into law?
b. New Mexico regulations require some audits under certain conditions. These Risk Limiting Audits (RLA) use a very limited hand count of ballots compared against a machine count. There is no excuse for machines to be off by even a single vote (see Section 4.2). When machines are found to be making errors during the Risk Limiting Audit, no investigation or hand recounts are ever pursued.
c. The typical RLA that is being encouraged across the country and in New Mexico is similar to a magic trick. An RLA requires that the ballots be rerun through the tabulator at the time of the audit to get a new Cast Vote Record (CVR) for the ballots. This is required because ballots on slow-speed tabulators are not kept in the order they were cast but are dumped into the ballot bin in random order. There is no way to pick out a random ballot and compare it against the CVR which is what the RLA requires. The RLA process examines a small subset of ballots that are randomly selected from a rerun of the ballots through a totally different
tabulator at a totally different time with new tabulator programming. All this does is probe that a specific ballot matches the interpretation of that ballot at the time of the audit. It says nothing about a different tabulator used during the election which had a different set of programming files which could have been set up to manipulation the votes recorded. Thus, the RLA gives an appearance of improving trust in the election when it does not do that at all.

## 4 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS \& VIOLATIONS

This section deals with the statutory requirements that are being violated by current election practices. A full legal memorandum is included as Appendix K.

### 4.1 RECORD PRESERVATION

State and federal law require election records are required to be kept for 22 months following federal elections and they must be made available for inspection under the IPRA Statutes in New Mexico. However, the entire 2020 Project File was illegally deleted in Otero County. The auditors also found correspondence between the SOS's office and other parties where the SOS admits to knowing that ballot images have been deleted in several counties within the 22-month window where they are required to be preserved. It has become standard procedure in counties to wipe and reuse the tabulator memory cards without first backing up all the files in violation of state and federal law. System log files from Chaves County showed that election files were being deleted on the tabulators themselves before and during the election (see Appendix D).

The auditors have submitted multiple IPRA requests which have been ignored by the SOS's office or delayed for as long as eight months before producing the records requested. The Otero County Clerk also delayed or ignored IPRA requests from the auditors.

### 4.2 ACCURACY REQUIREMENTS

According to the EAC VVSG 1.1, which were in effect at the time of the 2020 General Election, the federal limit for error in electronic election tabulation equipment is 1 in 125,000 votes, or $0.0008 \%{ }^{27}$ This allowable error rate has been codified into New Mexico statute. Machines are often designed to meet exacting standards where accuracy is imperative to the process the

[^18]machine is used for. It is not unreasonable to expect tabulators to have no trouble meeting the error threshold set by state law.

However, based on the accuracy analysis performed during this audit (see Section 5) and a review of historical audits performed in New Mexico since 2012, the machines have never come close to staying within the legal limitation on error.

Table 3 shows a summary of the results of the Risk Limiting Audits (RLA) performed after every election since 2012. ${ }^{28}$ Recall that RLAs pull a tiny fraction of the total ballots cast and compare a hand recount to a machine recount. The "Number of Errors" in the table are the number of errors made by the machines on this tiny subset of ballots that were examined across the state.

Table 3. Summary of Official Risk Limiting Audits Since 2012

| Election | Number of Errors | Maximum Error Rate | Number of Times Error <br> Exceeds the Legal Limit* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 General | 77 | $0.213 \%$ | 266 |
| 2014 General | 4 | $0.081 \%$ | 101 |
| 2016 General | 5 | $0.094 \%$ | 118 |
| 2018 General | 52 | $0.254 \%$ | 318 |
| 2020 General | 116 | $0.134 \%$ | 168 |

*Per NM State Law, $0.0008 \%$ is the maximum allowable error rate

From the table, even the extremely limited RLAs performed by the SOS consistently show error rates hundreds of times higher than are allowable by law. The machines are not meeting the minimum requirements of the election code and must be decertified as a matter of law.

The SOS is also lying to New Mexicans when she describes what the RLAs are and what happens when the machines fail to match the hand tallies. Her website states, "[The RLA] process involves randomly selecting races and precincts throughout the state and hand counting the results in those precincts. The hand counted results are then compared to the normal machine counted results to ensure accuracy." These statements imply that the RLAs are a full hand recount of the election results compared to the machine count. In reality, only a tiny subset is being checked

[^19]and it has very little to do with the election results. The SOS also lies about what happens when errors are found in the RLAs: "Any discrepancies between the results are thoroughly investigated." ${ }^{29}$ There has been no follow up investigation to any of the tabulators which were found to be incorrectly counting votes during the RLAs.

The accounting firm who performs the RLA notes in their report that the procedures they use were given to them by the SOS and they offer the disclaimer: "we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described...either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose." ${ }^{30}$ In other words, the "independent auditor" is checking only what the SOS tells them and they make no guarantee that the RLA is a real check of the election results. There is no industry in existence that would call that arrangement an independent audit.

It should also be noted that primary elections do not even receive this minimal RLA which leaves the door open for bad actors to manipulate outcomes in primaries knowing they will not receive even a minimal, ineffective check of how the machines were operating during the election. A real check of each election would be a statistical analysis of the Cast Vote Record in each county like what was done for this audit. This analysis can be done by a professional statistician in a matter of days and would give a reliable indication of whether there was fraudulent manipulation or indications of equipment failures during an election.

[^20]
### 4.3 CERTIFICATION LAPSES

The certification for New Mexico's election system has been out of compliance since 2017. The certification process is defined and supported by the EAC. The EAC maintains a document called Voluntary Voter System Guidelines (VVSG) which defines the standards that election systems much meet. The VVSGs are called "guidelines" and the EAC has no enforcement authority. However, in New Mexico the VVSGs carry the force of law in because they have been incorporated into our Election Code per NMSA 1-9-7-.4(B), which states: "A voting system that does not comply with all requirements in the Election Code and the most recent voluntary voting system guidelines adopted by the United States election assistance commission shall be decertified for use in this state" (emphasis added).

The timeline describing the complete lapse of the election system in New Mexico is shown as Figure 24. The numbers in brackets on the figure are the section of Appendix E to find the backup documentation for the facts stated in the timeline.

Election System Certification Lapse in New Mexico


Figure 24. Election System Certification Lapse Timeline

On February 24, 2017, the EAC's accreditation of a company called Pro V\&V expired. On August 24, 2017, the SOS used this company to "certify" New Mexico's tabulators and election software to VVSG 1.1 (the current standard at that time). Pro V\&V's accreditation remained defunct until March 10, 2020, when they re-applied to the EAC to have their accreditation renewed. Almost one year later, the EAC renewed Pro V\&V's accreditation and blamed COVID for the lapse, even though the accreditation had expired over three years before the start of COVID. So, elections held in New Mexico in 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 were held on machines that were not properly certified.

In the meantime, the EAC wrote and adopted a major update to the VVSG's. The newest version is VVSG 2.0 and was adopted in February 2021, and the National Voluntary Lab Accreditation Program (NVLAP) handbook was published in October, 2021. The EAC "is prepared for VSTL accreditation for VVSG 2.0, however, it is up to the labs on when to apply for accreditation."31 In other words, the process to accredit labs to certify election systems to the latest EAC standards has been in place since October 2021. However, as of this writing, neither of the two labs (Pro V\&V or SLI Compliance) have even applied for accreditation. The period between the last application for accreditation and approval was approximately one year. Given the disinterest shown by the labs to even become accredited, it is unknown how may months or years may elapse before it is even possible for any election system to be properly certified to the latest VVSGs in accordance with state law.

The SOS acknowledges these issues with accreditation and certification of the election system in a letter her office wrote to Dominion on May 28, 2021: "The SOS is required to review for recertification each voting system already in use in the state in the year following a presidential election. All certified voting systems are required to be tested by an independent authority and comply with all requirements in the Election Code and the most recent voluntary voting system guidelines (VVSG) adopted by the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC). While VVSG 2.0 was adopted by the EAC in February 2021, the EAC has not yet certified any independent voting system testing laboratories...Since this effort is likely to take some time, we

[^21]plan to review our current voting system based upon the previously adopted standards." (Letter is included in Appendix E).

The auditors agree with the SOS that it is not possible to certify New Mexico's election system to the current standards as required by statute. However, we disagree that the SOS has the unilateral authority to bypass state statute and decide to certify the election system to an outdated standard. The EAC and the testing labs together let the entire certification and accreditation process lapse for over four years and the labs have shown no interest in becoming accredited to the current standards. New Mexicans cannot be held hostage to testing labs or a bureaucracy that has no interest in doing their jobs well enough that compliance is even possible. No confidence can be had in election systems that are overseen by an incompetent bureaucracy and disinterested testing labs.

Similar problems exist with the accreditation and certification from the testing lab SLI Compliance which "certified" the AskED ePollbook and ballot on demand system that is used in New Mexico and provided by a company called ROBIS. However, the conversation about the ePollbooks and ballot on demand printing system can be simplified by pointing out that the date on the test report to show certification is December 1, 2011. The auditors confirmed with ROBIS that the software for the AskED ePollbook and ballot printing system is updated multiple times per year. Not only that, but the latest version of software is automatically distributed to all AskED customers when it becomes available like web-based applications used on smartphones. There is no possible way that the SOS can claim that the ePollbooks and ballot printing systems are certified if they have gone through dozens of software updates in the eleven years that have elapsed since they were last tested. There is also no way to have confidence in certification if the software used is automatically updated across the United States without testing and buy-in from the individual jurisdictions.

The SOS and vendor argue that the VVSGs only apply to the hardware of the ballot on demand/ePollbook system and software changes are somehow exempt. This is in direct contradiction to the language of the VVSGs which explicitly state the system that produces the ballots is subject to the Guidelines and the system must be considered as a combination of software and hardware. VVSG Section 1.1 states: The VVSGs apply "to all system hardware, software, telecommunications, and documentation intended for use to: prepare the voting
system for use in an election, produce appropriate ballot formats, test that the voting system and ballot materials have been properly prepared and are ready for use, record and count votes, consolidate and report election results, display results on-site or remotely, produce and maintain comprehensive audit trail" (emphasis added). VVSG Section 4 contains requirements for the machines that are part of a voting system, including ballot printers and computers used to prepare ballots: "This section [of the VVSG] applies to the combination of software and hardware to accomplish specific performance and system control requirements." ${ }^{32}$

The VVSG's make no distinction between hardware and software. The SOS and her vendors are improperly picking and choosing when they will follow the law and when they will make up their own standards.

In summary, neither the tabulators nor the ballot on demand/ePollbooks being used in New Mexico are properly certified according to state law. The ePollbooks are not even certifiable as they use software which is constantly updated without notice to the jurisdictions or testing for each update.

### 4.4 BALLOT REQUIREMENTS

The Election Codes requires that "[p]aper ballots shall be numbered consecutively." NMSA 1-1012 (A). Ballots in New Mexico are printed at the time the voter checks in at the polling place, or by a clerk's office when an absentee ballot application is received. They are not sequentially numbered, and the only record of how many ballots have been printed at any given time are stored on internet connected ePollbooks, which are vulnerable to being changed without knowledge of election officials.

The SOS and some county clerks violated NMSA 1-10-2 by allowing the third-party vendor, Automated Election Services (AES), to print and mail absentee ballots on behalf of some counties. This is in direct violation of the state statute, which states: "The county clerk shall prepare and supply the ballots used in elections conducted under the Election Code [Chapter 1 NMSA 1978].

[^22]The secretary of state may assist in preparing and supplying ballots. Ballots other than those prepared by the county clerk or secretary of state shall not be used." AES included QR codes on all the ballots they printed. It is unknown what information was encoded in these QR codes or whether it could have compromised our elections in any way.

### 4.5 SOFTWARE REQUIREMENTS

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall have operating system software which includes error detection and correction codes. More importantly, software shall include comprehensive diagnostics to ensure that failures do not go undetected (see NMSA 1-9-7.9 (E)). Auditors showed Dominion software let an entire election be processed in Chaves County with different versions of software on the tabulators and the Election Management System (see Appendix D). "Error" was indicated in the system log files, but the error was not detected by election workers real-time, and the machines were allowed to proceed with ballot tabulation.

The SOS has misrepresented to the public and to clerks that their Election Management System (EMS) does not have remote accessibility. In fact, state law requires it (see NMSA 1-9-7.9 (H)). "Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall possess the capability of remote transmission of election results to a central location only by reading the removable storage media devices once they have been removed from the tabulation device after the poll closing sequence has been completed." This statement implies that the EMS has remote accessibility, which is supported by the vulnerability assessment discussed in Section 3.

## 5 RECORD ACCURACY

The auditors did a careful check of all aspects of the paper and digital record for accuracy. The following records were checked and compared with each other:

- Tabulator Tapes - These are long, paper receipts printed by each tabulator at the end of the election.
- Ballot Images - These are scans of the paper ballots made and stored within each tabulator at the time they were cast.
- Ballot Scans - These are scans of the paper ballots made by the auditors on March 9, 2022. Scans were created using Canon DR-G1100 and Canon DR-G1130 duplex, highspeed scanners. These scanners were chosen as they are the same off-the-shelf scanner incorporated into Dominion ICC tabulators and were known to be appropriate for the purpose. The ballot scanning was done with the cooperation of the county clerk with proper chain of custody followed throughout and agreed upon by both parties. The press and Democrat observers were present, and a space was available for the public to observe the proceedings. Several sheriff deputies were also in attendance as many threats had been received by the auditors and volunteers from local and out-of-state individuals for participating in the audit.
- Cast Vote Record (CVR) - The Cast Vote Record (CVR) is a digital database stored within the Election Management System (EMS). The CVR has a line for every ballot that was cast in the election and a record of how the vote was adjudicated by the Dominion tabulators.
- County Canvass - The County Canvass is a spreadsheet summarizing the record of the election by tabulator which is created by the County Clerk.
- Secretary of State Official Canvass - The State Official Canvass is a record of the election by precinct.

The accuracy of each of these records is discussed in the following sections.

### 5.1 TABULATOR TAPES AND THE CAST VOTE RECORD

The tabulator tapes and the CVR matched closely except for the write-in votes for the US Representative position. There was at least one legitimate write-in vote cast for Steve Jones which was noted on the tabulator tape for Tabulator 826, found in the ballot images, but zero votes were counted for Mr. Jones in the Cast Vote Record and the County and State canvasses.

### 5.2 COUNTY CANVASS AND STATE CANVASS

The County Canvass and the State Canvass matched except in the State House District 53 races where the SOS awarded Willie Madrid 1,213 votes where the County recorded 1,212 votes.

### 5.3 BALLOT IMAGES AND BALLOT SCANS

This section will explain the types of ballots that are cast and the process the auditors used to evaluate the Dominion created ballot images and the scans of the ballots created by the auditors.

### 5.3.1 Types of Ballots

The types of ballots are as follows:

1. Ballots Scanned by the Tabulators: these are all the ballots that can be processed on the electronic equipment. They include most ballots cast in person by voters and most absentee ballots processed by the clerk's staff. All the ballots scanned by the tabulators should have one associated ballot image (BI) that is created by the tabulators. These ballots include absentee, early, and election day ballots.
2. Hand Tallied Ballots: These are ballots that cannot be run through the tabulators. They include:
a. Damaged ballots: Ballots that were torn or stained such that the tabulators cannot process them.
b. Ballots with Voter Corrections: There were dozens of absentee ballots where the voter made a choice, changed their mind, clearly marked out their first choice, and then marked their intended choice. As these ballots were processed by election workers, the tabulators should have given the election worker an "overvote" error which allows the election worker the opportunity to check the ballot for voter intent and hand tally the votes that appear as overvotes (see Section 5.4). However, it appears this process was not used in Otero County and these ballots were processed incorrectly. It is unknown if the overvote error message failed to appear on the tabulators or if election workers were not properly trained to examine ballots when the error rate occurred and move ballots with voter corrections into the hand-tally category.
c. Military Ballots (UOCAVA and FWAP): Absentee ballots sent in by military and overseas citizens come in various forms. These ballots can be mailed in a special envelope different from a typical absentee ballot. They can also be emailed directly to the County Clerk, in which case the county clerk fills out a military ballot based on the choices selected. These ballots do not have timing marks or precinct bar codes, so they cannot be processed by the tabulators and must be hand tallied. There was a total of 243 ballots in this category in the Otero 2020 General Election.
d. Visually Impaired Voter Absentee Ballots: Visually impaired voters can cast absentee ballots electronically and send them to the County Clerk. These ballots are also in a form that is not readable by the tabulators. There were seven of these ballots cast in Otero County in 2020.
e. Provisional Ballots: These are ballots where there was some problem with the voter's registration that prevented them from being allowed to cast a regular, in-person ballot. These voters are asked to cast a provisional ballot which is accepted or rejected after review of the registration record. Most provisional ballots are rejected. In Otero County, there were 20 provisional ballots submitted, but only 8 were accepted (4 during early voting and 4 on election day). These ballots are in a form that can't be read by the tabulators and must be hand tallied.

The Otero County Clerk provided all the paper ballots that were processed on the tabulators, and some of the hand tallied ballots to be scanned by the auditors. Copies were provided of all 240 military ballots that were either mailed in or produced by the clerk. The eight provisional and three FWAP ballots were not provided, except for the total number of ballots that came from each precinct from these categories.

### 5.3.2 Method of Evaluation

Software was written by the audit team to adjudicate the votes on both the Dominion produced ballots images and the ballot scans made by the auditors. The software established a
"fingerprint" for each ballot image and ballot scan, made up of the precinct the ballot came from followed by a series of 0's and 1's that represent how the votes were cast for the candidates on the ballot. Using these fingerprints, the images and scans were matched up into groups based on precinct and vote pattern.

Where a one-to-one correspondence between images and scans could not be made by the software, the images and scans were pulled out and examined manually by the audit team. When manually examined one by one, it was easy to identify identical images and scans because most vote marks have a unique appearance based on where white space was left in the oval, or where ink ran over the oval outline. Since some of the hand tallied ballots were scanned, there were more scans that images.

The software adjudication of the ballot images and ballot scans were saved to a csv file very similar to the Cast Vote Record created by the Dominion software. The total votes could then be added up per precinct and compared with the official canvass and it matched closely with the official results for most races within the margin of the number of ballots which were not provided.

Several other analyses were completed with the software as well. All the ballots that had overvotes were examined to ensure they were correctly counted. All the ballots that had ink bleed through were identified and examined. Some anomalies dealing with ink were discovered (see Section 5.5). Issues with skewed, stretched, and distorted images were looked at (see Section 5.6). Vote mark pixel density anomalies were also examined for each ballot. Analysis of
voting patterns and additional work on the CVR in addition to the analysis discussed in Section 6 has also begun and will be published later as a supplement to this report.

### 5.3.3 Comparison of Ballot Images to Ballot Scans

Every ballot image should have had a corresponding ballot scan, however there were two ballot images in the record which had no corresponding ballot scans. It is possible that ballots for these images exist and were not produced by the County Clerk. It is also possible that the images were improperly created or manipulated by the Dominion software.

There was one absentee ballot that was scanned twice. It is known this ballot was scanned twice because there are two different ballot images with two distinct entries in the CVR where the vote marks are identical on the front and back of the ballots, but there was only one corresponding ballot scan. Figure 25 shows this ballot with two unique ballot image numbers assigned by the Dominion system.


Figure 25. Ballot Scanned Twice

It is unknown exactly how this ballot was scanned twice since the absentee ballots in Otero County are processed on ICE tabulators which drop the ballots into a locked storage bin after scanning. If the ballot had been scanned by an election worker, removed from the locked storage bin, and scanned again to attempt to affect the outcome of the election, then we would expect there to be more than one of these. A more likely possibility is that the tabulator scanned the ballot and reversed instead of advancing it into the storage bin, and the election worker
rescanned the ballot not knowing the tabulator would save and tabulate both images. It is more likely that this double scan occurred as a programming error in the tabulator than that an election worker did anything wrong. The Dominion programming must be examined to determine if there is a flaw that can allow a reversal and double scan to occur.

### 5.4 CAST VOTE RECORD AND DOMINION ADJUDICATION ERRORS

The Cast Vote Record was checked against the ballot images by matching up the precinct and vote patterns from each line in the CVR with the precinct and vote patterns on the ballot images as adjudicated by the software. The ballot images that did not have an exact match in the CVR were pulled out of the record. The votes recorded in the CVR were then plotted onto these images and manually examined to determine where the error was.

A total of 71 votes were incorrectly tabulated by the ICE tabulators. That is 15 times higher than the allowable limit as explained in Section 4.2. These improperly adjudicated votes fall into six categories - (1) unexplainable mis-adjudication, (2) paper folds interpreted as votes, (3) voter missed oval, (4) voter made small mark in one oval and full vote in another oval, (5) marks on the ballot strayed into oval, but were not a vote, (6) voter changed their mind and clearly indicated their intent, but their vote was counted as an overvote instead. The following figures show examples of each of these. The boxes around the vote ovals indicate that a vote was counted by the Dominion software for that oval. Ovals without boxes, mean no vote was counted or the race was found to have overvotes by the Dominion software.


Figure 26. Votes Unexplainably Mis-adjudicated by Dominion ICE Tabulator

Figure 26 shows votes mis-adjudicated by Dominion software. Vote A was counted as a vote for the write-in candidate, but it was clearly not a vote since the oval was not marked. Votes B through F had clear marks for one candidate, but it appears that writing the ballots or fold marks running through the write-in box was interpreted wrongly as a second vote in this races and the software counted these as overvotes.


Figure 27. Dominion Software Interpreting Folds as Votes

Figure 27 shows votes where fold marks were interpreted as marks inside ovals, causing the software to interpret these races as being overvoted.

The adjudication errors shown in Figures 26 and 27 show serious flaws in Dominion software. It clearly does not check that both the oval and the write-in box have marks on them before counting write-in votes. Further, interpreting fold marks as votes violates EAC VVSG's requirement that electronic tabulators be able to tell the difference between votes and fold marks.

The errors resulting in overvotes in Figures 26 and 27 occurred on tabulators used to process absentee and in-person ballots. The tabulator should have alerted the voter or the election worker that there was an overvote, inspection would have revealed that these ballots needed to be hand-tallied because there were no genuine overvotes on these ballots. It is unknown if the software failed to display an overvote error, or if the election workers were not trained to know what to do when the error appeared. It is important that this issue be investigated and corrected.


Figure 28. Dominion Software Missing Lightly Marked Votes and Votes Outside Ovals

Figure 28 shows votes where the voter missed most of the oval with their mark or they made a mark that was interpreted by the tabulator as a light or white color. Dominion software counted these races as undervotes, even though the intent of the voter was clearly to cast a vote in these races. It is not necessarily expected that optical scanning technology would catch these issues, but people hand-counting these ballots would not have missed these votes.


Figure 29. Dominion ICE Tabulators Misinterpreting Stray Marks for Votes 1

The votes shown in Figure 29 were all interpreted by the Dominion ICE tabulators as overvotes, even though the voter most likely did not intend them to be overvotes. Votes A through D look like the voter was filling in poorly printed ovals to show a solid line, and votes E through G look like the voter put their marker down inside the wrong oval initially, but clearly marked their choice in another oval. The EAC VVSG's require that electronic tabulators be able to tell the difference between stray marks and real votes, but clearly, they can't tell the difference. This error occurred on ballots cast both in-person and absentee.


Figure 30. Dominion ICE Tabulator Misinterpreting Stray Marks for Votes 2

Figure 30 shows a ballot where the voter intended to cross out names on their ballot and their marks strayed into the oval next to the name. Dominion counted two of these cross-outs as votes for those candidates. This ballot was cast in-person. Again, the EAC VVSG's require that electronic tabulators be able to tell the difference between stray marks and real votes, but they are simply reading pixels inside ovals. A human hand-tallying this ballot would have been able to tell what this voter's intent was.


Figure 31. Dominion ICE Tabulator Misinterpreting Voter Intent

Figure 31 shows the most common misinterpretation of votes where a voter accidentally marked the wrong candidate first and then marked the candidate they really intended. Often the voter would make notes on their ballot to be clear about their intent, and even initial the changes. This error occurred on a mix of in-person and absentee ballots. The in-person voters may have had an opportunity to spoil their ballot and fill out a new one, but that likely was not possible for the absentee voters.

The errors shown in Figures 26 through 31 are important because they demonstrate that optical scanning technology is not capable of producing the near-zero error rate that the EAC has led the American people to believe. The tabulators are not able to tell the difference between stray marks, folds, and votes. The tabulators seem to have been programmed to count write-in votes based only on writing on the ballot and without filling in the vote oval - this is blatantly contrary to how the SOS instructs voters to cast write-in votes. ${ }^{33}$

And even the advertised features of the Dominion tabulators do not appear to be working correctly. Figure 32 is a table from the Dominion Democracy Suite New Mexico User's Guide which represents that overvotes and ambiguous marks should generate a warning message to alert the voter (in the case of in-person voting), or the clerk's staff (in the case of processing absentee ballots) that there is an error on the ballot that needs to be inspected and possibly

[^23]corrected. It does not appear that this warning appeared, or else the election workers were not properly trained to know what to do when they saw it.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Blank Ballot <br> Warning | The tabulator does not detect any voter selections on the scanned ballot. <br> Please ensure you used a proper marking pen. |
| Overvote <br> Warning | One or more contests have too many votes. If you choose to cast the <br> ballot as-is, contests with too many votes will not be counted. |
| Ambiguous <br> Marks Warning | The tabulator detected marks on the ballot but the selections are not <br> clear. The ballot will be returned automatically. |
| Ballot Misread <br> Warning | The tabulator is unable to recognize the ballot. Check the ballot for <br> damage or stray marks, particularly in the timing mark area. If damaged, <br> spoil the ballot and issue another. If no damage is detected, re-insert the <br> ballot in a different orientation. |

Figure 32. Tabulator Warning Messages from Democracy Suite NM User's Guide, October 2017

The errors discovered in the Otero County Cast Vote Record also raise the issue of votes not being treated equally because uniform processes are not deployed across the state in accordance with NMSA 1-2-1(B). Some counties used Dominion ICC tabulators to process absentee ballots which incorporated a process called "adjudication." Figure 36 is a figure from the Dominion User's Guide that explains the type of errors that can be corrected by the adjudication process. Note that most of the votes shown in Figures 26 through 31 could have been caught and corrected if they had gone through the "adjudication" process which was available to voters in other counties.
Vote removed for choice "Jane Doe"
United States Senator $\theta \mid$ State Representative

| (Vote for one) | District 32 <br> (Vote for one) |
| :---: | :---: |
| © John Doe |  |
| CJane Doe | J John Doe |
| * Write-In Test | Jane Doe |
| Representative To The US © Congress Congressional 7 (Vote for one) | District Attorney 17th Judicial District (Vote for one) |
| $L$ John Doe 4 -riis one | \% John Doe |
| X lane Doe No | Jane Doe |


| United States Senator (Vote for one) | State Representative <br> District 32 <br> (Vote for one) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\therefore$ John Doe |  |
| - Jane Doe | f/ John Doe |
| * Write-In Tast | Jane Doe |
| Representative To The US © <br> Congress <br> Congressional 7 <br> (Vote for one) | District Attorney 17th Judicial District (Vote for one) |
| 6 John Doe 4-this one | \%f John Doe |
| X Jane Doe No | Jane Doe |
| Smodiler |  |
| Regent Of The University OD Colorado <br> At Large <br> مlat for one) |  |
| 4. John Doe |  |
| Jane Doe |  |

Figure 33. "Adjudication" Examples from Dominion New Mexico User's Guide

The ICC Tabulators and "adjudication" process have their own vulnerabilities as discussed in Section 2.4.2. But the use of different equipment county to county result in votes counting differently.

### 5.5 INK ANOMALIES

Several ballots had unexplained anomalies where it appeared that more than one type of ink was used on the ballot. Figure 34 shows one of these types of anomalies where one type of ink appears to have been used on the front of the ballot, but a different type of ink on the back of the ballot.


Figure 34. Example of One-Way Ink Bleed Through

The ink that was used on the front of the ballot in Figure 34 bled through to the back, but the ink on the back did not bleed through to the front. Most likely a different type of ink was used on the back of the ballot than on the front. It is possible that these votes were printed and not made by the voter as discussed in Section 2.4.1. To prevent this possibility, the ink cartridge in the tabulators should be removed and only installed long enough to mark a ballot at the request of a voter who desires to use the ATI function at a polling place.

For contrast, Figure 35 shows a ballot that was filled out with one type of ink as the ink bled through to both sides of the ballot.


Figure 35. Example of Two-Way Bleed Through

Another anomaly discovered was some ballots had clear marks for all their votes on the ballot image created by Dominion during the election, but some of these marks had faded or disappeared on the paper ballots that were scanned in March 2022. Figures 36 and 37 show two ballots with this anomaly that were cast in-person at two different locations. It is unknown what caused this issue.


Figure 36. Disappearing Ink on Ballots, Example 1


Figure 37. Disappearing Ink on Ballots, Example 2

### 5.6 PRINTING ISSUES

The adjudication software was used to measure the size of the tables printed on the ballots was measured. Some ballots were found to have skewed, stretched, or compressed dimensions. These issues can be a result the flaws in the scanning process, flaws in the printing process, or ballots printed by unofficial sources.

Figure 38 is an example of two absentee ballots from the same precinct which should have been identical since they would have both been produced from the same official pdf. The ballot on the left appears to have been printed correctly because the vote ovals were all where they were expected to be when the program applied the map for this precinct to locate the vote ovals. However, the ballot on the right has the ovals in the first and third columns shifted up and the ovals in the center column are shifted up and to the right.


Figure 38. Example of Properly Aligned and Skewed Ballots


Figure 39. Example of Skewed Ballot

The ballot in Figure 39 was printed with extreme skewing. The back was more skewed than the front. We can confirm the ballot was printed skewed and not scanned skewed because the edge of the paper can be seen in both the image and the scan and both show severe skewing. It would be surprising if the ballot on demand system was printing ballots this badly out of calibration. Another possibility is this ballot was a copy that came from an unofficial source.

The stretching, compression, and skewing observed in some ballots could be due to ballots being printed or copied outside of the official sources, from errors in printer in the ballot on demand
system, or pdfs being used by the ballot on demand system that were corrupted or changed. These issues are still being examined in conjunction with scans from other counties and findings will be published later if conclusions are able to be made.

### 5.6 BALLOT ENVELOPES

Since absentee voting is the most prone to fraud, election workers must be very careful to apply the minimal standards that New Mexico has for accepting absentee ballots. Based on the examples that will be presented in this section and the fact that the number of absentee ballots submitted increased significantly while the rejection rate decreased in Otero County (see Section 2.6.2), it does not appear that even these minimal standards were met. Very significant issues with chain of custody and confirmation of dropped votes as found in the canvass were also discovered.

### 5.6.1 Questionable Ballot Envelopes

This section includes some questionable and illegal examples from an examination of the absentee ballot envelopes. Where appropriate, voter names and social security numbers have been redacted for privacy, but the full images will be provided to officials upon request. Figure 40 shows some examples of outer envelopes that were not signed and apparently were approved for processing without curing.


Figure 40. Blank Ballot Envelopes

New Mexico does not have signature matching requirements or photo ID. Signature matching is by no means a foolproof way to prevent absentee ballot fraud but having no standards whatsoever is foolish and an invitation for fraud. Figure 41 shows several examples of signatures that were accepted in Otero County. The signatures in the figure are highlighted because, in the opinion of the reviewers, not even a single letter was identifiable based on the voter's name it was supposed to represent. Some signatures look like scribbles or a series or loops.


Figure 41. Examples of Completely Illegible Signatures Accepted in Otero County

NMSA Section 1-6-9 states that only an immediate family member can return a ballot on behalf of a voter, but Figure 42 shows an example of a "friend" returning a ballot on behalf of a voter. This is illegal.


Figure 42. Ballot Returned Illegally by Friend


Figure 43. Examples of Potential Irregularities

Figure 43 shows five examples of potential irregularities. Some ballots were declared as delivered by "self," but the handwriting in the "delivery person" section did not appear to match the handwriting under the privacy flap (Example A). Another ballot declared it was delivered by the voter's son, but it appears the same person signed the envelope for the voter and the delivery person (Example B). The ballot envelopes in Examples C and D were sent to the same address to two different people with difference last names. It appears that the same person may have filled out and signed both envelopes. Example E shows a ballot with a completely illegible signature as well as an unlikely social security number.

The County Clerk told the auditors that while most mail in Otero County is routed through El Paso; the post office would often bypass routing absentee ballots through El Paso and deliver locally mailed ballots directly to the Clerk's office. However, dozens of absentee envelopes were found that had a local postmark and an El Paso postmark.

Two USPS employees were consulted by the auditors asking if multiple postmarks are typically placed on mail. The USPS employees said postmarks are typically only placed on envelopes at the post office where they originate. Based on that, the postmark examples in Figure 44 do not make any sense.


Figure 44. Double and Triple Postmarks

From the figure, Example A has two postmarks from October $29^{\text {th }}$, one from Mescalero and one in El Paso, and a third postmark from Alamogordo on the $30^{\text {th }}$. Example B has an October $26^{\text {th }}$ postmark from Las Vegas, Nevada, a postmark from El Paso on the $29^{\text {th }}$ and a third postmark in Alamogordo on the $30^{\text {th }}$. Example C has an El Paso postmark from the October $19^{\text {th }}$, and a Timberon postmark from October $20^{\text {th }}$. Going from El Paso, to Timberon back to Alamogordo is not a possible route based on how mail is handled in Otero County.

Why would absentee ballots have multiple postmarks? Is election mail handled differently than typical mail? Is it possible these envelopes were taken out of the mail stream illegally, had their ballot replaced, and mailed a second or third time?

### 5.6.2 Missing Ballot Envelopes

The Official SOS Canvass states that 5,991 absentee ballots were cast in Otero County. However, only 5,937 were produced for scanning by the County Clerk. It is unknown whether the missing 54 envelopes were withheld, lost, or if they ever existed.

### 5.6.3 Significant Chain of Custody Problems

County Clerks are required to fill out a chain of custody form each time the drop boxes were emptied. The form includes the date and time the box was emptied, the seal numbers on the box, and the number of ballots collected. A minimum of two election workers were to be present and sign the form (see Figure 22 for an example). The chain of custody documents for the drop boxes were obtained and it was found that 2,078 ballots were delivered through the drop boxes. This accounts for $36 \%$ of all absentee ballots cast in Otero County.

The Otero County Clerk does not keep track of how many ballots are delivered by mail each day, but the number of the absentee ballot envelopes that were sent by mail, when and where they were postmarked, and when they were delivered could largely be determined from the analysis of the envelope scans.

According to the envelope analysis, 2,821 ballots were sent through the mail. There were 243 UOCAVA and FWAP absentee ballots. Some of these were mailed, but most were processed by
the clerk over email and would not have gone through either a drop box or the USPS. That means conservatively, 852 absentee ballots have no chain of custody in Otero County. This amounts to $15 \%$ of all absentee ballots cast. Considering the evidence of ballot stuffing found in the statistical analysis discussed in Section 6, the lack of proper chain of custody is a serious problem and may indicate wrongdoing.

How were 850 ballots submitted into the election that have no record of where they came from? Was this done fraudulently, by accident, or because of poor training? Who is responsible?

### 5.6.4 Absentee Ballot Daily and Cumulative Counts Over the Early Voting Period

The County Clerk is to stamp a "received date" on each envelope as it comes in. Using these received dates, the drop box chain of custody documents, and the number of envelopes that had postmarks, it was possible to determine the pattern that absentee ballots were being received from each source over the early voting period. The envelope analysis revealed that 143 envelopes had no received date and another 23 were not legible, so these could not be included in the analysis.

Figure 45 shows the absentee ballot count each day through the early voting period. The ballots are broken out by type. From the figure, chain of custody is missing where the grey line is higher than the blue line, which occurs to some degree throughout the record. The worst incidence of missing chain of custody occurred on October $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$, when 413 ballots were submitted through the drop boxes, and another 296 ballots were submitted without any chain of custody.

Daily Absentee Ballot Count Received Each Day by Type


Figure 45. Daily Absentee Ballot Count by Type

The Country Clerk needs to determine what happened on those days that caused a large injection of absentee ballot to be made without any chain of custody and whether it was accidental or fraudulent.

Figure 46 shows the cumulative count of absentee ballots as they were coming in from each source over the course of early voting. Cumulatively, there were at least 850 absentee ballots that were counted in Otero County with no chain of custody. This was more than enough to affect the outcome of the State House District 53 race.


Figure 46. Cumulative Absentee Ballot Count by Type

Additionally, preliminary analysis confirmed that at least 120 voters who submitted absentee envelopes are not on the rolls. Several names that were on the absentee ballot envelopes are on the rolls, but do not have a vote in their voter history for 2020. This confirms the existence of "dropped votes" as found in the canvass (see Section 7). Additional analysis must be done to quantify the extent of dropped votes and missing voters.

### 5.7 SUMMARY

The tabulator tapes, state and county canvass matched each other well with small errors - but these are all generated by output from the electronic election system without reference to the paper ballots. The errors made by the Dominion software in adjudicating ballots are very concerning. These errors were small in comparison to the margin of victory for the races that were affected by the errors; however, they are far larger than allowed by law, which is the standard by which the machines must be measured. It is also clear that Dominion software is faulty because it is not able to tell the difference between fold marks and real votes as the law requires. The software is also not programed to correctly identify write-in votes as only those where the oval is filled in and a name is written in the box provided. None of the adjudication errors that the Dominion software made would have occurred if the votes were hand-counted.

Examination of the ballot images and scans raised serious questions. Some ballots appear to have been filled out with two types of ink. It is possible that votes were printed by the tabulators. This issue needs to be taken seriously. It should be made standard practice statewide not to install the ink in the ICE tabulators except for the brief time needed by a voter to use the ATI feature on request.

Questions also exist as to why some ballots are shortened, lengthened, or skewed. Were these ballots printed by non-official sources? If so, who and how did they get the ballot templates? Did the official pdf's get changed or corrupted in the ballot on demand system? Is the rented ballot on demand system faulty? The duplicate ballot image is also a serious concern as it was very unlikely to be caused by human error. How did the Dominion system manage to create two ballot images for a single ballot?

The problems with chain of custody in the absentee ballots are very serious. Absentee voting is already prone to fraud, and the analysis in Section 6 shows absentee ballot stuffing occurred in Otero County. It is a big problem that the County Clerk cannot account for where $15 \%$ of the ballots came from, and almost half of these unknown ballots were injected into the election on a single day. It needs to be determined what went wrong and whether these ballots were fraudulently cast. Preliminary analysis of the names that were on the absentee ballots confirm
that some absentee votes were dropped from the voting history. This is consistent with the findings from the canvass and indicative of digital manipulation of the rolls.

All of these are serious questions that need answers.

## 6 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF ELECTION RESULTS

Statistical analysis can be used to detect anomalies that are consistent with nefarious activity and can provide circumstantial evidence for such things as fraud in financial systems, insurance claims, tax returns, credit card transactions, school test scores, etc. Properly applied data analytics can detect irregularities in election results, too, and narrow the scope of further investigations by pointing where to look for possible root causes. A statistical analysis of the election results from Otero and Sandoval Counties was performed by a data forensic scientist.

Statistical anomalies consistent with mail-in ballot stuffing were found for most, but not all, races in both Otero and Sandoval counties. In addition, Sandoval County had statistical characteristics consistent with digital manipulation of the results of the election. This appears as though ballots favoring one candidate were front-loaded at the very beginning of the election by an overwhelming margin of $30 \%$ (in every race, except one) and then linearly, systematically, tapered down to no front-loading (0\%) so that the remaining ballot results matched the proportion favoring that candidate in the remainder of the election. This manipulation of ballot results was most likely done electronically (or digitally) since it would be nearly impossible to achieve manually. The same unusual pattern in early mail-in ballot results has been found in multiple counties throughout the country.

The method and results for the statistical analysis are discussed in the following sections for several contests. The full results can be found in Appendix H and I for Otero and Sandoval Counties, respectively.

### 6.1 DATA SOURCE AND METHOD

The election system of hardware and software used by both counties is provided by the vendor, Dominion. The election system creates a Cast Vote Record (CVR) for each ballot and stores it digitally. Cast Vote Records or CVRs exist in the election system database and it is the source of
data used in this statistical analysis. CVRs have a "Common Data Format Specification34" so they are interoperable with different vendors and types of election equipment or software, to easily transfer, communicate, and aggregate at a state level.

A CVR refers to a single ballot stored in the election system. The term CVR is often used interchangeably for three things: 1) a ballot image, 2) a text-document showing how ovals were read and translated by software for a single ballot, or 3) a single row-type record of contests, choices, and other variables such as Precinct, BallotType, Tabulator, Batch, etc. It is the third meaning that was used in this analysis, similar to a spreadsheet, i.e., rows of CVR data equal to the total number of ballots that were cast in the 2020 General election for all contests, for both counties.

The Otero County analysis covered 25 contests, including 15 partisan races, 5 judge retentions, 2 amendments, and 3 bonds. Unopposed races were not included. For Sandoval County, the analysis covered 39 races, including 27 partisan races, 6 judge retentions, 2 amendments, and 4 bonds.

Statistical control limits are provided in the analysis for reference where possible. Statistical control limits are boundaries that separate the likelihood of random causes of variation in the results from special causes of variation (anomalies which need an explanation).

The control limits were calculated using p-control chart formulas35 based on the binomial distribution. This methodology has been used for decades to identify statistical anomalies and indicate where to look for explanations or root causes.

[^24]
### 6.2 STATISTICAL EVIDENCE OF MANIPULATION IN ELECTIONS

### 6.2.1 Understanding the Scale of Marginal Differences in Vote Percentages

It is not unusual to have small differences in Vote percentages between similar groups, such as $1 \%$. In fact, it is common to calculate a "Margin of Error" within 2 or $3 \%$ depending on the sample size, when conducting polls prior to an election to estimate the percentage of favorable votes for a Candidate. Small differences in percentages can be detected statistically if the sample size is large enough. However, when a marginal difference between groups is 10 times bigger, at 20 or $30 \%$, it's an order of magnitude larger in scale! It is a huge difference! It doesn't take a large sample size to know that a marginal difference of 20 or $30 \%$ is extraordinarily large and likely not due to random chance alone, rather some other mechanism is at work. It's time to investigate and find the source(s) of the root cause.

### 6.2.2 Ballot Stuffing

Elections can be manipulated through ballot stuffing by illegal submission of absentee ballots or by voting in-person under a false name and address - in this case the paper record will not expose the fraudulent results. Ballot stuffing can also be done in the digital record by adding, switching, or dropping votes - in this case the paper record will not match the election results and can expose the fraudulent results.

When ballot stuffing occurs using physical ballots (as shown in the documentary 2000 Mules), identifying the fraud from the paper ballots or digital images will likely be impossible, because counterfeit ballots were used and turned in. However, it can appear as statistically significant differences in the CVR data which cannot be explained by the usual factors such as differences between subpopulations within the county (such as Republican or Democrat leaning precincts), or by unique procedures used by individual clerks.

Ballot stuffing is more obvious if significant differences in CVR data happen in some races but not others. Figure 47 shows two examples of statistical evidence consistent with mail-in ballot stuffing (or digital manipulation of the CVR data), one for county commissioner and the other for county treasurer.


Figure 47. Evidence of Ballot Stuffing in Absentee Ballots

The figure above shows a large marginal difference of about $30 \%$ in vote percentage between the Mail-In (Absentee) group and the other two In-person groups, for both races. Earliness is not a good explanation for this $30 \%$ step since both the Mail-In and Early In-Person groups cover the same 3 week time period when it was possible to turn in a ballot. This large step should not exist
yet it is statistically significant. It demands an explanation and is consistent with mail-in ballot stuffing for both races.

Figure 48 shows an example where no statistical evidence consistent with mail-in ballot stuffing (or digital manipulation of the CVR data), appeared in the Absentee ballots. There is very little marginal difference in vote percentage between any of the vote type groups in this judge retention contest.

## No Statistical Evidence consistent with Mail-In Ballot Stuffing or Digital Manipulation



Figure 48. No Evidence of Ballot Stuffing in Absentee Ballots

### 6.2.2 Digital Manipulation

One way to discover if an election is being manipulated digitally (electronically) is to examine the mail-in portion of the election by itself, ie CVR data from Absentee ballots only. Mail-in ballot results should be randomly distributed, meaning no trends or shifts, because voters request their ballots at random, ballots arrive at random time intervals from date of request, ballots wait a random amount of time before being filled out and mailed back, they arrive at the clerk's office randomly, and they get processed randomly (not by Precinct or Party, etc). Therefore, mail-in ballots should have a cumulative vote proportion for a particular candidate that settles on the expected final average quickly with very little variation after a sufficiently large number of absentee ballots have been received36 and processed at the clerks office. What is a sufficiently large number of ballots? This can be demonstrated and understood by plotting the cumulative proportion of ballots that favor Candidate A as they accumulate by batches or subgroups over time.

To further judge whether or not the mail-in results are occurring as expected, the cumulative vote proportion for two candidates can be compared simultaneously by calculating a ratio of Candidate A's cumulative proportions to Candidate B's cumulative proportions. This ratio is known as the Odds Ratio, because it provides the odds of winning. If the odds ratio is greater than 1, for example 2.6, the Candidate in the numerator wins by a factor of 2.6 times more votes than the Candidate in the denominator.

If there is a trend or a shift in either candidate's proportion of votes, it will cause the cumulative ratio to not settle down on the final expected ratio quickly and not appear as a flat horizontal line. Instead shapes such as trends or swoops or peaks or valleys will appear in the cumulative ratio. This indicates that absentee ballot results stored in the CVR database are not random but have been manipulated or controlled in some manner.

Figure 49 shows an example of the cumulative ratio for two candidates for the Presidential contest using CVR data from Sandoval County. The top graph was created from the cumulative proportion of votes for Biden divided by the cumulative proportion of votes for Trump, using

[^25]absentee ballots which were in batches of size 25 as recorded in sequential order in the Sandoval CVR data. You can see a clear downward trend.

The bottom graph was created by first randomly shuffling the order of the absentee ballots, then putting them in batches of size 25 , then calculating the cumulative proportions for each candidate, and finally calculating the cumulative ratios. By forcing the randomization, you can see the expected flat horizontal line. It settles on the final cumulative ratio of 2.61 rather quickly, at about Tabulator Batch ID 200. Since each batch has 25 ballots in Sandoval County's case, this equates to $200 \times 25=5,000$ ballots. It only takes 5,000 ballots out of a total of 29,203 to settle on the expected final outcome favoring Biden winning over Trump by a factor of 2.6 times as many votes for the randomized absentee ballots.


Figure 49. Evidence of Digital Manipulation (top) Compared to No Digital Manipulation (bottom)

The above figure (top) shows the cumulative odds ratio is ever-changing from the beginning to the end of the absentee portion of the election. This should not occur if the absentee ballots were truly random. Notice at the beginning the odds ratio is about 5 , meaning Biden was winning with 5 times as many votes as Trump, finally ending up with about half that at 2.6. This is consistent with digitally front-loading ballots favoring Biden since this would be extremely
difficult to coordinate and achieve this trend physically. This same manipulated trend has been shown to exist in mail-in CVR records across the country.

The bottom plot shows that after a small number $(5,000)$ of truly randomized absentee ballots are counted, the cumulative Biden to Trump ratio does not change from the final average by counting more and more absentee ballots.

