

THE GEORGIA REPORT REVISION A

July 30, 2021

Written By:

Matt Braynard, Executive Director
The LAA Research Group

**LOOK
AHEAD
AMERICA**

THE VOTER INTEGRITY PROJECT

Disclaimer and Update

We received feedback from some of the organizations that we shared our data with and decided to revise The Georgia Report to reflect those changes.

Disclaimer regarding illegal ballots versus illegal voters: While this report identifies a large number of ballots that were cast illegally and the names of ineligible voters in whose name the ballots were cast, it does not allege that that the person in whose name the ballot was cast was the person who cast it. It is nearly impossible to prove who cast a ballot, legal or otherwise, particularly as a private, non-governmental organization.

Disclaimer regarding redaction of voter information and research: The public version of this report has redacted appendixes that include voter data and supplemental research. The full version will be made available to government and law enforcement officials and, on a limited basis, to select individuals and members of the media.

Key Revisions

- We discovered that we under-reported in Tranche One by additional 345 illegal registrations, boosting the illegal votes in the margin of victory from 1,056 to 1,401, or up from 9% to 12%.
- We also added subdivisions and severity rankings of all the items in Tranche One in anticipation of counter arguments that these were transposed Mailing Addresses.
- We reviewed three of our challenged examples that we coded as illegally cast vote determinations. We provided additional data in Appendix A to show that these voters definitely lived out of state and did not qualify as absentee voters.
- The 2015 study that we cited and GA SOS Raffensperger's recent removal of over 100,000 supposedly inactive voters using the NCOA validates our methodology. While the 2017 article we also cited for OOSSR does not mention NCOA, it actually fortifies our NCOA claims and methodology.
- We