### 6.3 OTERO COUNTY: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS BY VOTING LOCATION AND TABULATOR

There were 15 vote centers, and 35 tabulators recorded in the CVR data from Otero County. The votes are further categorized by Counting Group or type of vote (Absentee, Early In-Person, Election Day In-Person). Votes cast at each polling location were placed in subgroups of 200 ballots37 in the order they were recorded in the CVR. The average proportion of votes for a Candidate was calculated for each group and the statistical control limits were calculated.

The sequential order of the ballots recorded in the CVR did not make logical sense, as absentee, early, and election day groups were shuffled and mixed with each other. Clerk's staff indicated that all data is originally entered into the election management system in groups, i.e. all absentee ballots are submitted together, then all early votes, and finally all election day votes are submitted. However, Clerk's staff also indicated that they submitted the memory sticks to the election management system twice and they may have been out of order the second time.

Two statistical p-control charts were created for each contest:

1. Vote percentage for Democrat (or "Yes" or "For" votes for judge retentions or other ballot measures) along with an average for each vote type with statistical control limits.

[^26]2. Vote percentage for Republican (or "No" or "Against" votes for judge retentions or other ballot measures) along with an average for each vote type with statistical control limits.

The statistical evidence shown on the p-control charts is consistent with ballot stuffing in the absentee group in all except four of the five judge retention contests.

Figure 50 shows the percentage for Biden in each subgroup by location for Otero County.


Figure 50. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - Presidential Race

Statistical evidence of mail-in ballot stuffing or digital manipulation of the presidential race can be seen in the 30 percent marginal difference between the percentage of votes cast for the Democrat candidates in the absentee and in-person voting groups in the partisan races. That difference is statistically significant with a p-value of $2.2 \times 10^{-16}$, meaning the shift is so large that there is only 1 chance in 450 quadrillion that it could have occurred if there was truly no difference between the two early counting groups. Therefore, something caused it, likely ballot, or digital stuffing.

Note that "Otero County" was the voting center for both the absentee and early voting groups. However, the "Location" within Otero County was the Clerk's Office for Early Mail-In, and both the Admin Building or Fairgrounds for Early In-Person. So, there is a possibility that the Location had an effect, although all precincts are represented in both early groups. It is also possible that something could have happened in only the Clerk's Office location consistent with ballot or digital stuffing to cause the vote percentage to favor Democrats.

Earliness is not a factor since both counting groups are early and cover about the same time period. Votes from 4 local Convenience Centers favor Democrats significantly, and votes from 8 local Convenience Centers favor Republicans significantly for in-person voting. These can be explained by the differences in party registrations in the precincts surrounding these voting locations.

All the partisan races, one judge retention, and the bonds and amendments showed similar evidence of ballot stuffing as the presidential race. Figures 51 through 56 shows the percentage for the Democrat candidate in the other federal races, one state senate race, and three state representative races.


Figure 51. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - US Senate Race


Figure 52. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - US Representative Race

## STATE SENATOR DIST 33: (D) LANG-BROWNE Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 10,841 -- Overall: 32.2\%
Size: numVotes $50>100 \bigcirc 150$


Figure 53. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - State Senate Race

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 51: (D) SWANSON Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 11,477 -- Overall: 34.4\%


Figure 54. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - State Representative Race

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 53: (D) MADRID Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 2,344 -- Overall: 50.2\%


Figure 55. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - State Representative Race

COUNTY CLERK: (D) MADRID Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,459 -- Overall: 31.3\%


Figure 56. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - County Clerk Race

For comparison of races that appear manipulated versus races that do not appear to be manipulated, Figures 57 and 58 show two of the four judge retentions which do not display any statistical difference between the types of voting.


Figure 57. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - Judge Retention

## JUDICIAL RETENTION - BRYANT: YES Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 19,427 -- Overall: 78\%


Figure 58. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - Judge Retention

The election outcomes in Figures 57 and 58 do not show ballot stuffing in the absentee counting group.

In summary, the large marginal difference of 20 to $30 \%$ between mail-in voting and early inperson voting in most but not all races, is strong evidence that ballot stuffing occurred in the absentee ballots in Otero County for deliberately chosen races. From Section 5, the paper record matches fairly closely with the official results, indicating that the ballot stuffing shown in the pcontrol charts was achieved by submitting fraudulently cast ballots. The full statistical analysis for all Otero County races by voting location can be found in Appendix H.

### 6.4 OTERO COUNTY: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS BY PRECINCT

There are 59 precincts in Otero County recorded for each ballot in the CVR data. Subgroups of 200 ballots38 were created for each combination of Precinct x Counting Group (or type of vote) using the sequential order as recorded in the CVR data. Then the proportion of votes favoring a candidate was calculated for each subgroup. The subgroups were plotted by precinct and colored by counting group. Precincts are ordered from largest to smallest. Dots on the right side will have more variation, since they are from the smallest precincts.

These kind of plots are sometimes known as Interaction Plots because they show if there are different or similar patterns between the levels of two factors. For example, if the proportion of votes for a Candidate in the early mail-in counting group depends on which precinct the ballot was from, then there is an interaction. The following plots show a stunning similarity in the spread of the vote percentage (about 20 to 30\%) favoring Democrat candidates between the early in-person (absentee) group and the other two groups similarly across almost all precincts.

Just as with the voting location analysis, the statistical evidence from the precinct analysis is consistent with ballot stuffing in the mail-in absentee group favoring Democrats and occurs similarly across all precincts, except for six of them. Four of the five judge retention contests showed no evidence of ballot stuffing in most precincts in the absentee counting group.

Figure 59 shows the percentage for Biden in the presidential race for each group in each precinct. The precincts are ordered from largest to smallest.

[^27]PRESIDENT: (D) BIDEN Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
59 Precincts Total Votes: 23,174 Overall Ave: $36 \%$
Absentee Ave: 59\% EarlyInPers Ave: 28\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Figure 59. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - Presidential Race
The distance along each line between the dots represents the marginal difference in percentage points of votes between the counting groups (or vote types). Almost all the precincts have a consistent, 20 to 30 -point difference between the in-person and absentee results. There are six precincts (boxed in red) where the difference is 10 points or less, indicating nothing can be concluded about ballot stuffing in those precincts.

All the partisan races, one judge retention, and the bonds and amendments ballot measures showed similar patterns as the presidential race. Figures 60 through 65 shows the percentage for the Democrat candidate in the other federal races, one state senate race, and three state representative races.


Figure 60. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - US Senate Race


Figure 61. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - US Representative Race

STATE SENATOR DIST 33: (D) LANG-BROWNE Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
25 Precincts Total Votes: 10,841 Overall Ave: $32 \%$
Absentee Ave: $54 \% \quad$ EarlyInPers Ave: $25 \% \quad$ ElectionDay Ave: $27 \%$
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Figure 62. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - State Senate Race

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 51: (D) SWANSON Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
25 Precincts Total Votes: 11,477 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 58\% EarlylnPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
Size: numVotes - 5 - 50 - 100 200


Figure 63. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - State Representative Race

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 53: (D) MADRID Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
10 Precincts Total Votes: 2,344 Overall Ave: 50\%
Absentee Ave: 63\% EarlyInPers Ave: 44\% ElectionDay Ave: 49\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Figure 64. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - State Representative Race

## COUNTY CLERK: (D) MADRID Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,459 Overall Ave: 31\%
Absentee Ave: 50\% EarlyInPers Ave: 24\% ElectionDay Ave: 29\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
Size: numVotes - 5 - 50 - 100 200


Figure 65. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - County Clerk Race

For comparison of the previous races showing evidence of ballot stuffing across most precincts versus races that do not, see Figures 66 and 67 which show two of the four judge retention contests. There is no spread of 20-30\% marginal difference between mail-in absentee and other groups across most precincts.


Figure 66. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - Judge Retention


Figure 67. Statistical Evaluation of Precincts by Vote Type - Judge Retention

In summary, large marginal differences exist between mail-in voting and in-person voting of about 20 to $30 \%$ across practically all the precincts in many but not all races. This is evidence consistent with ballot stuffing or digital manipulation in the absentee ballots in Otero County. The full statistical analysis by precinct can be found in Appendix H.

### 6.5 SANDOVAL COUNTY: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS BY VOTING LOCATION

There were 40 vote centers in Sandoval County recorded in the CVR data. Like Otero County, the votes are categorized into Counting Group, or type of vote (Absentee, Early In-Person, Election Day In-Person). Votes cast at each polling location were placed in subgroups of 200 ballots $^{39}$ in the order they were recorded in the CVR. The average proportion of votes for a Candidate was calculated for each group and the statistical control limits were calculated. The sequential order of the CVR data was in the correct order of vote type: absentee, then early in-person, and finally election day.

Two statistical p-control charts were created for each contest:

1. Vote percentage for Democrat (or "Yes" or "For" votes for judge retentions or other ballot measures) along with an average for each vote type with statistical control limits.
2. Vote percentage for Republican (or "No" or "Against" votes for judge retentions or other ballot measures) along with an average for each vote type with statistical control limits.

The statistical evidence shown on the p-control charts is consistent with ballot stuffing AND digital manipulation in the absentee group in all except three judge retention contests and three bond questions.

Figure 68 shows the percentage for Biden in each subgroup by location for Sandoval County.

[^28]PRESIDENT: (DEM) BIDEN Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 200 Total Votes: 76,142
Overall Ave: 53\% Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 40\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 48\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


Figure 68. Statistical Evaluation of Polling Location by Vote Type - Presidential Race

Like Otero County, there is a 30-point marginal difference between the average percentage of votes cast for the Democrat candidates between the absentee and in-person voting groups in the partisan races, consistent with ballot stuffing.

Unlike Otero County, an unusually high preference for Biden at $80 \%$ was observed in ballots at the beginning of the CVR record which decreased steadily until the end of the absentee ballot record at $60 \%$. The other two groups favored Biden at $40 \%$ and $48 \%$.

It is simply impossible to have both types of irregularities occur simultaneously, meaning a shift AND a trend, in random mail-in ballots, therefore, this statistical evidence is consistent with both mail-in ballot stuffing AND Digital manipulation.

For ballots to occur naturally in this order, practically all Biden voters would have to mail back their ballots first. Then gradually and consistently there would be fewer Biden voters mailing back their ballots and more Trump voters until the end of the absentee voting period when there would have been the fewest Biden voters and the most Trump voters. This scenario is impossible as people do not coordinate and behave this way.

The clear trend was also not achieved through any kind of presorting of ballots by precinct or ballot type (ballot types approximate precincts since precincts that share races are grouped together into ballot types). The ballot types for Sandoval County are recorded in the CVR data. Figure 69 shows the ballot types in the order they are placed in the CVR.


Figure 69. Ballot Types on Absentee Ballots from CVR in Sandoval County

In the above figure, the ballot types are clearly not ordered and are arriving randomly from the entire county throughout the mail-in absentee portion of the CVR data.

Therefore, barring any kind of presorting by elections staff according to the votes on the ballots which would be illegal, the ballots must have been digitally manipulated or controlled to be placed in this order, perhaps via programming or other access and manipulation of the election system.

To further illustrate the irregularity of the order of the votes in the CVR data, Figure 70 shows the cumulative Biden votes divided by the cumulative Trump votes ("cumulative odds ratio") across the mail-in absentee records in Sandoval County.


TabulatorBatch_ID in Recorded Order
Figure 70. Cumulative Odds Ratio for Sandoval County Presidential Race

As explained in Section 6.2.2, the absentee portion of the election should be random, resulting in the cumulative odds ratio converging relatively quickly on the expected average ${ }^{40}$ and remain there. However, almost all the races in Sandoval County show a constantly changing odds ratio throughout the mail-in absentee records. Appendix I contains the full statistical analysis for all the races in Sandoval County.

Figure 71 shows one of the races which did not have this irregularity.

JUDICIAL RETENTION - SMITH: Cumulative Odds Ratio of Votes: YES -to- NO
1173 Tabulator-Batches had mostly 25 Records each -- Total Votes: 24,582 Final Ratio: 2.58
Sandoval Co NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
TabulatorID 3217 - 395 - 394


TabulatorBatch_ID in Recorded Order
Figure 71. Cumulative Odds Ratio for Sandoval County Judge Retention

[^29]From the above figure, the cumulative odds ratio for the judge retention race quickly converges to the average value and does not vary from that average through the end of the record.

### 6.6 SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The statistical analysis in this chapter provides circumstantial evidence that elections in two New Mexico counties are being manipulated. The analysis for Otero County showed statistical evidence consistent with ballot stuffing in the absentee counting group in most, but not all races. This irregularity added approximately 30 percent in the absentee ballots for Democrat candidates, and "yes" or "for" votes for almost all the other ballot measures. Only four races in Otero County had no statistical evidence consistent with ballot stuffing and these were judge retention contests. It is possible that ballot stuffing occurred through the casting of fraudulent absentee ballots since the paper record matches fairly well with the official election results.

Using the percentage of ballot stuffing that was calculated in the absentee counting group, Table 4 shows estimated projections of the outcome of the races in Otero County if this ballot stuffing was removed from the official totals. From the table, the only race that was likely awarded to the wrong candidate after removing the ballot stuffing was the State Representative District 53 race between Willie Madrid and Rick Little.

The analysis for Sandoval County produced statistical evidence of ballot stuffing in the absentee counting group which added about 30 percent in the absentee ballots to the democrat candidates, and "yes" or "for" votes to most of the other ballot measures. The analysis for Sandoval County also showed evidence consistent with digital manipulation in the CVR data to front-load ballots heavily favored for a particular candidate or choice.

Only six races in Sandoval County had no statistical evidence of ballot stuffing or digital manipulation. It is unknown whether the paper record in Sandoval County will match the official election outcome since it has not yet been examined. However, it is not expected that the absentee ballots will match the official outcome because of the digital manipulation that is apparent in the CVR record. Table 5 shows the estimated projections of the outcomes of the races in Sandoval County as if there were no ballot stuffing manipulation.

While digital manipulation is not apparent in Otero County, the Otero County Officials must understand that Otero County uses the same electronic election system that has been shown repeatedly to manipulate the digital CVR data in physically impossible ways across the country and elsewhere within New Mexico. New Mexicans cannot continue to be forced to cast their ballots on machines capable of manipulating elections.

Table 4. Otero County: Estimated Projections of Election Outcomes Removing Absentee Ballot Stuffing

|  |  | Official Results |  |  |  | Approximate \% Of Absentee Ballots Stuffed | Number of <br> Absentee Ballots Stuffed | Projected Results after Removing Ballot Stuffing |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Absentee | Early | Election Day | Total |  |  | Absentee | Early | Election Day | Total |
| Us President | Biden | 3,490 | 3,587 | 1,408 | 8,485 | 30\% | 1,047 | 2,443 | 3,587 | 1,408 | 7,438 |
|  | Trump | 2,291 | 9,169 | 3,061 | 14,521 | - | - | 2,291 | 9,169 | 3,061 | 14,521 |
| Us Senate | Lujan | 3,259 | 3,342 | 1,386 | 7,987 | 27\% | 880 | 2,379 | 3,342 | 1,386 | 7,107 |
|  | Ronchetti | 2,455 | 9,190 | 2,982 | 14,627 | - | - | 2,455 | 9,190 | 2,982 | 14,627 |
| Us Rep | Small | 3,537 | 3,849 | 1,628 | 9,014 | 28\% | 990 | 2,547 | 3,849 | 1,628 | 8,024 |
|  | Herrell | 2,272 | 8,837 | 2,861 | 13,970 | - | - | 2,272 | 8,837 | 2,861 | 13,970 |
| State Senate Dist. 33 | LangBrowne | 1,465 | 1,614 | 480 | 3,559 | 29\% | 425 | 1,040 | 1,614 | 480 | 3,134 |
|  | Burt | 1,276 | 4,834 | 1,316 | 7,426 | - | - | 1,276 | 4,834 | 1,316 | 7,426 |
| State Senate <br> Dist. 34 | Kugler | 1,533 | 1,465 | 642 | 3,640 | 27\% | 414 | 1,119 | 1,465 | 642 | 3,226 |
|  | Griggs | 1,428 | 4,604 | 1,718 | 7,750 | - | - | 1,428 | 4,604 | 1,718 | 7,750 |
| State Rep. Dist. 51 | Swanson | 1,777 | 1,793 | 487 | 4,057 | 30\% | 533 | 1,244 | 1,793 | 487 | 3,524 |
|  | Black | 1,281 | 5,217 | 1,134 | 7,632 | - | - | 1,281 | 5,217 | 1,134 | 7,632 |
| State Rep. Dist. 53 | Madrid* | 403 | 447 | 362 | 1,212 | 17\% | 69 | 334 | 447 | 362 | 1,143 |
|  | Little | 244 | 578 | 374 | 1,196 | - | - | 244 | 578 | 374 | 1,196 |
| State <br> Rep.Dist. 56 | Childress | 746 | 959 | 490 | 2,195 | 22\% | 164 | 582 | 959 | 490 | 2,031 |
|  | Cook | 632 | 2,469 | 850 | 3,951 | - | - | 632 | 2,469 | 850 | 3,951 |
| Supreme Court P1 | Bacon | 3,368 | 3,647 | 1,531 | 8,546 | 28\% | 943 | 2,425 | 3,647 | 1,531 | 7,603 |
|  | Fuller | 2,347 | 9,006 | 2,888 | 14,241 | - | - | 2,347 | 9,006 | 2,888 | 14,241 |
| Supreme <br> Court P2 | Thomson | 3,294 | 3,434 | 1,430 | 8,158 | 28\% | 922 | 2,372 | 3,434 | 1,430 | 7,236 |
|  | Morris | 2,426 | 9,177 | 2,984 | 14,587 | - | - | 2,426 | 9,177 | 2,984 | 14,587 |
| Court Of <br> Appeals P1 | Ives | 3,218 | 3,317 | 1,352 | 7,887 | 27\% | 869 | 2,349 | 3,317 | 1,352 | 7,018 |
|  | Johnson | 2,485 | 9,270 | 3,052 | 14,807 | - | - | 2,485 | 9,270 | 3,052 | 14,807 |
| Court Of <br> Appeals P2 | Henderson | 3,109 | 3,227 | 1,261 | 7,597 | 27\% | 839 | 2,270 | 3,227 | 1,261 | 6,758 |
|  | Lee | 2,255 | 8,447 | 2,638 | 13,340 | - | - | 2,255 | 8,447 | 2,638 | 13,340 |
| Court Of <br> Appeals P3 | Yohalem | 3,197 | 3,311 | 1,354 | 7,862 | 27\% | 863 | 2,334 | 3,311 | 1,354 | 6,999 |
|  | Montoya | 2,497 | 9,223 | 3,025 | 14,745 | - | - | 2,497 | 9,223 | 3,025 | 14,745 |
|  | Madrid | 2,875 | 3,042 | 1,290 | 7,207 | 22\% | 633 | 2,243 | 3,042 | 1,290 | 6,575 |
| County Clerk | Holmes | 2,896 | 9,591 | 3,131 | 15,618 | - | - | 2,896 | 9,591 | 3,131 | 15,618 |
| County <br> Treasurer | Melton | 2,994 | 3,140 | 1,311 | 7,445 | 25\% | 749 | 2,246 | 3,140 | 1,311 | 6,697 |
|  | Whiteside | 2,711 | 9,414 | 3,067 | 15,192 | - | - | 2,711 | 9,414 | 3,067 | 15,192 |
|  | Cummins | 1,272 | 1,396 | 376 | 3,044 | 28\% | 356 | 916 | 1,396 | 376 | 2,688 |


| County Commissioner | Marquardt | 1,126 | 4,007 | 1,299 | 6,432 | - | - | 1,126 | 4,007 | 1,299 | 6,432 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Judicial | Yes | 4,005 | 7,771 | 2,736 | 14,512 | 8\% | 320 | 3,685 | 7,771 | 2,736 | 14,192 |
| Medina | No | 1,029 | 3,310 | 1,005 | 5,344 | - | - | 1,029 | 3,310 | 1,005 | 5,344 |
| Judicial <br> Retention | Yes | 3,838 | 8,873 | 2,934 | 15,645 | - | - | 3,838 | 8,873 | 2,934 | 15,645 |
| Blankenship | No | 1,194 | 2,305 | 839 | 4,338 | - | - | 1,194 | 2,305 | 839 | 4,338 |
| Judicial Retention | Yes | 3,942 | 8,539 | 2,765 | 15,246 | - | - | 3,942 | 8,539 | 2,765 | 15,246 |
| Counts | No | 1,158 | 2,706 | 1,024 | 4,888 | - | - | 1,158 | 2,706 | 1,024 | 4,888 |
| Judicial | Yes | 3,879 | 8,619 | 2,898 | 15,396 | - | - | 3,879 | 8,619 | 2,898 | 15,396 |
| Bryant | No | 1,092 | 2,413 | 842 | 4,347 | - | - | 1,092 | 2,413 | 842 | 4,347 |
| Judicial <br> Retention | Yes | 4,017 | 8,622 | 2,923 | 15,562 | - | - | 4,017 | 8,622 | 2,923 | 15,562 |
| Schneider | No | 1,021 | 2,507 | 844 | 4,372 | - | - | 1,021 | 2,507 | 844 | 4,372 |
| Constitutional Amendment | For | 3,165 | 4,878 | 2,074 | 10,117 | 15\% | 475 | 2,690 | 4,878 | 2,074 | 9,642 |
|  | Against | 2,124 | 6,961 | 1,995 | 11,080 | - | - | 2,124 | 6,961 | 1,995 | 11,080 |
| Constitutional <br> Amendment | For | 3,486 | 5,942 | 2,342 | 11,770 | 12\% | 418 | 3,068 | 5,942 | 2,342 | 11,352 |
|  | Against | 1,701 | 5,649 | 1,614 | 8,964 | - | - | 1,701 | 5,649 | 1,614 | 8,964 |
| Bond | For | 3,603 | 6,555 | 2,577 | 12,735 | 8\% | 288 | 3,315 | 6,555 | 2,577 | 12,447 |
| Question A | Against | 1,760 | 5,294 | 1,488 | 8,542 | - | - | 1,760 | 5,294 | 1,488 | 8,542 |
|  | For | 3,449 | 6,163 | 2,487 | 12,099 | 10\% | 345 | 3,104 | 6,163 | 2,487 | 11,754 |
| Question B | Against | 1,901 | 5,687 | 1,568 | 9,156 | - | - | 1,901 | 5,687 | 1,568 | 9,156 |
|  | For | 3,347 | 6,030 | 2,483 | 11,860 | 5\% | 167 | 3,180 | 6,030 | 2,483 | 11,693 |
| Question C | Against | 2,044 | 5,863 | 1,590 | 9,497 | - | - | 2,044 | 5,863 | 1,590 | 9,497 |

*Official Results have 1,213 as total for Willie Madrid, but votes only add up to 1,212. Also, this race was likely given to the wrong candidate.

Table 5. Sandoval County: Estimated Projections of Election Outcomes Removing Absentee Ballot Stuffing

|  |  | Official Results |  |  |  | Approximate \% Of Absentee Ballots Stuffed | Number of Absentee Ballots Stuffed | Projected Results after Removing Ballot Stuffing |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Absentee | Early | Election Day | Total |  |  | Absentee | Early | Election Day | Total |
| Us President*** | Biden | 20,888 | 15,028 | 4,672 | 40,588 | 30\% | 6,266 | 14,622 | 15,028 | 4,672 | 34,322 |
|  | Trump | 8,011 | 21,458 | 4,705 | 34,174 | - | - | 8,011 | 21,458 | 4,705 | 34,174 |
| Us Senate*** | Lujan | 19,488 | 13,922 | 4,372 | 37,782 | 28\% | 5,457 | 14,031 | 13,922 | 4,372 | 32,325 |
|  | Ronchetti | 9,391 | 22,346 | 4,929 | 36,666 | - | - | 9,391 | 22,346 | 4,929 | 36,666 |
| Us Rep*** | Haaland | 3,728 | 2,871 | 559 | 7,158 | 23\% | 857 |  | 2,871 | 559 | 3,430 |
|  | Holmes | 1,546 | 3,379 | 785 | 5,710 |  |  |  | 3,379 | 785 | 4,164 |
| Us Rep*** | Fernandez | 16,413 | 11,827 | 4,178 | 32,418 | 30\% | 4,924 | 11,489 | 11,827 | 4,178 | 27,494 |
|  | Johnson | 7,438 | 18,432 | 3,876 | 29,746 | - | - | 7,438 | 18,432 | 3,876 | 29,746 |
| State Senate <br> Dist. 9*** | Mckenna | 8,365 | 6,119 | 1,002 | 15,486 | 28\% | 2,342 | 6,023 | 6,119 | 1,002 | 13,144 |
|  | Clark | 3,616 | 8,243 | 1,405 | 13,264 | - | - | 3,616 | 8,243 | 1,405 | 13,264 |
| State Senate. <br> Dist 10 | Duhigg | 938 | 577 | 159 | 1,674 | 35\% | 328 | 610 | 577 | 159 | 1,346 |
|  | Gould | 483 | 1,193 | 259 | 1,935 | - | - | 483 | 1,193 | 259 | 1,935 |
| State Senate. <br> Dist 19 | Risner | 170 | 50 | 60 | 280 | 26\% | 44 | 126 | 50 | 60 | 236 |
|  | Schmedes | 85 | 71 | 205 | 361 | - | - | 85 | 71 | 205 | 361 |
| State Senate. <br> Dist 22 | Shendo | 3,098 | 2,386 | 2,594 | 8,078 | 24\% | 744 | 2,354 | 2,386 | 2,594 | 7,334 |
|  | Aguayo | 1,051 | 2,457 | 1,174 | 4,682 | - |  | 1,051 | 2,457 | 1,174 | 4,682 |
| State Rep. Dist.$22$ | Valasquez | 1,721 | 1,156 | 211 | 3,088 | 26\% | 447 | 1,274 | 1,156 | 211 | 2,641 |
|  | Lord | 554 | 1,077 | 405 | 2,036 |  |  | 554 | 1,077 | 405 | 2,036 |
| State Rep. Dist.$23^{* * *}$ | Ely | 2,163 | 1,597 | 139 | 3,899 | 25\% | 541 | 1,622 | 1,597 | 139 | 3,358 |
|  | Mcmath | 903 | 1,909 | 300 | 3,112 |  |  | 903 | 1,909 | 300 | 3,112 |
| State Rep.Dist.$43^{* * *}$ | Chandler | 612 | 316 | 357 | 1,285 | 30\% | 184 | 428 | 316 | 357 | 1,101 |
|  | Hampton | 177 | 357 | 467 | 1,001 | - | - | 177 | 357 | 467 | 1,001 |
| State Rep.Dist.$44$ | Tripp | 4,894 | 3,633 | 434 | 8,961 | 27\% | 1,321 | 3,573 | 3,633 | 434 | 7,640 |
|  | Culbert | 2,932 | 6,708 | 820 | 10,460 | - |  | 2,932 | 6,708 | 820 | 10,460 |
| State Rep.Dist.$57$ | Helean | 3,826 | 3,064 | 646 | 7,536 | 30\% | 1,148 | 2,678 | 3,064 | 646 | 6,388 |
|  | Harper | 1,930 | 5,314 | 976 | 8,220 | - |  | 1,930 | 5,314 | 976 | 8,220 |
| State Rep.Dist. 65 | Lente | 2,150 | 2,035 | 2,441 | 6,626 | 13\% | 280 | 1,871 | 2,035 | 2,441 | 6,347 |
|  | Salazar | 340 | 725 | 612 | 1,677 |  |  | 340 | 725 | 612 | 1,677 |
| Supreme CourtP1*** | Bacon | 20,278 | 14,910 | 4,854 | 40,042 | 30\% | 6,083 | 14,195 | 14,910 | 4,854 | 33,959 |
|  | Fuller | 8,512 | 21,351 | 4,424 | 34,287 | - | - | 8,512 | 21,351 | 4,424 | 34,287 |
| Supreme Court$\mathbf{P 2}^{* * *}$ | Thompson | 19,772 | 14,390 | 4,637 | 38,799 | 29\% | 5,734 | 14,038 | 14,390 | 4,637 | 33,065 |
|  | Morris | 8,951 | 21,827 | 4,612 | 35,390 | - | - | 8,951 | 21,827 | 4,612 | 35,390 |


| Court Of Appeals P1*** | Ives | 19,218 | 13,932 | 4,407 | 37,557 | 28\% | 5,381 | 13,837 | 13,932 | 4,407 | 32,176 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Johnson | 9,393 | 22,200 | 4,823 | 36,416 | - | - | 9,393 | 22,200 | 4,823 | 36,416 |
| Court Of <br> Appeals P2*** | Henderson | 18,761 | 13,421 | 4,218 | 36,400 | 28\% | 5,253 | 13,508 | 13,421 | 4,218 | 31,147 |
|  | Lee | 8,237 | 20,032 | 3,949 | 32,218 | - | - | 8,237 | 20,032 | 3,949 | 32,218 |
| Court Of Appeals P3*** | Yohalem | 19,148 | 13,833 | 4,304 | 37,285 | 30\% | 5,744 | 13,404 | 13,833 | 4,304 | 31,541 |
|  | Montoya | 9,359 | 22,127 | 4,876 | 36,362 | - | - | 9,359 | 22,127 | 4,876 | 36,362 |
| Prc Dist 1 | Hall | 1,208 | 1,007 | 69 | 2,284 | 26\% | 314 | 894 | 1,007 | 69 | 1,970 |
|  | Jones | 428 | 1,100 | 169 | 1,697 | - | - | 428 | 1,100 | 169 | 1,697 |
| Prc Dist 3 | Maestes | 17,242 | 13,509 | 2,591 | 33,342 | 27\% | 4,655 | 12,587 | 13,509 | 2,591 | 28,687 |
|  | Luchini | 5,968 | 14,544 | 2,606 | 23,118 | - | - | 5,968 | 14,544 | 2,606 | 23,118 |
| Public <br> Education <br> Comm. Dist. 4 | Burt | 19,707 | 15,413 | 4,269 | 39,389 | 26\% | 5,124 | 14,583 | 15,413 | 4,269 | 34,265 |
|  | Burrows | 6,647 | 15,860 | 3,456 | 25,963 |  |  | 6,647 | 15,860 | 3,456 | 25,963 |
| Dist Attorney <br> 13th Dist.*** | Romo* | 19,455 | 14,318 | 4,525 | 38,298 | 28\% | 5,447 | 14,008 | 14,318 | 4,525 | 32,851 |
|  | Jimenez** | 9,015 | 21,524 | 4,597 | 35,136 |  |  | 9,015 | 21,524 | 4,597 | 35,136 |
| County Clerk*** | Romero | 19,428 | 14,050 | 4,401 | 37,879 | 29\% | 5,634 | 13,794 | 14,050 | 4,401 | 32,245 |
|  | Griego | 9,145 | 21,899 | 4,771 | 35,815 | - | - | 9,145 | 21,899 | 4,771 | 35,815 |
| County <br> Treasurer*** | Talor | 19,819 | 14,715 | 4,750 | 39,284 | 29\% | 5,748 | 14,071 | 14,715 | 4,750 | 33,536 |
|  | Ward | 8,692 | 21,139 | 4,384 | 34,215 | - | - | 8,692 | 21,139 | 4,384 | 34,215 |
| County Commissioner Dist 2 | Baczkiewicz | 4,503 | 3,190 | 382 | 8,075 | 27\% | 1,216 | 3,287 | 3,190 | 382 | 6,859 |
|  | Block | 2,381 | 5,220 | 839 | 8,440 | - | - | 2,381 | 5,220 | 839 | 8,440 |
| County Commissioner Dist 4 | Piland | 3,296 | 2,251 | 550 | 6,097 | 32\% | 1,055 | 2,241 | 2,251 | 550 | 5,042 |
|  | Heil | 1,728 | 4,336 | 865 | 6,929 |  |  | 1,728 | 4,336 | 865 | 6,929 |
| Judicial Retention Medina | Yes | 20,307 | 19,208 | 5,590 | 45,105 | 18\% | 3,655 | 16,652 | 19,208 | 5,590 | 41,450 |
|  | No | 5,244 | 11,570 | 2,537 | 19,351 | - | - | 5,244 | 11,570 | 2,537 | 19,351 |
| Judicial Retention Lawrence | Yes | 18,970 | 19,902 | 5,600 | 44,472 | - | - | 18,970 | 19,902 | 5,600 | 44,472 |
|  | No | 6,490 | 10,751 | 2,501 | 19,742 | - | - | 6,490 | 10,751 | 2,501 | 19,742 |
| Judicial Retention Eichwald | Yes | 20,004 | 19,851 | 5,618 | 45,473 | - | - | 20,004 | 19,851 | 5,618 | 45,473 |
|  | No | 5,681 | 11,071 | 2,564 | 19,316 | - | - | 5,681 | 11,071 | 2,564 | 19,316 |
| Judicial <br> Retention Smith | Yes | 17,912 | 19,564 | 5,276 | 42,752 | - | - | 17,912 | 19,564 | 5,276 | 42,752 |
|  | No | 6,970 | 10,130 | 2,397 | 19,497 | - | - | 6,970 | 10,130 | 2,397 | 19,497 |
| Judicial Retention Mercer | Yes | 19,582 | 18,781 | 5,198 | 43,561 | - | - | 19,582 | 18,781 | 5,198 | 43,561 |
|  | No | 5,299 | 10,733 | 2,416 | 18,448 | - | - | 5,299 | 10,733 | 2,416 | 18,448 |
| Judicial Retention Johnston | Yes | 18,222 | 19,567 | 5,308 | 43,097 |  |  | 18,222 | 19,567 | 5,308 | 43,097 |
|  | No | 6,608 | 10,090 | 2,326 | 19,024 |  |  | 6,608 | 10,090 | 2,326 | 19,024 |
| Constitutional Amendment 1 | For | 17,394 | 15,607 | 4,826 | 37,827 | 17\% | 2,957 | 14,437 | 15,607 | 4,826 | 34,870 |
|  | Against | 9,561 | 17,435 | 3,410 | 30,406 | - | - | 9,561 | 17,435 | 3,410 | 30,406 |
|  | For | 19,223 | 19,272 | 5,358 | 43,853 | 12\% | 2,307 | 16,916 | 19,272 | 5,358 | 41,546 |


| Constitutional Amendment 2 | Against | 7,317 | 13,180 | 2,756 | 23,253 | - | - | 7,317 | 13,180 | 2,756 | 23,253 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bond Question A | For | 19,678 | 20,390 | 5,806 | 45,874 | 12\% | 2,361 | 17,317 | 20,390 | 5,806 | 43,513 |
|  | Against | 7,853 | 13,114 | 2,522 | 23,489 | - | - | 7,853 | 13,114 | 2,522 | 23,489 |
| Bond Question B | For | 19,126 | 19,272 | 5,755 | 44,153 | 10\% | 1,913 | 17,213 | 19,272 | 5,755 | 42,240 |
|  | Against | 8,396 | 14,181 | 2,569 | 25,146 | - | - | 8,396 | 14,181 | 2,569 | 25,146 |
| Bond QuestionC | For | 18,398 | 18,564 | 5,618 | 42,580 | 10\% | 1,840 | 16,558 | 18,564 | 5,618 | 40,740 |
|  | Against | 9,153 | 14,960 | 2,739 | 26,852 | - | - | 9,153 | 14,960 | 2,739 | 26,852 |
| Library Bond | For | 18,795 | 19,096 | 5,493 | 43,384 | - | - | 18,795 | 19,096 | 5,493 | 43,384 |
|  | Against | 8,971 | 14,730 | 2,925 | 26,626 | - | - | 8,971 | 14,730 | 2,925 | 26,626 |

*Official Results have 38,293 votes for Romo, but votes add up to 38,298.
**Official Results have 35,1363 votes for Jimenez, but votes add up to 35,136.
***After removal of projected ballot stuffing, race flips to other candidate or comes within recount range

## 7 CANVASS

In order to verify the accuracy of the Otero County voter rolls and November 2020 voting history records, Otero County citizens volunteered to canvass residences as part of the audit approved by the Otero County Commission. The canvass was performed from the first week of February through the first week of April, 2022.

### 7.1 DATA

The voter registration database changes daily as people are added and removed from the rolls, and as voters update their information. To properly evaluate the data, it is necessary to have the voter rolls as they were immediately before and after the election, as well as the most recent copy for canvassing. As such, the auditors requested several snapshots of the voter rolls for Otero County, but discovered that the Otero County Clerk does not make a regular backup of the rolls and the only the most recent version is maintained. It is highly recommended that the County Clerk's office make regular backup copies of the voter rolls every month, and before and after each election.

The Secretary of State blocked the auditors from receiving the most up-to-date voter registration database for Otero County claiming that verifying voter rolls for accuracy is not an approved use. The idea that the Otero County Commission is not eligible to have an updated copy of their rolls to verify their accuracy is in opposition to their lawful duty to certify elections that are based in part on those rolls. Therefore, the canvass data was compiled from the voter registration database that was already in the possession of tge auditors and was current as of July 2021.

The number of total votes recorded as having been cast in the July 2021 copy of the voter rolls was 200 less than the total number of votes on the official canvass. These could be due to voters having moved away to other jurisdictions and being removed from the rolls since the election, or it could be due to manipulation in the digital record.

There was a variance of 318 ballots between the precincts where voters are registered and the precincts where the records say ballots were cast (see Figure 72).


Precinct

Figure 72. Variance Between County's Vote Count and Voter Roll Vote Count
From Figure 72, precincts showing negative numbers mean that the voter rolls now are missing that number of votes in the voter history. Precincts showing positive numbers indicate that the voter rolls are now showing too many votes as having been cast in that precinct. It is unknown whether the variance is due to voters moving from one precinct to another, whether there has been manipulation in the in the digital record, or both.

The voter rolls in every county in New Mexico showed significant manipulation for several months following the election (see Section 2). Approximately 1,000 Otero voters, and 50,000 voters statewide show a "registration date" after the 2020 election, but their voter history shows they cast a ballot in 2020. Determining whether the right number of voters in each precinct was recorded would only be possible if a copy of the voter rolls had been preserved immediately following each election.

### 7.2 METHODOLOGY FOR CANVASSING

Canvassing is going door-to-door and speaking to residents to verify that the people listed on the rolls for each address are currently living at the address and that the method of voting was recorded correctly. All canvassing volunteers were trained before participating in the canvass and were issued a standardized script of questions. Canvassers typically canvassed in teams of two. Canvassers did not engage in political discussion or negative interactions.

Each team of canvassers was given a packet that contained forms for 20 to 40 addresses at a time. The forms contained the names of the registered voters at each address, their birth year, whether they voted in the on the November 2020 election, and how they cast their ballot - early in-person, absentee, or on election day. Canvassers never asked respondents which candidate they voted for. Typically approximately half of the residents contacted were available to speak when the canvassers knocked on their door.

The canvassers asked a standard list of questions at each door where the respondent agreed to participate in the canvassing survey:

1. Which registered voter am I speaking with?
2. Were you living in this location in November 2020?
3. Were these other registered voters living here in November 2020?
4. Did you vote in November 2020?
5. If yes, did you vote early, absentee, or in-person on election day?
6. Do you know how other members of this household cast their ballot or are they available to speak?

The canvassers made note on the forms of any discrepancy between the respondent's answers and the information that was listed on the rolls. Recognizing that it had been over a year since the election inquired about, the canvassers would alert the respondent of the discrepancy to make sure they were not possibly mistaken in their answer when the rolls disagreed with the respondent's answer. If the respondents were unsure about their answers, then their responses were not included in the canvass results.

### 7.3 METHODOLOGY FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND PRECINCT SELECTION

Otero County has 59 precincts, but the canvass was limited to the precincts where volunteers were available to work. Precinct selection was not based on any targeting criteria from the data itself. Canvass data was collected in Precints $8,9,10,15,17,19,20,26,27,31,32,35,36,37,39$, $48,49,53$ and 54, which cover the communites of Alamogordo, Boles Acres, Cloudcroft, High Rolls, and La Luz. The residences within the precincts canvassed were randomly selected.

Table 6 lists the precincts canvassed, the total number of residences in each precinct, the number of residences contacted, and the number of residences that participated in the survey. Approximately half of the doors knocked had someone home and available to answer the survey.

Table 6. Otero County Precincts Canvassed

| Precint | Community | Number of <br> Residences | Number of Residences <br> Contacted | Number of Residences that <br> Participated in Survey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | Cloudcroft | 654 | 158 | 71 |
| 9 | High Rolls | 417 | 104 | 61 |
| 10 | La Luz | 317 | 66 | 28 |
| 15 | Alamogordo | 706 | 113 | 57 |
| 17 | Alamogordo | 279 | 279 | 212 |
| 19 | Alamogordo | 232 | 53 | 24 |
| 20 | Alamogordo | 236 | 139 | 56 |
| 26 | Alamogordo | 394 | 348 | 181 |
| 27 | Alamogordo | 352 | 300 | 148 |
| 31 | Alamogordo | 285 | 184 | 73 |
| 32 | Alamogordo | 347 | 28 | 18 |
| 35 | Boles Acres | 633 | 221 | 115 |
| 36 | Alamogordo | 541 | 535 | 244 |
| 37 | Alamogordo | 293 | 293 | 143 |
| 39 | Alamogordo | 363 | 176 | 70 |
| 48 | Alamogordo | 479 | 225 | 117 |
| 49 | Alamogordo | 647 | 613 | 320 |
| 53 | La Luz | 330 | 121 | 62 |
| 54 | La Luz | 376 | 20 | 7 |
| TOTAL |  | 7,881 | 3,993 | 2,007 |

After canvassing was complete, a voter distribution comparison was completed to ensure that the voter sample was properly distributed to legitimately make inferences about the whole county using the data. The sample distribution was determined to be acceptable (see Appendix F). The entire voter roll has 34,287 registered voters and canvassers were able to complete the survey at 2,007 residences which covered a sample size of 3,682 registrations. The margin of error for the county is plus or minus $1.28 \%$ with a $90 \%$ confidence level.

### 7.4 FINDINGS

Canvassed registrations were placed into five categories:

1. Registrations with no issues: names, addresses, and 2020 voter history were correct.
2. Dropped Votes: respondent said they voted in 2020 but their voter history has no vote recorded, or their entire registration entry is gone from the rolls.
3. Incorrectly Recorded Votes: respondent said they voted a certain way, but their voter history has their vote recorded under a different method.
4. Ghost Votes: respondent said they did not vote but a vote was recorded under their name, or a vote was recorded at an address under the name of a person who did not live there.
5. Registrant does not live at the address and should be removed from the rolls. This category is subdivided into registrants who need to be removed and voted in 2020 and registrants who need to be removed and did not vote in 2020.

Figure 73 shows the distribution of these five catgories in the entire county-wide sample.


Figure 73. Canvass Results Overall

There was some variation in the distribution of the problem categories among the precincts. For example, Cloudcroft had a much higher than expected number of ghost votes than the rest of the county, with $17 \%$ of the registrations surveyed having ghost votes and $14 \%$ having incorrectly recorded votes. A high number of addresses in Cloudcroft were also found not to exist.

## 7.5 "NOT AT ADDRESS" CATEGORY

The large percentage of registrations in the "Not at Address and Need to be Removed" category is concerning because they indicate that the rolls are very out of date, are being artificially inflated, or both. The "Not at Address" category includes deceased voters, voters who have moved, incomplete or non-existent addresses, vacant houses, vacant lots, and businesses which are not residences.

New Mexico pays a private organization called the Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC) to help detect people who have moved to other jurisdictions and remove them from the rolls. It appears that this service is not working as advertised as an average of $30 \%$ of the rolls are registrants who no longer live at the address they were registered.

Recognizing that it had been 15 months since the election when the canvass began, it would be expected that some people would have moved away in the intervening months and may not updated their registration to their new address. According to the U.S. Census Bureau a total of $8.4 \%$ of people moved in $2021,{ }^{41}$ so a conservative estimate of people who may have moved in the 15 months since the election and 6 months since the registration data snapshot was taken might be $10 \%$. However, the actual average was $30 \%$, or three times higher than expected. It is likely that some of those in the "Not at Address and Need to be Removed" category who also voted were not legitimate votes, but it is impossible to confirm how many since the residents are no longer at these addresses. Table 7 shows the distribution of the these out of date registrations by party.

Table 7. Distribution of Registrations Not at Addresses

|  | Voted | Did Not Vote |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Democrat | $20 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Republican | $55 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| DTS | $22 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Other | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

## 7.6 "DROPPED VOTES" AND "INCORRECTLY RECORDED VOTES" CATEGORY

The "Dropped Votes" and "Incorrectly Recorded Votes" categories account for 7\% of the registration database. These categories are very concerning because it means the digital voter

[^30]history record does not reflect what the respondents reported. It is unknown whether the discrepancies were introduced in the ePollbook system, in the voter rolls themselves, or during the transfer of voter check-in data from the ePollbooks to the voter rolls after the election.

The distribution of dropped votes by type of vote is shown in Table 8, and the distribution of dropped votes by party is shown in Table 9. Forty percent of the "Dropped Votes" category were people whose information had been completely dropped from the rolls along with their voter history. These cases were often a husband and wife, where both respondents said that they cast a vote in 2020, but only one spouse remained on the rolls with their voter history and the spouse and been wholly dropped off the rolls.

Table 8. Distribution of Dropped Votes by Vote Type

| Voted Absentee | Voted Early | Voted Election Day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $37 \%$ |

Table 9.Distribution of Dropped Votes by Party

| Republican | Democrat | DTS | Libertarian | INM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $49 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

From the tables, the dropped votes by type of vote skew toward votes that were cast on election day. The dropped votes come from the Republican and Democrat parties in approximately the same percentages as people are registered. However, dropped votes skews away from the decline to state (DTS) category (which makes up 24\% of the total county's registration) and toward the INM party which only makes up $1 \%$ of the total county's registration.

Most of the "Incorrectly Recorded Votes" respondents reported that they voted on election day, but their votes were recorded as Early or Absentee votes. Since the occurrence of incorrectly recorded votes skews very strongly in one direction, it is unlikely that this discrepancy can be explained away by bad memory on the part of the respondents which would be expected to be randomly distributed. Table 10 shows the distribution of incorrectly recorded votes by type and party.

Table 10. Distribution of Incorrectly Recorded Votes by Type and Party

|  | Voted A, <br> SOS Claimed E | Voted E, <br> SOS claimed A | Voted E, <br> SOS claimed P | Voted P, <br> SOS claimed A | Voted P, <br> SOS claimed E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Republican | 9 | 9 | 8 | 22 | 68 |
| Democrat | 0 | 6 | 3 | 15 | 17 |
| DTS | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 17 |
| Libertarian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ |

## 7.7 "GHOST VOTES" CATEGORY

The "Ghost Votes" category accounts for 4\% of the registration database. This category indicates that the election system is being subverted both in the digital record and with physical ballots. Table 11 shows the distribution of ghost votes by type of vote and Table 12 shows the distribution of ghost votes by party.

Table 11. Distribution of Ghost Votes by Type of Vote

| Absentee | Early | Election Day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $22 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $23 \%$ |

Table 12. Distribution of Ghost Votes by Party

| Rep | Dem | DTS | LIB | INM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $49 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |

Table 11 shows that most of the ghost votes were cast in-person. The fact that there are ghost votes in the in-person voting categories of early and election day voting is alarming. We expected to see ghost votes cast as absentee ballots since it has long been known that it is easy to subvert elections through absentee voting and absentee voting was extremely anomalous in every county in New Mexico compared to the historical record.

However, the canvass in Otero County shows that it is possible to subvert elections using inperson voting. New Mexico has no voter ID laws, so anyone can walk into a polling place, claim
they are a voter and cast a ballot without proving who they are with an ID. Voter rolls are easy to obtain, and County Clerks and the SOS make ePollbook data widely available during the early voting period. If someone wanted to subvert an election and they knew which people were registered but rarely vote, and they had access to the data showing who had shown up and who had not, it would be straightforward to cast a vote on behalf of another person without raising any alarms.

### 7.8 SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND IMPACTED VOTES

Table 13 shows the high, low, and best estimates of the total number of registrations likely affected by the various issues uncovered by the canvass on a countywide basis.

Table 13. Summary of Impacted Votes from Issues Discovered During the Canvass

|  | Registrations <br> No Issues | Dropped <br> Votes | Ghost <br> Votes | Not at <br> Incorrectly <br> Recorded | Not at Address <br> \& Voted to be <br> Removed | Not at <br> (Possible <br> Ghosts) | Address <br> \& Didn't <br> Vote |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low <br> Estimate | 19,960 | 781 | 1,474 | 1,582 | 9,946 | 3,757 | 6,188 |
| Best <br> Estimate | 20,218 | 791 | 1,493 | 1,602 | 10,075 | 3,855 | 6,268 |
| High <br> Estimate | 20,476 | 801 | 1,512 | 1,622 | 10,204 | 3,947 | 6,348 |

From the table, the best estimate for the number of illegitimately cast votes is 1,493 . There are another 3,806 votes that are unknowns because the registrants are no longer living at their address where they are registered. The best estimate for the number of outdated registrations is 10,075. In total it is estimated that 791 votes were dropped, and the method of voting for 1,602 voters was incorrectly recorded.

### 7.9 SPECIFIC ISSUES DISCOVERED

Several respondents who participated in the canvass survey reported that they were not registered to vote and were surprised they were on the voter registration list. One man was a German citizen living in Alamogordo. He knew he was not eligible to vote and had never registered himself. Another lives only part-time in New Mexico, but is registered to vote in Texas.

Another respondent reported that she had received half a dozen absentee ballot applications to her home, but she tore them all up. She went to the poll on election day and was told that she had already cast an absentee ballot, but was told to fill out a provisional ballot. With all the digital manipulation seen in the voter history record, it is not certain that her vote counted.

Vacation RV parks and AirBnB rentals were discovered to have people voting from them with registration dates far back as 2011 who were not the owners. We found homeowners who had built their homes and could confirm there were people registered to their address who had never lived there. An apparent family of four cast votes from an address that neighbors confirmed had not had a house on it since the 1990s - this family had registration dates in 2020 and 2021.

Cloudcroft had an excessive number of ghost votes, and registrations to addresses that did not exist or to businesses where the registrant was unknown to the business owner. It was alarming how many of the most problematic registrations and votes had registration dates in the few months before the election where the rolls show the most manipulation happening.

Figure 74 is the Google street image of 617 New York Avenue. There has not been a house on this lot for many years, yet someone has voted from this location for the last three elections.


Figure 74. Google Street View of 617 New York Avenue

A person with a registration date from 2007 was registered to an address in Precinct 36. The residents at that address said the gentleman was a next-of-kin who had passed away in the 1990s and had never even lived in New Mexico let alone in their house.

A trailer park in Alamogordo had 88 people registered to it. After the canvassing team had made contact with all the residents they could, the trailer park owner kindly offered to help the canvassers determine the validity of the remaining registrations. This small sample of 88 homes allowed the canvassing team to get more complete data than is typically possible when no information can be obtained about prior residents. The park owner reported that 12 of the people (14\%) had never lived in the park, but 3 had cast ballots - most of these had registration dates in 2020 or 2021. Another 14 registrants (16\%) had moved away before the election, but 6 of them cast ballots in the 2020 election. Two registrants show as having registered to the park address after they had moved away. Forty-five of the registrants (50\%) had registration dates in 2020 or 2021 which could indicate an extremely high turnover rate for this park, a large amount of manipualtion in the database for this address, or some combination of the two. This small case
study is more evidence that manipulation is happening in the rolls. The auditors do not believe that these registrants are individually committing these crimes. It is more likely that people's names and addresses are artificially injected into the rolls.

During the 2020 Primary, hundreds of Republican voters went to the polls on election day and were told that they could not vote because they were not registered as Republicans. This happened again in the 2022 Primary. Many of these had been life-long Republicans. These testimonies support evidence from the Otero County canvass indicating that people are being registered and records are being changed without the registrants' knowledge.

### 7.10 CLARIFICATION ON RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS

The canvass revealed that approximately 10,075 registrations are outdated and should be removed. It is clear that New Mexico's participation in ERIC has not been sufficient to keep the rolls in Otero County clean and up to date.

A false interpretation of the law regarding residency has been encouraged by the New Mexico SOS, equipment vendors, the Otero County Clerk, and other county clerks. During the 2021 local election Dona Ana County allowed election training to be conducted by the ePollbook vendor, ROBIS. During the training, election workers were encouraged to allow people to vote who were not living at the addresses where they were registered. The training protocols even urged people to vote if they moved away years ago and could only remember part of their old address. Dona Ana County Clerk, Amanda Askin, espoused the same position to an election judge who questioned the practice. Askin said, "Every legal voter should be allowed to vote on a standard ballot even if they moved and never updated their registration." The Otero County Clerk, Robyn Holmes, has made similar statements several times in public meetings.

Clerks and vendors who refuse to acknowledge what the law states about residency are encouraging voters to commit crimes. Voters must agree to or sign a statement that their place of residence is their registration address when they request an absentee ballot or check in at a polling place. With the existing of Same Day Registration, there is absolutely no reason for clerks not to follow the law and require voters' registration to be up to date when they cast a ballot.

Clerks do not have to turn any voter away since voters can always update their address before voting if they realize it is wrong.

State statute NMSA 1-4-28 states: "the secretary of state, county clerks and boards of registration [appointed by the County Commission], in compliance with the Federal National Voter Registration Act of 1993, shall remove from the official list of eligible voters the names of voters who are ineligible to vote due to change of residence... The secretary of state shall conduct a general program that identifies voters who may no longer reside at their address of registration. This program shall use information supplied by the United States postal service national change of address service. This program may also include, among other practices, identification of voters whose official election-related mail is returned and periodic mailings to verify continued residency at their address of registration..." (emphasis added).

The law is written that the SOS, county clerks, and registration boards are to take an active role in ensuring that the people listed on the voter rolls live at the addresses where they are registered.

NMSA 1-1-7 defines what constitutes residency and it is a narrow definition with few, defined exceptions. "The place of residence is governed by the following rules:
A. The residence of a person is that place in which his habitation is fixed, and to which, whenever he is absent, he has the intention to return;
B. The place where a person's family resides is presumed to be his place of residence, but a person who takes up or continues his abode with the intention of remaining at a place other than where his family resides is a resident where he abides;
C. A change of residence is made only by the act of removal joined with the intent to remain in another place. There can be only one residence;
D. A person does not gain or lose residence solely by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States or of this state, or while a student at an institution of learning, or while kept in an institution at public expense, or while confined in a public prison or while residing upon an Indian or military reservation;
E. No member of the armed forces of the United States, his spouse or his dependent is a resident of this state solely by reason of being stationed in this state;
F. A person does not lose his residence if he leaves his home and goes to another country, state or place within this state for temporary purposes only and with the intention of returning;
G. A person does not gain a residence in a place to which he comes for temporary purposes only;
H. A person loses his residence in this state if he votes in another state in an election requiring residence in that state, and has not upon his return regained his residence in this state under the provisions of the constitution of New Mexico;
I. "Residence" is computed by not including the day on which the person's residence commences and by including the day of the election;
J. A person does not acquire or lose residence by marriage only"

Federal law applies to all elections where a federal candidate is on the ballot and further clarification on residency can be found in 52 US Code Section 10307(c), "Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or illegal voting, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for registration to vote or for voting shall be fined not more than $\$ 10,000$ or imprisoned not more than five years, or both" (emphasis added).

The document Federal Prosecution of Election Offences further clarifies that 10307(c) makes it unlawful, in an election in which a federal candidate is on the ballot, to knowingly and willfully: (1) give false information as to name, address, or period of residence for the purpose of establishing one's eligibility to register or vote; (2) pay, offer to pay, or accept payment for registering to vote or for voting; or (3) conspire with another person to vote illegally. Violations are punishable by imprisonment for up to five years" (emphasis added).

In summary, "residency" has a narrow, legal meaning when it applies to voting eligibility. It applies to the time of registration and residency must be maintained to continue to vote in a particular jurisdiction. The current policy of the Secretary of State, the ePollbook vendor, and misinformed county clerks to allow anyone to vote in New Mexico as long as they lived in New Mexico once upon a time and can barely remember their old address is illegal.

It should also be noted that when convenient, the same people who argue that out-of-date rolls cannot be cleaned, or even canvassed, and that it is alright to vote from an old address will wield the letter of the law when it comes to attacking their political enemies based on questions about residency. ${ }^{42}$
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## 8 CONCLUSIONS

The County Commission has a duty to satisfy itself that the elections they certify are properly conducted. New Mexico statutes give citizens the right to examine their own election records. However, the opposition and smearing endured by the Otero County Commission, audit team, and volunteers for simply investigating whether their election system is trustworthy was like something out of a third world dictatorship. The Commissioners and audit team were criticized, slandered, and intimidated for simply pursuing their duty and right to review public records. Much of this opposition and smearing was perpetuated by the SOS, her staff, other state officials, and certain members of the local and national media.

State and local election officials say that the election results go through multiple checks and audits and that the results are trustworthy. New Mexicans are told the electronic equipment is secure and accurate. If that is the case, then these officials have no reason to harass an elected body who is double checking those assertions. The over-the-top smear campaign over this audit did nothing but erode public confidence in these officials and the elections they run.

The reality uncovered by this audit is the SOS has not even fulfilled the most basic function of properly certifying the election system. The SOS has been caught multiple times providing enhanced access and sensitive election data to her partisan friends while she demonizes regular citizens for taking it on themselves to determine if their voter rolls are accurate. Election records were illegally destroyed in Otero County and all over the state with the knowledge of the SOS.

Dona Ana County and Otero County both had massive issues with their chain of custody of absentee ballots. Dona Ana County cannot account for where almost $30 \%$ of their absentee ballots came from, and Otero County cannot account for the source of $15 \%$ of their absentee ballots. There is evidence of absentee ballot stuffing in every county in the state. In-depth statistical analysis of Otero and Sandoval Counties show that absentee ballots were stuffed to swing the results of absentee voting as much as $30 \%$ in many races. Additionally, Sandoval County has evidence of digital manipulation within the Dominion Election Management System. If digital manipulation is happening in Sandoval County, then it can happen in any county. The
statistical evidence combined with the chain of custody issues suggests a partnership between election workers in a position of trust, the people or organization who are stuffing the ballots, and the election software itself. Internet connected ePollbooks, liberal sharing of data about who has voted and who has not, and drop boxes are seriously undermining the integrity of New Mexico elections.

The election system has serious vulnerabilities in equipment design, equipment certification, programming, registration database, ballot preparation, logic and accuracy testing, early voting, early counting, election day counting, election night reporting, internet connected pollbooks, and election auditing.

Evidence that these vulnerabilities are being subverted to swing elections in New Mexico is plentiful. The state's voter registration database is clearly being manipulated regularly. It shares the same platform as election management and election night reporting systems, meaning all three systems are likely compromised. Ballots discovered with a mixture of handmade and printed ballots, ballots scanned twice, indifferent attention to certification, ballots printed improperly without any real accounting, secrecy about programming and hardware installed in the machines, ineffective logic and accuracy testing, absentee ballot stuffing, fraudulent votes cast in person, impossible behavior in vote counts and election night reporting, digital manipulation of the voter history, failed risk limiting audits, and deletion of election records are all possible because of the vulnerabilities in the election system.

The election system has not been properly certified since 2017 because of gross negligence on the part of the EAC and the testing labs. The ePollbook systems used in New Mexico are not even certifiable because the software is regularly updated. The Dominion Voting System cannot be legally certified in any case because it does not meet state law requirements for accuracy as confirmed by this audit and the official Risk Limiting Audits performed by the SOS.

The door-to-door canvass of the registration database confirms that the rolls are astonishingly out of date, meaning New Mexico's participation in ERIC is, at best, useless. The canvass also confirms voter fraud and digital manipulation of the rolls is happening. The SOS's assertion that the election system she oversees is secure and accurate is absolutely false.

## 9 RECOMMENDATIONS

New Mexico's election statutes have been made more permissive and less secure over many decades, likely on purpose. The SOS regularly lobbies to centralize her power, remove local control, open access to already compromised systems, push voters toward absentee voting, and remove any meaningful checks that ensure only legal voters are casting ballots. The SOS opposes common sense voter ID laws, even though they are desired by a strong majority of New Mexicans.

The problems in the election system are not going to be fixed overnight, but there are several things the County Commission can fix immediately:

1. Pass an ordinance prohibiting drop boxes from being used in Otero County.
2. Direct the Otero County Clerk to enforce the laws regarding residency. If she continues to defy the law, the Commission should request a law enforcement investigation or withhold funding.
3. State statutes give the Otero County Clerk leeway to actively clean the rolls. Otero County must implement an ongoing program to canvass and remove voters who have moved from the rolls.
4. Direct the County Clerk to make monthly backups of the voter rolls and immediately before and after each election. If she refuses to implement such a program, the County Commission can submit monthly IPRAs to the clerk and maintain a historical record of the rolls themselves. Ongoing analysis of the rolls is recommended to do in-depth checks for artificial manipulation. Sources of registrations, original registration dates, and last-change dates must be analyzed together.
5. The County Commission has the authority to do away with voting convenience centers and mobile voting. Require voters to vote within their precincts, or at designated voting locations combining small, adjacent precincts. Prohibit the use of the uncertified, internet-connected ePollbooks.
6. Require the County Clerk to purchased secure, sequentially numbered ballots as the law requires as a condition of approving the election budget line items. The uncertified ballot on demand system cannot be used.
7. Cease Otero County's monetary contribution and participation in ERIC.
8. Prohibit ink cartridges from being installed in Dominion ICE tabulators, except for requested use of the ATI by voters.

Fully correcting the election system will require the cooperation of the County Clerk, SOS, and possibly the legislature to implement. However, the County Commission has a strong voice since they must certify elections in their county and approve budgets and salaries for the aspects of elections paid for by Otero County. The following recommendations must be pursued by the Otero County Commission either through issuance of writs of mandamus against the SOS or initiation of lawsuits for her failure to protect elections and provide a certified election system:
9. Add a field in the voter registration database for registrants in the military. The potential that any given out-of-date registrant is in the military is often used to ignore residency laws. Designating who is military and who is not will assist greatly in cleaning the rolls.
10. Disconnect Otero County's voter rolls from the compromised, centralized voter registration database. Require the MVD to provide paper records of new registrations to Otero County for manual entry.
11. County needs to demand the SOS disclose who has third party access to the voter rolls and other systems. She must monitor and make public the IP addresses of computers that access the rolls.
12. Hand count paper ballots at the precinct level. Small, adjacent precincts can be combined, but voters must have a designated place to vote and only paper poll books must be used.
13. Otero County must cease publishing regular lists of who has requested a ballot or voted during early voting. This practice makes undermining New Mexico's elections easy.

## APPENDIX A

## Ballots Added and Subtracted After Election Day

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| = = BERNALILLO, NEW MEXICO - = = |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | 608 | 541 | $\begin{array}{r} 281,546 \\ +281,546 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 281,546 \\ +281,546 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100,304 \\ +100,304 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 100,304 \\ +100,304 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 175,238 \\ +175,238 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 175,238 \\ +175,238 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,765 \\ +3,765 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,765 \\ +3,765 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 608 | 606 | $\begin{array}{r} 315,332 \\ +33,786 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 315,332 \\ +33,786 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 115,674 \\ +15,370 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 115,674 \\ +15,370 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 192,042 \\ & +16,804 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 192,042 \\ +16,804 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,779 \\ +1,014 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,779 \\ +1,014 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 14 / 2020 \\ & 10: 41: 46 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 608 | 607 | $\begin{array}{r} 315,380 \\ +48 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 315,380 \\ +48 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 115,682 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 115,682 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 192,081 \\ +39 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 192,081 \\ +39 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 4,779 | 0 | 4,779 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 16 / 2020 \\ & 10: 44: 33 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 608 | 608 | $\begin{aligned} & 317,589 \\ & +2,209 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 317,589 \\ & +2,209 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 116,135 \\ +453 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 116,135 \\ +453 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 193,756 \\ +1,675 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 193,756 \\ +1,675 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,829 \\ +50 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,829 \\ +50 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 24 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:08:21 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 608 | 608 | 317,590 +1 | 0 | 317,590 +1 | 116,135 | 0 | 116,135 | 0 | 0 | 193,757 +1 | 0 | 193,757 +1 | 0 | 0 | 4,829 | 0 | 4,829 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Bernalillo

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- CATRON, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 4 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 1,229 \\ +1,229 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,229 \\ +1,229 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 929 \\ +929 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 929 \\ +929 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r\|} 289 \\ +289 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 289 \\ +289 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ +6 \end{array}$ | 0 | 6 +6 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 8 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2,284 \\ +1,055 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,284 \\ +1,055 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 1,672 \\ +743 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,672 \\ +743 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 580 \\ +291 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 580 \\ +291 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ +10 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ +10 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 9 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,322 \\ +38 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,322 \\ +38 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,697 \\ +25 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,697 \\ +25 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 592 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 592 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ +1 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 17 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:01:07 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 9 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,325 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,325 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{r} 1,698 \\ +1 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,698 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 594 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 594 +2 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/18/2020 } \\ & \text { 12:18:14 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 9 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,326 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,326 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 1,698 | 0 | 1,698 | 0 | 0 | 595 +1 | 0 | 595 +1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Catron


| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- CHAVES, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 63 | 59 | $\begin{array}{r} 21,983 \\ +21,983 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 21,983 \\ +21,983 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,344 \\ +15,344 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,344 \\ +15,344 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,239 \\ +6,239 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,239 \\ +6,239 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 264 \\ +264 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 264 \\ +264 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 63 | 60 | $\begin{array}{r} 22,423 \\ \hline+440 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 22,423 \\ +440 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,641 \\ +297 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,641 \\ +297 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,376 \\ +137 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,376 \\ +137 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 268 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 268 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 63 | 61 | $\begin{array}{r} 22,431 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 22,431 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,646 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,646 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,379 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,379 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:01:07 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 63 | 61 | $\begin{array}{r} 22,443 \\ +12 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 22,443 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,656 \\ +10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 15,656 \\ & +10 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 6,381 \\ & +2 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 6,381 +2 | 0 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 0 |

[^32]
## 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING

==- CIBOLA, NEW MEXICO -==

| ==- CIBOLA, NEW MEXICO == |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 2 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,159 \\ +1,159 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,159 \\ +1,159 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 759 \\ +759 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 759 \\ +759 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 374 \\ +374 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 374 \\ +374 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 16 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,791 \\ +7,632 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,791 \\ +7,632 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 3,946 \\ +3,187 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,946 \\ +3,187 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,668 \\ +4,294 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,668 \\ +4,294 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 97 \\ +81 \end{array}$ | 0 | 97 +81 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,839 \\ +48 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,839 \\ +48 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,962 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,962 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,696 \\ +28 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,696 \\ +28 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 98 \\ +1 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 98 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/10/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,891 \\ +52 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,891 \\ +52 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 3,970 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,970 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,738 \\ +42 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,738 \\ +42 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 99 +1 | 0 | 99 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & 9: 59: 01 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,903 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,903 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,975 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,975 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,745 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,745 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=cibola

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- COLFAX, NEW MEXICO .== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ecincts | All $\mathrm{V}_{\text {otes }}$ |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Tot | Reporting | Total | Absentee | Non- Absentee | Total | Absentee | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non- } \\ \text { Absentee } \end{gathered}$ | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non- } \\ \text { Absentee } \end{gathered}$ | Early | Election | Total | Absentee | Non- | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 10 | 6 | ${ }_{4}^{4.044}$ | 0 | ${ }_{4}^{4.044}$ | 1,942 | $\bigcirc$ | +1.942 | - | 0 | ${ }_{\substack{2.024 \\+2.024}}$ | - | ${ }_{\substack{2.024 \\+2.224}}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | - $\begin{array}{r}50 \\ +50\end{array}$ | - | + $\begin{array}{r}50 \\ +50\end{array}$ | $\bigcirc$ | - |
|  | 10 | 9 | (0.016 | - | +0,016 | ( ${ }_{\substack{3.271 \\+1320}}$ | $\bigcirc$ | ( | - | - | ${ }_{\substack{2.611 \\+587}}$ | 。 | +i.6071 | - | - | - $\begin{gathered}87 \\ +37\end{gathered}$ | 。 | 87 +37 | - | - |

[^33]
## 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING

==- CURRY, NEW MEXICO $==$

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 37 | 35 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 14,812 \\ +14,812 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,812 \\ +14,812 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,303 \\ +10,303 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,303 \\ +10,303 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 4,179 \\ +4,179 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,179 \\ +4,179 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 226 \\ +226 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 226 \\ +226 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 37 | 36 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,834 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,834 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,315 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,315 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,188 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,188 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 227 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 227 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:01:07 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 37 | 36 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,077 \\ +243 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,077 \\ +243 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 10,428 \\ +113 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,428 \\ +113 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,300 \\ +112 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,300 \\ +112 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 244 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 244 \\ +17 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 37 | 36 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,101 \\ +24 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,101 \\ +24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,444 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,444 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\left.\begin{array}{\|r\|} 4,307 \\ +7 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,307 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 245 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 245 +1 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Curry

2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- DEBACA, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 3 | $\begin{array}{r} 899 \\ +899 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 899 \\ +899 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 654 \\ +654 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 654 \\ +654 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 231 \\ +231 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 231 \\ +231 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ +11 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 11 +11 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/10/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 3 | $\begin{array}{r} 901 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 901 +2 | $\begin{array}{r} 656 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 656 +2 | 0 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=DeBaca

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| = = DONA ANA, NEW MEXICO $==$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,465 \\ +2,465 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,465 \\ +2,465 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 655 \\ +655 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 655 \\ +655 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,755 \\ +1,755 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,755 \\ +1,755 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 33 \\ +33 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r}33 \\ +33 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 170 | $\begin{array}{r} 81,509 \\ +79,044 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 81,509 \\ +79,044 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 32,484 \\ +31,829 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,484 \\ +31,829 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,202 \\ +45,447 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,202 \\ +45,447 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,098 \\ +1,065 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,098 \\ +1,065 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 170 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 82,556 \\ +1,047 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,556 \\ +1,047 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32,760 \\ +276 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,760 \\ +276 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,919 \\ +717 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,919 \\ +717 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,129 \\ +31 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,129 \\ +31 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 170 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,618 \\ +62 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,618 \\ +62 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 32,789 \\ +29 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,789 \\ +29 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,949 \\ +30 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,949 \\ +30 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 12 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:51:08 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 170 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,638 \\ +20 \end{array}$ | 0 | 82,638 +20 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 32,799 \\ +10 \end{array}$ | 0 | 32,799 +10 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,957 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | 47,957 +8 | 0 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/13/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:37:03 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 170 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,640 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 82,640 +2 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,800 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 32,800 +1 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 47,958 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 47,958 +1 | 0 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 21 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:17:33 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 170 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,642 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 82,642 +2 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,802 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,802 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 47,958 | 0 | 47,958 | 0 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12/16/2020 } \\ & \text { 4:41:36 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 170 | 170 | 82,641 -1 | 0 | 82,641 <br> -1 | 32,802 | 0 | 32,802 | 0 | 0 | 47,957 <br> -1 | 0 | 47,957 -1 | 0 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Dona\ Ana

2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING ==- EDDY, NEW MEXICO -==

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 55 | 48 | $\begin{array}{r} 19,815 \\ +19,815 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 19,815 \\ +19,815 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,257 \\ +15,257 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,257 \\ +15,257 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,286 \\ +4,286 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,286 \\ +4,286 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 190 \\ +190 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 190 \\ +190 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 55 | 55 | $\begin{aligned} & 23,039 \\ & +3,224 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 23,039 \\ +3,224 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,356 \\ +2,099 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,356 \\ +2,099 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,343 \\ +1,057 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,343 \\ +1,057 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 236 \\ & +46 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 236 \\ & +46 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 6 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 55 | 55 | $\begin{array}{r} 23,222 \\ +183 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 23,222 \\ +183 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,454 \\ +98 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,454 \\ +98 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,424 \\ +81 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,424 \\ +81 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 239 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r}239 \\ +3 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Eddy

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- GRANT, NEW MEXICO $==$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 39 | 38 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,357 \\ +14,357 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,357 \\ +14,357 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,528 \\ +6,528 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,528 \\ +6,528 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 7,538 \\ +7,538 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,538 \\ +7,538 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 158 \\ +158 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 158 \\ +158 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 39 | 38 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,435 \\ +78 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,435 \\ +78 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,553 \\ +25 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,553 \\ +25 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,590 \\ +52 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,590 \\ +52 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 159 +1 | 0 | 159 +1 | 0 | 0 |

[^34]| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- GUADALUPE, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 7 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2,179 \\ +2,179 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,179 \\ +2,179 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 912 \\ +912 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 912 \\ +912 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 1,229 \\ +1,229 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,229 \\ +1,229 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ +21 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ +21 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/13/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:37:03 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,188 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,188 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 916 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 916 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,234 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,234 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/18/2020 } \\ & \text { 12:18:14 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,189 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,189 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 917 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 917 +1 | 0 | 0 | 1,234 | 0 | 1,234 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Guadalupe


| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- HARDING, NEW MEXICO $==$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 3 | $\begin{gathered} 499 \\ +499 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 499 \\ +499 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 316 \\ +316 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 316 \\ +316 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 176 \\ +176 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 176 \\ +176 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | 3 +3 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 3 | $\begin{array}{r} 504 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 504 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 319 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 319 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 178 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 178 +2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 8: 24: 21 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 3 | $\begin{array}{r} 505 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 505 +1 | 319 | 0 | 319 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 179 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 179 +1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Harding

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- HIDALGO, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,819 \\ +1,819 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,819 \\ +1,819 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 987 \\ +987 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 987 \\ +987 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} 801 \\ +801 \end{array}\right\|$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 801 \\ +801 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,948 \\ & +129 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,948 \\ +129 \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 1,105 \\ +118 \end{array}\right\|$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,105 \\ +118 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 812 \\ +11 \end{array}$ | 0 | 812 +11 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/10/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:59:01 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,969 \\ +21 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,969 \\ +21 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,117 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,117 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 821 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | 0 | 821 +9 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 20 / 2020 \\ & 8: 47: 39 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,985 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,985 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,125 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,125 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 829 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | 829 +8 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12/16/2020 } \\ & \text { 4:41:36 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,974 \\ -11 \end{array}$ | 0 | 1,974 .11 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,120 \\ \hline-5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,120 \\ -5 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 823 \\ -6 \end{array}$ | 0 | 823 -6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Hidalgo

## 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING

==- LEA, NEW MEXICO -==

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 49 | 46 | $\begin{array}{r} 19,203 \\ +19,203 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 19,203 \\ +19,203 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 15,190 \\ +15,190 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,190 \\ +15,190 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,729 \\ +3,729 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,729 \\ +3,729 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 183 \\ +183 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 183 \\ +183 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 49 | 49 | $\begin{array}{r} 20,805 \\ +1,602 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 20,805 \\ +1,602 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,475 \\ & +1,285 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 16,475 \\ & +1,285 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,007 \\ +278 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,007 \\ +278 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 212 \\ +29 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 212 \\ +29 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 6 / 2020 \\ & 3: 42: 56 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 49 | 49 | $\begin{array}{r} 20,918 \\ +113 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 20,918 \\ +113 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 16,531 \\ +56 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,531 \\ +56 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,061 \\ +54 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,061 \\ +54 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 214 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 214 +2 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Lea


| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- LINCOLN, NEW MEXICO $==$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 21 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 10,176 \\ +10,176 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,176 \\ + \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,872 \\ +6,872 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,872 \\ +6,872 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{\|} \begin{array}{r} 3,139 \\ +3,139 \end{array} \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,139 \\ +3,139 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 1117 \\ +111 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 111 \\ +111 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 22 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,272 \\ +96 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,272 \\ +96 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,929 \\ +57 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,929 \\ +57 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,175 \\ +36 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,175 \\ +36 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 112 +1 | 0 | 112 +1 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:01:07 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 22 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,306 \\ +34 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,306 \\ +34 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,942 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,942 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,194 \\ +19 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,194 \\ +19 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 113 +1 | 0 | 113 +1 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Lincoln

## (20)

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 21 | 20 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 12,038 \\ +12,038 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 12,038 \\ +12,038 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,230 \\ +4,230 \\ +0 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,230 \\ +4,230 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,363 \\ +7,363 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,363 \\ +7,363 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r\|} 348 \\ +348 \\ + \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 348 \\ +348 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & 9: 01: 07 ~ P M \end{aligned}$ | 21 | 20 | $\begin{array}{r} 12,284 \\ +246 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 12,284 \\ +246 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,274 \\ 4,274 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,274 \\ +44 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,549 \\ +186 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,549 \\ +186 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 360 \\ +12 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 360 \\ +12 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 21 | 20 | $\begin{array}{r} 12,293 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | 0 | 12,293 +9 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,278 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r}4,278 \\ +4 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 7,554 +5 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r}7,554 \\ +5 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Los\ Alamos

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- LUNA, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Election } \\ & \text { Day } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 6 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,220 \\ +3,220 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,220 \\ +3,220 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,369 \\ +1,369 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,369 \\ +1,369 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,800 \\ +1,800 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,800 \\ +1,800 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 16 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,101 \\ +4,881 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,101 \\ +4,881 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 4,406 \\ +3,037 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,406 \\ +3,037 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 3,563 \\ +1,763 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,563 \\ +1,763 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 16 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,103 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,103 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,407 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,407 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,564 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 3,564 +1 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/10/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:59:01 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 16 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,104 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 8,104 +1 | 4,407 | 0 | 4,407 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,565 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,565 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12/16/2020 } \\ & \text { 4:41:36 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,103 \\ \hline-1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 8,103 -1 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,408 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 4,408 +1 | 0 | 0 | 3,563 -2 | 0 | 3,563 -2 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Luna

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- MCKINLEY, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 54 | $\begin{array}{r} 25,926 \\ +25,926 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 25,926 \\ +25,926 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,597 \\ +7,597 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,597 \\ +7,597 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,684 \\ +17,684 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,684 \\ +17,684 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 258 \\ +258 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 258 \\ +258 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & 9: 01: 07 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 54 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,193 \\ +267 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,193 \\ +267 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,717 \\ & +120 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,717 \\ +120 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,826 \\ +142 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,826 \\ +142 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 262 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 262 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/10/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 54 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,339 \\ +146 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,339 \\ +146 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,760 \\ +43 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,760 \\ +43 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,926 \\ +100 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,926 \\ +100 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 264 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 264 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & 9: 59: 01 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 54 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 26,406 \\ +67 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,406 \\ +67 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,782 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,782 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,969 \\ +43 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,969 \\ +43 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 265 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 265 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/20/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:47:39 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 54 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,409 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,409 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,783 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,783 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,971 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,971 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 265 | 0 | 265 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 23 / 2020 \\ & \text { 6:21:26 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 54 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,481 \\ +72 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,481 \\ +72 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,802 \\ +19 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,802 \\ +19 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,023 \\ +52 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,023 \\ +52 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 266 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 266 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12/16/2020 } \\ & \text { 4:41:36 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 54 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,486 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,486 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 7,801 | 0 | 7,801 -1 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,029 \\ +6 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,029 \\ +6 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 266 | 0 | 266 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=McKinley

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- MORA, NEW MEXICO :== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | Non- <br> Absentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 11 | 10 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 2,683 \\ +2,683 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,683 \\ +2,683 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 902 \\ +902 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 902 \\ +902 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,744 \\ +1,744 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,744 \\ +1,744 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 20 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:47:39 AM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 11 | 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,686 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,686 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 903 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 903 +1 | 0 | 0 | 1,745 +1 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,745 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 14 +1 | 0 | 14 +1 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Mora

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- OTERO, NEW MEXICO $==$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 8 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 19,206 \\ +19,206 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 19,206 \\ +19,206 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12,335 \\ +12,335 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 12,335 \\ +12,335 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,438 \\ +6,438 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,438 \\ +6,438 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 298 \\ +298 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 298 \\ +298 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | $\begin{aligned} & 23,123 \\ & +3,917 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 23,123 \\ +3,917 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14,343 \\ +2,008 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,343 \\ +2,008 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,235 \\ +1,797 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,235 \\ +1,797 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 369 \\ +71 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 369 \\ +71 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 23,556 \\ +433 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 23,556 \\ +433 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14,514 \\ +171 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,514 \\ +171 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,477 \\ +242 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,477 \\ +242 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 387 \\ +18 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 387 \\ +18 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 6 / 2020 \\ & 3: 42: 56 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | $\begin{array}{\|r} 23,569 \\ \hline+13 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 23,569 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14,521 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,521 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,483 \\ +6 \end{array}$ | 0 | 8,483 +6 | 0 | 0 | 387 | 0 | 387 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 17 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:49:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | 23,571 +2 | 0 | 23,571 +2 | 14,521 | 0 | 14,521 | 0 | 0 | 8,485 +2 | 0 | 8,485 +2 | 0 | 0 | 387 | 0 | 387 | 0 | 0 |

Source: $\underline{\text { http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\%20Mexico\&county=Otero }}$

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| = = QUAY, NEW MEXICO -= |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | 12 | 10 | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 3,578 \\ +3,578 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,578 \\ +3,578 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,395 \\ +2,395 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,395 \\ +2,395 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,116 \\ +1,116 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,116 \\ +1,116 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 39 \\ +39 \end{array}$ | 0 | 39 +39 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 12 | 11 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,844 \\ & +266 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 3,844 \\ +266 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,613 \\ +218 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,613 \\ +218 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,163 \\ +47 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,163 \\ +47 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ +1 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 40 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 8: 24: 21 \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | 12 | 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,873 \\ +29 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,873 \\ +29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,634 \\ +21 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,634 \\ +21 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,170 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | 1,170 +7 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & +1 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 41 +1 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=QUAY


| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- RIO ARRIBA, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 23 | 20 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,463 \\ +15,463 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,463 \\ +15,463 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,222 \\ +5,222 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,222 \\ +5,222 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,067 \\ +10,067 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,067 \\ +10,067 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 94 \\ +94 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 94 \\ +94 \\ +94 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 23 | 23 | $\begin{array}{r} 21,121 \\ +5,658 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 21,121 \\ +5,658 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,255 \\ +2,033 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,255 \\ +2,033 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,597 \\ +3,530 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,597 \\ +3,530 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 140 \\ +46 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 140 \\ +46 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 6 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:59:44 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 23 | 23 | $\begin{aligned} & 16,511 \\ & -4,610 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,511 \\ -4,610 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,390 \\ & -1,865 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,390 \\ & -1,865 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,896 \\ -2,701 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,896 \\ -2,701 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 116 \\ & -24 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 116 \\ -24 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 15 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:32:09 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 23 | 23 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,628 \\ +117 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,628 \\ +117 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,408 \\ +18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,408 \\ +18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,990 \\ +94 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,990 \\ +94 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 119 +3 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r}119 \\ +3 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Rio\ Arriba

2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING
==- ROOSEVELT, NEW MEXICO -==

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- ROOSEVELT, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 18 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 6,557 \\ +6,557 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,557 \\ +6,557 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,612 \\ +4,612 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 4,612 \\ +4,612 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,774 \\ +1,774 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,774 \\ +1,774 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 137 \\ +137 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 137 \\ +137 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 19 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,600 \\ +43 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,600 \\ +43 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,629 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,629 \\ +17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,799 \\ +25 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,799 \\ +25 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 138 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 138 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & 9: 01: 07 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 19 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,608 \\ +8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,608 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,634 \\ +5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,634 \\ +5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,802 \\ +3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,802 \\ +3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Roosevelt

2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING
==- SANDOVAL, NEW MEXICO $==$

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 139 | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 785 \\ +785 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 785 \\ +785 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ +87 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ +87 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ +87 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ +87 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 174 \\ +174 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 174 \\ +174 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 139 | 139 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 75,490 \\ +74,705 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 75,490 \\ +74,705 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 33,836 \\ +33,749 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 33,836 \\ +33,749 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 39,895 \\ +39,808 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 39,895 \\ +39,808 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,158 \\ +984 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,158 \\ +984 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 139 | 139 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,142 \\ +652 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,142 \\ +652 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34,048 \\ +212 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 34,048 \\ +212 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,307 \\ +412 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,307 \\ +412 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,175 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,175 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & 9: 01: 07 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 139 | 139 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,215 \\ +73 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,215 \\ +73 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 34,063 \\ +15 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 34,063 \\ +15 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,361 \\ +54 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,361 \\ +54 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,179 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 1,179 +4 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/9/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:01:00 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 139 | 139 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,493 \\ +278 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,493 \\ +278 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34,156 \\ +93 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 34,156 \\ +93 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,538 \\ +177 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,538 \\ +177 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,187 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,187 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 139 | 139 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,561 \\ +68 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,561 \\ +68 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34,173 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 34,173 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,588 \\ +50 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 40,588 \\ +50 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 1,187 | 0 | 1,187 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & 9: 59: 01 ~ P M \end{aligned}$ | 139 | 139 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,562 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 76,562 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34,174 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 34,174 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 40,588 | 0 | 40,588 | 0 | 0 | 1,187 | 0 | 1,187 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Sandoval

2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING
==- SAN JUAN, NEW MEXICO -==

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 77 | 53 | $\begin{array}{r} 37,161 \\ +37,161 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 37,161 \\ +37,161 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26,092 \\ +26,092 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 26,092 \\ +26,092 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,194 \\ +10,194 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,194 \\ +10,194 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 581 \\ +581 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 581 \\ +581 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 77 | 75 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,125 \\ +14,964 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,125 \\ +14,964 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32,807 \\ +6,715 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,807 \\ +6,715 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,991 \\ +7,797 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,991 \\ +7,797 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 820 \\ +239 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 820 \\ +239 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 77 | 76 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,180 \\ +55 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,180 \\ +55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32,824 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,824 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,025 \\ +34 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,025 \\ +34 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 822 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 822 +2 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:01:07 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 77 | 76 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,284 \\ +104 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,284 \\ +104 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32,872 \\ +48 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,872 \\ +48 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,076 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,076 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 827 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 827 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & 8: 59: 42 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 77 | 76 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,293 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,293 \\ +9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32,874 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,874 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,081 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,081 \\ +5 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 827 | 0 | 827 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12/16/2020 } \\ & \text { 4:41:36 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 77 | 77 | $\begin{array}{r} 52,294 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 52,294 +1 | 32,874 | 0 | 32,874 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,083 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,083 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 827 | 0 | 827 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=San\ Juan

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| = = SAN MIGUEL, NEW MEXICO $===$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 32 | 2 | $\begin{array}{r} 951 \\ +951 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 951 \\ +951 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 415 \\ +415 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 415 \\ +415 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 509 \\ +509 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 509 \\ +509 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ +14 \end{array}$ | 0 | 14 +14 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 32 | 29 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,447 \\ +10,496 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,447 \\ +10,496 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,406 \\ +2,991 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,406 \\ +2,991 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,822 \\ +7,313 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,822 \\ +7,313 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ +99 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ +99 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 6 / 2020 \\ & 3: 42: 56 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 32 | 30 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,457 \\ +10 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,457 \\ +10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,407 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 3,407 +1 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,830 \\ +8 \end{array}$ | 0 | 7,830 +8 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/7/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:01:07 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 32 | 30 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,504 \\ +47 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,504 \\ +47 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,414 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,414 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,869 \\ +39 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,869 \\ +39 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 114 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 114 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:59:42 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 32 | 30 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,511 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,511 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,417 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,417 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 7,873 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 7,873 +4 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & 9: 59: 01 ~ P M \end{aligned}$ | 32 | 30 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,531 \\ +20 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,531 \\ +20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,421 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,421 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 7,888 \\ +15 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,888 \\ +15 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 115 \\ +1 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 115 +1 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=San\ Miguel

## 务

## 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING

==- SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO -==

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | Election Day |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 154 | 134 | $\begin{array}{r} 71,980 \\ +71,980 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 71,980 \\ +71,980 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14,569 \\ +14,569 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,569 \\ +14,569 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 56,394 \\ +56,394 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 56,394 \\ +56,394 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 568 \\ +568 \\ + \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 568 \\ +568 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 154 | 150 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 80,535 \\ +8,555 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 80,535 \\ & +8,555 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,101 \\ +3,532 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,101 \\ +3,532 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 61,121 \\ +4,727 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 61,121 \\ +4,727 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 736 \\ +168 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 736 \\ +168 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 5 / 2020 \\ & 9: 00: 51 \text { PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 154 | 152 | $\begin{array}{r} 81,213 \\ +678 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 81,213 \\ +678 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,236 \\ +135 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,236 \\ +135 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 61,629 \\ +508 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 61,629 \\ +508 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 753 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 753 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/9/2020 } \\ & 9: 01: 00 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 154 | 152 | $\begin{array}{r} 81,253 \\ +40 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 81,253 \\ +40 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,240 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,240 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 61,662 \\ +33 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 61,662 \\ +33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 754 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 754 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 10 / 2020 \\ & 9: 59: 01 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 154 | 154 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,198 \\ +945 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,198 \\ +945 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,325 \\ +85 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,325 \\ +85 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 62,507 \\ +845 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 62,507 \\ +845 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 758 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 758 +4 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 13 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:37:03 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 154 | 154 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,227 \\ +29 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 82,227 \\ +29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,329 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18,329 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 62,530 \\ +23 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 62,530 \\ +23 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 758 | 0 | 758 | 0 | 0 |

[^35]
## 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING

==- SIERRA, NEW MEXICO $==$

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 785 \\ +785 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 785 \\ +785 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 559 \\ +559 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 559 \\ +559 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 199 \\ +199 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 199 \\ +199 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ +13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 9 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,855 \\ +5,070 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,855 \\ +5,070 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,516 \\ +2,957 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,516 \\ +2,957 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,213 \\ +2,014 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,213 \\ +2,014 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 64 \\ +51 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 64 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,943 \\ +88 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,943 \\ +88 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,541 \\ +25 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,541 \\ +25 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,264 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,264 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & +2 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & +2 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,945 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,945 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,542 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 3,542 +1 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,265 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 2,265 +1 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Sierra

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- SOCORRO, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 27 | 14 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,161 \\ +4,161 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,161 \\ +4,161 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,205 \\ +2,205 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,205 \\ +2,205 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,867 \\ +1,867 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,867 \\ +1,867 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 58 \\ +58 \\ + \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 58 \\ +58 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 27 | 24 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,111 \\ +2,950 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,111 \\ +2,950 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,242 \\ +1,037 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,242 \\ +1,037 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,686 \\ +1,819 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,686 \\ & +1,819 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ +55 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ +55 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 6 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 27 | 27 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,159 \\ +48 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,159 \\ +48 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,255 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,255 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,721 \\ +35 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,721 \\ +35 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/10/2020 } \\ & \text { 9:59:01 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 27 | 27 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,160 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,160 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 3,255 | 0 | 3,255 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,722 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 3,722 +1 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Socorro

2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING
==- TAOS, NEW MEXICO $==$

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 25 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,485 \\ +8,485 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 8,485 \\ +8,485 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,937 \\ +1,937 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,937 \\ +1,937 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,404 \\ +6,404 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 6,404 \\ +6,404 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 57 \\ +57 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 57 \\ +57 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/4/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 33 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,188 \\ +2,703 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,188 \\ +2,703 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,977 \\ +1,040 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,977 \\ +1,040 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,966 \\ +1,562 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,966 \\ +1,562 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 111 \\ +54 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 111 \\ +54 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 49 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,790 \\ +5,602 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,790 \\ +5,602 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,638 \\ +661 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,638 \\ +661 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 12,816 \\ +4,850 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 12,816 \\ +4,850 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & +39 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & +39 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/10/2020 } \\ & 9: 59: 01 ~ P M ~ \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 50 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,012 \\ +222 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,012 \\ +222 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,662 \\ +24 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,662 \\ +24 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,008 \\ +192 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,008 \\ +192 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 151 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 151 +1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/12/2020 } \\ & \text { 8:51:08 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 50 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,035 \\ +23 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,035 \\ +23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,663 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,663 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,030 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,030 \\ +22 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 21 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:17:33 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 50 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,039 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,039 \\ +4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3,664 \\ +1 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,664 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,033 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,033 \\ +3 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 24 / 2020 \\ & 8: 08: 21 \mathrm{AM} \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 50 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,181 \\ +142 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,181 \\ +142 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,715 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,715 \\ +51 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,121 \\ +88 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 13,121 \\ +88 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 152 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 152 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Taos

2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING
==- TORRANCE, NEW MEXICO -==

| ==- TORRANCE, NEW MEXICO -== |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 3 / 2020 \\ & 10: 51: 30 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 14 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,767 \\ +4,767 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,767 \\ +4,767 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,534 \\ +3,534 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,534 \\ +3,534 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\left.\begin{array}{r} 1,130 \\ +1,130 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,130 \\ +1,130 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 65 \\ +65 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 65 \\ +65 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 21 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,210 \\ +2,443 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,210 \\ +2,443 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,732 \\ +1,198 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,732 \\ +1,198 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\left.\begin{gathered} 2,314 \\ +1,184 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,314 \\ +1,184 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 104 \\ & +39 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 104 \\ & +39 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:24:21 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 22 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,247 \\ +37 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,247 \\ +37 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,756 \\ +24 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 4,756 \\ & +24 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,327 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,327 \\ +13 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 6 / 2020 \\ & 3: 42: 56 \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 22 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,281 \\ +34 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,281 \\ +34 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,772 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,772 \\ +16 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,344 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,344 \\ +17 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 105 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 105 +1 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Torrance

| 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ==- UNION, NEW MEXICO $==$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 6 | 4 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 1,309 \\ +1,309 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,309 \\ +1,309 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,004 \\ +1,004 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,004 \\ +1,004 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 292 \\ +292 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 292 \\ +292 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ +7 \\ +7 \end{array}$ | 0 | 7 +7 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & 3: 29: 32 \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 6 | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,780 \\ +471 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,780 \\ +471 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,381 \\ & +377 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,381 \\ & +377 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 381 \\ & +89 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 381 \\ & +89 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ +4 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 11 +4 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/6/2020 } \\ & \text { 3:42:56 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 6 | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 1,789 \\ +9 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 1,789 +9 | 1,388 +7 | 0 | 1,388 +7 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 383 \\ +2 \end{array}$ | 0 | 383 +2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Union

## 2020 ELECTION NIGHT VOTE REPORTING

==- VALENCIA, NEW MEXICO $==$

|  | Precincts |  | All Votes |  |  | Trump |  |  |  |  | Biden |  |  |  |  | Jorgenson |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Total | Reporting | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{gathered} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Absentee | NonAbsentee | Early | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Election } \\ \text { Day } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111/3/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:51:30 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 31 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,019 \\ +16,019 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 16,019 \\ +16,019 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,755 \\ +10,755 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 10,755 \\ +10,755 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,002 \\ +5,002 \\ +5,02 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,002 \\ +5,002 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 182 \\ +182 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 182 \\ +182 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 4 / 2020 \\ & \text { 3:29:32 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 62 | $\begin{array}{r} 31,939 \\ +15,920 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 31,939 \\ +15,920 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,245 \\ +6,490 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,245 \\ +6,490 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,051 \\ +9,049 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,051 \\ +9,049 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 400 \\ +218 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 400 \\ +218 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 12 / 2020 \\ & 8: 51: 08 ~ P M \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 62 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,274 \\ +335 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,274 \\ +335 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,362 \\ +117 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,362 \\ +117 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,262 \\ +211 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14,262 \\ +211 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 406 \\ +6 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 406 \\ +6 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 13 / 2020 \\ & \text { 8:37:03 PM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 62 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,275 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 32,275 +1 | 17,362 | 0 | 17,362 | 0 | 0 | 14,263 +1 | 0 | 14,263 +1 | 0 | 0 | 406 | 0 | 406 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/14/2020 } \\ & \text { 10:41:46 AM } \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 62 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,276 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,276 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,363 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17,363 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 14,263 | 0 | 14,263 | 0 | 0 | 406 | 0 | 406 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11/23/2020 } \\ & \text { 6:21:26 PM } \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 62 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,277 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,277 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,364 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | 0 | 17,364 +1 | 0 | 0 | 14,263 | 0 | 14,263 | 0 | 0 | 406 | 0 | 406 | 0 | 0 |

Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\ Mexico\&county=Valencia

## APPENDIX B

Clerk's Frustration Over Third Party Interference

```
From: ClerkList on behalf of Amanda López Askin
Date: September 10, 2020 1:44:20 PM (-06)
To: Linda Stover
Cc: ClerkList@NMClerks.org
Subject: [ClerkList] FW: CVI - New Mexico Absentee Ballot Application Mailings **In Homes Soon**
Attachments:
```


## Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.
Linda and all,
I had an exchange (see below) and expressed my...concerns. She responded and proceeded as planned. It is very frustrating and at the time Mandy had already voiced her concerns as well. I am at a loss as to how to express to this group how this effects our workload and the confusion it causes for voters.

## W armly, Amanda <br> Amanda López Askin, Ph.D. <br> Doña Ana County Clerk

Doña Ana County Clerk's Office
845 N. M otel Blvd.
Las Cruces, NM 88007
575.647.7421
575.525.6134
amanda@donaanacounty.org


[^36]
## CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Use extra care with attachments, links or when responding to this message. Original Sender: JCarrier@blankrome.com.

[^37]Throughout the country they are dedicated to mailing absentee ballot applications even in places where there is a state/county effort underway as well. This is because they have undertaken randomized controlled trials focused on mailing additional applications after mailings from states and counties and found a very large response to the additional mailings. Overall, they found that these mailings work better than either mailing

CVI tries to be as clear as possible that if people have already signed up to vote by mail they should ignore the CVI letter. But if there is any

From: Amanda López Askin [amanda@donaanacounty.org](mailto:amanda@donaanacounty.org)
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 1:25 PM
To: Carrier, Jennifer < JCarrier@blankrome.com>
Cc: Vigil, Mandy, SOS [Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us](mailto:Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us)
Subject: RE: CVI - New Mexico Absentee Ballot Application Mailings **In Homes Soon**
Jennifer,
I wanted to touch base with you again about your mailings. Certainly Doña Ana County is supportive of all efforts to engage voters, particularly those who may not otherwise participate, in our county.

The challenge we have with your particular mailer is that our county has already made the decision to mail applications to every eligible voter in our county, in excess of 60 K .

Two mailers with applications will undoubtedly confuse individuals who are not as familiar as others, and it may cause hesitation or even suspicion for some. As appreciative as I am of your efforts and overall goals, I would hope you would listen to those on the front-lines, so to speak, of administering elections and with knowledge of our unique communities.

W armly,
Amanda
Amanda López Askin, Ph.D. Doña Ana County Clerk

Doña Ana County Clerk's Office
845 N. M otel Blvd.
Las Cruces, NM 88007
575.647.7421
575.525.6134
amanda@donaanacounty.org


From: Carrier, Jennifer < JCarrier@blankrome.com>
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 10:58 AM
To: Vigil, Mandy, SOS [Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us](mailto:Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us); Lange, Dylan, SOS [Dylan.Lange@state.nm.us](mailto:Dylan.Lange@state.nm.us); Curtas, Alex, SOS
[Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us](mailto:Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us); Varghese, Blezoo, SOS [blezoo.varghese@state.nm.us](mailto:blezoo.varghese@state.nm.us); Romero, Alicia, SOS [Alicia.Romero2@state.nm.us](mailto:Alicia.Romero2@state.nm.us)
Cc: Stover, Linda [lstover@bernco.gov](mailto:lstover@bernco.gov); Amanda López Askin [amanda@donaanacounty.org](mailto:amanda@donaanacounty.org)
Subject: RE: CVI - New Mexico Absentee Ballot Application Mailings **In Homes Soon**
Director Vigil and All -
When I sent the PDF of the draft mailing yesterday, I didn't realize the instruction page was excluded. Attached is the instruction page that will be included in the mailing. I'm sorry for any confusion!

Jen

Jennifer L. Carrier | BLANKROME
1825 Eye Street NW | Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202.420 .3034 | Fax: 202.420.2201 | Email: JCarrier@blankrome.com

[^38]Director Vigil and All --
I am writing to provide details regarding upcoming absentee ballot application mailings in New Mexico from the Center for Voter Information (CVI).

Attached is a sample of the absentee ballot application mailing CVI will be sending to New Mexico registered voters in upcoming mailings. These mailings will be in "waves" with the first wave landing around August 5 and the last wave in mid-September. Below is a count-by-county breakdown.

## Mission: Expand Access to Democracy by Underrepresented Populations

CVI's goal is to bring more people into our democracy. CVI successfully utilizes direct mail and online formats to foster registration and voting by under-represented populations in the American electorate. A special focus is on the Rising American Electorate (RAE), consisting of young people, communities of color, and unmarried women. For more information on the mission and the RAE, please see centerforvoterinformation.org.

*     *         *             *                 *                     * $*$

If you talk to anyone that wants to be removed from the CVI mailing list, their letter has a code near the bottom that they can email to CVI to be automatically removed (unsubscribe@,centerforvoterinformation.org). Or you can take down the codes or names/addresses and send them to me (or call me) for removal. Additionally, you can direct anyone to CVI's toll-free number: 866-377-7396.

I hope you can pass this information along to all of the counties. Let me know if you have any questions or encounter any issues!
Jen

| BERNALILLO | 176,283 |
| :--- | ---: |
| CATRON | 45 |
| CHAVES | 9,183 |
| CIBOLA | 1,899 |
| COLFAX | 1,742 |
| CURRY | 6,740 |
| DE BACA | 145 |
| DONA ANA | 41,009 |
| EDDY | 7,332 |
| GRANT | 4,202 |
| GUADALUPE | 786 |
| HARDING | 33 |
| HIDALGO | 569 |
| LEA | 9,798 |
| LINCOLN | 1,112 |
| LOS ALAMOS | 4,804 |
| LUNA | 4,034 |
| MCKINLEY | 4,272 |
| MORA | 75 |
| OTERO | 7,484 |
| QUAY | 1,325 |
| RIO ARRIBA | 2,226 |
| ROOSEVELT | 2,344 |
| SAN JUAN | 13,227 |
| SAN MIGUEL | 4,858 |
| SANDOVAL | 32,110 |
| SANTA FE | 39,197 |
| SIERRA | 945 |
| SOCORRO | 2,215 |
| TAOS | 2,982 |
| TORRANCE | 832 |
| UNION | 618 |
| VALENCIA | 15,307 |
| $----------------------~$ | 399,733 |
| Total |  |
|  |  |

## APPENDIX C

## Expert Report on Election System Vulnerability

# Some Election System VuInerabilities 

Otero County, NM

July 2022
Jeff Lenberg, Vulnerability Expert

## Introduction

The individual and collective freedoms of the people of this country are dependent on our ability to freely and fairly elect those who will represent and lead us. If we collectively do not agree with the way our leaders are functioning, we are supposed to be able to select different ones. However, if elections can be controlled by any other entity(s), we know with a high level of certainty that our country will fall into the hands of tyrannical rulers. Those who would purposely subvert free and fair elections are not likely to be benevolent dictators but almost certainly tyrannical rulers.

Each county in the country has the responsibility to conduct free and fair elections. All counties should welcome inquiries into their election system and processes. If there is nothing to hide, then nothing of concern will be found during those investigations. If issues are found they should be thoroughly investigated and not summarily dismissed. Again, if the issue is not really a problem that will be revealed by deeper investigation and that in turn will give voters more confidence in the election systems and processes being used. Voter confidence is significantly reduced when investigator issues are summarily dismissed or worse when the investigators come under personal attack for daring to raise concerns.

It is my assessment that our current election system is highly vulnerable to various sorts of attacks. This brief summary report identifies some of those vulnerabilities. There are strong indicators that the 2020 General Election in multiple states was manipulated at various levels by one or more bad actors and thus requires much more detailed investigation if people are to regain trust in our elections.

## Information Gathering

I was asked to assist the 2022 audit in Otero County starting with the development of a process for scanning of all paper ballots \& absentee ballot envelopes. In addition, I was asked to further look into additional county election processes to the extent possible. I was able to observe Logic and Accuracy Testing when performed in preparation for the June 2022 primary election. In addition, I was able to meet with the County Clerk and a key assistant to ask a series of process related questions. Furthermore, for a brief time the key election assistant accessed the Election Management System to look for certain files/functions at my direction.

## Setting the Stage

The bad actor who would subvert our election processes has various desires at different stages in the election process. This section outlines some of those desires so that they can be used as a backdrop to compare the observations that come out of the limited review of the Otero election processes/equipment.

Setting the Stage: Voting Equipment Design

- The desire of a bad actor is to interject into the hardware and software design vulnerabilities that could be subverted either through design or by some other bad actor that gains access after manufacture.

Setting the Stage: Voting Equipment Certification

- The desire of the bad actor is to create a process of equipment certification and associated organizations that appear to be effective while in fact providing security holes to our election processes.
- The desire of the bad actor is to limit and control approved certification entities. Thus giving detailed access to all election hardware/software making it easy for them to subvert it.

Setting the Stage: Election Programming

- The desire of a bad actor is to access the election programming process either by a company insider or by breaking into the programming server for a particular company. For each major equipment vendor there is essentially a single programming package. If this package is subverted it could effect every voting machine from that company in every location across the nation from a single source without the knowledge of the person performing the election programming nor any one else within the election process in any state in the U.S.

Setting the Stage: Registration Database

- The desire of a bad actor is to get as many people registered to vote that appear to be real but are much less likely to vote. The bad actor would want a large number to not be registered to either of the two major parties. This allows their voter record to be altered to make the voter turnout to appear to match results in the favor of either major party.

Setting the Stage: Ballot Preparation

- The desire of the bad actor is to have blank ballots that have no chain of custody. They can make, fill, and insert ballots into the process at various stages.

Setting the Stage: Logic and Accuracy Testing (LAT)

- The desire of the bad actor is to use the LAT test to appear to validate correct operation of a machine while priming the machine to miscount during the actual election process.

Setting the Stage: Early Voting

- The desire of the bad actor is to use early voting to track voter turnout and project and interject additional ballots as needed to target a specific modified result.

Setting the Stage: Early Counting

- The desire of the bad actor is to access vote tallies during the Early Voting stage. If a large enough percentage of the votes are early votes, an accurate projection of election results can be made. The bad actor then can arrange additional election manipulation measures to get their desired outcome.

Setting the Stage: Election Day Counting

- The desire of the bad actor is to modify some of the vote tallies to give the desired result.

Setting the Stage: Election Reporting

- The desire of the bad actor is to control the flow of election results being reported so as to fit a narrative that they have crafted and promoted ahead of the actual election.

Setting the Stage: Poll Books using the Internet

- The desire of the bad actor is to access poll book information so as to keep track of who has voted using which method so that they can modify the voter history to approximately reflect modifications that were made to election turnout results.

Setting the Stage: Election Auditing

- The desire of the bad actor is to keep audits from being triggered by making requirements for an audit to be extremely stringent. In addition, the bad actor encourages the use of risk limiting audits which are in fact useless exercises while appearing to bring confidence to the results.


## Vulnerability Issues Observed in Otero County

The following vulnerability related issues come out of the limited interactions that were allowed in Otero County in the first half of 2022. In preparation, please read the "Setting the Stage" section first.

## Voting Equipment Design

- It was observed during LAT testing that the equipment is designed to print votes on the ballot for those with disabilities using the same voting slot as that used for tallying votes. And that the votes were printed to appear to be hand filled instead of perfect ovals. While we support access to voting for all people including those who are disabled, a vote printing machine should never be combined with a vote tallying machine. This could easily be subverted to fill in votes for any race that a voter chose not to vote. In addition, a vote could be added to a race that had already been voted which would cause an overvote and an invalidation of that voters choice.
- It was observed that the model of the voting machine used in Otero was from the same company that provided voting equipment in Michigan. The earlier model of the same line of equipment in Michigan had a design flaw which allowed additional paper tapes to be printed any time after the originals with modified results and yet appeared to be the originals from election night. It is important to note that the paper tapes are the primary method of verification of the unofficial returns reported via electronic media on election night.
- The Election Management System (EMS) desktop computer used to program the removable media for the tabulators and tally the results from the tabulators has capabilities that are far beyond what is required for the simple task it is required to do. The computing capability required to program the removable media and to tally results from the media is minimal and could be performed on a modest laptop. Some of the included or optional capabilities of concern of this desktop computer include:
- ability to block going to sleep or to be awakened from sleep using wake on USB or wake on LAN;
- equipped with Intel Ready Mode Technology (RMT) in which the operating system is fully functional with the screen OFF;
- Intel Active Management Technology (AMT) provides persistent out-of-band connectivity that operates independently of the OS, allowing fixes to a wider range of system issues even when the OS is down;
- ability to do a secure erase at the BIOS level using AMT mentioned just above.
- The EMS desktop computer was observed to have on it Microsoft SQL Server Management Studio 17. This was accessed without requiring any password to be entered. This tool set allows all function specific software security to be easily bypassed. This software also allows complete manipulation of the underlying database which is used to store essentially all aspects of the election specific data. There is no need for this advanced tool set to be present on the EMS computer for the simple media programming and tallying functions. In addition, this software is not listed in the software "certified" for use on this model of voting machine.


## Voting Equipment Certification

- During the audit that was performed in Otero, there were those claiming it was not valid because it was not being done by an organization approved by the EAC (Election Assistance Commission). This same claim was made in Maricopa County. There are only two organizations that have been approved by EAC to test/certify voting equipment. If you are going to audit voting equipment you would not use either one of the two organizations that were involved in their approval for use in the first place. That is an obvious conflict of interest. You would not have a CPA firm audit it's own previous work. You would get a truly independent organization to do the audit.
- How is it that the two companies that are approved by the EAC allowed the major vendors of voting equipment to provide functionality that should never be allowed in voting equipment including:
- internal or external cell modems in tabulators;
- ability to fill in votes (that appear to be hand voted) on a a blank or partially filled ballot on a vote tabulator;
- ability to manipulate tabulators to reprint paper tapes that appear in every way to be originals from election night;
- and Election Management System desktop computers that have very significant remote access options.

Vulnerability assessments by these two companies should have highlighted these issues and required removal of these capabilities prior to certification.

## Election Programming

- Election programming is provided by a third party which is either the voting machine vendor or a company closely associated with them. The encrypted election files needed to program tabulators along with the EMS database and all other election related files are provided to the county via a single Project File named for the 2020 election and accompanied by an associated security file. While election files were located for other past elections, the Project File for the November 2020 election was not present on the EMS. Upon checking a backup USB stick that was made by the County at the direction of voting machine company representatives, it was discovered that several previous elections were in a subdirectory named for each election. However, the November 2020 election had an appropriate subdirectory but it only contained the November 2020 associated security file while the Project File was missing. Why was this file removed? And by whom?
- While looking for the Project File, results for the 2020 election were recalled from the database. The Result Tally and Reporting (RTR) software application clearly showed that results including images had been read into the EMS from the removable media for each tabulator.

However, the raw results and the image files could not be located on the EMS desktop computer. Why were these files removed? And by whom? And for what purpose? Image files were provided to the audit team. Where did they come from?

## Registration Database

- It was learned that ERIC (Election Registration Information Center, a third party nongovernment organization) receives complete NM MVD data \& complete NM voter registration rolls and sends back to the state a list of eligible voters who are not registered. The county personnel are then able to notify these individuals that they are eligible to vote. Sounds great if used properly to get additional people legally registered to vote. However, what if this process is misused?
- For the 3 years prior to the 2020 election, there were an abnormal number of registrations of voters throughout the state. And the high number of registrations occurred in a suspiciously weekly-consistent rate. This seems to have started roughly at the time that the NM MVD was directly linked to the NM voter registration system. Could it be that results from ERIC were being used to inject additional voters or modification of existing voter records into the system without the consent of those individuals? This would be expected of a bad actor that wants to bulk up the registered voter roles with an abnormal percentage of non-party specific voters that can later be manipulated in the voter records.
- It was learned that Otero County receives on a weekly basis a flow of voter registration forms from agencies of the State of NM that are not the MVD. These forms are offered to people who apply for certain services from the State of NM. It was reported that duplicates with minor misspelling in name are often caught and thus an additional voter registration is not entered. What if other counties are not as diligent as the staff in Otero County to check for duplicates?
- The audit team performed a canvas of actual voters to see if they voted and by what means. There are a large number of reports of people who voted and yet the voter history shows them as not having voted. This is consistent with a bad actor marking a non-voter as someone who voted while marking a voter as not having voted. This is required to make the percentages make sense when votes are manipulated within the machines.


## Ballot Preparation

- It was observed that unencrypted PDF files for each of the ballot styles were on the EMS in a subdirectory that was easily accessible. This same situation was found in Maricopa County, Arizona as well as Antrim County, Michigan. Anyone who gains access to these PDF files can make ballots that are indistinguishable from official ballots, fill them in, and copy them to the extent of their resources. They could make as many as tens of thousands of ballots if they have access to high quality, high speed copiers. Ballots should be produced in limited numbers with a numbered removable tab so that once voted the ballot can not be identified. However, there should be a full accounting for every single ballot used and left over from printed stocks. This is done in some counties in other parts of the country. In NM ballot-on-demand systems further confuse and complicate an accurate accounting of ballots.

If the blank ballot images are not secured or the paper ballots have little or no accountability it opens the door for a bad actor to relatively easily stuff the ballot box with absentee ballots or add batches of ballots even during the early voting process. In NM and elsewhere there appears
to be big hole in chain of custody of ballots prior to ballots being voted.
Logic and Accuracy Testing (LAT)

- Test ballots were provided by the voting machine subcontractor for the logic and accuracy testing. This is generally the case across the country, that the county does not provide those ballots but instead the same company that provides the tabulator programming provides them.

It has already been demonstrated that the programming for this class of voting machine can be subverted to give electronic results and paper tape results that agree with each other but don't agree with the paper ballots. The thing that stands in the way is the argument that the LAT would show that subversion.

However if the bad actor has managed to subvert the software on the voting machine itself, then the LAT could actually serve as an event or series of events that enables the subversion while not triggering it during the LAT. A typical sequence as was demonstrated in Otero County is to program the removable media, put it in the tabulator, open the polls, run the LAT ballots through the machine, close the polls, and rezero the machine in preparation for the real election. What if a certain number of ballots is required to trigger the subversion and the preprinted ballots do not meet the requirement? What if the act of rezeroing the polls is what enables a vote modification when the polls are subsequently opened?

## Early Voting

- Early voting enables more than one vulnerability. In NM the Secretary of State issues to the political parties the turnout by party by county throughout early voting. A bit of statistical analysis combined with some polling, allows a bad actor to project how well or badly the election is going for their preferred candidates. This in turn allows a calculation of what additional measures need to be taken to ensure their candidate will win.
- Once early voting tabulators have been opened they are not closed each night. Instead there is a tabulator cover that is locked in what should be a locked room. The security on some of the locations is not of a high caliber and is easy to defeat. In addition locking mechanisms on the tabulators themselves are generally not hard to defeat. But of greater concern is that between the time early voting closes and the machines are closed and results printed on election day is usually two full days in between where the tabulators are often moved to a central location while the polls are still open. Any one with private access to those machines in that two day interval could easily run hundreds of additional ballots through those machines undetected.

Early Counting

- In elections prior to 2020 it was standard procedure to not start closing machines and getting the results prior to election day. However, in 2020 that changed in many locations. For example, in Maricopa County the early votes were run through high speed tabulators on a daily basis up through election day. As of October $30^{\text {th }}$ over 1.6 million ballots out of 2.09 million total votes had been tabulated with the results being available to those who might have wanted to be bad actors. With that many votes already counted and with just a bit of mathematical analysis, the results of the Maricopa County elections were already known on October 30. This would allow bad actors to make adjustments to ensure their candidates would win. Early counting of vote tallies should never ever be allowed. Note that the votes tabulated in Otero county used only slow speed tabulators and results were not known until the polls were closed on election day
unless the equipment employed hidden modems which could in theory provide on-going results if the software on the tabulator had been subverted to provide that function.

While it is known that Otero County did not order modems for their tabulators, the machines of this class typically have a place for an internal modem. The only way to tell for sure if a modem is installed is to be able to open up the machine to see if a modem was installed. One test tabulator in Otero had a sealed cover that was opened up for us. Behind that cover were a USB connector and an RS45 connector. This would indicate that their was some sort of circuitry installed at that location on the motherboard inside the case. A previous model of this line of tabulators at that same location on the motherboard had connectors for an internal modem. The only way to tell whether this model had a modem installed or not would have been to disassemble the case of the equipment which was not permitted.

## Election Day Counting

- As mentioned previously under Voting Machine Design, there is a huge vulnerability that has been put in place by the voting machine company. The same machine that tabulates the ballots can be used to vote on a blank ballot or a partially filled out ballot to allow for disabled person votes to be cast using a separate device that is pulled into the same tabulator.

The person enters their desired votes. A blank ballot is put in the same slot on the tabulator that is used for normal voting. The ballot has votes printed in the bubbles and then is reversed back out of the machine. A helper can check for proper votes placed on the ballot and then the ballot is resubmitted to the machine for normal tabulation. Note that the votes that the machine prints on the ballot appear to be hand generated and not perfectly filled in ovals.

It has been noted that in multiple other states using similar models of tabulators that there were an abnormal number ( $20 \%$ to as high as $85 \%$ ) of reversals of ballots which then were accepted on the second or third try with no problem. What if this disabled voting feature was subverted so that a ballot that was already voted, had additional votes added in races that there had been a no vote? There are a large number of people who do not vote on down ballot races for a variety of reasons. The subverted software would detect the unvoted race, print the desired result, reverse the ballot, the attendant would then immediately resubmit the ballot as per the standard procedure without noticing that some additional votes may have been added to the ballot. This would be the perfect crime because even a hand recount would not detect that the vote had been subverted.

## Election Reporting

- The Election Mangement System (EMS) is designed to read the results for each tabulator, allow for inspection of the results for that tabulator, and then publish the results to be added into the totals for the county with the other tabulators.

However, the EMS has a function that allows the manual inspection \& approval process to be bypassed such that results are automatically "published" (added) to the totals for the county. It is not known if this feature is enabled or not on the Otero County EMS. However, this feature should not exist, a person should be required to do at least a cursory inspection of the results before allowing them to be added to the totals. A simple quality check of how many votes were cast, how many overvotes, and how many undervotes would preclude gross errors from occurring such as were reported in Antrim County, Michigan on election night.

- When the EMS reads the results from the removable media from each tabulator there are a number of files that should be loaded on to the EMS including, summary results, the detailed cast vote record, the log file that records every action taken on the tabulator including a record of each ballot being cast, and images taken for each ballot including the interpreted text version of the votes that were cast for that ballot. All of these tabulator files were missing from the EMS for the 2020 General election. Who deleted these files, when were they deleted, and why were they deleted? These files must be maintained if a thorough audit is to take place.


## Poll Books using the Internet

- By design electronic poll books are connected to the Internet so that they can check a central database of registered voters and record who voted and where. This on the surface seems to be a good thing since it can help preclude individuals from voting in multiple locations or at multiple times.

However, this opens huge vulnerabilities as some electronic poll books have been observed to allow access to random Internet websites in addition to the registration database. This would allow a bad actor to get access into the poll book system and gather up the information in the central database. This information is what is then needed to reflect back into the official voter history a profile needed to approximately match the manipulation of the votes that was performed during the election.

- Furthermore, it turns out for auditing purposes this poll book information is essential to be able to recreate what actually happened and when. However, in a number of states including the state of NM, this information is not made available and in some states it is deleted so that it can not be easily retrieved.


## Election Auditing

- The state of NM has enacted election regulations that specify exactly when and how recounts will occur. The recounts are not manual recounts but use the same machines that were used in the election. Furthermore, the recount procedures restrict testing of the machines being used such that they would not meet a trigger level if a bad actor has subverted the machines using a trigger level to enable vote modifications. Why would such restrictive procedures be written into law?

Otero County did a machine recount for a state representative race after the 2020 General Election. These restrictive measures written in the law were used to limit testing when additional testing was requested during the recount.

- The state of NM regulations require some audits occur under certain conditions. During these audits a very limited hand count of ballots is compared against the machine count. However, when discrepancies have been observed as in the 2018 General Election, if the discrepancies are somewhat offsetting the conclusion by state auditors is that there is not a problem. In fact, any error in either direction should be additive and not canceling. There is no excuse for machines being off from the hand count by even a single ballot. For the small number of ballots being counted the hand count can be repeated as many times as necessary and by multiple parties to ensure that the hand count is correct. Any discrepancy between hand count and machine count must be fully investigated but that has not occurred.
- The typical Risk Limiting Audit (RLA) that is being encouraged across the country and in NM is similar to a magic trick. An RLA generally requires that the ballots, at the time of the audit, be rerun through a tabulator to get a new Cast Vote Record (CVR) for the ballots. This is required since at the time of the election the ballots on the slow-speed tabulators are not kept in the order that they are processed by the tabulator but are dumped into a big ballot bin in random order. Therefore there is no way to pull out a specific ballot to compare it against the CVR which is what the RLA requires. The RLA process examines a small subset of ballots that are randomly selected from a rerun of the ballots through a totally different tabulator at a totally different time with new tabulator programming. All this does is prove that a specific ballot matches the interpretation of that ballot at the time of the audit when run through a machine that has new programming on it that is not set up to manipulate the votes. It says absolutely nothing about a different tabulator used on election day or for early voting which had a different set of programming files which could have been set up to manipulate the votes recorded. Thus the RLA gives an appearance of improving trust in the election when it does not do that at all.


## APPENDIX D

Issues Discovered in System Log Files

## SYSTEM LOG FILES

Each tabulator keeps a "system log file" or "slog" file to record everything that happened to the tabulator from the time it was turned on to initiate a new election to the time the election was completed. Examining the system log files can be beneficial to determining if proper procedure was following and if anything went wrong during an election.

Due to the erasure of the 2020 Project File in Otero County, the system log files were not able to be examined. However, limited system log files were available from Chaves County and several issues were discovered. It is possible that similar issues were present in Otero County.

The first issue was an error message that stated "wrong version: " "5.2.17" Expecting:
"5.2.4"." (See Figure 75)

| 207 | 14 Oct 2020 | $10: 32: 26$ [File Verifier] INFO : [Verification] Loading machine configuration to runtime settings started |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 208 | 14 Oct 2020 10:32:26 [File Verifier] WARN : [Verification] Wrong mbs version: " 5.2 .17 " Expecting: " $5.2 .4 "$ |  |
| 209 | 14 Oct 2020 10:32:26 [File Verifier] INFO : [Verification] Loading conditional points from alternative selectors |  |

Figure 75. Software Mismatch Error

This issue indicates that there was a software mismatch between the software installed on the tabulator and the software installed on the EMS. A well-designed software would have required the election worker to fix this problem before proceeding with the election, but Dominion software allows potential catastrophic errors to remain without being rectified before proceeding with an election.

Similar software mismatches have been blamed for at least two catastrophic errors in recent elections. The first was a vote switch of 7,000 votes that were cast for Trump but counted for Biden in Antrim County, MI during the 2020 General election. The second occurred during a 2021
local election in Williamson County, TN which resulted in votes on ballots not being counted at all. ${ }^{43}$ Investigation into whether this software mismatch had a significant affect on the election in Chaves County is still ongoing, though it is known that a tabulator in Chaves County failed its post-election "Risk Limiting Audit" and that the Secretary of State has done nothing to investigate these errors or determine if they were widespread or only applied to the tabulators in Chaves County.

The second issue discovered is that the Dominion software was that election files were being zeroed out and deleted as the election was progressing (see Figure 76). In Chaves County, files were deleted on September $22^{\text {nd }}, 23^{\text {rd }}$, October $2^{\text {nd }}$, November $2^{\text {nd }}$ and morning and afternoon on November $3^{\text {rd }}$.

[^39]Figure 76. Election Files Being Deleted

The figure shows that "eletiondata.dat" file and its associated SHA file was deleted. This deletion was initiated by the software itself according to a Dominion representative who said, "The file that is being deleted...is created for each tabulator...and holds the elections specifics for each tabulator like, Tabulator name, Election Name, ballots, language, precincts and all the other election specific settings and data. During initial boot from the CFO card the system clears all election data from the CFO card in preparation for reading the CF1 card and loading the current tabulator election data..." (emphasis added). The Dominion representative failed to explain why this deletion happens not just on the initial boot as claimed, but several times before and during the election, including on the afternoon of election day when the polls were open. Was the electiondata.dat file being changed, which would require it to overwrite the corresponding file on the CFO card? If it was being changed, how was it being changed and why?

[^40]The system logs also indicate that the user was being prompted to make choices regarding "Ranked Choice Voting" (see Figure 77).

```
"{5CD5700C-6949-415C-B6A2-17AF64454D43}" Info: "Results transfer connection type" Value: "1"
"{5FE6FCB5-11A3-4BD6-9BDD-36B0086ED127}" Info: "Ask for AVS ballot identifier" value: "0"
"{606F3C32-3928-4A43-86DD-655384698015}" Info: "Number of rank levels to report in RCV contests" Value: "1"
"{60CE6744-6D38-46CE-86DD-659370C5CC92}" Info: "Drop red color" Value: "0"
```

Figure 77. Illegal Ranked Choice Voting Software May be Installed

Ranked Choice Voting is an uncertified software that allows fractional weights to be applied to individual votes and an algorithm to determine the winner of a race where more than two candidates are on the ballot to avoid runoff elections. Ranked Choice Voting has been introduced into local election in Las Cruces and Santa Fe, but it is illegal to use it for state-run elections.
NMAC Section 1.10.12.13 states, "Each ballot shall increase the ballots case count by one." There is no room in this statute for changing the ballot counts to fractions, which ranked-choice software does. The software also violates state law because it is not certifiable by the EAC according to Dominion's own literature (see Figure 78).


Figure 78. Dominion Software not EAC Certified

Since the software was prompting the election worker to make choices regarding Ranked Choice Voting, it is suspected that the Ranked Choice Voting module may be installed statewide contrary to state law. The SOS prevented any conclusive investigation into whether this software is present in the Otero County election system.

Another issue highlighted from the review of the Chaves County slog files is that all people who log onto the tabulator whether in regular mode or enhanced administrator mode use the username "admin" (see Figure 79).

```
14 Oct 2020 11:31:50 [Security Token Interceptor] INFO : [Security Token] A token requiring authorization has been detected
14 Oct 2e20 11:31:50 [Security Token Interceptor] INFO : [Security Token] The inserted security token is either a Tech key or an invalid Admin key or a user has canelled login
14 Oct 202e 11:31:51 [Security Token Interceptor] INFO : [Security Token] A token requiring authorization has been detected
14 oct 2e20 11:32:01 [Security Token Interceptor] INFO : [Security Token] The inserted security token is either a Tech key or an invalid Admin key or a user has canelled login
lu
```

Figure 79. All Users Are Anonymous

If all election workers log into the tabulators with the same username and one of them does something they shouldn't, then it is impossible to find out who did what. On top of having anonymous login usernames, it has also been confirmed by the auditors that most counties use an extremely low-security password that is very guessable and is not changed from election to election. At a minimum, usernames should be unique to individual users and passwords must be made more secure and changed each election.

```
    1 = Battery level at which to beep
    10000 = max ballots accepted
    1 = AVS vote mark tyme
    30 = max linear horizontal skew
    40 = max linear vertical skew
    9= max non-linear vertical skew
    2 = votebox pixel count area adjustment
    9 = write-in pixel count area adjustment
    4 = DRO pixel count area adjustment
500 = write-in 100% pixel count
    80 = min correlation % corner markers
    85 = min correlation % barcode bars
    85 = min correlation % edge markers
    25 = number of precincts/splits to print
    5 = vertical marker search space height, pixels
    16 = vertical marker Y distance tolerance, pixels
    4 = percent of tolerance for ballot height
    30 = corner marker dimension tolerance, pixels
    18 = barcode bar dimension tolerance, pixels
    8= edge marker dimension tolerance, pixels
    0= medium correlation % corner markers
    0 = medium correlation % barcode bars
    0}=\mathrm{ medium correlation % edge markers
    0 b ballot print offset front X (1/7200")
    0= ballot print offset front Y
```

Figure 80. How the Scanner Interprets Votes can Be Manipulated

Figure 80 is from a system log from a Dominion machine in Georgia showing some of the 400 user-defined settings possible with Dominion tabulators. The boxed lines are settings dealing with how the adjudication program establishes a connection between the scanned image and the programmed map for each ballot type. These setting could be changed from tabulator to tabulator and change how ballots are adjudication. It should not be possible to interpret images differently from tabulator to tabulator.

It is recommended that Otero County take necessary steps to confirm whether Ranked Choice Software is installed on equipment in their county immediately and whether the proper version of software is installed on all their election equipment. It is also recommended that the Otero County Commission and the Otero County Clerk take steps to ensure that all future slog files are preserved and examine them for these types of errors in the future that could indicate wrongdoing and software errors which could have a catastrophic effect on election results that could remain undetected by through the typical post-election canvass.

## APPENDIX E

Certification Documents

United States Election Assistance Commission

## Certificate of Accreditation

## Pro V\&V, Inc. Huntsville, Alabama

is recognized by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission for the testing of voting systems to the 2005 Voluntary Voting Systems Guidelines under the criteria set forth in the EAC Voting System Testing and Certification Program and Laboratory Accreditation Program. Pro V\&V is also recognized as having successfully completed assessments by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program for conformance to the requirements of ISO/IEC 17025 and the criteria set forth in NIST Handbooks 150 and 150-22.

Effective Through

February 24, 2017


Date: $2 / 24 / 15$
Acting Executive Director, U.S. Election Assistance Commission
EAC Lab Code: 1501


## Test Report

Dominion Voting Systems
Democracy Suite (D-Suite) System
Version 5.4-NM
Certification Testing

Approved by:


Approved by:


Wendy Owens, VSTL Program Manager
August 24, 2017

## 1 Introduction

The purpose of this Test Report is to document the procedures that Pro V\&V, Inc. followed to evaluate the Dominion Democracy Suite (D-Suite) 5.4 Voting System to the requirements set forth for voting systems in the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) 2005 Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSG), Version 1.0.

### 1.1 References

The documents listed below were utilized in the development of this Test Report:

- Election Assistance Commission (EAC) 2005 Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSG) Version 1.0, Volume I, "Voting System Performance Guidelines", and Volume II, "National Certification Testing Guidelines"
- Election Assistance Commission Testing and Certification Program Manual, Version 2.0
- Election Assistance Commission Voting System Test Laboratory Program Manual, Version 2.0
- National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program NIST Handbook 150-2016, "NVLAP Procedures and General Requirements (NIST Handbook 150)", dated July 2016
- National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program NIST Handbook 150-22, 2008 Edition, "Voting System Testing (NIST Handbook 150-22)", dated May 2008
- United States $107^{\text {th }}$ Congress Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002 (Public Law 107252), dated October 2002
- Pro V\&V, Inc. Quality Assurance Manual, Version 7.0
- EAC Requests for Interpretation (RFI) (listed on www.eac.gov)
- EAC Notices of Clarification (NOC) (listed on www.eac.gov)
- NTS Test Report No. PR036164-01, Rev. C, "Test Report for EAC 2005 VVSG Certification Testing Performed on Dominion Voting Systems 4.14-E, EAC Certification Number: DVS-DemSuite4.14-E", dated 06/25/2015
- Pro V\&V Test Report No. TR-01-01-DVS-2016-01.01, Rev. D, "Test Report for EAC 2005 VVSG 1.0 Certification Testing Dominion Voting Systems Democracy Suite (DSuite) Version 5.0-A Voting System", EAC Project Number DVS1601, dated 2/7/17
- Pro V\&V Test Report No. TR-01-02-DVS-012-2017.01, "Test Report for Dominion Voting Systems Democray Suite (D-Suite) System Version 5.2 Gap Analysis Testing", dated 7/31/17
- Dominion Voting Systems Democracy Suite 5.4-NM Technical Data Package (A listing of the D-Suite 5.4-NM documents submitted for this test campaign is listed in Section 2.4 of this Test Plan)


### 1.2 Terms and Abbreviations

The terms and abbreviations applicable to the development of this Test Report are listed below:
"ADA" - Americans with Disabilities Act 1990
"ATI" - Audio Tactile Interface
"BMD" - Ballot Marking Device
"CM" - Configuration Management
"COTS" - Commercial Off-The-Shelf
"DRE" - Direct Record Electronic
"EAC" - United States Election Assistance Commission
"EMS" - Election Management System
"FCA" - Functional Configuration Audit
"HAVA" - Help America Vote Act
"ICC" - ImageCast Central
"ICE" - ImageCast Evolution
"ICP" - ImageCast Precinct
"ISO" - International Organization for Standardization
"NOC" - Notice of Clarification
"PCA" - Physical Configuration Audit
"PCOS" - Precinct Count Optical Scan
"QA" - Quality Assurance


Pro V\&V, Inc.
6705 Odyssey Drive, Suite C
Huntsville, AL 35806

March 10, 2020

Jerome Lovato, Testing and Certification Director<br>U. S. Election Assistance Commission<br>Voting System Testing and Certification Program<br>1335 East West Highway, Suite 4300<br>Silver Spring, MD 20910

## Re: Letter of Agreement

Dear Mr. Lovato,
The undersigned representative of Pro V\&V, Inc.(hereinafter "Laboratory"), being lawfully authorized to bind Laboratory and having read the EAC Voting System Test Laboratory Program Manual, accepts and agrees on behalf of Laboratory to follow the program requirements as laid out in Chapter 2 of the Manual. Laboratory shall meet all program requirements as they relate to NVLAP accreditation; conflict of interest and prohibited practices; personnel policies; notification of changes; resources; site visits, notice of law suits; testing, technical practices and reporting; laboratory independence; authority to do business in the United States; VSTL communications; financial stability; and recordkeeping. Laboratory further recognizes that meeting these program requirements is a continuing responsibility. Failure to meet each of the requirements may result in the denial of an application for accreditation, a suspension of accreditation or a revocation of accreditation.

Sincerely,


Pro V\&V, Inc. Laboratory Director
256.713.1111
jack.cobb@provandv.com
U.S. Election Assistance Commission

633 3rd St. NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20001

| FROM: | Jerome Lovato, Voting System Testing and Certification Director |
| :--- | :--- |
| SUBJECT: | Pro V\&V EAC VSTL Accreditation |
| DATE: | $1 / 27 / 2021$ |

Pro V\&V has completed all requirements to remain in good standing with the EAC's Testing and Certification program per section 3.8 of the Voting System Test Laboratory Manual, version 2.0:

Expiration and Renewal of Accreditation. A grant of accreditation is valid for a period not to exceed two years. A VSTL's accreditation expires on the date annotated on the Certificate of Accreditation. VSTLs in good standing shall renew their accreditation by submitting an application package to the Program Director, consistent with the procedures of Section 3.4 of this Chapter, no earlier than 60 days before the accreditation expiration date and no later than 30 days before that date. Laboratories that timely file the renewal application package shall retain their accreditation while the review and processing of their application is pending. VSTLs in good standing shall also retain their accreditation should circumstances leave the EAC without a quorum to conduct the vote required under Section 3.5.5.

Due to the outstanding circumstances posed by COVID-19, the renewal process for EAC laboratories has been delayed for an extended period. While this process continues, Pro V\&V retains its EAC VSTL accreditation.


United States Election Assistance Commission

## Certificate of Accreditation

## Pro V\&V, Inc. Huntsville, Alabama

is recognized by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission for the testing of voting systems to the 2005 and 2015 Voluntary Voting Systems Guidelines (VVSG 1.0 \& 1.1) under the criteria set forth in the EAC Voting System Testing and Certification Program and Laboratory Accreditation Program. Pro V\&V is also recognized as having successfully completed assessments by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program for conformance to the requirements of ISO/ IEC 17025 and the criteria set forth in NIST Handbooks 150 and 150-22.

Original Accreditation Issued on: 2/24/2015
Accreditation remains effective until revoked
by a vote of the EAC pursuant to 52 U.S.C. $\S$ 20971(c)(2).
Mona $\downarrow_{\text {arrington }}$ Date: $2 / 1 / 21$

| Mona Harrington |
| :--- |
| Executive Director, U.S. Election Assistance Commission |

EAC Lab Code: $\mathbf{1 5 0 1}$
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION 633 3rd St. NW, Suite 200

## Major Updates of the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines 2.0

On February 10, 2021 the U.S. Election Assistance Commission adopted the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSG) 2.0. The major updates included in the VVSG 2.0 are the following:

- Improved cybersecurity requirements to secure voting and election management systems associated with the administration of elections.
- Software independence
- Requires systems to be air-gapped from other networks and disallows the use of wireless technologies
- Physical security
- Multi-factor authentication
- System integrity
- Data protection
- Interoperability
- Ensures devices are capable of importing and exporting data in common data formats
- Requires manufacturers to provide complete specifications of how the format is implemented
- Requires that encoded data uses a publicly available method
- Improved accessibility requirements to enhance the voting experience for voters with disabilities:
- VVSG 2.0 allows for systems where all voters can vote privately and independently throughout the voting process:
- Marking
- Verifying
- Casting
- Language access throughout the process
- Improved documentation requirements for accessibility testing
- Voter privacy features
- Accessibility requirements derived from federal laws
- Other Changes
- Ballot secrecy
- Improved auditability
- User-centered design
- Reorganized to simplify usage and focus on functional requirements
- Manuals
- Penetration testing
- Component testing pilot program

Additional information and the full text of the VVSG 2.0 can be found on the EAC's website.


STATE OF NEW MEXICO
MAGGIE TOULOUSE OLIVER
SECRETARY OF STATE

May 28, 2021
Melissa Romero
Dominion Voting Systems
melissa.romero@dominionvoting.com

## Re: Recertification of Voting Systems

Dear Ms. Romero:
Pursuant to Section 1-9-7.4(A) NMSA 1978, the SOS is required to review for recertification each voting system already in use in the state in the year following a presidential election. All certified voting systems are required to be tested by an independent authority and comply with all requirements in the Election Code and the most recent voluntary voting system guidelines (VVSG) adopted by the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC).

While VVSG 2.0 was adopted by the EAC in February 2021, the EAC has not yet certified any independent voting system testing laboratories (VSTLs) to test and certify voting systems to these new standards. We understand that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is in the process of developing the test processes and procedures for VSTLs. After these are adopted, the VSTLs will be required to earn accreditation with the EAC to test voting systems to the new VVSG 2.0 standards. Since this effort is likely to take some time, we plan to review our current voting systems based upon the previously adopted standards. Once the EAC has testing and certification procedures in place for VVSG 2.0, we will initiate a new voting system certification initiative.

According to the Election Code, a "voting system" includes the equipment and peripherals used for casting and counting votes as well as the equipment and peripherals used for printing or marking ballots. The full legal definition of voting system can be found in Section 1-9-1(B) NMSA 1978.

To begin the testing and certification process required for recertification, we request that you submit the following information to our office no later than June 14, 2021:

1. The voting system and version that is being submitted for recertification.
2. A description of any modification to a hardware or software component or configuration of the voting system since the last time the system was certified for use in New Mexico, if applicable.
3. A description of how the system meets all of the applicable voting system requirements included in the New Mexico Election Code (see enclosures).
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4. A copy of the most recent VSTL report and proof of compliance on the system eligible for recertification. The report provided must come from an EAC accredited test laboratory.
5. Description of your transition plan to become certified to VVSG 2.0, if applicable.

If you intend to have multiple system models or firmware versions recertified, please submit a separate application for each system. Enclosed for your convenience is a copy of the requirements for voting systems outlined in Article 9 of the Election Code.

Upon completion of an examination of all recertification materials, the SOS may require additional information, testing, or inspection as deemed necessary to comply with the recertification requirements in statute. After the SOS has completed a full review of all required information, the SOS shall make a written report and post the report and recertification materials on the SOS website for a mandatory 21-day public comment period.

Following the period of public comment, the SOS shall submit the reports and any public comments to the Voting System Certification Committee (VSCC) for their consideration and to make a recommendation to the SOS for recertification of the voting systems.

If you have questions or require any further information regarding the re-certification process, please contact me at Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us.

Sincerely,


Mandy Vigil
State Elections Director

Enclosures: As stated

## New Mexico Election Code Voting System Requirements

Voting Systems used for casting and counting ballots in the state shall meet all outlined requirements in Article 9 of the election code as follows:

## 1-9-7.7. Voting systems; technical requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. have a unique embedded internal serial number for audit purposes;
B. be supplied with a dust- and moisture-proof cover for transportation and storage purposes;
C. if the net weight of the system, or aggregate of voting device parts, is over twenty pounds, have self-contained wheels so that the system can be easily rolled by one person on rough pavement and can roll through a standard thirty-inch door frame; D. be a stand-alone, non-networked election system such that all pre-election, election day and post-election events and activities can be recorded and retained in each device;
E. employ scalable technology allowing easy enhancements that meet United States election assistance commission standards and state law;
F. have ancillary equipment, such as printers, power sources, microprocessors and switch and indicator matrices, that is installed internally or is modular and transportable;
G. display publicly the number of ballots processed;
H. be able to print:
(1) an alphanumeric printout of the contests, candidates and vote totals when the polls are opened so that the poll workers can verify that the counters for each candidate are on zero;
(2) an alphanumeric printout of the contests, candidates and vote totals at the close of the polls, which printouts shall contain the system serial number and public counter total; and
(3) as many copies of the alphanumeric printouts as necessary to satisfy state law; and
I. include a feature to allow reports to be sent to an electronic data file.

## 1-9-7.8. Voting systems; operational requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. have internal application software that is specifically designed and engineered for the election application;
B. include comprehensive diagnostics designed to ensure that failures do not go undetected;
C. have a real-time clock capable of recording and documenting the total time polls are opened; and
D. have a self-contained, internal backup battery that powers all components of the system that are powered by alternating current power; and, in the event of a power outage in the polling place:
(1) the self-contained, internal backup battery power shall engage with no disruption of operation for at least two hours and with no loss of data; and
(2) the system shall maintain all vote totals, public counter totals and the internal clock time in the event that the main power and battery backup power fail.

## 1-9-7.9. Voting systems; memory; removable storage media device; requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. be programmable with removable storage media devices;
B. contain ballot control information, summary vote totals, maintenance logs and operator logs on the removable storage media device;
C. ensure that the votes stored on the removable storage media device accurately represent the actual votes cast;
D. be designed so that no executable code can be launched from random access memory;
E. have any operating system software stored in nonvolatile memory, which shall include internal quality checks such as parity or error detection and correction codes, and which software shall include comprehensive diagnostics to ensure that failures do not go undetected;
F. allow for pre-election testing of the ballot control logic and accuracy, with results stored in he memory that is used on election day, and shall be capable of printing a zero-results printout prior to these tests and a results printout after the test;
G. have internal audit trail capability such that all pre-election, election day and post-election events shall be stored, recorded and recovered in an easy-to-read printed form and be retained within memory that does not require external power for memory retention;
H. possess the capability of remote transmission of election results to a central location only by reading the removable storage media devices once they have been removed from the tabulation device after the poll closing sequence has been The EMS has wireless completed; and
I. prevent data from being altered or destroyed by report generation or by the transmission of results.

## 1-9-7.10. Voting systems; ballot handling and processing requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. accept a ballot that is a minimum of six inches wide and a maximum of twentyfour inches long, in dual columns and printed on both sides;
B. accept a ballot in any orientation when inserted by a voter;
C. have the capability to reject a ballot on which a voter has made more than the allowable number of selections in any contest;
D. be designed to accommodate the maximum number of ballot styles or ballot variations encountered in the largest New Mexico election jurisdiction; and E. be able to read a single ballot with at least four hundred twenty voting positions.

## 1-9-7.11. Voting systems; source code; escrow.

As a condition of initial certification and continued certification, the source code that operates a voting system shall be placed in escrow and be accessible to the state of New Mexico in the event the manufacturer ceases to do business or ceases to support the voting system.

Ms. Mandy Vigil
sent via electronic mail
Elections Director, Bureau of Elections
New Mexico Office of the Secretary of State
325 Don Gaspar, Suite 300
Santa Fe, NM 87501
Email: Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us

Ms. Vigil:
Dominion Voting Systems, Inc. (Dominion) hereby requests re-certification by the New Mexico Secretary of State of the Democracy Suite 5.4 voting system. Specifically, we seek approval for:

- Democracy Suite Election Management System v5.4.17.5 - application software used to managethe election workflow, from import of election definition information, ballot layout, voting machine programming and pre-election test, Election Night reporting, and post-election activities.
- Democracy Suite Adjudication v5.4.17.3 - application software used to allow ballots with exceptions or out-stack conditions such as over-votes, blank ballots, write-ins and marginal marks to be resolved on-screen and sent to tally.
- ImageCast Evolution v5.4.8.3 - an accessible voting machine that combines an optical scanner and a ballot marking device, suitable for use by all voters while complying with the accessibility requirements of the Help America Vote Act and the 2005 Voluntary Voting System Guidelines (VVSG).
- ImageCast Central v5.4.2.1 - a high-speed absentee ballot central scanning solution that utilizes Canon brand scanners (DR-X1OC and DR-G1130).

Dominion would also like to submit for re-certification:

- ImageCast Central v5.4.2.2, which the State previously approved for use in jurisdictions using the Rank Choice Voting method in Democracy Suite 5.4 voting system.

There have been no modifications to the hardware or software for this configuration except the removal of the ImageCast Precinct tabulator, which is no longer in use in the State.

This letter includes a point-by-point commentary on the items in the 2015 Election Handbook that apply to voting systems to aid the examination committee in better understanding the Democracy Suite 5.4 system.

Enclosed with this letter is the Technical Data Package (TDP) for this system along with a list of other States' approvals of this or other versions of the Democracy Suite system. As there is considerable documentation to cover the system, I recommend that any reviewers start with 2.02 - System Configuration and Overview Guide. The Overview Guide provides introductory material for the system, with some degree of detail regarding its componentsand their specifications. From there, documents starting with 2.03, 2.04, 2.05, and 2.06 contain detailed specifications of system hardware, software, and security. Documents starting with 2.08, 2.09, and 2.10 as well as User Guides describe how the
system is set-up, operated, and maintained. Also included are the New Mexico User Guide documents.

This application also includes a copy of the Test Report from ProV\&V, an EAC accredited voting system test laboratory (VSTL). A description of Dominion's VVSG 2.0 transition plan is also included.

The materials supporting this re-certification application will be provided through a download link that will be sent via email to you. To access the download link, a passphrase will be required, which will be sent via a separate email. Due to the proprietary nature of the materials, they will be compressed into encrypted ZIP files. Once you've received the download, please contact me and I will provide you with the passphrase for decryptingthe contents of the ZIP files.

We look forward to working with you toward the re-certification of Democracy Suite 5.4 in the State ofNew Mexico.

Sincerely,


Certification Director
Dominion Voting Systems, Inc.

## New Mexico requirements and Democracy Suite 5.4, Summary

## 1-9-7.1. Voting system; use of paper ballot.

A. All voting systems used in elections covered by the Election Code [Chapter 1 NMSA 1978] shall use a paper ballot on which the voter physically or electronically marks the voter's choices on the ballot itself.

Democracy Suite 5.4 is an optical scan voting system. Voters with accessibility needs mark theirballot using the ImageCast ${ }^{\circledR}$ Evolution, generating a paper ballot.

## 1-9-7.7. Voting systems; technical requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. have a unique embedded internal serial number for audit purposes;

Each unit carries a serial number in non-volatile internal memory, given to the unit at the time of its manufacture.
B. be supplied with a dust- and moisture-proof cover for transportation and storage purposes; Each ballot box has a top cover for this purpose; individual units can be transported in a dust and moisture proof case.
C. if the net weight of the system, or aggregate of voting device parts, is over twenty pounds, have self-contained wheels so that the system can be easily rolled by one person on rough pavement and can roll through a standard thirty-inch door frame;

All ballot boxes have casters, are designed to be moved by one person, and fit through a 30inch door.
D. be a stand-alone, non-networked election system such that all pre-election, election dayand post-election events and activities can be recorded and retained in each device;

Dominion recommends strongly that the election systems never be attached to the Internet or other network. Democracy Suite 5.4 is capable of operating in this manner.
E. employ scalable technology allowing easy enhancements that meet United States Election Assistance Commission standards and state law;

Democracy Suite 5.4 has a variety of scalable configurations and platform options. It has been certified by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to the VVSG 2005 requirements.
F. have ancillary equipment, such as printers, power sources, microprocessors and switchand indicator matrices, that is installed internally or is modular and transportable;

All necessary printers, power supplies, and similar ancillary devices required for precinct use are built into the voting machine or ballot box.

## G. display publicly the number of ballots processed;

The ImageCast Evolution scanner continuously shows the number of ballots processed (Public Counter) when polls are open.
H. be able to print:
(1) an alphanumeric printout of the contests, candidates and vote totals when the polls are opened so that the poll workers can verify that the counters for each candidate are on zero;
(2) an alphanumeric printout of the contests, candidates and vote totals at the close of the polls, which printouts shall contain the system serial number and public counter total; and
(3) as many copies of the alphanumeric printouts as necessary to satisfy state law; and

All ImageCast equipment is capable of printing reports to these specifications. They also allow the jurisdiction to program a default number of report copies and allow the pollworker to print additional report copies as needed.
I. include a feature to allow reports to be sent to an electronic data file.

Reports can be exported to Excel, pdf, and other formats at the jurisdiction's discretion.

## 1-9-7.8. Voting systems; operational requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. have internal application software that is specifically designed and engineered for theelection application;

All internal application software is produced by Dominion Voting Systems, specifically for elections.
B. include comprehensive diagnostics designed to ensure that failures do not go undetected;

All scanners have a Power-On Self-Test (POST) as well as continuous monitoring of all critical functions so that malfunctions result in immediate warning to the pollworker and in unrecoverable situations, unit shutdown.
C. have a real-time clock capable of recording and documenting the total time polls areopened; and

All scanners have a real-time clock. Poll opening and closing events are recorded in the unit's audit log.
D. have a self-contained, internal backup battery that powers all components of the system that are powered by alternating current power; and, in the event of a power outage in the polling place:
(1) the self-contained, internal backup battery power shall engage with no disruptionof operation for at least two hours and with no loss of data; and
(2) the system shall maintain all vote totals, public counter totals and the internal clock time in the event that the main power and battery backup power fail.

All precinct-based scanners contain an internal battery tested to maintain at least two hours of operation. In the event that battery power is exhausted, all vote totals, counters, clock time, and any votes cast and confirmed to a voter are saved.

## 1-9-7.9. Voting systems; memory; removable storage media device; requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. be programmable with removable storage media devices;

Each ImageCast scanner, as well as Central Count scanners, are programmed through Compact Flash cards.
B. contain ballot control information, summary vote totals, maintenance logs and operatorlogs on the removable storage media device;

These items are carried on the Compact Flash cards for each scanner, and can be uploaded along with results from that scanner.
C. ensure that the votes stored on the removable storage media device accurately representthe actual votes cast;

ImageCast Evolution utilizes a pair of Compact Flash cards, writing results information to each one and checking that written information so that the accuracy of the information on each card is ensured. Mismatches in card content cause the unit to give a warning message then shut down.
D. be designed so that no executable code can be launched from random access memory;

ImageCast scanners are protected from code being launched from random access memory. The firmware for each unit is encrypted and signed when placed in the unit and only that code will execute on the scanner.
E. have any operating system software stored in nonvolatile memory, which shall include internal quality checks such as parity or error detection and correction codes, and which software shall include comprehensive diagnostics to ensure that failures do not go undetected;

The operating system for the scanners is stored in non-volatile memory on each unit. Each unit undergoes a Power-On Self-Test (POST) to ensure the integrity of its firmware prior to allowing polls to be opened.
F. allow for pre-election testing of the ballot control logic and accuracy, with results storedin the memory that is used on election day, and shall be capable of printing a zero-results printout prior to these tests and a results printout after the test;

Pre-election logic and accuracy testing is accomplished using the same compact flash cards in each unit that will be utilized on Election Day. Zero tapes are available at the start of preelection logic and accuracy test as well as Election Day. Results tapes are also available after pre-election logic and accuracy testing and Election Day.
G. have internal audit trail capability such that all pre-election, election day and post-election events shall be stored, recorded and recovered in an easy-to-read printed form and be retained within memory that does not require external power for memory retention;

Each ImageCast scanner, as well as the central election management software maintain audit trails in accordance with VVSG 2005 requirements. These can be recovered in soft files and printed to hard copy as desired. The logs are stored on the Compact Flash cards in the scanners until uploaded to the election management software.
H. possess the capability of remote transmission of election results to a central location onlyby reading the removable storage media devices once they have been removed from the tabulation device after the poll closing sequence has been completed; and

The Democracy Suite 5.4 system accommodates remote transmission sites wherein, after a paper tape results report is printed, the Compact Flash cards containing results and logs are removed from the scanners and the contents transmitted subsequent to that removal.
I. prevent data from being altered or destroyed by report generation or by the transmissionof results.

Report generation and transmission do not affect the raw results or logs. This applies to any of the scanners and the election management software.

## 1-9-7.10. Voting systems; ballot handling and processing requirements.

Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall:
A. accept a ballot that is a minimum of six inches wide and a maximum of twenty-fourinches long, in dual columns and printed on both sides;

ImageCast scanners meet this requirement, being able to scan 8.5 inch by 11, 14-, 17-, 20-, and 22 -inch ballots, two to four columns, double-sided.
B. accept a ballot in any orientation when inserted by a voter;

Any of the four possible orientations are read by ImageCast scanners.
C. have the capability to reject a ballot on which a voter has made more than the allowable number of selections in any contest;

Overvoted contests will cause a ballot to be rejected by the scanner.
D. be designed to accommodate the maximum number of ballot styles or ballot variations encountered in the largest New Mexico election jurisdiction; and

Democracy Suite is designed to accommodate the largest jurisdictions in the United States and can easily accommodate New Mexico jurisdiction geographic and ballot layout needs.
E. be able to read a single ballot with at least four hundred twenty voting positions.

Democracy Suite can prepare ballots with 462 ballot positions.

## 1-9-7.11. Voting systems; source code; escrow.

As a condition of initial certification and continued certification, the source code that operates a voting system shall be placed in escrow and be accessible to the state of New Mexico in the event the manufacturer ceases to do business or ceases to support the voting system.

Dominion utilizes the NCC Group as a third-party escrow agent. The State of New Mexico has been given beneficiary status for the escrowed products of this system configuration. The release conditions meet the state's requirements.

## 1-9-13. Voting system technicians.

A. Voting system technicians shall be trained and certified by the secretary of state as to their adequacy of training and expertise on voting systems certified for use in the state.

Dominion has a variety of training courses and materials to aid in compliance with this requirement.

May 25, 2021
REFERENCE 9 - Only the first three pages of the test report are provided. The full report will be provided on request.

Maggie Toulouse Oliver
New Mexico Secretary of State
325 Don Gasper, Suite 300
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

## RE: Application for Recertification of AskED Ballot Printing System

Dear Secretary Toulouse-Oliver,
In response to your May 18, 2021 letter Robis Elections is requesting the recertification of the AskED Ballot Printing System.

The AskED Ballot Printing System (The System) was independently tested by SLI Global Solutions (SLI) in December of 2011. SLI Global Solutions is testing laboratory accredited by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and has been given accredited voting system testing lab (VSTL) status by the Election Assistance Commission. Based on the results of the independent testing, the AskED System was certified by the Voting System Certification Committee (VSCC) in New Mexico in 2011, 2013 and 2017.

In addition to the testing provided by SLI in 2011, the printers used by the AskED System were submitted for testing by Dominion Voting in 2016. After testing, the printers were successfully qualified for use with Dominion ImageCast Tabulators currently in use throughout the State of New Mexico. A copy of the qualification letter is included with the application.

Enhancements continue to be made to the AskED Software, such as support of SERVIS APIs, Same Day Registration, and improvements do not impact areas of functionality required in the New Mexico State Election Code nor is there any specific test for these features. The specific State requirements were tested by SLI and the AskED system proved compliant. Therefore, the lab report provided by SLI is still relevant for determining if the AskED System meets code requirements. In addition to the 2011 report, we have included certification test results from the states of California, New York, and Virginia

Furthermore, the AskED System has been successfully implemented multiple times throughout the State of New Mexico, including:

Bernalillo County: All statewide elections 2012-2021, non-statewide elections 2013-2021.
San Juan County: All statewide elections 2014-2021, non-statewide elections 2013-2021.
Sandoval County: Statewide elections 2016-2021.
Dona Ana County: All statewide elections 2018-2021, non-statewide election 2017-2021
Taos County: Statewide elections 2018 and 2020
McKinley County: Statewide elections 2018
City of Farmington: Municipal Election 2014 \& 2016
City of Las Cruces: Municipal Election 2017
City of Rio Rancho: Municipal Election 2020

City of Aztec: Municipal Election 2020
City of Bloomfield: Municipal Election 2020
Town of Kirtland: Municipal Election 2020

In all of these elections the AskED Ballot Printing System has again been proven compliant with New Mexico State Election Code.

We submit this and request that our system once again be certified for use in the State.

Sincerely,


David Davoust
President
Robis Elections, Inc.
Enclosures:

1) Copy of 2011 Independent Lab Report by SLI Global Solutions
2) Copy of 2016 Dominion Voting ImageCast Qualification Letter

## Test Report

## State of New Mexico Ballot on Demand Testing Program

Test Report Rev 03
December $1^{\text {st }}, 2011$

Prepared for:

| Client Name | Robis Elections |
| :--- | :--- |
| Governing Organization | State of New Mexico |

Prepared by:


LOBAL SOLUTIONS
$21616^{\text {th }}$ St.
Suite 700
Denver, CO 80202
303-575-6881
www.SLIGlobalsolutions.com


NVLAP LAB CODE 200733-0

Accredited by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) National Voluntary Lab Accreditation Program (NVLAP), and accredited by the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) for VSTL status.

## Revision History

| Release | Author | Revisions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rev 01 | M. Santos | Initial Release |
| Rev02 | M. Santos | Clarification on 4.2 |
| Rev03 | M. Santos | Update to 4.3 |

## Disclaimer

The Certification Test results reported herein must not be used by the client to claim product certification, approval, or endorsement by NVLAP, NIST, or any agency of the Federal Government. Results herein relate only to the items tested.

## Copyright © 2011 SLI Global Solutions, Incorporated

## Trademarks

- SLI is a registered trademark of SLI Global Solutions, Incorporated.
- All other products and company names are used for identification purposes only and may be trademarks of their respective owners.

The tests referenced in this document were performed in a controlled environment using specific systems and data sets, and results are related to the specific items tested. Actual results in other environments may vary.

[^41]
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction ..... 4
1.1 References ..... 4
2 Robis System Overview ..... 5
2.1 Documentation Provided ..... 5
2.2 Declared System to be Reviewed ..... 5
3 Testing Methodology Employed ..... 5
3.1 Test Campaign ..... 5
4 TEST Background ..... 6
4.1 Review ..... 6
4.2 Functional Testing ..... 6
5 Requirements Analysis ..... 7
5.1 Requirements Reviewed ..... 7
6 Test Results Summary ..... 17

## APPENDIX F

## Canvass Data Distribution Calculations

## New Mexico Distribution Comparison

When testing the distributions of those voters that were canvassed versus not, using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, we find the following p-values:

- All Voters (2.0\%)
- REP Voters (3.4\%)
- DEM Voters (6.5\%)
- DTS Voters (14.9\%)
- OTHER Voters (2.4\%)

Utilizing a $99 \%$ confidence level, we can assert that the age distributions are similar enough to say that any differences may be due to sampling error. Given this it is reasonable to assume that the distribution of the voters canvassed is similar to that of all voters in Otero County and assertions can be cast to the county as a whole.



## APPENDIX G

## Vote Count Reports Sent to

## Democrat Operative by SOS

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS
Tuesday, November 3, 2020 10:34 AM
'Katharine Clark'
FW: New Mexico Vote Counts (3 Nov 2020-8am)
AbsEarlyVoteCount 2020-11-03.pdf; SDRCount 2020-11-03.xlsx; AbsEarlyVoteCount 2020-11-03.xlsx; AbsCount 2020-11-03.xlsx

From: Curtas, Alex, SOS
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 8:20 AM
To: Curtas, Alex, SOS [Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us](mailto:Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us)
Subject: New Mexico Vote Counts (3 Nov 2020-8am)
Current as of 8:00a MST

## Alex Curtas | Communications Director

New Mexico Secretary of State Maggie Toulouse Oliver
325 Don Gaspar, Ste. 300 | Santa Fe, NM 87501
Cell: 505.469.2783 | Desk: 505.827.3613
alex.curtas@state.nm.us

Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

| County | DEM | REP |  | LIB |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bernalillo | 97038 | 34605 | 1236 | 27136 | 160015 |
| Catron | 213 | 302 | 10 | 81 | 606 |
| Chaves | 2071 | 1895 | 38 | 695 | 4699 |
| Cibola | 1733 | 533 | 14 | 312 | 2592 |
| Colfax | 1469 | 622 | 12 | 348 | 2451 |
| Curry | 1621 | 1416 | 26 | 551 | 3614 |
| De Baca | 123 | 67 | 1 | 9 | 200 |
| Dona Ana | 19428 | 6208 | 258 | 6124 | 32018 |
| Eddy | 2088 | 1475 | 25 | 550 | 4138 |
| Grant | 3611 | 1029 | 34 | 742 | 5416 |
| Guadalupe | 846 | 117 | 4 | 32 | 999 |
| Harding | 81 | 100 | 0 | 8 | 189 |
| Hidalgo | 449 | 170 | 6 | 72 | 697 |
| Lea | 1480 | 1536 | 31 | 665 | 3712 |
| Lincoln | 1014 | 1273 | 23 | 482 | 2792 |
| Los Alamos | 3284 | 1196 | 68 | 1387 | 5935 |
| Luna | 1704 | 677 | 9 | 447 | 2837 |
| McKinley | 3721 | 688 | 30 | 666 | 5105 |
| Mora | 823 | 160 | 4 | 60 | 1047 |
| Otero | 2965 | 2370 | 37 | 1336 | 6708 |
| Quay | 498 | 323 | 5 | 103 | 929 |
| Rio Arriba | 4638 | 728 | 26 | 521 | 5913 |
| Roosevelt | 633 | 531 | 11 | 219 | 1394 |
| San Juan | 5043 | 4555 | 86 | 1921 | 11605 |
| San Miguel | 6179 | 1086 | 30 | 791 | 8086 |
| Sandoval | 19560 | 8539 | 286 | 5976 | 34361 |
| Santa Fe | 37494 | 4549 | 244 | 7063 | 49350 |
| Sierra | 952 | 573 | 7 | 289 | 1821 |
| Socorro | 1412 | 532 | 12 | 268 | 2224 |
| Taos | 5448 | 610 | 26 | 706 | 6790 |
| Torrance | 1112 | 912 | 20 | 349 | 2393 |
| Union | 172 | 165 | 2 | 34 | 373 |
| Valencia | 8811 | 3929 | 102 | 2335 | 15177 |
| Total | 237714 | 83471 | 2723 | 62278 | 386186 |


| County | Party | Absentee | In Person | Election Day | Total Voted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEM | 196451 | 182961 | 4661 | 384073 |
|  | DTS | 50161 | 67137 | 2462 | 119760 |
|  | LIB | 2193 | 3694 | 141 | 6028 |
|  | OTH | 2035 | 3090 | 116 | 5241 |
|  | REP | 69626 | 199376 | 5463 | 274465 |
| Bernalillo | DEM | 83445 | 62411 | 1435 | 147291 |
| Bernalillo | DTS | 22500 | 24035 | 859 | 47394 |
| Bernalillo | LIB | 1015 | 1421 | 47 | 2483 |
| Bernalillo | OTH | 847 | 1046 | 39 | 1932 |
| Bernalillo | REP | 29670 | 56368 | 1409 | 87447 |
| Catron | DEM | 193 | 198 | 6 | 397 |
| Catron | DTS | 68 | 123 | 16 | 207 |
| Catron | LIB | 9 | 5 | 1 | 15 |
| Catron | OTH | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| Catron | REP | 261 | 675 | 50 | 986 |
| Chaves | DEM | 1612 | 3314 | 53 | 4979 |
| Chaves | DTS | 503 | 1579 | 43 | 2125 |
| Chaves | LIB | 25 | 80 | 5 | 110 |
| Chaves | OTH | 43 | 155 | 4 | 202 |
| Chaves | REP | 1511 | 9839 | 162 | 11512 |
| Cibola | DEM | 1331 | 2136 | 75 | 3542 |
| Cibola | DTS | 223 | 425 | 16 | 664 |
| Cibola | LIB | 10 | 26 | 0 | 36 |
| Cibola | OTH | 20 | 42 | 0 | 62 |
| Cibola | REP | 367 | 1478 | 52 | 1897 |
| Colfax | DEM | 1287 | 739 | 88 | 2114 |
| Colfax | DTS | 282 | 243 | 45 | 570 |
| Colfax | LIB | 10 | 14 | 1 | 25 |
| Colfax | OTH | 10 | 12 | 1 | 23 |
| Colfax | REP | 535 | 923 | 132 | 1590 |
| Curry | DEM | 1415 | 1797 | 61 | 3273 |
| Curry | DTS | 476 | 1034 | 70 | 1580 |
| Curry | LIB | 31 | 62 | 5 | 98 |
| Curry | OTH | 11 | 29 | 3 | 43 |
| Curry | REP | 1305 | 5955 | 189 | 7449 |
| De Baca | DEM | 120 | 171 | 0 | 291 |
| De Baca | DTS | 7 | 27 | 0 | 34 |
| De Baca | LIB | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| De Baca | OTH | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| De Baca | REP | 65 | 296 | 0 | 361 |
| Dona Ana | DEM | 16475 | 17432 | 570 | 34477 |
| Dona Ana | DTS | 5015 | 6929 | 333 | 12277 |
| Dona Ana | LIB | 207 | 288 | 18 | 513 |
| Dona Ana | OTH | 147 | 212 | 10 | 369 |


| McKinley | DTS | 424 | 1803 | 71 | 2298 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McKinley | LIB | 18 | 46 | 0 | 64 |
| McKinley | OTH | 30 | 134 | 5 | 169 |
| McKinley | REP | 453 | 2531 | 105 | 3089 |
| Mora | DEM | 566 | 770 | 29 | 1365 |
| Mora | DTS | 36 | 49 | 1 | 86 |
| Mora | LIB | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Mora | OTH | 4 | 9 | 0 | 13 |
| Mora | REP | 81 | 235 | 10 | 326 |
| Otero | DEM | 2546 | 2864 | 93 | 5503 |
| Otero | DTS | 1132 | 1955 | 62 | 3149 |
| Otero | LIB | 32 | 132 | 6 | 170 |
| Otero | OTH | 53 | 97 | 1 | 151 |
| Otero | REP | 2070 | 7972 | 218 | 10260 |
| Quay | DEM | 421 | 657 | 24 | 1102 |
| Quay | DTS | 73 | 195 | 8 | 276 |
| Quay | LIB | 2 | 10 | 0 | 12 |
| Quay | OTH | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 |
| Quay | REP | 258 | 1271 | 72 | 1601 |
| Rio Arriba | DEM | 3368 | 5323 | 186 | 8877 |
| Rio Arriba | DTS | 348 | 561 | 19 | 928 |
| Rio Arriba | LIB | 17 | 26 | 1 | 44 |
| Rio Arriba | OTH | 40 | 52 | 4 | 96 |
| Rio Arriba | REP | 466 | 1160 | 66 | 1692 |
| Roosevelt | DEM | 512 | 764 | 30 | 1306 |
| Roosevelt | DTS | 165 | 479 | 22 | 666 |
| Roosevelt | LIB | 10 | 36 | 2 | 48 |
| Roosevelt | OTH | 7 | 17 | 2 | 26 |
| Roosevelt | REP | 442 | 2828 | 95 | 3365 |
| San Juan | DEM | 4544 | 7720 | 306 | 12570 |
| San Juan | DTS | 1616 | 4489 | 218 | 6323 |
| San Juan | LIB | 77 | 287 | 13 | 377 |
| San Juan | OTH | 66 | 199 | 12 | 277 |
| San Juan | REP | 4106 | 19150 | 566 | 23822 |
| San Miguel | DEM | 4195 | 2710 | 68 | 6973 |
| San Miguel | DTS | 406 | 298 | 13 | 717 |
| San Miguel | LIB | 15 | 13 | 0 | 28 |
| San Miguel | OTH | 46 | 24 | 1 | 71 |
| San Miguel | REP | 557 | 823 | 20 | 1400 |
| Sandoval | DEM | 16663 | 12880 | 376 | 29919 |
| Sandoval | DTS | 4914 | 6369 | 207 | 11490 |
| Sandoval | LIB | 232 | 381 | 16 | 629 |
| Sandoval | OTH | 153 | 236 | 10 | 399 |
| Sandoval | REP | 7059 | 17457 | 414 | 24930 |
| Santa Fe | DEM | 28940 | 21929 | 276 | 51145 |


| County | DEM | REP |  | LIB | DTS | OTH |  | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bernalillo | 1425 | 1221 | 40 | 840 | 67 | 3593 |  |  |  |
| Catron | 5 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 25 |  |  |  |
| Chaves | 78 | 327 | 1 | 52 | 2 | 460 |  |  |  |
| Cibola | 39 | 47 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 108 |  |  |  |
| Colfax | 20 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 41 |  |  |  |
| Curry | 37 | 139 | 2 | 56 | 2 | 236 |  |  |  |
| De Baca | 0 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 |  |  |  |
| Dona Ana | 512 | 448 | 14 | 309 | 9 | 1292 |  |  |  |
| Eddy | 63 | 368 | 6 | 55 | 5 | 497 |  |  |  |
| Grant | 81 | 81 | 3 | 32 | 5 | 202 |  |  |  |
| Guadalupe | 11 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Harding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Hidalgo | 11 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |
| Lea | 40 | 214 | 1 | 35 | 3 | 293 |  |  |  |
| Lincoln | 31 | 84 | 1 | 28 | 1 | 145 |  |  |  |
| Los Alamos | 21 | 32 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 78 |  |  |  |
| Luna | 48 | 86 | 0 | 28 | 4 | 166 |  |  |  |
| McKinley | 234 | 134 | 5 | 148 | 6 | 527 |  |  |  |
| Mora | 8 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 |  |  |  |
| Otero | 70 | 209 | 9 | 61 | 3 | 352 |  |  |  |
| Quay | 9 | 30 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 49 |  |  |  |
| Rio Arriba | 95 | 47 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 166 |  |  |  |
| Roosevelt | 20 | 84 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 127 |  |  |  |
| San Juan | 140 | 343 | 13 | 93 | 1 | 590 |  |  |  |
| San Miguel | 41 | 21 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 80 |  |  |  |
| Sandoval | 264 | 399 | 18 | 154 | 19 | 854 |  |  |  |
| Santa Fe | 357 | 125 | 6 | 173 | 19 | 680 |  |  |  |
| Sierra | 18 | 51 | 1 | 28 | 5 | 103 |  |  |  |
| Socorro | 22 | 33 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 70 |  |  |  |
| Taos | 57 | 20 | 1 | 45 | 5 | 128 |  |  |  |
| Torrance | 20 | 51 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 92 |  |  |  |
| Union | 4 | 23 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 31 |  |  |  |
| Valencia | 101 | 237 | 5 | 41 | 16 | 400 |  |  |  |
| Total | 3884 | 4902 | 134 | 2343 | 186 | 11449 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lopez, LeeAnn, SOS
From: ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS
Sent:
Tuesday, November 3, 2020 11:40 AM
To:
Subject:
Attachments:
'Katharine Clark'
FW: New Mexico Vote Counts (3 Nov 2020-11:30am)
ElectionDayVoteCount-2020-11-03_11-30-00.xlsx; ElectionDayVoteCount-2020-11-03_ 11-30-00.pdf

From: Curtas, Alex, SOS
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 11:38 AM
To: Curtas, Alex, SOS [Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us](mailto:Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us)
Subject: New Mexico Vote Counts (3 Nov 2020-11:30am)
These counts current as of 11:30am MST

## Alex Curtas | Communications Director

New Mexico Secretary of State Maggie Toulouse Oliver
325 Don Gaspar, Ste. 300 | Santa Fe, NM 87501
Cell: 505.469.2783 | Desk: 505.827.3613
alex.curtas@state.nm.us
Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

| County | Party | Absentee | In Person | Election Da | otal Voted | Absentee | In Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEM | 196716 | 182962 | 20707 | 400385 | 321005 | 456260 |
|  | DTS | 50301 | 67137 | 10676 | 128114 |  |  |
|  | LIB | 2198 | 3694 | 665 | 6557 |  |  |
|  | OTH | 2040 | 3090 | 527 | 5657 |  |  |
|  | REP | 69750 | 199377 | 21004 | 290131 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DEM | 83559 | 62411 | 5201 | 151171 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DTS | 22570 | 24035 | 3213 | 49818 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | LIB | 1018 | 1421 | 201 | 2640 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | OTH | 849 | 1046 | 162 | 2057 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | REP | 29707 | 56368 | 4869 | 90944 |  |  |
| Catron | DEM | 193 | 198 | 41 | 432 |  |  |
| Catron | DTS | 68 | 123 | 46 | 237 |  |  |
| Catron | LIB | 9 | 5 | 2 | 16 |  |  |
| Catron | OTH | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |  |  |
| Catron | REP | 261 | 675 | 251 | 1187 |  |  |
| Chaves | DEM | 1622 | 3314 | 363 | 5299 |  |  |
| Chaves | DTS | 513 | 1579 | 268 | 2360 |  |  |
| Chaves | LIB | 25 | 80 | 21 | 126 |  |  |
| Chaves | OTH | 43 | 155 | 28 | 226 |  |  |
| Chaves | REP | 1524 | 9839 | 814 | 12177 |  |  |
| Cibola | DEM | 1333 | 2136 | 466 | 3935 |  |  |
| Cibola | DTS | 223 | 425 | 93 | 741 |  |  |
| Cibola | LIB | 10 | 26 | 8 | 44 |  |  |
| Cibola | OTH | 20 | 42 | 8 | 70 |  |  |
| Cibola | REP | 368 | 1478 | 203 | 2049 |  |  |
| Colfax | DEM | 1296 | 739 | 323 | 2358 |  |  |
| Colfax | DTS | 286 | 243 | 170 | 699 |  |  |
| Colfax | LIB | 10 | 14 | 10 | 34 |  |  |
| Colfax | OTH | 10 | 12 | 5 | 27 |  |  |
| Colfax | REP | 542 | 923 | 423 | 1888 |  |  |
| Curry | DEM | 1417 | 1797 | 232 | 3446 |  |  |
| Curry | DTS | 480 | 1034 | 222 | 1736 |  |  |
| Curry | LIB | 31 | 62 | 18 | 111 |  |  |
| Curry | OTH | 11 | 29 | 7 | 47 |  |  |
| Curry | REP | 1315 | 5955 | 639 | 7909 |  |  |
| De Baca | DEM | 120 | 171 | 0 | 291 |  |  |
| De Baca | DTS | 7 | 27 | 0 | 34 |  |  |
| De Baca | LIB | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| De Baca | OTH | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| De Baca | REP | 65 | 297 | 0 | 362 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DEM | 16486 | 17432 | 2488 | 36406 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DTS | 5024 | 6929 | 1515 | 13468 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | LIB | 208 | 288 | 77 | 573 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | OTH | 147 | 212 | 48 | 407 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | REP | 5207 | 15378 | 2246 | 22831 |  |  |
| Eddy | DEM | 1807 | 3444 | 476 | 5727 |  |  |
| Eddy | DTS | 430 | 1499 | 261 | 2190 |  |  |


| Eddy | LIB | 16 | 97 | 19 | 132 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eddy | OTH | 25 | 92 | 9 | 126 |
| Eddy | REP | 1251 | 10753 | 797 | 12801 |
| Grant | DEM | 2854 | 4284 | 244 | 7382 |
| Grant | DTS | 604 | 943 | 108 | 1655 |
| Grant | LIB | 22 | 45 | 9 | 76 |
| Grant | OTH | 41 | 67 | 9 | 117 |
| Grant | REP | 782 | 2937 | 311 | 4030 |
| Guadalupe | DEM | 788 | 495 | 77 | 1360 |
| Guadalupe |  | 24 | 31 | 14 | 69 |
| Guadalupe |  | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 |
| Guadalupe |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| Guadalupe | REP | 103 | 163 | 19 | 285 |
| Harding | DEM | 73 | 73 | 24 | 170 |
| Harding | DTS | 7 | 10 | 8 | 25 |
| Harding | REP | 87 | 134 | 30 | 251 |
| Hidalgo | DEM | 399 | 395 | 100 | 894 |
| Hidalgo | DTS | 33 | 53 | 18 | 104 |
| Hidalgo | LIB | 5 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| Hidalgo | OTH | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Hidalgo | REP | 130 | 257 | 136 | 523 |
| Lea | DEM | 1071 | 2094 | 245 | 3410 |
| Lea | DTS | 412 | 1816 | 247 | 2475 |
| Lea | LIB | 23 | 95 | 9 | 127 |
| Lea | OTH | 23 | 86 | 14 | 123 |
| Lea | REP | 1189 | 9989 | 735 | 11913 |
| Lincoln | DEM | 937 | 1126 | 122 | 2185 |
| Lincoln | DTS | 425 | 758 | 140 | 1323 |
| Lincoln | LIB | 23 | 53 | 6 | 82 |
| Lincoln | OTH | 17 | 29 | 3 | 49 |
| Lincoln | REP | 1162 | 3977 | 496 | 5635 |
| Los Alamos | DEM | 2764 | 2388 | 84 | 5236 |
| Los Alamos | DTS | 1152 | 1409 | 109 | 2670 |
| Los Alamos | LIB | 61 | 86 | 11 | 158 |
| Los Alamos | OTH | 21 | 33 | 3 | 57 |
| Los Alamos | REP | 1021 | 2172 | 200 | 3393 |
| Luna | DEM | 1298 | 1716 | 139 | 3153 |
| Luna | DTS | 338 | 614 | 68 | 1020 |
| Luna | LIB | 7 | 23 | 3 | 33 |
| Luna | OTH | 13 | 22 | 4 | 39 |
| Luna | REP | 509 | 2244 | 166 | 2919 |
| McKinley | DEM | 2628 | 8972 | 1510 | 13110 |
| McKinley | DTS | 424 | 1803 | 399 | 2626 |
| McKinley | LIB | 18 | 46 | 12 | 76 |
| McKinley | OTH | 31 | 134 | 20 | 185 |
| McKinley | REP | 454 | 2531 | 483 | 3468 |
| Mora | DEM | 566 | 770 | 145 | 1481 |
| Mora | DTS | 36 | 49 | 8 | 93 |


| Mora | LIB | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mora | OTH | 4 | 9 | 1 | 14 |
| Mora | REP | 81 | 235 | 65 | 381 |
| Otero | DEM | 2546 | 2864 | 335 | 5745 |
| Otero | DTS | 1132 | 1955 | 263 | 3350 |
| Otero | LIB | 32 | 132 | 26 | 190 |
| Otero | OTH | 53 | 97 | 10 | 160 |
| Otero | REP | 2070 | 7972 | 853 | 10895 |
| Quay | DEM | 421 | 657 | 102 | 1180 |
| Quay | DTS | 73 | 195 | 57 | 325 |
| Quay | LIB | 2 | 10 | 6 | 18 |
| Quay | OTH | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| Quay | REP | 260 | 1271 | 276 | 1807 |
| Rio Arriba | DEM | 3387 | 5323 | 1256 | 9966 |
| Rio Arriba | DTS | 352 | 561 | 182 | 1095 |
| Rio Arriba | LIB | 17 | 26 | 13 | 56 |
| Rio Arriba | OTH | 40 | 52 | 15 | 107 |
| Rio Arriba | REP | 469 | 1160 | 363 | 1992 |
| Roosevelt | DEM | 516 | 764 | 124 | 1404 |
| Roosevelt | DTS | 169 | 479 | 87 | 735 |
| Roosevelt | LIB | 10 | 36 | 9 | 55 |
| Roosevelt | OTH | 7 | 17 | 7 | 31 |
| Roosevelt | REP | 444 | 2828 | 328 | 3600 |
| San Juan | DEM | 4557 | 7721 | 1332 | 13610 |
| San Juan | DTS | 1623 | 4489 | 907 | 7019 |
| San Juan | LIB | 77 | 287 | 60 | 424 |
| San Juan | OTH | 66 | 199 | 45 | 310 |
| San Juan | REP | 4113 | 19150 | 1790 | 25053 |
| San Miguel | DEM | 4197 | 2710 | 314 | 7221 |
| San Miguel | DTS | 406 | 298 | 72 | 776 |
| San Miguel | LIB | 15 | 13 | 5 | 33 |
| San Miguel | OTH | 46 | 24 | 4 | 74 |
| San Miguel | REP | 557 | 823 | 119 | 1499 |
| Sandoval | DEM | 16663 | 12880 | 1706 | 31249 |
| Sandoval | DTS | 4914 | 6369 | 819 | 12102 |
| Sandoval | LIB | 232 | 381 | 52 | 665 |
| Sandoval | OTH | 153 | 236 | 37 | 426 |
| Sandoval | REP | 7059 | 17457 | 1488 | 26004 |
| Santa Fe | DEM | 28941 | 21929 | 1316 | 52186 |
| Santa Fe | DTS | 5499 | 5136 | 535 | 11170 |
| Santa Fe | LIB | 195 | 213 | 29 | 437 |
| Santa Fe | OTH | 220 | 219 | 32 | 471 |
| Santa Fe | REP | 3565 | 7201 | 650 | 11416 |
| Sierra | DEM | 819 | 830 | 140 | 1789 |
| Sierra | DTS | 247 | 505 | 105 | 857 |
| Sierra | LIB | 7 | 15 | 6 | 28 |
| Sierra | OTH | 14 | 22 | 6 | 42 |
| Sierra | REP | 512 | 1817 | 330 | 2659 |


| Socorro | DEM | 1202 | 1388 | 128 | 2718 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Socorro | DTS | 226 | 403 | 61 | 690 |
| Socorro | LIB | 8 | 19 | 10 | 37 |
| Socorro | OTH | 16 | 22 | 2 | 40 |
| Socorro | REP | 438 | 1390 | 206 | 2034 |
| Taos | DEM | 4480 | 5866 | 721 | 11067 |
| Taos | DTS | 582 | 931 | 165 | 1678 |
| Taos | LIB | 23 | 40 | 13 | 76 |
| Taos | OTH | 42 | 64 | 12 | 118 |
| Taos | REP | 494 | 1131 | 273 | 1898 |
| Torrance | DEM | 951 | 839 | 150 | 1940 |
| Torrance | DTS | 272 | 439 | 99 | 810 |
| Torrance | LIB | 16 | 34 | 4 | 54 |
| Torrance | OTH | 17 | 24 | 2 | 43 |
| Torrance | REP | 783 | 2088 | 298 | 3169 |
| Union | DEM | 138 | 256 | 61 | 455 |
| Union | DTS | 26 | 63 | 25 | 114 |
| Union | LIB | 2 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| Union | OTH | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Union | REP | 151 | 676 | 137 | 964 |
| Valencia | DEM | 6687 | 4980 | 742 | 12409 |
| Valencia | DTS | 1724 | 1934 | 392 | 4050 |
| Valencia | LIB | 70 | 130 | 21 | 221 |
| Valencia | OTH | 103 | 129 | 31 | 263 |
| Valencia | REP | 3077 | 8108 | 1010 | 12195 |


| From: | ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, November 3, 2020 3:41 PM |
| To: | 'Katharine Clark' |
| Subject: | FW: New Mexico Vote Counts (3 Nov 2020-3:30pm) |
| Attachments: | ElectionDayVoteCount-2020-11-03_15-30-00.xlsx; ElectionDayVoteCount-2020-11-03_ |
|  | 15-30-00.pdf |

The few minutes later official one

From: Curtas, Alex, SOS
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 3:36 PM
To: Curtas, Alex, SOS [Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us](mailto:Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us)
Subject: New Mexico Vote Counts (3 Nov 2020-3:30pm)
Current as of 3:30pm MST today.


STATE OF NEW MSEVSO
MAGGIE TOULOUSE OLIVER
secretiary or state
Alex Curtas | Director of Communications
New Mexico Office of the Secretary of State
325 Don Gaspar, Ste. 300 | Santa Fe, NM 87501
Cell: 505-469-2783 | Desk: 505-827-3613
alex.curtas@state.nm.us
Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

| County | Party | Absentee | In Person | Election Da | otal Voted | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { Absentee } & \text { In Person } \\ 323469 & 456260\end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEM | 197932 | 182962 | 35089 | 415983 |  |  |
|  | DTS | 50917 | 67137 | 18706 | 136760 |  |  |
|  | LIB | 2235 | 3694 | 1118 | 7047 |  |  |
|  | OTH | 2064 | 3090 | 971 | 6125 |  |  |
|  | REP | 70321 | 199377 | 33533 | 303231 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DEM | 84515 | 62411 | 9259 | 156185 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DTS | 23011 | 24035 | 5770 | 52816 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | LIB | 1047 | 1421 | 356 | 2824 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | OTH | 867 | 1046 | 287 | 2200 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | REP | 30061 | 56368 | 7703 | 94132 |  |  |
| Catron | DEM | 193 | 198 | 87 | 478 |  |  |
| Catron | DTS | 68 | 123 | 99 | 290 |  |  |
| Catron | LIB | 9 | 5 | 6 | 20 |  |  |
| Catron | OTH | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |  |  |
| Catron | REP | 264 | 675 | 482 | 1421 |  |  |
| Chaves | DEM | 1631 | 3314 | 693 | 5638 |  |  |
| Chaves | DTS | 522 | 1579 | 493 | 2594 |  |  |
| Chaves | LIB | 25 | 80 | 36 | 141 |  |  |
| Chaves | OTH | 43 | 155 | 44 | 242 |  |  |
| Chaves | REP | 1530 | 9839 | 1359 | 12728 |  |  |
| Cibola | DEM | 1335 | 2136 | 1082 | 4553 |  |  |
| Cibola | DTS | 224 | 425 | 271 | 920 |  |  |
| Cibola | LIB | 10 | 26 | 15 | 51 |  |  |
| Cibola | OTH | 20 | 42 | 15 | 77 |  |  |
| Cibola | REP | 369 | 1478 | 442 | 2289 |  |  |
| Colfax | DEM | 1300 | 739 | 579 | 2618 |  |  |
| Colfax | DTS | 291 | 243 | 274 | 808 |  |  |
| Colfax | LIB | 10 | 14 | 14 | 38 |  |  |
| Colfax | OTH | 10 | 12 | 14 | 36 |  |  |
| Colfax | REP | 542 | 923 | 673 | 2138 |  |  |
| Curry | DEM | 1436 | 1797 | 491 | 3724 |  |  |
| Curry | DTS | 494 | 1034 | 450 | 1978 |  |  |
| Curry | LIB | 32 | 62 | 37 | 131 |  |  |
| Curry | OTH | 11 | 29 | 13 | 53 |  |  |
| Curry | REP | 1338 | 5955 | 1151 | 8444 |  |  |
| De Baca | DEM | 120 | 171 | 0 | 291 |  |  |
| De Baca | DTS | 7 | 27 | 0 | 34 |  |  |
| De Baca | LIB | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| De Baca | OTH | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| De Baca | REP | 65 | 297 | 0 | 362 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DEM | 16519 | 17432 | 4319 | 38270 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DTS | 5054 | 6929 | 2644 | 14627 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | LIB | 209 | 288 | 128 | 625 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | OTH | 147 | 212 | 103 | 462 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | REP | 5231 | 15378 | 3309 | 23918 |  |  |
| Eddy | DEM | 1807 | 3444 | 822 | 6073 |  |  |


| Eddy | DTS | 430 | 1499 | 515 | 2444 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eddy | LIB | 16 | 97 | 40 | 153 |
| Eddy | OTH | 25 | 92 | 25 | 142 |
| Eddy | REP | 1251 | 10753 | 1343 | 13347 |
| Grant | DEM | 2854 | 4284 | 591 | 7729 |
| Grant | DTS | 604 | 943 | 256 | 1803 |
| Grant | LIB | 22 | 45 | 18 | 85 |
| Grant | OTH | 41 | 67 | 21 | 129 |
| Grant | REP | 783 | 2937 | 587 | 4307 |
| Guadalupe | DEM | 791 | 495 | 192 | 1478 |
| Guadalupe | DTS | 24 | 31 | 25 | 80 |
| Guadalupe |  | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| Guadalupe | OTH | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Guadalupe | REP | 103 | 163 | 62 | 328 |
| Harding | DEM | 75 | 73 | 46 | 194 |
| Harding | DTS | 7 | 10 | 11 | 28 |
| Harding | LIB | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Harding | REP | 87 | 134 | 51 | 272 |
| Hidalgo | DEM | 402 | 395 | 204 | 1001 |
| Hidalgo | DTS | 36 | 53 | 26 | 115 |
| Hidalgo | LIB | 5 | 4 | 2 | 11 |
| Hidalgo | OTH | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Hidalgo | REP | 132 | 257 | 232 | 621 |
| Lea | DEM | 1076 | 2094 | 641 | 3811 |
| Lea | DTS | 417 | 1816 | 655 | 2888 |
| Lea | LIB | 23 | 95 | 30 | 148 |
| Lea | OTH | 23 | 86 | 37 | 146 |
| Lea | REP | 1193 | 9989 | 1555 | 12737 |
| Lincoln | DEM | 942 | 1126 | 199 | 2267 |
| Lincoln | DTS | 427 | 758 | 230 | 1415 |
| Lincoln | LIB | 23 | 53 | 10 | 86 |
| Lincoln | OTH | 17 | 29 | 5 | 51 |
| Lincoln | REP | 1176 | 3977 | 755 | 5908 |
| Los Alamos | DEM | 2790 | 2388 | 217 | 5395 |
| Los Alamos | DTS | 1182 | 1409 | 262 | 2853 |
| Los Alamos | LIB | 63 | 86 | 26 | 175 |
| Los Alamos | OTH | 21 | 33 | 8 | 62 |
| Los Alamos | REP | 1040 | 2172 | 400 | 3612 |
| Luna | DEM | 1305 | 1716 | 417 | 3438 |
| Luna | DTS | 339 | 614 | 194 | 1147 |
| Luna | LIB | 8 | 23 | 14 | 45 |
| Luna | OTH | 13 | 22 | 11 | 46 |
| Luna | REP | 514 | 2244 | 336 | 3094 |
| McKinley | DEM | 2628 | 8972 | 1016 | 12616 |
| McKinley | DTS | 424 | 1803 | 314 | 2541 |
| McKinley | LIB | 18 | 46 | 4 | 68 |
| McKinley | OTH | 30 | 134 | 21 | 185 |


| McKinley | REP | 454 | 2531 | 234 | 3219 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mora | DEM | 566 | 770 | 391 | 1727 |
| Mora | DTS | 36 | 49 | 30 | 115 |
| Mora | LIB | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Mora | OTH | 4 | 9 | 3 | 16 |
| Mora | REP | 81 | 235 | 132 | 448 |
| Otero | DEM | 2568 | 2864 | 848 | 6280 |
| Otero | DTS | 1143 | 1955 | 681 | 3779 |
| Otero | LIB | 32 | 132 | 45 | 209 |
| Otero | OTH | 54 | 97 | 40 | 191 |
| Otero | REP | 2082 | 7972 | 1722 | 11776 |
| Quay | DEM | 427 | 657 | 220 | 1304 |
| Quay | DTS | 73 | 195 | 103 | 371 |
| Quay | LIB | 3 | 10 | 8 | 21 |
| Quay | OTH | 2 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| Quay | REP | 263 | 1271 | 435 | 1969 |
| Rio Arriba | DEM | 3422 | 5323 | 2417 | 11162 |
| Rio Arriba | DTS | 358 | 561 | 343 | 1262 |
| Rio Arriba | LIB | 17 | 26 | 19 | 62 |
| Rio Arriba | OTH | 41 | 52 | 34 | 127 |
| Rio Arriba | REP | 474 | 1160 | 618 | 2252 |
| Roosevelt | DEM | 518 | 764 | 222 | 1504 |
| Roosevelt | DTS | 170 | 479 | 178 | 827 |
| Roosevelt | LIB | 10 | 36 | 20 | 66 |
| Roosevelt | OTH | 7 | 17 | 15 | 39 |
| Roosevelt | REP | 446 | 2828 | 525 | 3799 |
| San Juan | DEM | 4582 | 7721 | 2415 | 14718 |
| San Juan | DTS | 1651 | 4489 | 1639 | 7779 |
| San Juan | LIB | 78 | 287 | 97 | 462 |
| San Juan | OTH | 66 | 199 | 98 | 363 |
| San Juan | REP | 4145 | 19150 | 2895 | 26190 |
| San Miguel | DEM | 4227 | 2710 | 882 | 7819 |
| San Miguel | DTS | 413 | 298 | 167 | 878 |
| San Miguel |  | 15 | 13 | 8 | 36 |
| San Miguel | OTH | 48 | 24 | 10 | 82 |
| San Miguel | REP | 574 | 823 | 316 | 1713 |
| Sandoval | DEM | 16691 | 12880 | 3033 | 32604 |
| Sandoval | DTS | 4942 | 6369 | 1434 | 12745 |
| Sandoval | LIB | 234 | 381 | 91 | 706 |
| Sandoval | OTH | 153 | 236 | 63 | 452 |
| Sandoval | REP | 7073 | 17457 | 2325 | 26855 |
| Santa Fe | DEM | 28853 | 21929 | 0 | 50782 |
| Santa Fe | DTS | 5466 | 5136 | 0 | 10602 |
| Santa Fe | LIB | 192 | 213 | 0 | 405 |
| Santa Fe | OTH | 218 | 219 | 0 | 437 |
| Santa Fe | REP | 3551 | 7201 | 0 | 10752 |
| Sierra | DEM | 822 | 830 | 230 | 1882 |


| Sierra | DTS | 251 | 505 | 180 | 936 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sierra | LIB | 7 | 15 | 8 | 30 |
| Sierra | OTH | 15 | 22 | 8 | 45 |
| Sierra | REP | 517 | 1817 | 519 | 2853 |
| Socorro | DEM | 1216 | 1388 | 590 | 3194 |
| Socorro | DTS | 230 | 403 | 207 | 840 |
| Socorro | LIB | 10 | 19 | 14 | 43 |
| Socorro | OTH | 18 | 22 | 13 | 53 |
| Socorro | REP | 447 | 1390 | 570 | 2407 |
| Taos | DEM | 4499 | 5866 | 1284 | 11649 |
| Taos | DTS | 588 | 931 | 318 | 1837 |
| Taos | LIB | 23 | 40 | 21 | 84 |
| Taos | OTH | 42 | 64 | 21 | 127 |
| Taos | REP | 496 | 1131 | 441 | 2068 |
| Torrance | DEM | 951 | 839 | 346 | 2136 |
| Torrance | DTS | 272 | 439 | 207 | 918 |
| Torrance | LIB | 16 | 34 | 9 | 59 |
| Torrance | OTH | 17 | 24 | 5 | 46 |
| Torrance | REP | 783 | 2088 | 626 | 3497 |
| Union | DEM | 139 | 256 | 99 | 494 |
| Union | DTS | 26 | 63 | 33 | 122 |
| Union | LIB | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 |
| Union | OTH | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Union | REP | 151 | 676 | 216 | 1043 |
| Valencia | DEM | 6732 | 4980 | 1257 | 12969 |
| Valencia | DTS | 1737 | 1934 | 697 | 4368 |
| Valencia | LIB | 70 | 130 | 35 | 235 |
| Valencia | OTH | 103 | 129 | 48 | 280 |
| Valencia | REP | 3105 | 8108 | 1519 | 12732 |


| County | Party | Absentee | In Person | Election Da | otal Voted | Absentee | In Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEM | 197932 | 182962 | 35089 | 415983 | 323469 | 456260 |
|  | DTS | 50917 | 67137 | 18706 | 136760 |  |  |
|  | LIB | 2235 | 3694 | 1118 | 7047 |  |  |
|  | OTH | 2064 | 3090 | 971 | 6125 |  |  |
|  | REP | 70321 | 199377 | 33533 | 303231 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DEM | 84515 | 62411 | 9259 | 156185 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DTS | 23011 | 24035 | 5770 | 52816 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | LIB | 1047 | 1421 | 356 | 2824 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | OTH | 867 | 1046 | 287 | 2200 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | REP | 30061 | 56368 | 7703 | 94132 |  |  |
| Catron | DEM | 193 | 198 | 87 | 478 |  |  |
| Catron | DTS | 68 | 123 | 99 | 290 |  |  |
| Catron | LIB | 9 | 5 | 6 | 20 |  |  |
| Catron | OTH | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |  |  |
| Catron | REP | 264 | 675 | 482 | 1421 |  |  |
| Chaves | DEM | 1631 | 3314 | 693 | 5638 |  |  |
| Chaves | DTS | 522 | 1579 | 493 | 2594 |  |  |
| Chaves | LIB | 25 | 80 | 36 | 141 |  |  |
| Chaves | OTH | 43 | 155 | 44 | 242 |  |  |
| Chaves | REP | 1530 | 9839 | 1359 | 12728 |  |  |
| Cibola | DEM | 1335 | 2136 | 1082 | 4553 |  |  |
| Cibola | DTS | 224 | 425 | 271 | 920 |  |  |
| Cibola | LIB | 10 | 26 | 15 | 51 |  |  |
| Cibola | OTH | 20 | 42 | 15 | 77 |  |  |
| Cibola | REP | 369 | 1478 | 442 | 2289 |  |  |
| Colfax | DEM | 1300 | 739 | 579 | 2618 |  |  |
| Colfax | DTS | 291 | 243 | 274 | 808 |  |  |
| Colfax | LIB | 10 | 14 | 14 | 38 |  |  |
| Colfax | OTH | 10 | 12 | 14 | 36 |  |  |
| Colfax | REP | 542 | 923 | 673 | 2138 |  |  |
| Curry | DEM | 1436 | 1797 | 491 | 3724 |  |  |
| Curry | DTS | 494 | 1034 | 450 | 1978 |  |  |
| Curry | LIB | 32 | 62 | 37 | 131 |  |  |
| Curry | OTH | 11 | 29 | 13 | 53 |  |  |
| Curry | REP | 1338 | 5955 | 1151 | 8444 |  |  |
| De Baca | DEM | 120 | 171 | 0 | 291 |  |  |
| De Baca | DTS | 7 | 27 | 0 | 34 |  |  |
| De Baca | LIB | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| De Baca | OTH | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| De Baca | REP | 65 | 297 | 0 | 362 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DEM | 16519 | 17432 | 4319 | 38270 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DTS | 5054 | 6929 | 2644 | 14627 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | LIB | 209 | 288 | 128 | 625 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | OTH | 147 | 212 | 103 | 462 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | REP | 5231 | 15378 | 3309 | 23918 |  |  |
| Eddy | DEM | 1807 | 3444 | 822 | 6073 |  |  |


| Eddy | DTS | 430 | 1499 | 515 | 2444 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eddy | LIB | 16 | 97 | 40 | 153 |
| Eddy | OTH | 25 | 92 | 25 | 142 |
| Eddy | REP | 1251 | 10753 | 1343 | 13347 |
| Grant | DEM | 2854 | 4284 | 591 | 7729 |
| Grant | DTS | 604 | 943 | 256 | 1803 |
| Grant | LIB | 22 | 45 | 18 | 85 |
| Grant | OTH | 41 | 67 | 21 | 129 |
| Grant | REP | 783 | 2937 | 587 | 4307 |
| Guadalupe | DEM | 791 | 495 | 192 | 1478 |
| Guadalupe |  | 24 | 31 | 25 | 80 |
| Guadalupe |  | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| Guadalupe |  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Guadalupe |  | 103 | 163 | 62 | 328 |
| Harding | DEM | 75 | 73 | 46 | 194 |
| Harding | DTS | 7 | 10 | 11 | 28 |
| Harding | LIB | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Harding | REP | 87 | 134 | 51 | 272 |
| Hidalgo | DEM | 402 | 395 | 204 | 1001 |
| Hidalgo | DTS | 36 | 53 | 26 | 115 |
| Hidalgo | LIB | 5 | 4 | 2 | 11 |
| Hidalgo | OTH | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Hidalgo | REP | 132 | 257 | 232 | 621 |
| Lea | DEM | 1076 | 2094 | 641 | 3811 |
| Lea | DTS | 417 | 1816 | 655 | 2888 |
| Lea | LIB | 23 | 95 | 30 | 148 |
| Lea | OTH | 23 | 86 | 37 | 146 |
| Lea | REP | 1193 | 9989 | 1555 | 12737 |
| Lincoln | DEM | 942 | 1126 | 199 | 2267 |
| Lincoln | DTS | 427 | 758 | 230 | 1415 |
| Lincoln | LIB | 23 | 53 | 10 | 86 |
| Lincoln | OTH | 17 | 29 | 5 | 51 |
| Lincoln | REP | 1176 | 3977 | 755 | 5908 |
| Los Alamos | DEM | 2790 | 2388 | 217 | 5395 |
| Los Alamos | DTS | 1182 | 1409 | 262 | 2853 |
| Los Alamos |  | 63 | 86 | 26 | 175 |
| Los Alamos | OTH | 21 | 33 | 8 | 62 |
| Los Alamos | REP | 1040 | 2172 | 400 | 3612 |
| Luna | DEM | 1305 | 1716 | 417 | 3438 |
| Luna | DTS | 339 | 614 | 194 | 1147 |
| Luna | LIB | 8 | 23 | 14 | 45 |
| Luna | OTH | 13 | 22 | 11 | 46 |
| Luna | REP | 514 | 2244 | 336 | 3094 |
| McKinley | DEM | 2628 | 8972 | 1016 | 12616 |
| McKinley | DTS | 424 | 1803 | 314 | 2541 |
| McKinley | LIB | 18 | 46 | 4 | 68 |
| McKinley | OTH | 30 | 134 | 21 | 185 |


| McKinley | REP | 454 | 2531 | 234 | 3219 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mora | DEM | 566 | 770 | 391 | 1727 |
| Mora | DTS | 36 | 49 | 30 | 115 |
| Mora | LIB | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Mora | OTH | 4 | 9 | 3 | 16 |
| Mora | REP | 81 | 235 | 132 | 448 |
| Otero | DEM | 2568 | 2864 | 848 | 6280 |
| Otero | DTS | 1143 | 1955 | 681 | 3779 |
| Otero | LIB | 32 | 132 | 45 | 209 |
| Otero | OTH | 54 | 97 | 40 | 191 |
| Otero | REP | 2082 | 7972 | 1722 | 11776 |
| Quay | DEM | 427 | 657 | 220 | 1304 |
| Quay | DTS | 73 | 195 | 103 | 371 |
| Quay | LIB | 3 | 10 | 8 | 21 |
| Quay | OTH | 2 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| Quay | REP | 263 | 1271 | 435 | 1969 |
| Rio Arriba | DEM | 3422 | 5323 | 2417 | 11162 |
| Rio Arriba | DTS | 358 | 561 | 343 | 1262 |
| Rio Arriba | LIB | 17 | 26 | 19 | 62 |
| Rio Arriba | OTH | 41 | 52 | 34 | 127 |
| Rio Arriba | REP | 474 | 1160 | 618 | 2252 |
| Roosevelt | DEM | 518 | 764 | 222 | 1504 |
| Roosevelt | DTS | 170 | 479 | 178 | 827 |
| Roosevelt | LIB | 10 | 36 | 20 | 66 |
| Roosevelt | OTH | 7 | 17 | 15 | 39 |
| Roosevelt | REP | 446 | 2828 | 525 | 3799 |
| San Juan | DEM | 4582 | 7721 | 2415 | 14718 |
| San Juan | DTS | 1651 | 4489 | 1639 | 7779 |
| San Juan | LIB | 78 | 287 | 97 | 462 |
| San Juan | OTH | 66 | 199 | 98 | 363 |
| San Juan | REP | 4145 | 19150 | 2895 | 26190 |
| San Miguel | DEM | 4227 | 2710 | 882 | 7819 |
| San Miguel |  | 413 | 298 | 167 | 878 |
| San Miguel |  | 15 | 13 | 8 | 36 |
| San Miguel | OTH | 48 | 24 | 10 | 82 |
| San Miguel | REP | 574 | 823 | 316 | 1713 |
| Sandoval | DEM | 16691 | 12880 | 3033 | 32604 |
| Sandoval | DTS | 4942 | 6369 | 1434 | 12745 |
| Sandoval | LIB | 234 | 381 | 91 | 706 |
| Sandoval | OTH | 153 | 236 | 63 | 452 |
| Sandoval | REP | 7073 | 17457 | 2325 | 26855 |
| Santa Fe | DEM | 28853 | 21929 | 0 | 50782 |
| Santa Fe | DTS | 5466 | 5136 | 0 | 10602 |
| Santa Fe | LIB | 192 | 213 | 0 | 405 |
| Santa Fe | OTH | 218 | 219 | 0 | 437 |
| Santa Fe | REP | 3551 | 7201 | 0 | 10752 |
| Sierra | DEM | 822 | 830 | 230 | 1882 |


| Sierra | DTS | 251 | 505 | 180 | 936 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sierra | LIB | 7 | 15 | 8 | 30 |
| Sierra | OTH | 15 | 22 | 8 | 45 |
| Sierra | REP | 517 | 1817 | 519 | 2853 |
| Socorro | DEM | 1216 | 1388 | 590 | 3194 |
| Socorro | DTS | 230 | 403 | 207 | 840 |
| Socorro | LIB | 10 | 19 | 14 | 43 |
| Socorro | OTH | 18 | 22 | 13 | 53 |
| Socorro | REP | 447 | 1390 | 570 | 2407 |
| Taos | DEM | 4499 | 5866 | 1284 | 11649 |
| Taos | DTS | 588 | 931 | 318 | 1837 |
| Taos | LIB | 23 | 40 | 21 | 84 |
| Taos | OTH | 42 | 64 | 21 | 127 |
| Taos | REP | 496 | 1131 | 441 | 2068 |
| Torrance | DEM | 951 | 839 | 346 | 2136 |
| Torrance | DTS | 272 | 439 | 207 | 918 |
| Torrance | LIB | 16 | 34 | 9 | 59 |
| Torrance | OTH | 17 | 24 | 5 | 46 |
| Torrance | REP | 783 | 2088 | 626 | 3497 |
| Union | DEM | 139 | 256 | 99 | 494 |
| Union | DTS | 26 | 63 | 33 | 122 |
| Union | LIB | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 |
| Union | OTH | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Union | REP | 151 | 676 | 216 | 1043 |
| Valencia | DEM | 6732 | 4980 | 1257 | 12969 |
| Valencia | DTS | 1737 | 1934 | 697 | 4368 |
| Valencia | LIB | 70 | 130 | 35 | 235 |
| Valencia | OTH | 103 | 129 | 48 | 280 |
| Valencia | REP | 3105 | 8108 | 1519 | 12732 |

Lopez, LeeAnn, SOS
From: ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS
Sent:
Tuesday, November 3, 2020 3:27 PM
To:
Subject:
'Katharine Clark'
Attachments:
FW: Vote Count as of 3:18 PM today
ElectionDayVoteCount-2020-11-03_15-18-25.xlsx

Check out these numbers...a just for me just now report.

From: Goode, Alan, SOS
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 3:25 PM
To: ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS [Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us](mailto:Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us)
Subject: Vote Count as of 3:18 PM today
Maggie,
Here are the current numbers as of 3:18 PM today.
Alan

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
MAGGIE TOULOUSE OLIVER
secretary of state
Alan Goode | IT Developer
New Mexico Office of the Secretary of State
325 Don Gaspar, Ste. 300 | Santa Fe NM 87501
Cell: (832) 498-8924 | Desk: (505) 827-6848
alan.goode@state.nm.us

Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

| County | Party | Absentee | In Person | Election Da | tal Voted | Absentee | In Person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEM | 197914 | 182962 | 33452 | 414328 | 323422 | 456260 |
|  | DTS | 50902 | 67137 | 17934 | 135973 |  |  |
|  | LIB | 2235 | 3694 | 1081 | 7010 |  |  |
|  | OTH | 2063 | 3090 | 932 | 6085 |  |  |
|  | REP | 70308 | 199377 | 32336 | 302021 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DEM | 84515 | 62411 | 9084 | 156010 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DTS | 23011 | 24035 | 5659 | 52705 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | LIB | 1047 | 1421 | 350 | 2818 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | OTH | 867 | 1046 | 283 | 2196 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | REP | 30060 | 56368 | 7567 | 93995 |  |  |
| Catron | DEM | 193 | 198 | 87 | 478 |  |  |
| Catron | DTS | 68 | 123 | 96 | 287 |  |  |
| Catron | LIB | 9 | 5 | 6 | 20 |  |  |
| Catron | OTH | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |  |  |
| Catron | REP | 264 | 675 | 473 | 1412 |  |  |
| Chaves | DEM | 1631 | 3314 | 693 | 5638 |  |  |
| Chaves | DTS | 522 | 1579 | 493 | 2594 |  |  |
| Chaves | LIB | 25 | 80 | 36 | 141 |  |  |
| Chaves | OTH | 43 | 155 | 44 | 242 |  |  |
| Chaves | REP | 1530 | 9839 | 1359 | 12728 |  |  |
| Cibola | DEM | 1335 | 2136 | 1082 | 4553 |  |  |
| Cibola | DTS | 224 | 425 | 271 | 920 |  |  |
| Cibola | LIB | 10 | 26 | 15 | 51 |  |  |
| Cibola | OTH | 20 | 42 | 15 | 77 |  |  |
| Cibola | REP | 369 | 1478 | 442 | 2289 |  |  |
| Colfax | DEM | 1299 | 739 | 557 | 2595 |  |  |
| Colfax | DTS | 291 | 243 | 266 | 800 |  |  |
| Colfax | LIB | 10 | 14 | 14 | 38 |  |  |
| Colfax | OTH | 10 | 12 | 14 | 36 |  |  |
| Colfax | REP | 542 | 923 | 656 | 2121 |  |  |
| Curry | DEM | 1429 | 1797 | 461 | 3687 |  |  |
| Curry | DTS | 488 | 1034 | 424 | 1946 |  |  |
| Curry | LIB | 32 | 62 | 34 | 128 |  |  |
| Curry | OTH | 11 | 29 | 12 | 52 |  |  |
| Curry | REP | 1333 | 5955 | 1083 | 8371 |  |  |
| De Baca | DEM | 120 | 171 | 0 | 291 |  |  |
| De Baca | DTS | 7 | 27 | 0 | 34 |  |  |
| De Baca | LIB | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| De Baca | OTH | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| De Baca | REP | 65 | 297 | 0 | 362 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DEM | 16519 | 17432 | 4238 | 38189 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DTS | 5053 | 6929 | 2594 | 14576 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | LIB | 209 | 288 | 125 | 622 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | OTH | 147 | 212 | 101 | 460 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | REP | 5229 | 15378 | 3257 | 23864 |  |  |
| Eddy | DEM | 1807 | 3444 | 780 | 6031 |  |  |


| Eddy | DTS | 430 | 1499 | 485 | 2414 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eddy | LIB | 16 | 97 | 39 | 152 |
| Eddy | OTH | 25 | 92 | 25 | 142 |
| Eddy | REP | 1251 | 10753 | 1275 | 13279 |
| Grant | DEM | 2854 | 4284 | 544 | 7682 |
| Grant | DTS | 604 | 943 | 237 | 1784 |
| Grant | LIB | 22 | 45 | 18 | 85 |
| Grant | OTH | 41 | 67 | 17 | 125 |
| Grant | REP | 783 | 2937 | 563 | 4283 |
| Guadalupe | DEM | 791 | 495 | 177 | 1463 |
| Guadalupe |  | 24 | 31 | 25 | 80 |
| Guadalupe |  | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| Guadalupe | OTH | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Guadalupe |  | 103 | 163 | 56 | 322 |
| Harding | DEM | 75 | 73 | 46 | 194 |
| Harding | DTS | 7 | 10 | 11 | 28 |
| Harding | LIB | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Harding | REP | 87 | 134 | 51 | 272 |
| Hidalgo | DEM | 402 | 395 | 189 | 986 |
| Hidalgo | DTS | 36 | 53 | 26 | 115 |
| Hidalgo | LIB | 5 | 4 | 2 | 11 |
| Hidalgo | OTH | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Hidalgo | REP | 132 | 257 | 222 | 611 |
| Lea | DEM | 1072 | 2094 | 531 | 3697 |
| Lea | DTS | 414 | 1816 | 546 | 2776 |
| Lea | LIB | 23 | 95 | 23 | 141 |
| Lea | OTH | 23 | 86 | 33 | 142 |
| Lea | REP | 1189 | 9989 | 1336 | 12514 |
| Lincoln | DEM | 942 | 1126 | 199 | 2267 |
| Lincoln | DTS | 427 | 758 | 230 | 1415 |
| Lincoln | LIB | 23 | 53 | 10 | 86 |
| Lincoln | OTH | 17 | 29 | 5 | 51 |
| Lincoln | REP | 1176 | 3977 | 755 | 5908 |
| Los Alamos | DEM | 2787 | 2388 | 208 | 5383 |
| Los Alamos | DTS | 1177 | 1409 | 254 | 2840 |
| Los Alamos |  | 63 | 86 | 26 | 175 |
| Los Alamos | OTH | 21 | 33 | 7 | 61 |
| Los Alamos | REP | 1040 | 2172 | 387 | 3599 |
| Luna | DEM | 1305 | 1716 | 346 | 3367 |
| Luna | DTS | 339 | 614 | 157 | 1110 |
| Luna | LIB | 8 | 23 | 11 | 42 |
| Luna | OTH | 13 | 22 | 10 | 45 |
| Luna | REP | 513 | 2244 | 297 | 3054 |
| McKinley | DEM | 2627 | 8972 | 483 | 12082 |
| McKinley | DTS | 424 | 1803 | 133 | 2360 |
| McKinley | LIB | 18 | 46 | 3 | 67 |
| McKinley | OTH | 30 | 134 | 10 | 174 |


| McKinley | REP | 454 | 2531 | 106 | 3091 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mora | DEM | 566 | 770 | 367 | 1703 |
| Mora | DTS | 36 | 49 | 28 | 113 |
| Mora | LIB | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Mora | OTH | 4 | 9 | 3 | 16 |
| Mora | REP | 81 | 235 | 123 | 439 |
| Otero | DEM | 2568 | 2864 | 834 | 6266 |
| Otero | DTS | 1143 | 1955 | 672 | 3770 |
| Otero | LIB | 32 | 132 | 44 | 208 |
| Otero | OTH | 54 | 97 | 39 | 190 |
| Otero | REP | 2082 | 7972 | 1698 | 11752 |
| Quay | DEM | 426 | 657 | 207 | 1290 |
| Quay | DTS | 73 | 195 | 100 | 368 |
| Quay | LIB | 3 | 10 | 7 | 20 |
| Quay | OTH | 1 | 5 | 2 | 8 |
| Quay | REP | 263 | 1271 | 418 | 1952 |
| Rio Arriba | DEM | 3422 | 5323 | 2417 | 11162 |
| Rio Arriba | DTS | 358 | 561 | 343 | 1262 |
| Rio Arriba | LIB | 17 | 26 | 19 | 62 |
| Rio Arriba | OTH | 41 | 52 | 34 | 127 |
| Rio Arriba | REP | 474 | 1160 | 618 | 2252 |
| Roosevelt | DEM | 518 | 764 | 211 | 1493 |
| Roosevelt | DTS | 170 | 479 | 169 | 818 |
| Roosevelt | LIB | 10 | 36 | 20 | 66 |
| Roosevelt | OTH | 7 | 17 | 14 | 38 |
| Roosevelt | REP | 446 | 2828 | 503 | 3777 |
| San Juan | DEM | 4582 | 7721 | 2372 | 14675 |
| San Juan | DTS | 1651 | 4489 | 1611 | 7751 |
| San Juan | LIB | 78 | 287 | 92 | 457 |
| San Juan | OTH | 66 | 199 | 96 | 361 |
| San Juan | REP | 4145 | 19150 | 2837 | 26132 |
| San Miguel | DEM | 4227 | 2710 | 738 | 7675 |
| San Miguel |  | 413 | 298 | 136 | 847 |
| San Miguel |  | 15 | 13 | 8 | 36 |
| San Miguel | OTH | 48 | 24 | 7 | 79 |
| San Miguel | REP | 574 | 823 | 271 | 1668 |
| Sandoval | DEM | 16691 | 12880 | 2971 | 32542 |
| Sandoval | DTS | 4942 | 6369 | 1396 | 12707 |
| Sandoval | LIB | 234 | 381 | 90 | 705 |
| Sandoval | OTH | 153 | 236 | 61 | 450 |
| Sandoval | REP | 7073 | 17457 | 2290 | 26820 |
| Santa Fe | DEM | 28852 | 21929 | 0 | 50781 |
| Santa Fe | DTS | 5466 | 5136 | 0 | 10602 |
| Santa Fe | LIB | 192 | 213 | 0 | 405 |
| Santa Fe | OTH | 218 | 219 | 0 | 437 |
| Santa Fe | REP | 3551 | 7201 | 0 | 10752 |
| Sierra | DEM | 822 | 830 | 220 | 1872 |


| Sierra | DTS | 251 | 505 | 169 | 925 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sierra | LIB | 7 | 15 | 8 | 30 |
| Sierra | OTH | 15 | 22 | 8 | 45 |
| Sierra | REP | 517 | 1817 | 495 | 2829 |
| Socorro | DEM | 1216 | 1388 | 499 | 3103 |
| Socorro | DTS | 230 | 403 | 175 | 808 |
| Socorro | LIB | 10 | 19 | 11 | 40 |
| Socorro | OTH | 18 | 22 | 12 | 52 |
| Socorro | REP | 447 | 1390 | 468 | 2305 |
| Taos | DEM | 4499 | 5866 | 1248 | 11613 |
| Taos | DTS | 588 | 931 | 311 | 1830 |
| Taos | LIB | 23 | 40 | 21 | 84 |
| Taos | OTH | 42 | 64 | 21 | 127 |
| Taos | REP | 496 | 1131 | 437 | 2064 |
| Torrance | DEM | 951 | 839 | 311 | 2101 |
| Torrance | DTS | 272 | 439 | 187 | 898 |
| Torrance | LIB | 16 | 34 | 7 | 57 |
| Torrance | OTH | 17 | 24 | 5 | 46 |
| Torrance | REP | 783 | 2088 | 566 | 3437 |
| Union | DEM | 139 | 256 | 95 | 490 |
| Union | DTS | 26 | 63 | 33 | 122 |
| Union | LIB | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 |
| Union | OTH | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Union | REP | 151 | 676 | 208 | 1035 |
| Valencia | DEM | 6732 | 4980 | 1257 | 12969 |
| Valencia | DTS | 1737 | 1934 | 697 | 4368 |
| Valencia | LIB | 70 | 130 | 35 | 235 |
| Valencia | OTH | 103 | 129 | 48 | 280 |
| Valencia | REP | 3105 | 8108 | 1519 | 12732 |

Lopez, LeeAnn, SOS

| From: | ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, November 3, 2020 7:19 PM |
| To: | 'Katharine Clark' |
| Subject: | FW: Election Day Counts as of 7:00 PM |
| Attachments: | ElectionDayVoteCount-2020-11-03_19-00-00.xlsx |

Better late than never?

From: Goode, Alan, SOS
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 7:08 PM
To: ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS [Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us](mailto:Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us)
Subject: Election Day Counts as of 7:00 PM
Maggie,
Here are the counts from 7:00 PM

Alan

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
MAGGIE TOULOUSE OLIVER
SECRETARY OF STATE
Alan Goode | IT Developer
New Mexico Office of the Secretary of State
325 Don Gaspar, Ste. 300 | Santa Fe NM 87501
Cell: (832) 498-8924 | Desk: (505) 827-6848
alan.goode@state.nm.us

Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

| County | Party | Absentee | In Person | Election Da | otal Voted | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { Absentee } & \text { In Person } \\ 325936 \quad 456260\end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEM | 199251 | 182962 | 52566 | 434779 |  |  |
|  | DTS | 51509 | 67137 | 27697 | 146343 |  |  |
|  | LIB | 2261 | 3694 | 1531 | 7486 |  |  |
|  | OTH | 2092 | 3090 | 1471 | 6653 |  |  |
|  | REP | 70823 | 199377 | 44561 | 314761 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DEM | 85216 | 62411 | 13178 | 160805 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | DTS | 23345 | 24035 | 8387 | 55767 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | LIB | 1066 | 1421 | 471 | 2958 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | OTH | 884 | 1046 | 433 | 2363 |  |  |
| Bernalillo | REP | 30298 | 56368 | 10050 | 96716 |  |  |
| Catron | DEM | 195 | 198 | 107 | 500 |  |  |
| Catron | DTS | 71 | 123 | 106 | 300 |  |  |
| Catron | LIB | 9 | 5 | 9 | 23 |  |  |
| Catron | OTH | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 |  |  |
| Catron | REP | 272 | 675 | 536 | 1483 |  |  |
| Chaves | DEM | 1638 | 3314 | 963 | 5915 |  |  |
| Chaves | DTS | 526 | 1579 | 708 | 2813 |  |  |
| Chaves | LIB | 26 | 80 | 52 | 158 |  |  |
| Chaves | OTH | 43 | 155 | 61 | 259 |  |  |
| Chaves | REP | 1534 | 9839 | 1775 | 13148 |  |  |
| Cibola | DEM | 1335 | 2136 | 1438 | 4909 |  |  |
| Cibola | DTS | 224 | 425 | 355 | 1004 |  |  |
| Cibola | LIB | 10 | 26 | 18 | 54 |  |  |
| Cibola | OTH | 20 | 42 | 23 | 85 |  |  |
| Cibola | REP | 369 | 1478 | 586 | 2433 |  |  |
| Colfax | DEM | 1312 | 739 | 749 | 2800 |  |  |
| Colfax | DTS | 295 | 243 | 325 | 863 |  |  |
| Colfax | LIB | 10 | 14 | 18 | 42 |  |  |
| Colfax | OTH | 10 | 12 | 17 | 39 |  |  |
| Colfax | REP | 544 | 923 | 786 | 2253 |  |  |
| Curry | DEM | 1445 | 1797 | 657 | 3899 |  |  |
| Curry | DTS | 499 | 1034 | 622 | 2155 |  |  |
| Curry | LIB | 32 | 62 | 44 | 138 |  |  |
| Curry | OTH | 12 | 29 | 17 | 58 |  |  |
| Curry | REP | 1344 | 5955 | 1463 | 8762 |  |  |
| De Baca | DEM | 120 | 171 | 0 | 291 |  |  |
| De Baca | DTS | 7 | 27 | 0 | 34 |  |  |
| De Baca | LIB | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| De Baca | OTH | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| De Baca | REP | 65 | 297 | 0 | 362 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DEM | 16579 | 17432 | 6211 | 40222 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | DTS | 5080 | 6929 | 3851 | 15860 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | LIB | 209 | 288 | 179 | 676 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | OTH | 147 | 212 | 151 | 510 |  |  |
| Dona Ana | REP | 5259 | 15378 | 4288 | 24925 |  |  |
| Eddy | DEM | 1850 | 3444 | 1090 | 6384 |  |  |


| Eddy | DTS | 453 | 1499 | 682 | 2634 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eddy | LIB | 17 | 97 | 48 | 162 |
| Eddy | OTH | 25 | 92 | 35 | 152 |
| Eddy | REP | 1279 | 10753 | 1713 | 13745 |
| Grant | DEM | 2871 | 4284 | 774 | 7929 |
| Grant | DTS | 610 | 943 | 325 | 1878 |
| Grant | LIB | 22 | 45 | 24 | 91 |
| Grant | OTH | 41 | 67 | 26 | 134 |
| Grant | REP | 788 | 2937 | 695 | 4420 |
| Guadalupe | DEM | 791 | 495 | 319 | 1605 |
| Guadalupe |  | 24 | 31 | 33 | 88 |
| Guadalupe |  | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| Guadalupe | OTH | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Guadalupe |  | 103 | 163 | 87 | 353 |
| Harding | DEM | 75 | 73 | 51 | 199 |
| Harding | DTS | 7 | 10 | 13 | 30 |
| Harding | LIB | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Harding | REP | 87 | 134 | 58 | 279 |
| Hidalgo | DEM | 408 | 395 | 303 | 1106 |
| Hidalgo | DTS | 36 | 53 | 38 | 127 |
| Hidalgo | LIB | 5 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| Hidalgo | OTH | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Hidalgo | REP | 137 | 257 | 304 | 698 |
| Lea | DEM | 1083 | 2094 | 871 | 4048 |
| Lea | DTS | 425 | 1816 | 924 | 3165 |
| Lea | LIB | 23 | 95 | 37 | 155 |
| Lea | OTH | 23 | 86 | 47 | 156 |
| Lea | REP | 1203 | 9989 | 2047 | 13239 |
| Lincoln | DEM | 944 | 1126 | 296 | 2366 |
| Lincoln | DTS | 430 | 758 | 317 | 1505 |
| Lincoln | LIB | 23 | 53 | 13 | 89 |
| Lincoln | OTH | 17 | 29 | 7 | 53 |
| Lincoln | REP | 1180 | 3977 | 1050 | 6207 |
| Los Alamos | DEM | 2791 | 2388 | 270 | 5449 |
| Los Alamos | DTS | 1182 | 1409 | 341 | 2932 |
| Los Alamos |  | 63 | 86 | 31 | 180 |
| Los Alamos | OTH | 21 | 33 | 10 | 64 |
| Los Alamos | REP | 1040 | 2172 | 494 | 3706 |
| Luna | DEM | 1307 | 1716 | 590 | 3613 |
| Luna | DTS | 340 | 614 | 265 | 1219 |
| Luna | LIB | 8 | 23 | 16 | 47 |
| Luna | OTH | 13 | 22 | 14 | 49 |
| Luna | REP | 517 | 2244 | 414 | 3175 |
| McKinley | DEM | 2648 | 8972 | 2687 | 14307 |
| McKinley | DTS | 429 | 1803 | 832 | 3064 |
| McKinley | LIB | 18 | 46 | 18 | 82 |
| McKinley | OTH | 30 | 134 | 55 | 219 |


| McKinley | REP | 458 | 2531 | 572 | 3561 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mora | DEM | 601 | 770 | 574 | 1945 |
| Mora | DTS | 38 | 49 | 46 | 133 |
| Mora | LIB | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Mora | OTH | 4 | 9 | 5 | 18 |
| Mora | REP | 85 | 235 | 181 | 501 |
| Otero | DEM | 2575 | 2864 | 1088 | 6527 |
| Otero | DTS | 1159 | 1955 | 931 | 4045 |
| Otero | LIB | 32 | 132 | 61 | 225 |
| Otero | OTH | 54 | 97 | 54 | 205 |
| Otero | REP | 2093 | 7972 | 2099 | 12164 |
| Quay | DEM | 428 | 657 | 281 | 1366 |
| Quay | DTS | 74 | 195 | 133 | 402 |
| Quay | LIB | 3 | 10 | 8 | 21 |
| Quay | OTH | 2 | 5 | 6 | 13 |
| Quay | REP | 265 | 1271 | 522 | 2058 |
| Rio Arriba | DEM | 3460 | 5323 | 3491 | 12274 |
| Rio Arriba | DTS | 362 | 561 | 506 | 1429 |
| Rio Arriba | LIB | 17 | 26 | 25 | 68 |
| Rio Arriba | OTH | 41 | 52 | 49 | 142 |
| Rio Arriba | REP | 478 | 1160 | 855 | 2493 |
| Roosevelt | DEM | 523 | 764 | 308 | 1595 |
| Roosevelt | DTS | 173 | 479 | 233 | 885 |
| Roosevelt | LIB | 10 | 36 | 27 | 73 |
| Roosevelt | OTH | 7 | 17 | 21 | 45 |
| Roosevelt | REP | 449 | 2828 | 696 | 3973 |
| San Juan | DEM | 4636 | 7721 | 3315 | 15672 |
| San Juan | DTS | 1695 | 4489 | 2405 | 8589 |
| San Juan | LIB | 78 | 287 | 128 | 493 |
| San Juan | OTH | 69 | 199 | 145 | 413 |
| San Juan | REP | 4188 | 19150 | 3884 | 27222 |
| San Miguel | DEM | 4255 | 2710 | 1412 | 8377 |
| San Miguel |  | 416 | 298 | 242 | 956 |
| San Miguel |  | 15 | 13 | 9 | 37 |
| San Miguel | OTH | 50 | 24 | 19 | 93 |
| San Miguel |  | 582 | 823 | 437 | 1842 |
| Sandoval | DEM | 16715 | 12880 | 4366 | 33961 |
| Sandoval | DTS | 4949 | 6369 | 2009 | 13327 |
| Sandoval | LIB | 235 | 381 | 122 | 738 |
| Sandoval | OTH | 153 | 236 | 90 | 479 |
| Sandoval | REP | 7077 | 17457 | 3099 | 27633 |
| Santa Fe | DEM | 28949 | 21929 | 1924 | 52802 |
| Santa Fe | DTS | 5511 | 5136 | 828 | 11475 |
| Santa Fe | LIB | 193 | 213 | 46 | 452 |
| Santa Fe | OTH | 221 | 219 | 48 | 488 |
| Santa Fe | REP | 3564 | 7201 | 794 | 11559 |
| Sierra | DEM | 822 | 830 | 276 | 1928 |


| Sierra | DTS | 251 | 505 | 225 | 981 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sierra | LIB | 7 | 15 | 12 | 34 |
| Sierra | OTH | 15 | 22 | 10 | 47 |
| Sierra | REP | 518 | 1817 | 615 | 2950 |
| Socorro | DEM | 1224 | 1388 | 807 | 3419 |
| Socorro | DTS | 232 | 403 | 270 | 905 |
| Socorro | LIB | 10 | 19 | 14 | 43 |
| Socorro | OTH | 18 | 22 | 16 | 56 |
| Socorro | REP | 447 | 1390 | 763 | 2600 |
| Taos | DEM | 4525 | 5866 | 1822 | 12213 |
| Taos | DTS | 595 | 931 | 412 | 1938 |
| Taos | LIB | 25 | 40 | 26 | 91 |
| Taos | OTH | 42 | 64 | 30 | 136 |
| Taos | REP | 499 | 1131 | 547 | 2177 |
| Torrance | DEM | 962 | 839 | 519 | 2320 |
| Torrance | DTS | 279 | 439 | 284 | 1002 |
| Torrance | LIB | 16 | 34 | 15 | 65 |
| Torrance | OTH | 18 | 24 | 10 | 52 |
| Torrance | REP | 799 | 2088 | 945 | 3832 |
| Union | DEM | 139 | 256 | 129 | 524 |
| Union | DTS | 29 | 63 | 48 | 140 |
| Union | LIB | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 |
| Union | OTH | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Union | REP | 151 | 676 | 273 | 1100 |
| Valencia | DEM | 6829 | 4980 | 1700 | 13509 |
| Valencia | DTS | 1763 | 1934 | 1001 | 4698 |
| Valencia | LIB | 71 | 130 | 49 | 250 |
| Valencia | OTH | 104 | 129 | 65 | 298 |
| Valencia | REP | 3151 | 8108 | 1933 | 13192 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## RE: Some stats for the CCs call

ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS [Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us](mailto:Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us)
Thu 11/5/2020 10:51 AM
To: Curtas, Alex, SOS [Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us](mailto:Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us); Vigil, Mandy, SOS [Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us](mailto:Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us)
Awesome thanks, Alex!

From: Curtas, Alex, SOS
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 10:49 AM
To: Vigil, Mandy, SOS [Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us](mailto:Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us); ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS [Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us](mailto:Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us)
Subject: Some stats for the CCs call
Same-Day Voter Registration Total - 11,451
Absentee Ballot Request Total - 386,364
Absentee Vote Count Total - 329,130
Early In-Person Vote Count Total - 456,260
Election Day Vote Count Total - 132,339
Total Statewide Vote Count - 917,729

Alex Curtas I Communications Director
New Mexico Secretary of State Maggie Toulouse Oliver
325 Don Gaspar, Ste. 300 I Santa Fe, NM 87501
Cell: 505.469.2783 I Desk: 505.827.3613
alex.curtas@state.nm.us
Follow us on Facebook + Twitter

## APPENDIX H

Full Statistical Analysis - Otero County

## PRESIDENT: (D) BIDEN Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 23,174 -- Overall: 35.7\%150 200 $\qquad$ 250

|  | Otero County | Cloudcroft C_Chmbrs | James Canyon FireStn | Mescalero CommCtr | Timberon Lodge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn | Estrada MemCivCtr | La Luz ElemSch | Pinon FireStn | Tularosa PubSafety |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr | Inn MountainGods | Mayhill CommCtr | Tays SpecEvntsCtr | Weed FireStn |



[^42]US SENATOR: (D) LUJAN Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,940 -- Overall: 33.9\%
Size: numVotes

- 100150
200250

|  | Otero County | Cloudcroft C_Chmbrs | James Canyon FireStn | Mescalero CommCtr | Timberon Lodge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn | Estrada MemCivCtr | La Luz ElemSch | Pinon FireStn | Tularosa PubSafety |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr | Inn MountainGods | Mayhill CommCtr | Tays SpecEvntsCtr | Weed FireStn |



[^43]page 9 of 104
US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 2: (D) SMALL Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,757 -- Overall: 38.6\%
Size: numVotes 50 100150200250

|  | - | Otero County | Cloudcroft C_Chmbrs | James Canyon FireStn | Mescalero CommCtr | Timberon Lodge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn | Estrada MemCivCtr | La Luz ElemSch | Pinon FireStn | Tularosa PubSafety |  |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr | Inn MountainGods | Mayhill CommCtr | Tays SpecEvntsCtr | Weed FireStn |  |



[^44]
## STATE SENATOR DIST 34: (D) KUGLER Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 11,160 -- Overall: 31.6\%


[^45]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 51: (D) SWANSON Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 11,477 -- Overall: 34.4\%


[^46]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 53: (D) MADRID Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 _- Total Votes: 2,344 -- Overall: 50.2\%


[^47]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 56: (D) CHILDRESS Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 6,081 -- Overall: 35.5\%


[^48]
## JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 1: (D) BACON Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,420 -- Overall: 37.2\%


[^49]JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 2: (D) THOMSON Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,379 -- Overall: 35.6\%
Size: numVotes


100150
200250

|  | Otero County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr |

- Cloudcroft C_ChmbrsJames Canyon FireStnMescalero CommCtr
- 

Timberon Lodge

- Estrada MemCivCtr
- La Luz ElemSch
- Pinon FireStn
- Tays SpecEvntsCtr

Tularosa PubSafety
Inn MountainGods
Mayhill CommCtr
-
Weed FireStn


[^50]
## JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 1: (D) IVES Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,327 -- Overall: 34.4\%250

|  | Otero County | Cloudcroft C_Chmbrs | James Canyon FireStn | Mescalero CommCtr | Timberon Lodge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn | Estrada MemCivCtr | La Luz ElemSch | Pinon FireStn | Tularosa PubSafety |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr | Inn MountainGods | Mayhill CommCtr | Tays SpecEvntsCtr | Weed FireStn |



[^51]JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 2: (D) HENDERSON Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,298 -- Overall: $33.2 \%$
150 200250

|  | Otero County | Cloudcroft C_Chmbrs | James Canyon FireStn | Mescalero CommCtr | Timberon Lodge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn | Estrada MemCivCtr | La Luz ElemSch | Pinon FireStn | Tularosa PubSafety |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr | Inn MountainGods | Mayhill CommCtr | Tays SpecEvntsCtr | Weed FireStn |



[^52]JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 3: (D) YOHALEM Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,245 -- Overall: 34.4\%


[^53]
## COUNTY CLERK: (D) MADRID Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,459 -- Overall: 31.3\%


[^54]COUNTY TREASURER: (D) MELTON Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 22,294 -- Overall: 32.7\%


[^55]
## COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 3: (D) CUMMINS Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 9,358 -- Overall: 31.9\%


[^56]JUDICIAL RETENTION - MEDINA: YES Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 19,539 -- Overall: 73.1\%

|  | Otero County | Cloudcroft C_Chmbrs | James Canyon FireStn | Mescalero CommCtr | Timberon Lodge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn | Estrada MemCivCtr | La Luz ElemSch | Pinon FireStn | Tularosa PubSafety |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr | Inn MountainGods | Mayhill CommCtr | Tays SpecEvntsCtr | Weed FireStn |



[^57]JUDICIAL RETENTION - BLANKINSHIP: YES Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 19,666 -- Overall: 78.3\%
Size: numVotes100

150200 $\square$ 250

|  | - | Otero County | Cloudcroft C_Chmbrs | James Canyon FireStn | Mescalero CommCtr | Timberon Lodge |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voting | Boles Acres FireStn | Estrada MemCivCtr | La Luz ElemSch | Pinon FireStn | Tularosa PubSafety |  |
| Centers | Chaparral CommCtr | Inn MountainGods | Mayhill CommCtr | Tays SpecEvntsCtr | Weed FireStn |  |



[^58]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - COUNTS: YES Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 19,812 -- Overall: 75.7\%


[^59]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - BRYANT: YES Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 19,427 -- Overall: 78\%


[^60]JUDICIAL RETENTION - SCHNEIDER: YES Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 19,617 -_ Overall: 78.1\%
Size: numVotes
250


[^61]
## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 1: FOR Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 20,861 Overall: 47.6\%
Size: numVotes
100150200 $\square$ 250
Voting
Centers

- Otero County
- Cloudcroft C_ChmbrsJames Canyon FireStn
- Mescalero CommCtrTimberon Lodge CentersChaparral CommCtr
- 

Inn MountainGods
z ElemSch
-
Mayhill CommCtr

- Pinon FireStn
- 

Tays SpecEvntsCtrWeed FireStn


[^62]
## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 2: FOR Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 20,403 -- Overall: 56.6\%


[^63]
## BOND QUESTION A: FOR Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 20,940 -- Overall: 59.7\%


[^64]
## BOND QUESTION B: FOR Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 20,917 -- Overall: 56.7\%
Size: numVotes
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## BOND QUESTION C: FOR Vote\% with Statistical Control Limits

Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs) in SubGroups of about 200 -- Total Votes: 20,977 -- Overall: 55.4\%


[^66]
## PRESIDENT: (D) BIDEN Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 23,174 Overall Ave: 36\%
Absentee Ave: 59\% EarlyInPers Ave: 28\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^67]
## PRESIDENT: (D) BIDEN Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 23,174 Overall Ave: 36\%
Absentee Ave: 59\% EarlyInPers Ave: 28\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^68]
## US SENATOR: (D) LUJAN Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,940 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 55\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^69]US SENATOR: (D) LUJAN Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,940 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 55\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5<50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee |  |
| Early In-PersonElection Day <br> In-Person |  |



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^70]
## US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 2: (D) SMALL Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,757 Overall Ave: 39\%
Absentee Ave: 61\% EarlyInPers Ave: 30\% ElectionDay Ave: 36\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^71]
## US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 2: (D) SMALL Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,757 Overall Ave: 39\%
Absentee Ave: 61\% EarlyInPers Ave: 30\% ElectionDay Ave: 36\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Size: numVotes $5 \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$\begin{tabular}{l}
200 <br>

CountGrp \begin{tabular}{l}
Early Mail-In <br>
Absentee

$\bigcirc$ Early In-Person 

Election Day <br>
In-Person
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^72]
## STATE SENATOR DIST 33: (D) LANG-BROWNE Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

25 Precincts Total Votes: 10,841 Overall Ave: 32\%
Absentee Ave: 54\% EarlyInPers Ave: 25\% ElectionDay Ave: 27\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^73]
## STATE SENATOR DIST 33: (D) LANG-BROWNE Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

25 Precincts Total Votes: 10,841 Overall Ave: 32\%
Absentee Ave: 54\% EarlyInPers Ave: 25\% ElectionDay Ave: 27\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Size: numVotes $5 \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$\begin{tabular}{l}
200 <br>

CountGrp \begin{tabular}{l}
Early Mail-In <br>
Absentee

$\bigcirc$ Early In-Person 

Election Day <br>
In-Person
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}



[^74]
## STATE SENATOR DIST 34: (D) KUGLER Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

32 Precincts Total Votes: 11,160 Overall Ave: 32\%
Absentee Ave: 52\% EarlyInPers Ave: 24\% ElectionDay Ave: 27\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^75]
## STATE SENATOR DIST 34: (D) KUGLER Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

32 Precincts Total Votes: 11,160 Overall Ave: 32\%
Absentee Ave: 52\% EarlyInPers Ave: 24\% ElectionDay Ave: 27\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


[^76]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 51: (D) SWANSON Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

25 Precincts Total Votes: 11,477 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 58\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^77]STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 51: (D) SWANSON Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
25 Precincts Total Votes: 11,477 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 58\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5 \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee | Election Day <br> In-Person |



[^78]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 53: (D) MADRID Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

10 Precincts Total Votes: 2,344 Overall Ave: 50\%
Absentee Ave: 63\% EarlyInPers Ave: 44\% ElectionDay Ave: 49\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^79]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 53: (D) MADRID Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

10 Precincts Total Votes: 2,344 Overall Ave: 50\%
Absentee Ave: 63\% EarlyInPers Ave: 44\% ElectionDay Ave: 49\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Size: numVotes $5 \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$\begin{tabular}{l}
200 <br>

CountGrp \begin{tabular}{l}
Early Mail-In <br>
Absentee

$\bigcirc$ Early In-Person 

Election Day <br>
In-Person
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}



[^80]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 56: (D) CHILDRESS Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

14 Precincts Total Votes: 6,081 Overall Ave: 36\%
Absentee Ave: 54\% EarlyInPers Ave: 28\% ElectionDay Ave: 36\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^81]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 56: (D) CHILDRESS Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

14 Precincts Total Votes: 6,081 Overall Ave: 36\%
Absentee Ave: 54\% EarlyInPers Ave: 28\% ElectionDay Ave: 36\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Size: numVotes $5 \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$\begin{tabular}{l}
200 <br>

CountGrp \begin{tabular}{l}
Early Mail-In <br>
Absentee

$\bigcirc$ Early In-Person 

Election Day <br>
In-Person
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}



[^82]
## JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 1: (D) BACON Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,420 Overall Ave: 37\%
Absentee Ave: 59\% EarlyInPers Ave: 29\% ElectionDay Ave: 35\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^83]
## JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 1: (D) BACON Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,420 Overall Ave: 37\%
Absentee Ave: 59\% EarlyInPers Ave: 29\% ElectionDay Ave: 35\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Precinct ID (Largest first)

JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 2: (D) THOMSON Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Lin
59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,379 Overall Ave: 36\%
Absentee Ave: 58\% EarlyInPers Ave: 27\% ElectionDay Ave: 32\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)
Cynthia Butler 07/16/22

## JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 2: (D) THOMSON Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,379 Overall Ave: 36\%
Absentee Ave: 58\% EarlyInPers Ave: 27\% ElectionDay Ave: 32\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Precinct ID (Largest first)

JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 1: (D) IVES Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,327 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 56\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 31\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)
Cynthia Butler 07/16/22

## JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 1: (D) IVES Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,327 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 56\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 31\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5<50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee |  |
| Early In-PersonElection Day <br> In-Person |  |



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^84]JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 2: (D) HENDERSON Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Contro 59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,298 Overall Ave: 33\%
Absentee Ave: 54\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 29\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^85]JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 2: (D) HENDERSON Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,298 Overall Ave: 33\%
Absentee Ave: 54\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 29\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5<50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee |  |
| Early In-PersonElection Day <br> In-Person |  |



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^86]JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 3: (D) YOHALEM Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Li 59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,245 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 56\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 31\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^87]
## JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 3: (D) YOHALEM Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,245 Overall Ave: 34\%
Absentee Ave: 56\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 31\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Size: numVotes $5 \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$\begin{tabular}{l}
200 <br>

CountGrp \begin{tabular}{l}
Early Mail-In <br>
Absentee

$\bigcirc$ Early In-Person 

Election Day <br>
In-Person
\end{tabular}

\end{tabular}



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^88]
## COUNTY CLERK: (D) MADRID Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,459 Overall Ave: 31\%
Absentee Ave: 50\% EarlyInPers Ave: 24\% ElectionDay Ave: 29\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^89]
## COUNTY CLERK: (D) MADRID Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,459 Overall Ave: 31\%
Absentee Ave: 50\% EarlyInPers Ave: 24\% ElectionDay Ave: 29\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Size: numVotes $5 \bigcirc 50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$\begin{tabular}{l}
200 <br>

CountGrp | Early Mail-In |
| :--- |
| Absentee | <br>

| Election Day |
| :--- |
| In-Person |

\end{tabular}



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^90]COUNTY TREASURER: (D) MELTON Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,294 Overall Ave: 33\%
Absentee Ave: 53\% EarlyInPers Ave: 25\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^91]COUNTY TREASURER: (D) MELTON Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
59 Precincts Total Votes: 22,294 Overall Ave: 33\%
Absentee Ave: 53\% EarlyInPers Ave: 25\% ElectionDay Ave: 30\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5<50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee |  |
| Early In-PersonElection Day <br> In-Person |  |



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^92]COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 3: (D) CUMMINS Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
24 Precincts Total Votes: 9,358 Overall Ave: 32\%
Absentee Ave: 53\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 22\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^93]page 92 of 156
COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 3: (D) CUMMINS Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group
24 Precincts Total Votes: 9,358 Overall Ave: 32\%
Absentee Ave: 53\% EarlyInPers Ave: 26\% ElectionDay Ave: 22\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5<50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee | Election Day <br> In-Person |



[^94]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - MEDINA: YES Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,539 Overall Ave: 73\%
Absentee Ave: 80\% EarlyInPers Ave: 70\% ElectionDay Ave: 73\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^95]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - MEDINA: YES Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,539 Overall Ave: 73\%
Absentee Ave: 80\% EarlyInPers Ave: 70\% ElectionDay Ave: 73\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes - 505000200 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CountGrp | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Early Mail-ln Early In-Person } \\ & \text { Absentee } \end{aligned}$ | Election Day In-Person |



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^96]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - BLANKINSHIP: YES Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,666 Overall Ave: 78\%
Absentee Ave: 76\% EarlyInPers Ave: 79\% ElectionDay Ave: 78\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^97]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - BLANKINSHIP: YES Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,666 Overall Ave: 78\%
Absentee Ave: 76\% EarlyInPers Ave: 79\% ElectionDay Ave: 78\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5<50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee |  |
| Early In-PersonElection Day <br> In-Person |  |



[^98]Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^99]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - COUNTS: YES Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,812 Overall Ave: 76\%
Absentee Ave: 77\% EarlyInPers Ave: 76\% ElectionDay Ave: 73\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^100]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - COUNTS: YES Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,812 Overall Ave: 76\%
Absentee Ave: 77\% EarlyInPers Ave: 76\% ElectionDay Ave: 73\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes - 50 100 200 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CountGrp | Early Mail-In Early In-Person Absentee | Election Day In-Person |



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^101]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - BRYANT: YES Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,427 Overall Ave: 78\%
Absentee Ave: 78\% EarlyInPers Ave: 78\% ElectionDay Ave: 78\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^102]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - BRYANT: YES Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,427 Overall Ave: 78\%
Absentee Ave: 78\% EarlyInPers Ave: 78\% ElectionDay Ave: 78\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^103]Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^104]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - SCHNEIDER: YES Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,617 Overall Ave: 78\%
Absentee Ave: 80\% EarlyInPers Ave: 78\% ElectionDay Ave: 78\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^105]page 122 of 156

## JUDICIAL RETENTION - SCHNEIDER: YES Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 19,617 Overall Ave: 78\%
Absentee Ave: 80\% EarlyInPers Ave: 78\% ElectionDay Ave: 78\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

| Size: numVotes $5<50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc$ | 200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CountGrpEarly Mail-In <br> Absentee |  |
| Early In-PersonElection Day <br> In-Person |  |



[^106]Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^107]
## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 1: FOR Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,861 Overall Ave: 48\%
Absentee Ave: 60\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\% ElectionDay Ave: 51\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Size: numVotes - 5 - 50 100 200


Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^108]
## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 1: FOR Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,861 Overall Ave: 48\%
Absentee Ave: 60\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\% ElectionDay Ave: 51\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^109]Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^110]
## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 2: FOR Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,403 Overall Ave: 57\%
Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 51\% ElectionDay Ave: 59\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^111]
## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 2: FOR Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,403 Overall Ave: 57\%
Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 51\% ElectionDay Ave: 59\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^112]
## BOND QUESTION A: FOR Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,940 Overall Ave: 60\%
Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 55\% ElectionDay Ave: 63\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^113]
## BOND QUESTION A: FOR Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,940 Overall Ave: 60\%
Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 55\% ElectionDay Ave: 63\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^114]Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^115]
## BOND QUESTION B: FOR Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,917 Overall Ave: 57\%
Absentee Ave: 64\% EarlyInPers Ave: 52\% ElectionDay Ave: 61\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^116]
## BOND QUESTION B: FOR Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,917 Overall Ave: 57\%
Absentee Ave: 64\% EarlyInPers Ave: 52\% ElectionDay Ave: 61\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^117]Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^118]
## BOND QUESTION C: FOR Vote\% by Precinct SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,977 Overall Ave: 55\%
Absentee Ave: 62\% EarlyInPers Ave: 51\% ElectionDay Ave: 61\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had > 300 Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

Precinctld



Precinct SubGroups (Largest Precincts first)

[^119]
## BOND QUESTION C: FOR Vote\% by Precinct, Counting Group

59 Precincts Total Votes: 20,977 Overall Ave: 55\%
Absentee Ave: 62\% EarlyInPers Ave: 51\% ElectionDay Ave: 61\%
Subgroups were created if Precinct-CountingGroups had $>300$ Ballots
Otero County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



[^120]Precinct ID (Largest first)

[^121]
## APPENDIXI

Full Statistical Analysis - Sandoval County

## PRESIDENT: (DEM) BIDEN Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 200 Total Votes: 76,142
Overall Ave: 53\% Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlylnPers Ave: 40\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

US SENATOR: (DEM) LUJAN Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 199 Total Votes: 75,877
Overall Ave: $49 \%$ Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 38\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 1: (DEM) HAALAND Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
7 BallotTypes 67 SubGroups Size: mostly 199 Total Votes: 12,785
Overall Ave: 56\% Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 46\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 3: (DEM) FERNANDEZ Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 21 BallotTypes 322 SubGroups Size: mostly 197 Total Votes: 61,842 Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlylnPers Ave: 39\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



STATE SENATOR DIST 9: (DEM) MC KENNA Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 12 BallotTypes 151 SubGroups Size: mostly 197 Total Votes: 28,568 Overall Ave: 54\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlylnPers Ave: 43\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



STATE SENATOR DIST 10: (DEM) DUHIGG Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
2 BallotTypes 19 SubGroups Size: mostly 198 Total Votes: 3,594
Overall Ave: 46\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 33\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE SENATOR DIST 19: (DEM) RISNER Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
1 BallotTypes 3 SubGroups Size: mostly 254 Total Votes: 646
Overall Ave: 43\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE SENATOR DIST 22: (DEM) SHENDO, JR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
6 BallotTypes 65 SubGroups Size: mostly 196 Total Votes: 12,695
Overall Ave: 63\% Absentee Ave: 75\% EarlyInPers Ave: 49\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 22: (DEM) VELASQUEZ Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Li
3 BallotTypes 26 SubGroups Size: mostly 198 Total Votes: 5,076
Overall Ave: 60\% Absentee Ave: 76\% EarlylnPers Ave: 52\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 23: (DEM) ELY Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

3 BallotTypes 36 SubGroups Size: mostly 196 Total Votes: 6,936
Overall Ave: 55\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 45\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 43: (DEM) CHANDLER Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Lin 2 BallotTypes 12 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 2,277
Overall Ave: 56\% Absentee Ave: 77\% EarlylnPers Ave: 47\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 44: (DEM) TRIPP Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 6 BallotTypes 106 SubGroups Size: mostly 197 Total Votes: 20,089 Overall Ave: $44 \%$ Absentee Ave: $61 \%$ EarlylnPers Ave: 34\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 57: (DEM) HELEAN Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 5 BallotTypes 82 SubGroups Size: mostly 197 Total Votes: 15,688
Overall Ave: $48 \%$ Absentee Ave: $66 \%$ EarlylnPers Ave: 37\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 65: (DEM) LENTE Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
4 BallotTypes 42 SubGroups Size:mostly 192 Total Votes: 8,251
Overall Ave: $80 \%$ Absentee Ave: $86 \%$ EarlylnPers Ave: 74\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 1: (DEM) BACON Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control L 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 196 Total Votes: 73,944 Overall Ave: 54\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 2: (DEM) THOMSON Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Contr 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 196 Total Votes: 73,807 Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlylnPers Ave: 40\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 1: (DEM) IVES Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Li 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 73,592 Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlylnPers Ave: 39\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 18 of 39
JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 2: (DEM) HENDERSON Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical C 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 73,555 Overall Ave: 49\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlylnPers Ave: 37\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 3: (DEM) YOHALEM Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Cont 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 73,265 Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlylnPers Ave: 38\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISS DIST 1: (DEM) HALL Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Lin
2 BallotTypes 21 SubGroups Size: mostly 196 Total Votes: 3,953
Overall Ave: 57\% Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlyInPers Ave: 48\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 21 of 39
PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISS DIST 3: (DEM) MAESTAS Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Contro 21 BallotTypes 330 SubGroups Size: mostly 175 Total Votes: 56,168 Overall Ave: 59\% Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlyInPers Ave: 48\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISS DIST 4: (DEM) BURT Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limi 27 BallotTypes 382 SubGroups Size: mostly 174 Total Votes: 65,007
Overall Ave: 60\% Absentee Ave: 75\% EarlyInPers Ave: 49\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

DIST ATTORNEY 13TH JUDICIAL DIST: (DEM) ROMO Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limi 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 192 Total Votes: 73,053 Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlylnPers Ave: 40\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

COUNTY CLERK: (DEM) BRADY-ROMERO Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 196 Total Votes: 73,309
Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlyInPers Ave: 39\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

COUNTY TREASURER: (DEM) TAYLOR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 194 Total Votes: 73,118 Overall Ave: 53\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 2: (DEM) AHKEE-BACZKIEWICZ Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical 6 BallotTypes 88 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 16,417
Overall Ave: 49\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 38\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 4: (DEM) PILAND Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 4 BallotTypes 69 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 12,979 Overall Ave: 47\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlylnPers Ave: 34\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 28 of 39
JUDICIAL RETENTION - MEDINA: YES Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 165 Total Votes: 64,128 Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 80\% EarlylnPers Ave: 62\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

## JUDICIAL RETENTION - SANCHEZ: YES Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 163 Total Votes: 63,883
Overall Ave: 69\% Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlylnPers Ave: 65\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


page 30 of 39
JUDICIAL RETENTION - EICHWALD: YES Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 166 Total Votes: 64,461
Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 78\% EarlyInPers Ave: 64\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

## JUDICIAL RETENTION - SMITH: YES Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 161 Total Votes: 61,930Overall Ave: 69\% Absentee Ave: 72\% EarlyInPers Ave: 66\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 32 of 39
JUDICIAL RETENTION - MERCER: YES Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 157 Total Votes: 61,695 Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 79\% EarlylnPers Ave: 64\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUDICIAL RETENTION - JOHNSTON: YES Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 161 Total Votes: 61,805 Overall Ave: $69 \%$ Absentee Ave: 73\% EarlylnPers Ave: 66\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 1: FOR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 179 Total Votes: 67,896
Overall Ave: 55\% Absentee Ave: 65\% EarlylnPers Ave: 47\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 35 of 39
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 2: FOR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 177 Total Votes: 66,772
Overall Ave: 65\% Absentee Ave: 72\% EarlylnPers Ave: 59\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

## BOND QUESTION A: FOR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 185 Total Votes: 69,009
Overall Ave: 66\% Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 61\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

## BOND QUESTION B: FOR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 181 Total Votes: 68,942
Overall Ave: 64\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlyInPers Ave: 58\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

## BOND QUESTION C: FOR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 183 Total Votes: 69,078
Overall Ave: 61\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 55\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

SANDOVAL LIBRARY BOND QUESTION: FOR Vote\% by BallotType SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
28 BallotTypes 389 SubGroups Size: mostly 183 Total Votes: 69,655
Overall Ave: 62\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlyInPers Ave: 56\%
Subgroups were created by splitting large BallotTypes into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



BallotType SubGroups in Recorded Order

## PRESIDENT: (DEM) BIDEN Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 200 Total Votes: 78,405 Overall Ave: 53\%
Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 40\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


US SENATOR: (DEM) LUJAN Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 200 Total Votes: 78,140 Overall Ave: 49\%
Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 38\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 1: (DEM) HAALAND Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
71 Tabulators 369 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 12,785 Overall Ave: 56\%
Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 46\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 3: (DEM) FERNANDEZ Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 105 Tabulators 426 SubGroups Size: mostly 162 Total Votes: 64,105 Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlyInPers Ave: 39\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

STATE SENATOR DIST 9: (DEM) MC KENNA Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 76 Tabulators 386 SubGroups Size: mostly 57 Total Votes: 28,568 Overall Ave: 54\%
Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: $43 \%$
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE SENATOR DIST 10: (DEM) DUHIGG Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

47 Tabulators 333 SubGroups Size: mostly 9 Total Votes: 3,594 Overall Ave: 46\%
Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 33\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


STATE SENATOR DIST 19: (DEM) RISNER Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
21 Tabulators 171 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 646 Overall Ave: 43\%
Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



STATE SENATOR DIST 22: (DEM) SHENDO, JR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 102 Tabulators 419 SubGroups Size: mostly 27 Total Votes: 14,927 Overall Ave: 63\% Absentee Ave: 75\% EarlyInPers Ave: 49\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 22: (DEM) VELASQUEZ Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Lin

42 Tabulators 293 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 5,076 Overall Ave: 60\%
Absentee Ave: 76\% EarlyInPers Ave: 52\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 23: (DEM) ELY Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

 46 Tabulators 338 SubGroups Size:mostly 2 Total Votes: 6,936 Overall Ave: 55\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 45\%Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 43: (DEM) CHANDLER Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Lim

57 Tabulators 297 SubGroups Size:mostly 1 Total Votes: 4,385 Overall Ave: $56 \%$
Absentee Ave: 77\% EarlyInPers Ave: 47\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 44: (DEM) TRIPP Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 63 Tabulators 371 SubGroups Size: mostly 46 Total Votes: 20,089 Overall Ave: 44\%
Absentee Ave: 61\% EarlyInPers Ave: 34\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 13 of 39
STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 57: (DEM) HELEAN Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
72 Tabulators 380 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 15,719 Overall Ave: $48 \%$
Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 37\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 14 of 39
STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 65: (DEM) LENTE Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 95 Tabulators 359 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 8,375 Overall Ave: 79\% Absentee Ave: 86\% EarlyInPers Ave: 74\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 1: (DEM) BACON Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Li 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 76,207 Overall Ave: 54\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: $41 \%$

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 2: (DEM) THOMSON Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Contro 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 194 Total Votes: 76,070 Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlyInPers Ave: 40\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 1: (DEM) IVES Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Lim 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 75,855 Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 39\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 2: (DEM) HENDERSON Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Co 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 75,787 Overall Ave: 49\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 37\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 3: (DEM) YOHALEM Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Contr 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 75,528 Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 38\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISS DIST 1: (DEM) HALL Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limi 29 Tabulators 278 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 3,953 Overall Ave: $57 \%$ Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlyInPers Ave: 48\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order
page 21 of 39
PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISS DIST 3: (DEM) MAESTAS Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control
85 Tabulators 396 SubGroups Size: mostly 162 Total Votes: 56,199 Overall Ave: 59\%
Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlyInPers Ave: 48\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISS DIST 4: (DEM) BURT Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 102 Tabulators 423 SubGroups Size: mostly 170 Total Votes: 67,208 Overall Ave: 60\% Absentee Ave: 75\% EarlyInPers Ave: 49\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


DIST ATTORNEY 13TH JUDICIAL DIST: (DEM) ROMO Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limit 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 75,316 Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlyInPers Ave: 40\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

COUNTY CLERK: (DEM) BRADY-ROMERO Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 75,541 Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlyInPers Ave: 39\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

COUNTY TREASURER: (DEM) TAYLOR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 75,319 Overall Ave: 54\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 2: (DEM) AHKEE-BACZKIEWICZ Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical C 59 Tabulators 366 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 16,417 Overall Ave: 49\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 38\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


[^122]COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 4: (DEM) PILAND Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 62 Tabulators 366 SubGroups Size: mostly 31 Total Votes: 13,010 Overall Ave: 47\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 34\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


[^123]JUDICIAL RETENTION - MEDINA: YES Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 170 Total Votes: 66,143 Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: $80 \%$ EarlyInPers Ave: 62\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

page 29 of 39
JUDICIAL RETENTION - SANCHEZ: YES Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 168 Total Votes: 65,867 Overall Ave: 69\%
Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlyInPers Ave: 65\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

page 30 of 39
JUDICIAL RETENTION - EICHWALD: YES Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 172 Total Votes: 66,476 Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 78\% EarlyInPers Ave: 64\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

JUDICIAL RETENTION - SMITH: YES Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 163 Total Votes: 63,914 Overall Ave: 69\% Absentee Ave: 72\% EarlyInPers Ave: 66\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


## JUDICIAL RETENTION - MERCER: YES Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 163 Total Votes: 63,648 Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 79\% EarlyInPers Ave: 64\%Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)



JUDICIAL RETENTION - JOHNSTON: YES Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 164 Total Votes: 63,789 Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 73\% EarlyInPers Ave: 66\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

page 34 of 39
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 1: FOR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 177 Total Votes: 69,973 Overall Ave: 56\%
Absentee Ave: 65\% EarlyInPers Ave: 47\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)

page 35 of 39
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 2: FOR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 175 Total Votes: 68,787 Overall Ave: 66\%
Absentee Ave: 72\% EarlyInPers Ave: 59\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


## BOND QUESTION A: FOR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 182 Total Votes: 71,055 Overall Ave: 66\%
Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 61\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


## BOND QUESTION B: FOR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits

108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 182 Total Votes: 71,019 Overall Ave: 64\%
Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlyInPers Ave: 58\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


BOND QUESTION C: FOR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits
108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 180 Total Votes: 71,124 Overall Ave: 62\%
Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 55\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


SANDOVAL LIBRARY BOND QUESTION: FOR Vote\% by Tabulator SubGroups with Statistical Control Limits 108 Tabulators 429 SubGroups Size: mostly 185 Total Votes: 71,763 Overall Ave: 62\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlyInPers Ave: 56\%

Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)


## PRESIDENT: (DEM) BIDEN Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 200 Total Votes: 76,142
Overall Ave: 53\% Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 40\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 48\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


[^124]
## US SENATOR: (DEM) LUJAN Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 200 Total Votes: 75,877
Overall Ave: 49\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 38\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 45\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


[^125]
## US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 1: (DEM) HAALAND Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 369 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 12,785
Overall Ave: 56\% Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 46\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 42\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 150 200 250


[^126]
## US REPRESENTATIVE DIST 3: (DEM) FERNANDEZ Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 415 SubGroups Size: mostly 162 Total Votes: 61,842
Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlyInPers Ave: 39\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 52\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 150 200 250


[^127]
## STATE SENATOR DIST 9: (DEM) MC KENNA Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 386 SubGroups Size: mostly 57 Total Votes: 28,568
Overall Ave: 54\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 43\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 42\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


## STATE SENATOR DIST 10: (DEM) DUHIGG Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 333 SubGroups Size: mostly 9 Total Votes: 3,594
Overall Ave: 46\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 33\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 38\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 150 200 250


## STATE SENATOR DIST 19: (DEM) RISNER Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 171 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 646
Overall Ave: $43 \%$ Absentee Ave: $66 \%$ EarlyInPers Ave: $41 \%$ ElecDayInPers Ave: 22\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


## STATE SENATOR DIST 22: (DEM) SHENDO, JR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 408 SubGroups Size: mostly 27 Total Votes: 12,695
Overall Ave: 63\% Absentee Ave: 75\% EarlyInPers Ave: 49\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 69\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 $150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^128]
## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 22: (DEM) VELASQUEZ Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 293 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 5,076
Overall Ave: 60\% Absentee Ave: 76\% EarlyInPers Ave: 52\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 34\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 150200 250


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 23: (DEM) ELY Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 338 SubGroups Size: mostly 2 Total Votes: 6,936
Overall Ave: 55\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 45\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 32\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 43: (DEM) CHANDLER Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 286 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 2,277
Overall Ave: 56\% Absentee Ave: 77\% EarlyInPers Ave: 47\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 43\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes

|  | 1 SandovalCoCentral | - 7 LasPlacitasPresbyter | 13 CochitiLakeFireEMS | 10 PlzEnchHi-St | 25 OurLadyOfAssumpt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 SandovalCoVotMachWhse | 8 CommResourceCtr | - 14 BernalilloHSGym | - 20 StFrancisHall | 26 PonderosaFireStn |
|  | 3 OurLadyQnOfAngels | - 9 ItalianAmericanClub | - 15 RioRanchoMidSch | 21 SanYsidroPubSafRm | 27 TorreonChaptHse |
|  | 4 SoulRioChurch | - 10 CorralesCommCtr | 16 ColinasdelNorteEISch | - 22 AlgodonesElemSch | 28 OjoEncinoChaptHse |
|  | - 5 SandovalCoAdmBIdg | -11 CounselorsChaptHse | - 17 BernalilloMidSch | 23 HighlandUniversity | 29 LaJaraFireStn |
|  | 6 PlazaEnchantedHills | - 12 FirstBaptistHall | - 18 CommOfJoyLutheran | 24 LaCuevaFireStn | NA |
|  |  | Size: numVotes | $100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200$ | 250 |  |



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 44: (DEM) TRIPP Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 371 SubGroups Size: mostly 46 Total Votes: 20,089
Overall Ave: 44\% Absentee Ave: 61\% EarlyInPers Ave: 34\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 32\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
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## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 57: (DEM) HELEAN Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 379 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 15,688
Overall Ave: 48\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 37\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 40\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE DIST 65: (DEM) LENTE Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 356 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 8,251
Overall Ave: 80\% Absentee Ave: $86 \%$ EarlyInPers Ave: 74\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 80\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes

## Size: numVotes 50 100 150 200 250



Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 1: (DEM) BACON Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 73,944
Overall Ave: 54\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 52\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


## JUSTICE SUPREME COURT POSITION 2: (DEM) THOMSON Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 194 Total Votes: 73,807
Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlyInPers Ave: 40\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 50\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


[^129]
## JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 1: (DEM) IVES Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 73,592
Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 39\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 48\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 $150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^130]
# JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 2: (DEM) HENDERSON Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limit 

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 195 Total Votes: 73,555
Overall Ave: 49\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 37\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 46\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


## JUDGE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 3: (DEM) YOHALEM Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 73,265
Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 38\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 47\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 $150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^131]
## PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISS DIST 1: (DEM) HALL Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 278 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 3,953
Overall Ave: 57\% Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlyInPers Ave: 48\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 29\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
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PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISS DIST 3: (DEM) MAESTAS Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 395 SubGroups Size: mostly 162 Total Votes: 56,168
Overall Ave: 59\% Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlyInPers Ave: 48\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 50\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 $150 \bigcirc 200$


Tabulator SubGroups in Recorded Order

## PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISS DIST 4: (DEM) BURT Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 412 SubGroups Size: mostly 170 Total Votes: 65,007
Overall Ave: 60\% Absentee Ave: 75\% EarlyInPers Ave: 49\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 55\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


[^132]
## DIST ATTORNEY 13TH JUDICIAL DIST: (DEM) ROMO Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 73,053
Overall Ave: 52\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlyInPers Ave: 40\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 50\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


COUNTY CLERK: (DEM) BRADY-ROMERO Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 73,309
Overall Ave: 51\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlylnPers Ave: 39\% ElecDaylnPers Ave: 48\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^133]
## COUNTY TREASURER: (DEM) TAYLOR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 193 Total Votes: 73,118
Overall Ave: 53\% Absentee Ave: 70\% EarlyInPers Ave: 41\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 52\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 2: (DEM) AHKEE-BACZKIEWICZ Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Lim SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 366 SubGroups Size: mostly 1 Total Votes: 16,417
Overall Ave: 49\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlylnPers Ave: 38\% ElecDaylnPers Ave: 31\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


[^134]COUNTY COMMISSIONER DIST 4: (DEM) PILAND Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 365 SubGroups Size: mostly 31 Total Votes: 12,979
Overall Ave: 47\% Absentee Ave: 66\% EarlyInPers Ave: 34\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 39\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$

| Location | - 1 SandovalCoCentral | - 7 PlazaEnchantedHills | 13 SandiaViewChrSch | 19 BernalilloMidSch | 25 SSCAFCA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 2 SandovalCoVotMachWhse | - 8 LasPlacitasPresbyter | - 14 BernalilloHSGym | - 20 PlzEnchHil-StFranH | 26 HighlandUniversity |
|  | 3 OurLadyQnOfAngels | - 9 ItalianAmericanClub | - 15 CharityBaptistChurch | 21 PlacitasCommLibrary | 27 OurLad |
|  | - 4 SoulRioChurch | 10 CorralesCommCtr | - 16 RioRanchoMidSch | 22 SanYsidroPubSafRm | NA |
|  | - 5 SandovalCoAdmBI | - 11 FirstBaptistHall | - 17 SantaAnaPuebWellCtr | 23 CorralesRecCtr |  |
|  | 6 CommOfJoyLutheran | 12 SanFelipePuebloSrCtr | 18 ColinasdeINorteEISch | 24 AlgodonesElemSch |  |



[^135]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - MEDINA: YES Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 170 Total Votes: 64,128
Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 80\% EarlyInPers Ave: 62\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 69\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


# JUDICIAL RETENTION - SANCHEZ: YES Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits 

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 172 Total Votes: 63,883
Overall Ave: 69\% Absentee Ave: 74\% EarlylnPers Ave: 65\% ElecDaylnPers Ave: 69\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


# JUDICIAL RETENTION - EICHWALD: YES Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits 

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 172 Total Votes: 64,461
Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 78\% EarlyInPers Ave: 64\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 69\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50100150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


## JUDICIAL RETENTION - SMITH: YES Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 163 Total Votes: 61,930
Overall Ave: 69\% Absentee Ave: 72\% EarlyInPers Ave: 66\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 69\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes 50 100 $150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^136]
## JUDICIAL RETENTION - MERCER: YES Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 163 Total Votes: 61,695
Overall Ave: 70\% Absentee Ave: 79\% EarlyInPers Ave: 64\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 68\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


## JUDICIAL RETENTION - JOHNSTON: YES Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 164 Total Votes: 61,805
Overall Ave: 69\% Absentee Ave: 73\% EarlyInPers Ave: 66\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 70\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^137]
## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 1: FOR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 177 Total Votes: 67,896
Overall Ave: 55\% Absentee Ave: 65\% EarlyInPers Ave: 47\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 59\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
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CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 2: FOR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits
SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 175 Total Votes: 66,772
Overall Ave: 65\% Absentee Ave: 72\% EarlyInPers Ave: 59\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 66\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^139]
## BOND QUESTION A: FOR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 182 Total Votes: 69,009
Overall Ave: 66\% Absentee Ave: 71\% EarlyInPers Ave: 61\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 70\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^140]
## BOND QUESTION B: FOR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 182 Total Votes: 68,942
Overall Ave: 64\% Absentee Ave: 69\% EarlyInPers Ave: 58\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 69\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^141]
## BOND QUESTION C: FOR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 180 Total Votes: 69,078
Overall Ave: 61\% Absentee Ave: 67\% EarlyInPers Ave: 55\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 67\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes
Size: numVotes $50 \bigcirc 100 \bigcirc 150 \bigcirc 200 \bigcirc 250$


[^142]
## SANDOVAL LIBRARY BOND QUESTION: FOR Vote\% by LOCATION with Statistical Control Limits

SANDOVAL County NM 2020 -- Cast Vote Records (CVRs)
40 Locations 418 SubGroups Size: mostly 185 Total Votes: 69,655
Overall Ave: 62\% Absentee Ave: 68\% EarlyInPers Ave: 56\% ElecDayInPers Ave: 65\%
Absentee Subgroups were created from 8 Tabulator-Batches (size 25 ea)
Other Subgroups were created by splitting large Tabulator-Batches into 300 or less Votes


[^143]
## APPENDIX J

## Annual Cost of the Election System

| New Mexico Sunshine Portal - |  |  |  |  | FY-2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor ID: 0000106196 |  |  | PO ID: |  | Purchase Export |  |
| DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC |  |  | 2200000065 |  | NM SOS Office |  |
| Contract ID: Various |  | Suffix of POs: 66, 67,68, 91, 95, 128 |  |  | \$1,425,614.74 | Total Amount |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | $\text { PO \# } 2200000065$ | Contract ID: 10000002100081 |  | 8,034.01 | 8,034.01 | 0.00 |
| Supplies-Field |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2200000066 | Contract ID: 10000002100081 |  | \$334,910.00 | \$334,910.00 | \$0.00 |
| 1 | IT HW/SW Agreements | Democracy Suite Light, (25) ICC Firmware, $(1,690)$ ICE Firmware Annual Licenses (33) | 30-Sep-21 | \$264,910.00 | \$264,910.00 | \$0.00 |
| 2 | IT HW/SW Agreements | RCV Software - Annual License (1) | 30-Sep-21 | \$70,000.00 | \$70,000.00 | \$0.00 |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2200000067 | Contract ID: 10000002100081 |  | 510,350.00 | 510,350.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | Preventative Maintenance - 2022 Primary Election | 30-Sep-21 | 75,700.00 | 75,700.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | IT HW/SW Agreements | Annual Hardware Warranty - ICC + ICE | 30-Sep-21 | 434,650.00 | 434,650.00 | 0.00 |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2200000068 | Contract ID: 10000002100081 |  | 83,450.00 | 83,450.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | Preventative Maintenance + GRT - 2021 RLE | 30-Sep-21 | 83,450.00 | 83,450.00 | 0.00 |




| New Mexico Sunshine Portal - |  |  |  |  | FY-2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor ID: 0000106196 |  |  | PO ID: |  | Purchase Export |  |
| DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC |  |  | 2100000035 |  | NM SOS Office |  |
| Contract ID: Various |  | Suffix of POs: 48, 53, 112, 159, 159, $160,179,205,228$ |  |  | \$1,817,535.01 | Total Amount |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2100000035 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 425,257.20 | 425,257.20 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Information Tech Equipment | 76 remaining ICE units and new ICC's and servers for Chaves and |  |  | 425,257.20 | 0.00 |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2100000048 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 485,210.00 | 485,210.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Agreements | Period: 07/01/20-06/30/21 - ICE + ICC Preventative Maintenance; |  |  | 485,210.00 0.00 |  |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2100000053 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 324,858.00 | 324,858.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT HW/SW Agreements |  |  | 324,858.00 | 324,858.00 | 0.00 |
|  | Agreements | Democracy Suite Light Annual Licences | 25-Aug-20 |  |  |  |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2100000112 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 12,339.90 | 12,339.90 | 0.00 |
|  | Supplies-Field | EMS Adjudication Workstation Kits (Qty 7) | 7-Oct-20 | 12,339.90 | 12,339.90 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Supplies |  |  |  |  |  |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

## FY-2021

Vendor ID: 0000106196
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC

PO ID:
2100000035

Purchase Export NM SOS Office
\$1,817,535.01 Total Amount

| Line <br> Item | Category | Description |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000156 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  |  |
|  | Amount <br> Expended | $23,295.30$ |  |  |
| 1 | Photo Services | NM 2020 General Election - Pre-Printed Official Ballots | $23,295.30$ |  |


| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000159 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 137,767.13 | 137,767.13 | 0.00 |
|  |  | Support - DVS Phone, AES: Certification, Pollworker, EV Phone/Onsite, Travel Hours, ED Onsite, AES Onsite, ED War Room |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | IT Services | Escalation Phone, DVS Onsite | 26-Oct-20 | 134,475.02 | 134,475.02 | 0.00 |
|  |  | ADMIN Support - DVS Phone, AES: Certification, Pollworker, EV Phone/Onsite, Travel Hours, ED Onsite, AES Onsite, ED War Room |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | IT Services | Escalation Phone, DVS Onsite | 26-Oct-20 | 3,292.11 | 3,292.11 | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000160 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 152,155.16 | 152,155.16 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT HW/SW Agreements | NM 2020 General Election - Database Programming for all 33 counties in NM | 26-Oct-20 | 152,155.16 | 152,155.16 | 0.00 |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

## FY-2021

Vendor ID: 0000106196
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC

PO ID:
2100000035

Purchase Export NM SOS Office
\$1,817,535.01 Total Amount

| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000179 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 52,197.16 | 52,197.16 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT HW/SW Agreements | 2020 General Election Recount: Democracy Suite EMS Programming <br> + On-site Services | 1-Dec-20 | 46,197.16 | 46,197.16 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Supply Inventory IT | 2020 General Election Recount: 100 Ct - Compact Flash Memory Card (16GB) | 1-Dec-20 | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2100000205 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 25,300.00 | 25,300.00 | 0.00 |

NM 2021 General Special Election - Database Programming for 5 Counties, Test Decks/Ballots, Phone Support - Certification, ABS
IT HW/SW \& EV Voting, Onsite Election Day Support and Command

|  | IT HW/SW | \& EV Voting, Onsite Election Day Support and Command |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Agreements | Center Support (Project Manager) - 1 day @ \$1200/day | $26-A p r-21$ | $10,000.00$ | $10,000.00$ |

NM 2021 General Special Election: Phone Support - Certification, ABS \& EV Voting, Onsite Election Day Support and Command
2 Professional Services Center Support (Project Manager) - 1 day @ \$1200/day 26-Apr-21 15,300.00 15,300.00 0.00

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000205 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | \$27,000.00 | \$27,000.00 | \$0.00 |
|  | Information Tech |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Equipment | (4) ImageCast Central Scanner - G2140 | 16-Jun-21 | \$27,000.00 | \$27,000.00 | \$0.00 |


| New Mexico Sunshine Portal - |  |  |  |  |  | FY-2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor ID: 0000106196 |  |  |  | PO ID: |  | Purchase Export |  |
| DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC |  |  |  | 2100000 |  | NM SOS Office |  |
| Contract ID: Various |  |  | Suffix of POs: 48, 53, 112, 159, 159,160,179, 205, 228 |  |  | \$1,817,535.01 | Total Amount |
| Line Item | Category | Description |  | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| Verify Totals of Purchase Orders |  |  |  |  | 1,665,379.85 |  |  |
| Out of Balance Purchases vs. Summary |  |  |  |  | (\$152,155.16) |  |  |


| New Mexico Sunshine Portal - |  |  |  |  | FY-2020 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor ID: 0000106196 |  |  | PO ID: |  | Purchase Export |  |
| DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC |  |  | 2000000048 |  | NM SOS Office |  |
| Contract ID: Various |  | Suffix of POs: 49, 59, 73, 74, 75, 78, 81, 112, 148, 168, 170, 171, 191 |  |  | \$3,746,870.17 | Total Amount |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Line } \\ & \text { Item } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2000000048 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 1,947,900.00 | 1,947,900.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Colfax County | 6-Aug-19 | 25,800.00 | 25,800.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System to be shipped after completion | 6-Aug-19 | 1,410,400.00 | 1,410,400.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Harding County | 6-Aug-19 | 43,000.00 | 43,000.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Lea County | 6-Aug-19 | 180,600.00 | 180,600.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Los Alamos | 6-Aug-19 | 8,600.00 | 8,600.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Otero | 6-Aug-19 | 68,800.00 | 68,800.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System San Miguel County | 6-Aug-19 | 77,400.00 | 77,400.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Santa Fe County | 6-Aug-19 | 107,500.00 | 107,500.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Union County | 6-Aug-19 | 12,900.00 | 12,900.00 | 0.00 |
| 9 | Supply Inventory IT | ImageCast Evolution Scanner System Valencia County | 6-Aug-19 | 12,900.00 | 12,900.00 | 0.00 |



Note *: Remember that in the FY-2019 Purchase Orders there were removals, changes and now in FY-2020 conversion from ICP to ICE
Why is the State getting charged licensing fees for a platform they have migrated away from?

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196
PO ID:
FY-2020

2000000048

## Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Contract ID: Various
Suffix of POs: 49, 59, 73, 74, 75, 78, 81, 112, 148, 168, 170, 171, 191 \$3,746,870.17 Total Amount

| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000059 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 133,765.79 | 133,765.79 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | DVS Phone Support-Certification, ABS \& EV Voting (Dates 9/25- 11/022019) | 18-Sep-19 | 7,200.00 | 7,200.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | Sales Tax @ 8.4375\% rate = | 18-Sep-19 | 10,408.29 | 10,408.29 | 0.00 |
| 2 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support-Certification Support (Dates TBD- Units in Hours) | 18-Sep-19 | 4,100.00 | 4,100.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support - Pollworker Training (Dates TBD - Units in Hours) | 18-Sep-19 | 2,460.00 | 2,460.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | IT Services | AES Phone Support for Early Voting (Dates TBD - Units in Hours) | 18-Sep-19 | 1,537.50 | 1,537.50 | 0.00 |
| 5 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support for Early Voting (Date: 10/19 - Units in Hours) | 18-Sep-19 | 7,277.50 | 7,277.50 | 0.00 |
| 6 | IT Services | AES Travel Hours for all Onsite Support - see detail in line below | 18-Sep-19 | 15,375.00 | 15,375.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | IT Services | Travel Hours include Pollworker Training, Cert Support and all EV and ED support, Dominion Onsite Support for Election Day - (Dates 11/4-11/6-Units in Days) | 18-Sep-19 | 29,520.00 | 29,520.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support for Election Day (Dates 11/4-11/6-Units in Hours) - 12 people in 6 regions for 3 days | 18-Sep-19 | 48,687.50 | 48,687.50 | 0.00 |
| 9 | IT Services | - 1 lead in 21 counties plus additional tabulator support, Election Day War Room Escalation Phone Support - (2 people for 24 hour shift) | 18-Sep-19 | 7,200.00 | 7,200.00 | 0.00 |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196

PO ID:
2000000048

FY-2020
Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Contract ID: Various
Suffix of POs: 49, 59, 73, 74, 75, 78, 81, 112, 148, 168, 170, 171, 191 \$3,746,870.17 Total Amount

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000073 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 70,000.00 | 70,000.00 | 0.00 |
|  | IT HW/SW | NM 2019 - Rank Choice Voting License (July 2019 - June 2020 | 5-Nov-19 | 70,000.00 | 70,000.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Agreements |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2000000074 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 152,155.16 | 152,155.16 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT HW/SW Agreements | NM 2019 Regular Local Election - Database Programming for all 33 counties in NM | 5-Nov-19 | 140,316.00 | 140,316.00 | 0.00 |
|  | IT HW/SW | 8.4375 tax rate | 5-Nov-19 | 11,839.16 | 11,839.16 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Agreements |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2000000075 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 46,268.70 | 46,268.70 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | NM 2019 Regular Local Election - Pre-Printed Official Ballots | 5-Nov-19 | 34,752.21 | 34,752.21 | 0.00 |
|  | Printing \& | NM 2019 Regular Local Election - Pre-Filled Test Decks | 5-Nov-19 | 9,983.00 | 9,983.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Photo Services |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Printing \& | Shipping and Handling - Estimated - Will Bill Actual | 5-Nov-19 | 1,533.49 | $1,533.49$ | 0.00 |
| 3 | Photo Services |  |  |  |  |  |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196
PO ID:
FY-2020

2000000048

## Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Contract ID: Various
Suffix of POs: 49, 59, 73, 74, 75, 78, 81, 112, 148, 168, 170, 171, 191 \$3,746,870.17 Total Amount

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000078 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 274,405.00 | 274,405.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT HW/SW Agreements | Preventative Maintenance for ICP - 304 (7/19/2019-6/30/20) | 20-Nov-19 | 50,160.00 | 50,160.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | IT HW/SW Agreements | Preventative Maintenance- 733 ICE (7/1/2019-6/30/2019) | 20-Nov-19 | 194,245.00 | 194,245.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | IT HW/SW Agreements | Preventative Maintenance-12 ICC (7/1/2019-6/30/20) | 20-Nov-19 | 30,000.00 | 30,000.00 | 0.00 |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2000000081 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 34,418.07 | 34,418.07 | 0.00 |
|  | 1 IT Services | Regular Local Election Recount Programming 2019. Seven (7) Units: Bernalillo, Santa Fe, Torrance, Hidalgo, Colfax, Rio Arriba, Valencia | 12-Dec-19 | 10,500.00 | 10,500.00 | 0.00 |
|  | 2 IT Services | Regular Local Election Recount Support 2019. Twelve (12) Units - Six (6) Techs for Two (2) Days Located in: Santa Fe, Torrance, Hidalgo, Colfax, Rio Arriba \& Valencia | 12-Dec-19 | 9,840.00 | 9,840.00 | 0.00 |
|  | 3 IT Services | Regular Local Election Recount Support 2019. Two (2) Units - One <br> (1) CRM, and One (1) Project Manager Oversight | 12-Dec-19 | 2,400.00 | 2,400.00 | 0.00 |
|  | 4 Supply Inventory IT | Regular Local Election Recount Support 2019-150 CF Cards for Programming | 12-Dec-19 | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 | 0.00 |
|  | 5 IT Services | Tax for Services 8.43752727\% | 12-Dec-19 | 2,678.07 | 2,678.07 | 0.00 |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC
PO ID:
FY-2020

2000000048

## Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Contract ID: Various
Suffix of POs: 49, 59, 73, 74, 75, 78, 81, 112, 148, 168, 170, 171, 191 \$3,746,870.17 Total Amount

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000112 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 151,262.00 | 151,262.00 | 0.00 |
|  | IT HW/SW | 2020 Primary New Mexico Onsite Preventative Maintenance | 13-Feb-20 | 151,262.00 | 151,262.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Agreements | (January 2020 - March 2020) |  |  |  |  |


| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Amount <br> Total Amount |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000148 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 | $160,000.00$ |  |
|  | Information Tech | IT Hardware: Central Scanning: Absentee / Vote By Mail Hardware - | $160,000.00$ |  |
| 1 | Equipment | Eight (8) ImageCast Central Kits - G1130 (3050) | 0.00 |  |


| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000168 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 152,155.16 | 152,155.16 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | NM 2020 Primary Election - Database Programming for all 33 counties in NM | 11-May-20 | 152,155.16 | 152,155.16 | 0.00 |


| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000170 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 133,765.80 | 133,765.80 | 0.00 |

IT Support: DVS: Phone Support - Certification, ABS \& EV
Voting, Onsite Support - Election Day; AES: Certification Support,
Pollworker Training, Phone/Onsite Support - Early Voting, Travel
1 IT Services
Hours, Onsite Support - Election Day; Election Day War Room Phone
11-May-20
$133,765.80$
$133,765.80$

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196
PO ID:
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC
2000000048

FY-2020
Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Contract ID: Various
Suffix of POs: 49, 59, 73, 74, 75, 78, 81, 112, 148, 168, 170, 171, 191 \$3,746,870.17 Total Amount


| Verify Totals of Purchase Orders | $3,516,993.49$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Out of Balance Purchases vs. summary | $(\$ 229,876.68)$ |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC

PO ID:
1920000021

* Prefix error

Suffix of POs: 37, 79, 89, 127, 209
FY-2019

Contract ID: Various
Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Total
\$1,897,065.80 Amount
Note *: PO number structure seems to be different that others used in FY-2019

| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1920000021 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 | Amount <br> Expended | Balance |
| 1 | Supply Inventory IT | NM 2018 Recount- CF Cards for Programming | $9,940.00$ |  |
| 2 | Supply Inventory IT | freight | $9,940.00$ |  |

Note *: PO number structure seems to be different that others used in FY-2019

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000037 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 749,955.00 | 749,955.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Supply Inventory IT | Image Cast Evolution Tabulator \& Ballot Box Top for ICE. List price |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Supply Inventory IT | Shipping and Handling - \$35/unit per unit | 7-Aug-18 | 6,055.00 | 6,055.00 | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000079 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 59,110.00 | 59,110.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | NM 2018 General Election - Pre-Printed Official Ballots | 21-Sep-18 | 46,943.00 | 46,943.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Printing \& Photo Services | NM 2018 General Election - Pre-Filled Test Decks | 21-Sep-18 | 10,023.00 | 10,023.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | Printing \& Photo Services | Shipping and Handling - Estimated - Will Bill Actual | 21-Sep-18 | 2,144.00 | 2,144.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | Printing \& Photo Services | Estimated 8.4375\% Tax | 21-Sep-18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

New Mexico Sunshine Portal -
Vendor ID: 0000106196
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC
PO ID:
1920000021

## Contract ID: Various

Suffix of POs: 37, 79, 89, 127, 209

## FY-2019

Purchase Export
NM SOS Office
Total
\$1,897,065.80 Amount

| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Amount <br> Total Amount |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000088 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 | $152,155.16$ |  |
|  |  | NM 2018 General Election-Tabulator Database Programming for all 33 |  |  |
| Balance |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | IT Services | Counties in NM/Includes GRT at 8.4375\% | 0.00 |  |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC
Contract ID: Various

PO ID:
1920000021
Suffix of POs: 37, 79, 89, 127, 209

FY-2019
Purchase Export
NM SOS Office

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000089 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 133,765.79 | 133,765.79 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | DVS Phone Support - Certification, ABS \& EV Voting (Dates 9/2511/03) | 24-Sep-18 | 7,200.00 | 7,200.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | Sales Tax @ 8.4375\% rate = | 24-Sep-18 | 10,408.29 | 10,408.29 | 0.00 |
| 2 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support - Certification Support (Dates TBD - Units in Hours) | 24-Sep-18 | 4,100.00 | 4,100.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support - Pollworker Training (Dates TBD - Units in Hours) | 24-Sep-18 | 2,460.00 | 2,460.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | IT Services | AES Phone Support for Early Voting (Dates TBD - Units in Hours) | 24-Sep-18 | 1,537.50 | 1,537.50 | 0.00 |
| 5 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support for Early Voting (Date: 10/20/2018- Units in Hours) | 24-Sep-18 | 7,277.50 | 7,277.50 | 0.00 |
| 6 | IT Services | AES Travel Hours for all Onsite Support - see detail in line belowTravel Hours include Pollworker Training, Cert Support and all EV and ED support | 24-Sep-18 | 15,375.00 | 15,375.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | IT Services | Dominion Onsite Support for Election Day - (Dates 11/5-11/7- Units in Days) 12 people in 6 regions for 3 days | 24-Sep-18 | 29,520.00 | 29,520.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 | IT Services | AES Onsite Support for Election Day (Dates 11/5-11/7- Units in Hours)1 lead in 21 counties plus additional tabulator support | 24-Sep-18 | 48,687.50 | 48,687.50 | 0.00 |
| 9 | IT Services | Election Day War Room Escalation Phone Support - (2 people for 24 hour shift) | 24-Sep-18 | 7,200.00 | 7,200.00 | 0.00 |

[^144]
## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196
DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC
PO ID:
1920000021

Contract ID: Various

| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000127 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 42,348.20 | 42,348.20 | 0.00 |
|  | 1 IT Services | Bern Co State Rep Dist 20 | 3-Dec-18 | 1,500.00 | 1,500.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 IT Services |  | NM 2018 GE Recount- State Rep Dist. 22-Bern Co, SF, Sandoval Co | 3-Dec-18 | 4,500.00 | 4,500.00 | 0.00 |
|  | 3 IT Services | NM 2018 GE Recount: Curry, DeBaca, Roosevelt, Guadalupe \& San Miguel District 63 | 3-Dec-18 | 7,500.00 | 7,500.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 IT Services |  | NM 2018 GE Recount Election Support- 6 techs on site 3 days @ SF, Sand., Curry, DeBaca, Roos\&It; Guad. Co. | 3-Dec-18 | 14,760.00 | 14,760.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 IT Services |  | NM 2018 GE Recount Support - 3 days | 3-Dec-18 | 3,600.00 | 3,600.00 | 0.00 |
| 6 IT Services |  | NM 2018 GE Recount CF Card Programming -130 | 3-Dec-18 | 7,800.00 | 7,800.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 IT Services |  | Sales Tax @ 8.4375\% | 3-Dec-18 | 2,688.20 | 2,688.20 | 0.00 |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000106196

FY-2019
Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Total
\$1,897,065.80 Amount

NM SOS Office
Total
\$1,897,065.80 Amount

| Line <br> Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000209 | Contract ID: 30-370-13-00011 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 1 | IT Services | New Mexico Onsite Preventative Maintenance and Warranty for local election November 2019 267ICP, 319 ICE, 3ICE - billing for only counties highlighted in attached spreadsheet | 24-Jun-19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | IT Services | New Mexico Onsite Preventative Maintenance and Warranty for local election November 2019 267ICP, 319 ICE, 3ICE - billing for only counties highlighted in attached spreadsheet | 24-Jun-19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3 | IT Services | New Mexico Onsite Preventative Maintenance and Warranty for local election November 2019 267ICP, 319 ICE, 3ICE - billing for only counties highlighted in attached spreadsheet | 24-Jun-19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | IT Services | New Mexico Onsite Preventative Maintenance and Warranty for local election November 2019 267ICP, 319 ICE, 3ICE - billing for only counties highlighted in attached spreadsheet | 24-Jun-19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Note: Equipment being removed from the New Mexico configuration: $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ ImageCast Precinct; $\mathbf{3 1 9}$ ImageCast Evolution, $\mathbf{3}$ ImageCast Evolution

| Verify Totals of Purchase Orders | $1,147,274.15$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Out of Balance Purchases vs. summary | $(\$ 749,791.65)$ |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

## FY-2022 <br> Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Total
\$2,714,438.16 Amount

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount <br> Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All | PO \# 2200000058 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | $99,235.46$ | $99,235.46$ |  |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | Election Supplies for Regular Local Election | 3-Sep-21 | $99,235.46$ | $99,235.46$ |  |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount <br> Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All | PO \# 2200000080 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | $1,181,377.80$ | $1,181,377.80$ | 0.00 |
| 1 | Rent Of Equipment | BOD System - AutoVotes | $25-$ Oct-21 | $1,181,377.80$ | $1,181,377.80$ | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount <br> Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All | PO \# 2200000117 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | $112,351.22$ | $112,351.22$ | 0.00 |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | County Supplies Primary 2022 Election | 28 -Feb-22 | $112,351.22$ | $112,351.22$ | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount <br> Expended | Balance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All | PO \# 2200000132 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | $1,321,473.68$ | $1,321,473.68$ |  |


| All | PO \# 2200000132 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 1,321,473.68 | 1,321,473.68 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Rent Of Equipment | Ballot on Demand, auto votes and same day registration units; <br> " | 25-Apr-22 | 1,051,467.90 | 1,051,467.90 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Rent Of Equipment | Ballot on Demand, auto votes and same day registration units; <br> " | 25-Apr-22 | 270,005.78 | 270,005.78 | 0.00 |
| AKA/DBA Automated Elections Services |  | https://www.electionpeople.com/Services/Autovote |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Verify Totals of Purchase Orders |  | 2,714,438.16 $\checkmark$ |  |  |



## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000046758

PO ID:
2100000034

## FY-2021

Purchase Export NM SOS Office

Contract ID: Various
Suffix of POs: 97, 101, 107, 164, 174, 200, 206, 214
\$2,703,241.74 Total Amount

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000107 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 127,894.76 | 127,894.76 | 0.00 |
|  |  | NMAV - Custom Absentee Application Packet Mailers |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Consisting Of Pre-Addressed Applications With Bar |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Code As Permitted 1-6 X 9 Outgoing Envelope, Data |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Processing, Imaging, Inserting and Delivery to the |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | Albuquerque Post Office | 30-Sep-20 | 127,894.76 | 127,894.76 | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000164 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 4,938.14 | 4,938.14 | 0.00 |
|  |  | ALL MAIL PRECINCT NOTICES: CATRON, CHAVES, CIBOLA, GRANT, MORA, OTERO, QUAY, ARRIBA, |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | MIGUEL, SOCORRO | 30-Oct-20 | 4,938.14 | 4,938.14 | 0.00 |

## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000046758

PO ID:
2100000034

## FY-2021

Purchase Export NM SOS Office

INK IMPRESSIONS INC
200, 206, 214
\$2,703,241.74 Total Amount


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000200 | Contract ID: 403701300005AA |  | 9,392.77 | 9,392.77 | 0.00 |
|  |  | Ballot on Demand - Printing and Mailing Services for CD1 Special Election: Santa Fe, Torrance \& |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | Valencia Counties (ZE1010 - State Cares) + est GRT | 7-Apr-21 | 9,392.77 | 9,392.77 | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2100000206 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 43,645.66 | 0.00 | 43,645.66 |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | 2021 CD1 Special Election Supplies as ordered by the counties. | 26-Apr-21 | 43,645.66 | 0.00 | 43,645.66 |


| New Mexico Sunshine Portal - |  |  |  |  | FY-2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor ID: 0000046758 |  |  | PO ID: |  | Purchase Export NM SOS Office |  |
|  | INK IMPRESSIONS INC |  | 100000034 |  |  |  |
| Contract ID: Various |  | Suffix of POs: 97, 101, 107, 164, 174, 200, 206, 214 |  |  | \$2,703,241.74 | Total Amount |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 2100000214 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 68,295.41 | 68,295.41 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Rent Of Equipment | AutoVotes for Absentee, Early Voting and Election Day, \& Same Day Voter Registration Units | 4-May-21 | 68,295.41 | 68,295.41 | 0.00 |
| AKA/DBA | Automated Elections Services | https://www.electionpeople.com/Services/Autovote |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Verify Totals of Purchase Orders |  | 2,697,406.80 |  |  |
|  |  | Out of Balance Purchases vs. Summary |  | (\$5,834.94) |  |  |



## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

Vendor ID: 0000046758

PO ID:
2000000033

## FY-2020

Purchase Export NM SOS Office
Contract ID: Various

Suffix of POs: 71, 155, 173, 190
\$4,121,217.26 Total Amount

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount <br> Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000155 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 836,274.44 | 836,274.44 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Postage \& Mail Services | Absentee application mailing as required by Supreme Court: NMAV-1 Absentee Voter Request Mailing | 8-May-20 | 332,000.00 | 332,000.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  | ESTIMATED First Class Postage |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Absentee application mailing as required by Supreme |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Printing \& Photo Services | Court: NMAV-1 Absentee Voter Request Mailing | 8-May-20 | 504,274.44 | 504,274.44 | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 2000000173 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 1,350,869.70 | 1,350,869.70 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Rent Of Equipment | AutoVotes for Absentee/Early Voting and Election Day <br> + Same Day Voter Registration Unit | 12-May-20 | 916,238.00 | 916,238.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Rent Of Equipment | SUPPLEMENTAL: AutoVotes for Absentee/Early Voting and Election Day + Same Day Voter Registration Unit | 12-May-20 | 434,631.70 | 434,631.70 | 0.00 |



## New Mexico Sunshine Portal -

## FY-2019

Vendor ID: 0000046758

PO ID:
1940000065

Purchase Export NM SOS Office

INK IMPRESSIONS INC
Suffix of POs: 83, 150
\$1,515,762.21 Total Amount

| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000065 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 108,142.94 | 108,142.94 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Printing \& Photo Services | Election Supplies as ordered by the County Clerks | 12-Sep-18 | 108,142.94 | 108,142.94 | 0.00 |


| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | PO \# 1940000083 | Contract ID: 403701300005AA |  | 1,407,619.27 | 1,407,619.27 | 0.00 |
| 1 | Rent Of Equipment | AutoVote on Demand Ballot-all inclusive Ballot Generating System, Software \& Election Services for 2018 General Election-BOD Systems Lease (in Units by County) | 21-Sep-18 | 1,225,575.00 | 1,225,575.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Rent Of Equipment | NM GRT @ 7.4375\% | 21-Sep-18 | 97,444.27 | 97,444.27 | 0.00 |
| 3 | Rent Of Equipment | Absentee Voting Systems | 21-Sep-18 | 84,600.00 | 84,600.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line Item | Category | Description | Date | Total Amount | Amount Expended | Balance |
| All | PO \# 1940000150 | Contract ID: 800001800064 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | Printing \& Photo Services | Election Supplies as ordered by the County Clerks | 24-Jan-19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

AKA/DBA Automated Elections Services https://www.electionpeople.com/Services/Autovote

## APPENDIX K <br> Legal Memorandum

## Legal Memorandum

## "Unequal weights and unequal measures are both alike an abomination to the LORD."

- Proverbs 20:10

This memorandum follows an evidentiary presentation ${ }^{1}$ concerning Dominion Voting Systems (Dominion) and ROBIS ePollbook vulnerability in Otero and Torrance Counties. The memorandum:
(1) Provides legal authorities relevant to your County Commission and Clerk.
(2) Identifies violations of the Election Code by the Secretary of State (SOS) and her agents.
(3) Identifies existing vulnerabilities in Dominion and ROBIS ePollbooks, requiring immediate action.
(4) Provides immediate recommendations for the responsible administration of elections.

## Who Has The Authority to Administer and Certify Elections?

Elections are administered both at the state and county level, with powers delegated by the legislature to the SOS, the Board of County Commissioners, and County Clerks, as established by the New Mexico State Constitution (NM. Const. Art. VII Section 1(B)) and the Election Code (NMSA 1-1-1 through NMSA 1-26-6).

These elected officials possess concurrent jurisdiction to govern the overall conduct of elections. However, when each party is left to their own distinct legal role, the whole of elections cannot be performed. For example, while the Clerk counts votes and the Sheriff assists in safeguarding and delivering election records, the County Commissioners are exclusively responsible for certifying post-election results in their jurisdiction. To put it another way, even though the SOS is the chief "elections officer" in the state, the SOS cannot certify Otero County's post-election results as a matter of law. The SOS cannot even certify a voting machine's use at the county level before elections begin. ${ }^{2}$ The SOS can merely receive results from Otero County after they are certified (in addition to the 32 other counties throughout New Mexico), and then record and report those results to the public at large.

[^145]In other words, each elected body has exclusive jurisdiction to carry out legally prescribed responsibilities that cannot be delegated away or usurped by the other. Case in point, when the SOS sought to institute straight-ticket voting in the 2018 general election, her actions were struck down by the New Mexico Supreme Court as unconstitutional, because the legislature alone has plenary authority over elections. Unite New Mexico v. Oliver, 2019-NMSC-009. Secretary Oliver sought to take legislative power she did not possess. While the legislature certainly conferred authority to her to prescribe the "form of the ballot," they never delegated her with power to determine the "question of straight-ticket voting." See Id.

The question before this Commission is profoundly more dire than simply determining where the SOS's power starts and stops. As demonstrated during the evidentiary presentation, the suite of Dominion voting machine products and ROBIS ePollbooks used in Otero County are massively vulnerable.

Those vulnerabilities, in addition to Mark Zuckerberg funded drop boxes, have been exploited to carry out systemic fraud throughout New Mexico. The result is an erosion of trust in Otero County elections. It's one thing to identify the SOS's gross negligence in procuring machines that are easily hacked, subverted, and not certified in accordance with the Election Assistance Commission's (EAC) guidelines. ${ }^{3}$ It's quite another matter to foist those same machines on counties, force their use in the administration of elections, and then demand you certify the results.

All elected officials, including County Commissioners, "shall treat their position as a public trust," and "shall use the powers and resources of public office only to advance the public interest." See NMSA 10-16-3. Likewise, County Commissioners "shall conduct themselves in a manner that justifies the confidence placed in them by the people, at all times maintaining the integrity and discharging ethically the high responsibilities of public service." See NMSA 10-16-3(B).

When the SOS fails to protect the interests of the voter in Otero County, the remaining representatives of the body politic are duty-bound to act as checks and balances against that weaker or corrupted vessel, to ensure justice and the rule of law are observed and restored. Simply put, the County Commission can withhold certification until it is satisfied that all major vulnerabilities in the election process have been removed.

## Election Code Authority of County Commissioners

The purpose of the Election Code is to secure "the purity of elections and guard against the abuse of the elective franchise." NMSA 1-1-1.1.

[^146]
## Relevant Powers of the Board of County Commissioners

To further the ends of securing the purity of elections and to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise, County Commissioners, not the Secretary of State or even the County Clerk, are exclusively responsible for certifying post-election results as the official canvassing board. ${ }^{4}$ See NMSA 1-13-13. And before providing approval of those results, the Commission has the authority to make necessary corrections if there is a discrepancy with election returns, discrepancy with the number of votes, or if "it appears there is any omission, informality, ambiguity, error, or uncertainty on the face of the returns." See NMSA 1-13-5 ब||'s (1) through (4). Redressing these concerns speak to your highest responsibility under the law. Namely, upholding, preserving, and when needed, restoring the public trust.

The following are examples of how the SOS, Dominion, ROBIS and their agents have repeatedly violated the N.M. Election Code and EAC requirements, violated the public trust, or grossly misinformed the public. Penalties for violating the Election Code range from a petty misdemeanor ${ }^{5}$ to a fourth-degree felony. ${ }^{6}$

## A. Violations of the Election Code by The Secretary of State, its Agents, and Dominion

1. A commissioned audit in Otero County confirmed that Dominion wiped the entire project file of the November 2020 general election from the County's Election Management System (EMS). All election records kept on compact flash drives retrieved from tabulators were also erased. Election records shall be preserved for 22 months under state and federal law. See NMSA 1-12-69 and 52 U.S.C. 20701. Dominion unlawfully destroyed data recording media, and voter files, which constitute $4^{\text {th }}$ degree felonies. See NMSA 1-5-22 and 1-5-23.

Additional investigation confirms that Dominion has wiped project files for the November 2020 general election in Mesa County, CO, Maricopa, AZ, and many other states under the false pretext of doing "preventative maintenance" or a "trusted build." Moreover, the SOS has admitted election files in several NM counties have been deleted.

[^147]From: Fresquez, Kari, SOS [Kari.Fresquez@state.nm.us](mailto:Kari.Fresquez@state.nm.us)
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 9:37 AM
To: Keith Manes [kmanes@leacounty.net](mailto:kmanes@leacounty.net)
Subject: RE: [External] Election Ballot Images

Hi Keith,

After reviewing the images Carrie sent and visiting with Melissa, I think you are fine to provide the ballot images with one caveat. The county clerk is required to protect voter secrecy when providing election results. The NMAC rule 1.10.33 describes that vote totals in precincts with fewer than 5 voters by voting method shall be compiled as a total result and not broken out by voting method. Therefore, I would advise that you identify any precincts that may have had fewer than 5 voters and make sure you are not providing the ballot images such that the requestor can identify voting method.

After talking with Mandy and Melissa it sounds like not all of the counties exported the ballot images from the media cards after the election but since you have them you can provide them under these conditions which are sensitive to voter secrecy.

Let me know if you have any question.

Take care,
Kari
Figure 1. "February 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, 2021, Correspondence from SOS Office Acknowledging Ballot Images were Missing in Several Counties."

Immediate course of action recommended: Demand the SOS provide correspondence of all steps undertaken to investigate destruction of election records in Otero County contrary to the law.
2. Failure of the SOS to report the above election code violations to the Attorney General or District Attorney for investigation is conduct that, in and of itself, violates the N.M. Election Code. See NMSA 1-2-2 and NMSA 1-2-2.1.
3. Evidence of system log files from the November 2020 election in Chaves County showed that the Dominion software version installed on the tabulators did not match the software version installed on the County's Election Management System (EMS). The log files showed a system "warning" error, but the machine warning did not alert election workers to fix the problem before continuing with the election. The software mismatch went undetected by the Clerk, and the tabulators and EMS in "a state of error" continued to be used throughout the election.

Immediate course of action recommended: Otero County uses the same tabulators, EMS, and software, as Chaves County. Demand that all Otero system log files for the last election in Otero be produced to the County Commission for inspection of a software mismatch or other errors. Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall include comprehensive diagnostics designed to ensure that failures do not go undetected. NMSA 1-9-7.8 (B).

```
14 Oct 2020 10:32:26 [File Verifier] INFO : [Verification] Loading machine configuration to runtime settings started
1 4 \text { Oct 2020 10:32:26 [File Verifier] WARN : [Verification] Wrong mbs version: "5.2.17" Expecting: "5.2.4"}
14 Oct 2020 10:32:26 [File Verifier] INFO : [Verification] Loading conditional points from alternative selectors
```

Figure 2. System Log Error Showing Software Version Mismatch
4. Evidence of vote flipping occurred during a Risk Limiting Audit (RLA) in Chaves County. ${ }^{7}$ The Chaves County Clerk alerted the SOS and FBI about Chaves County failing the RLA, but no action was taken. Again, Otero County uses the same tabulators, EMS, and software as Chaves County in the conducting of RLAs. Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall ensure that the votes stored on the removable storage media device accurately represent the actual votes cast. NMSA 1-9-7.9 (C). The SOS failed to report this violation of the Election Code. See NMSA 1-2-2 and NMSA 1-2-2.1.

Immediate course of action recommended: Demand all SOS correspondence demonstrating their steps to address and resolve failure of the RLA in Chaves County, as Otero shares many ballot races with Chaves County.
5. Dominion machines are not currently certified in compliance with the N.M. Election Code. In a letter dated May 28th, 2021, ${ }^{8}$ the SOS office advises Dominion, that they are unable certify Dominion's system under the most recent United States Election Assistance Commission Code (EAC). The EAC published and identified their most recent "Voluntary Voting System Guidelines," as "VVSG 2.0." However, the EAC has not certified any independent testing laboratories to perform the "VVSG 2.0" certification.

This is a major problem under New Mexico's Election Code as written. "A voting system that does not comply with all requirements in the Election Code and the most recent voluntary voting system guidelines adopted by the United States election assistance commission shall be decertified for use in this state." NMSA 1-9-7.4(B).

The SOS has unilaterally decided that her office need only comply with the previously adopted standards. This is contrary to state statute, which mandates decertification of any system not in compliance with the most recent "VVSG." Since the EAC guidelines are adopted and codified into statute, they are not voluntary. Her letter was dated May 28th, 2021, over 1 year ago. ${ }^{9}$ Otero County is currently running elections on voting systems that should have been decertified as a matter of law.

Immediate course of action recommended: An objection to use any or all Dominion voting machines in Otero County can be filed in the District Court by a political party, organization representatives, election observers and candidates pursuant to NMSA 1-1110. Certification by the Commission should be withheld so long as Dominion voting

[^148]systems are being used in violation of the Election Code. A formal resolution should be voted on to prohibit use of Dominion machines and require the administration of elections through hand count tabulation of paper ballots in small, manageable precincts.
6. ROBIS ePollbooks have never been properly certified. The SOS posts all certification documentation for the election equipment used in this state on her website. The SOS claims the ePollbook system is certified based on a test report dated December 1, 2011. ${ }^{10}$ Aside from the issues with certification to VVSG 2.0, this certification document is completely invalid because it is 11 years out of date. The ROBIS ePollbook system used in New Mexico is an internet connected system which is updated multiple times per year according to the vendor. A system that is automatically updated by the vendor whenever changes are made to the software is not certifiable. The SOS is making no effort whatsoever to ensure a tested and certified system is being used for the most inherently vulnerable part of our election system.

Immediate course of action recommended: Check in voters at precinct locations using paper pollbooks.
7. The ROBIS ePollbooks and Ballot on Demand ballot printing system violates the law. The Election Codes requires that "[p]aper ballots shall be numbered consecutively." NMSA 1-10-12 (A). Ballots in New Mexico are printed at the time the voter checks in at the polling place, or by a clerk's office when an absentee ballot application is received. They are not sequentially numbered, and the only record of how many ballots have been printed at any given time are stored on internet connected ePollbooks, which are vulnerable to being changed without knowledge of election officials.

Immediate course of action: The Otero County clerk has authority to prepare and supply ballots under NMSA 1-10-2 and could order ballots that have the proper sequential numbering to be used in Otero County elections.
8. The SOS and some county clerks violated NMSA 1-10-2 by allowing the third-party vendor, Automated Election Services (AES), to print and mail absentee ballots on behalf of some counties. This is in direct violation of the state statute, which states: "The county clerk shall prepare and supply the ballots used in elections conducted under the Election Code [Chapter 1 NMSA 1978]. The secretary of state may assist in preparing and supplying ballots. Ballots other than those prepared by the county clerk or secretary of state shall not be used."

Immediate course of action: Otero County does not use third parties to produce their ballots, however multiple other New Mexico counties did count absentee ballots created and mailed by a third party which should not have been used. The Otero County

[^149]Commission can demand why the SOS led county clerks to believe it was legal to let a third party produce and mail absentee ballots outside the control of the county clerks.
9. The ROBIS ePollbook System violates one of the most fundamental purposes of the election code, namely, "to secure the secrecy of the ballot." NMSA 1-1-1.1. The ePollbook system records the name, precinct, polling place, ballot type and time of checkin in digital records. The Dominion tabulators record the polling place, precinct, ballot type, and (in some cases) the time each ballot was scanned. It is possible using these two records to match up names of voters with the image of their ballot and know exactly how they voted. The ballot images are public record according to statute. Even if the check-in information is protected by the clerk, the ePollbooks are internet connected. Thus, the information on them is always vulnerable to bad actors that can match voters to their ballots, profile voters, and stuff ballot boxes.


Figure 3. Screenshot of Information Collected by ROBIS ePollbook System


Figure 4. Screenshot of Information on Dominion Ballot Images

Immediate course of action recommended: Otero County must discontinue their use of electronic, internet-connected ePollbooks and go to paper poll books with in-precinct voting.
10. "Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall have an internal audit trail capability such that all pre-election, election day and post-election events shall be stored, recorded and recovered in an easy-to-read printed form and be retained within memory that does not require external power for memory retention." NMSA 1-9-7.9 (G). Auditors demonstrated that system log files in Chaves County showed that election files were being removed while the elections were progressing. It is illegal to delete these files during an election.

```
lu 14 Oct 2020 11:26:53 [Main thread] INFO : [Init] "Root File System New SHA value: ffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffff"
14 Oct 2020 11:26:53 [Main thread] INFO : [Init] "Election Application New SHA value: ffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffff"
136 14 Oct 2020 11:26:53 [Main thread] INFO : [File Access] File "/mnt/cfe/electiondata.dat" successfully removed
```

Figure 5. System Log Files Show Files Being Deleted

Immediate course of action recommended: Otero County uses the same tabulators, EMS, and software, as Chaves County. Demand that all Otero system log files for the last election be produced to the County Commission for inspection of whether election files were being deleted during the election.
11. Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall be designed so that no executable code can be launched from random access memory. NMSA 1-9-7.9 (D). Independent auditors are unable verify this requirement since Dominion's source code has not been provided to, or examined by, the Otero County Clerk. There is no legal basis to withhold the source code for the Clerk's independent review. The source code is to be held in escrow and be made accessible to the state of New Mexico as a matter of law. See NMSA 1-9-7.11. Clerks are the obvious representatives of the state when it comes to certifying use of the machines. See NMSA 1-11-5. Dominion's claim that the source code cannot be produced for intellectual or proprietary reasons must yield to state law.

Immediate course of action: Upon objection filed with the District Court pursuant to NMSA 1-11-10, Dominion source code should be made available for review through an "in-camera" inspection before a District Court Judge with an independent expert selected by the SOS, and an independent expert selected by the County Commission, with both parties present. If it is found that the source code is reliable and not a source of vulnerability, the parties would be bound by the Court's authority to maintain confidentiality concerning Dominion's intellectual property. If the source code is proven to be vulnerable to fraudulent manipulation, no legal protection should be afforded. Regardless of the Court's potential ruling on releasing the source code, the decision to certify post-election election results and use of Dominion resides exclusively with the County Commission.
12. Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall have operating system software which includes error detection and correction codes. More importantly, software shall include comprehensive diagnostics to ensure that failures do not go undetected. See NMSA 1-9-7.9 (E). Again, auditors showed Dominion and the SOS let an entire election be processed with different versions of software on the tabulators and the election management system. "Error" was indicated in the system log files, but the error was not detected be election workers real-time, and the machines were allowed to proceed with ballot tabulation.
13. The SOS has misrepresented to the public and to Clerks that their Election Management System (EMS) does not have remote accessibility. In fact, state law requires it. See NMSA

1-9-7.9 (H). "Voting systems certified for use in state elections shall possess the capability of remote transmission of election results to a central location only by reading the removable storage media devices once they have been removed from the tabulation device after the poll closing sequence has been completed." This statement implies that the EMS shall have remote accessibility.
14. Nation-state vulnerability expert Jeff Lenberg (Lenberg) provided testimony before the Otero County commission that the Dominion machines being used in New Mexico have a feature where they can be "woken up" remotely. Even more concerning, the "wake up" can be done without the screen turning on to alert election workers that the machine is being accessed. Additionally, Lenberg's has produced 10 expert reports detailing the massive vulnerabilities of Dominion as part of pending litigation in Antrim County, Michigan, which uses the same machines as Otero County. All can be downloaded and retrieved at depernolaw.com.
15. Lenberg provided testimony before the Otero County commission that Dominion machines in New Mexico have a socket design on their machines, strategically placed to easily add a wireless modem to their mother boards. Dominion CEO John Poulos committed perjury before the Michigan Senate that Dominion voting machines are not designed for remote access.
16. Lenberg provided testimony before the Otero County commission that Dominion machines in New Mexico, through the proper credentials (keys) and cellular modem, can be accessed from anywhere in the world. It was discovered that the county clerks in Otero do not hold the credentials to their own machines. Otero is completely dependent on a third-party corporation that refuses to allow auditors to inspect for a cellular modem on their tabulators.
17. Lenberg provided testimony before the Otero County commission that Dominion machines in New Mexico can change votes in an election through existing software on the machines. Moreover, bad actors can change the time and date on the printout tapes to make it appear that the altered votes were the actual votes on election night. In other words, even a full year after an election, Dominion can alter election results and make it appear that those results were from November 3, 2020.

This is not an exhaustive list of machine vulnerability in Otero County. More findings will be produced upon receipt. County Commissioners hold vast power over the conduct of elections in their jurisdiction. Not only do they alone possess the authority to certify post-election results, but they also designate polling places, consolidate precincts, designate any mail ballot precincts, and can create additional polling places. NMSA 1-3-2.

County Commissioners, also have the authority to permit voters in the county to cast ballots in voter convenience centers, or exempt certain precincts from operating voting convenience centers at all. NMSA 1-3-4. County Commissioners have the power to create, divide, or abolish precinct boundaries. NMSA 1-3-5.

Based on the aforementioned, it is our recommendation that action items be put on the next Otero County Commission meeting agenda for a vote on whether to (1) remove Dominion voting machines and ROBIS ePollbooks before they can be used in the general election, and (2) remove drop boxes that were never legislatively prescribed for use in Otero County. The public trust is irrevocably broken concerning use of Dominion, ROBIS ePollbooks, and the Zuckerberg drop boxes. County Commissioners, "shall treat their position as a public trust," and "shall use the powers and resources of public office only to advance the public interest." See NMSA 10-16-3.

## Relevant Powers of the County Clerk In Support of the County Commission

The legal responsibility to certify, and choose whether to use Dominion machines before an election, also rests with the County Clerk. "Forty-two days before an election, the county clerk may begin to prepare, inspect, certify and seal electronic voting machines." NMSA 1-11-5. Please note there is no legal authority for a third-party vendor such as Dominion, SLI Compliance or Pro $V \& V$, or AES to certify the machines for approval. The authority rests with exclusively with the County Clerk. Without access to the source code held in escrow or a physical examination of the motherboards and hardware for remote access, the Clerk is not making a meaningful inspection, and therefore cannot make an intelligent decision on whether the machines should be certified for use.

Immediate course of action: Objection to use any, or all of the voting machines, can be filed in the District Court by a party, organization representatives, election observers or candidates. NMSA 1-1110. The Election Code is silent on whether a Clerk can simply withhold certification on the voting machines, or must file an objection with the District Court on behalf of the County.

Much like the County Commission, County Clerks, not the Secretary of State, administer the day-to-day work of elections in Otero County. They appoint precinct level election boards to administer elections (NMSA 1-2-6), assign board members to their precincts (NMSA 1-2-11), fill vacancies (NMSA 1-2-15) and select presiding judges and election judges to oversee elections (NMSA 1-2-12). County Clerks are charged with maintaining accurate vote tallies and certify the process at the precinct level. See NMSA 1-1-8. And challengers, watchers, and county canvass observers are subject to the authority of the county precinct election boards. See NMSA 1-2-22 through 33.

The County Commission and County Clerk possess the exclusive authority to certify elections in their county as being trustworthy and in keeping with the public trust. But final authority rests with the Otero County Commission. The power of certification at the local level does not vest in the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State merely furnishes counties with forms and certificates that they must fill out after they discharge their duties. NMSA 1-2-3. Power to discharge a particular duty, is only power if it can be withheld at the appropriate time.

The County Commission and Clerk have legal authority to withhold certification when public trust in elections is irrevocably broken due to massive election vulnerabilities, fraud, or illegality.

Exhibit 1: Paperwork altering SOS of failure of Risk Limiting Audit in Chaves County

COUNTY CLERK<br>Dave Kunko<br>PO Box 580<br>Roswell, NM 88202<br>575-624-6614<br>FAX 575-624-6523<br>dkunko@co.chaves.nm.us



COMMISSIONERS

| Cara Dana | $>$ | District 1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| T. Calder Ezzell Jr. | $>$ | District 2 |
| Jeff Bilberry | $>$ | District 3 |
| Robert Corn | $>$ | District 4 |
| William E. Gavin | $>$ District 5 |  |

November 24, 2020
Robert J. Rivera, CPA, PC
6 Call Medico, Suite 4
Santa Fe, NM 87505-4761
RE: Post-Election Voting System Check for the November 3, 2020 General Election
Dear Mr. Rivera,
Chaves County was selected to participate in the accuracy check of the tabulators used in the 2020 General Election. At this time, we have completed the accuracy check. We were able to locate all the ballots in precinct 22 . We hand tallied these ballots for the U.S. Representative District 2 contest and Judge of the Court of Appeals, Position 3 contest and found the following discrepancies:

Tabulator AAFEBEM0046 - Absentee, Spare \#2
39 ballots were hand tallied. The discrepancy appears in the Judge of the Court of Appeals, Position 3, contest.
The results from RTR - Dominion Server show to be:
Thomas C. Montoya - 16
Jane B. Yohalem - 23
Undervotes - 0
Overvotes - 0
The hand tally results show to be:
Thomas C. Montoya - 15
Jane B. Yohalem - 24
Undervotes - 0
Overvotes - 0
Attached please find our tally sheets as well as a report from the Dominion system for the tabulator with the discrepancy. Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thank you, Finder ruler
Cindy Fuller
Chief Deputy Clerk
Shaves County

# Election Summary Report 

General Election<br>Chaves County<br>November 03, 2020

Summary for: UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT 2, JUDGE OF THE COUR OF APPEALS POSITION 3, o22 SPARE 2-ABSENTEE, All Tabulators, Election Day, Early Absentee

Registered Voters: 39 of 0 (N/A)
Ballots Cast: 39

## UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT 2 (Vote for 1)

|  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Times Cast |  | $39 / 0 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Undervotes |  | 0 |
| Overvotes | Party | 0 |
| Candidate | REP | Total |
| YVETTE HERRELL | DEM | 14 |
| XOCHITL TORRES SMALL |  | 25 |
| Total Votes |  | 39 |
|  |  | Total |
| Unresolved Write-In |  | 0 |

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS POSITION 3 (Vote for 1)

|  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Times Cast | $39 / 0 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| Undervotes |  | 0 |
| Overvotes | Party | 0 |
| Candidate | REP | Total |
| THOMAS C MONTOYA | DEM | 16 |
| JANE B YOHALEM | 23 |  |
| Total Votes | 39 |  |
|  |  | Total |
| Unresolved Write-In | 0 |  |
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[^23]:    ${ }^{33}$ www.sos.state.nm.us/voting-and-elections/voting-faqs/voting/ (last question)

[^24]:    ${ }^{34}$ See the National Institute of Standards and Technology document, Mar 2020: https://pages.nist.gov/CastVoteRecords/
    ${ }^{35} \mathrm{p}$ is for "proportion" or "percentage", ie the proportion or percentage of votes favoring a candidate

[^25]:    ${ }^{36}$ This is known as the Law of Large Numbers in probability theory.

[^26]:    ${ }^{37}$ or less if the initial subgroup was small, or more if the last subgroup had 201 to 300 ballots.

[^27]:    ${ }^{38}$ or less if the initial subgroup was small, or more if the last subgroup had 201 to 300 ballots.

[^28]:    ${ }^{39}$ or less if the initial subgroup was small, or more if the last subgroup had 201 to 300 ballots.

[^29]:    ${ }^{40}$ This is known as the Law of Large Numbers in probability theory

[^30]:    ${ }^{41}$ www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2021/cps-asec-geographicmobility.htm|\#:~:text=This\%20represents\%20an\%208.4\%25\%20mover,and\%20main\%20reason\%20for\% 20 relocating.

[^31]:    ${ }^{42}$ https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/why-did-mark-meadows-register-to-vote-at-an-address-where-he-did-not-reside

[^32]:    Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\%20Mexico\&county=CHAVES

[^33]:    Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\%20Mexico\&county=Colfax

[^34]:    Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\%20Mexico\&county=Grant

[^35]:    Source: http://magaraccoon.com/votereport.asp?state=New\%20Mexico\&county=Santa\%20Fe

[^36]:    From: Carrier, Jennifer [JCarrier@blankrome.com](mailto:JCarrier@blankrome.com)
    Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2020 8:07 AM
    To: Amanda López Askin [amanda@donaanacounty.org](mailto:amanda@donaanacounty.org)
    Cc: Vigil, Mandy, SOS [Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us](mailto:Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us)
    Subject: RE: CVI - New Mexico Absentee Ballot Application Mailings **In Homes Soon**

[^37]:    Clerk Lopez Askin -
    Thank you for your email. I'm sorry for the delay - I talked about this some more with the program team at CVI. would have worked independently. additional language you'd suggest I can see if they can modify further.
    Thank you for everything Dona Ana County is doing to engage voters!
    Jen

    Jennifer L. Carrier | BLANKROME
    1825 Eye Street NW | Washington, DC 20006
    Phone: 202.420 .3034 | Fax: 202.420 .2201 | Email: JCarrier@blankrome.com

[^38]:    From: Carrier, Jennifer
    Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 3:35 PM
    To: Vigil, Mandy, SOS [Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us](mailto:Mandy.Vigil@state.nm.us); Lange, Dylan, SOS [Dylan.Lange@state.nm.us](mailto:Dylan.Lange@state.nm.us); 'Curtas, Alex, SOS'
    [Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us](mailto:Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us); Varghese, Blezoo, SOS [blezoo.varghese@state.nm.us](mailto:blezoo.varghese@state.nm.us); Romero, Alicia, SOS [Alicia.Romero2@state.nm.us](mailto:Alicia.Romero2@state.nm.us)
    Cc: 'Stover, Linda' [lstover@bernco.gov](mailto:lstover@bernco.gov); 'Lopez Askin, Amanda' [amanda@donaanacounty.org](mailto:amanda@donaanacounty.org)
    Subject: CVI - New Mexico Absentee Ballot Application Mailings **In Homes Soon**

[^39]:    133 Oct 2020 11:26:53 [Main thread] INFO : [Init] "Root File System New SHA value: ffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffff" 13414 Oct 2020 11:26:53 [Main thread] INFO : [Init] "Election Application SHA value: eӨf4439406cbaae9ff8c9cbaedebbf4e83781327736f6926aaa04912e36e284a" 13514 Oct 2020 11:26:53 [Main thread] INFO: [Init] "Election Application New SHA value: ffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffffff" 13614 Oct 2020 11:26:53 [Main thread] INFO : [File Access] File "/mnt/cfe/electiondata.dat" successfully removed
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[^144]:    Note *: Two line items with the same number

[^145]:    ${ }^{1}$ Audit findings from several New Mexico counties are provided in the memo, as deviations in one county necessarily affect all ballot races shared with Otero County. The full Torrance County presentation can be reviewed here: https://rumble.com/v16cc09-torrance-county-commission-estancia-new-mexico-may-25-2022.html. The full Otero presentation can be viewed here: https://youtu.be/Fg6Gf6QjqGM.

    ## ${ }^{2}$ See NMSA 1-11-5.

[^146]:    ${ }^{3}$ As explained below, adherence to EAC "guidelines" are not voluntary in New Mexico. That's because the legislature adopted and prescribed compliance with the most recent version provided by the EAC. Dominion is not currently certified under the most recent EAC requirements. New Mexico law requires decertification.

[^147]:    ${ }^{4}$ The Board of County Commissioners is ex-officio (by virtue of office or position) the county canvassing board for the county. NMSA 1-13-1.
    ${ }^{5}$ NMSA 1-20-22. Violation of Election Code; general penalty. If the Election Code does not impose a specific penalty for the violation of a provision prohibiting a specific act, "whoever knowingly commits such violation is guilty of a petty misdemeanor." If a willful violation of the Election code is carried out by election officers, they can be found "guilty of a fourth-degree felony and, in addition, violation is sufficient cause for removal from office in a proceeding instituted for that purpose as provided by law."
    ${ }^{6}$ NMSA 1-20-15. Conspiracy to violate Election Code. Conspiracy to violate the Election Code [Chapter 1 NMSA 1978] consists of knowingly combining, uniting or agreeing with any other person to omit any duty or commit any act, the omission of which duty, or combination of such act, would by the provisions of the Election Code constitute a fourth-degree felony. Whoever commits conspiracy to violate the Election Code is guilty of a fourth-degree felony.

[^148]:    ${ }^{7}$ See Ex. 1 - Correspondence from Chaves County Clerk concerning failure of the RLA.
    ${ }^{8}$ This letter was withheld from numerous public records' request for over 8 months.
    ${ }^{9}$ See Ex. 2 - SOS letter admitting Dominion is not certified per the requirements of the Election Code.

[^149]:    ${ }^{10}$ www.sos.state.nm.us/voting-and-elections/data-and-maps/voting-system-certification-committee/

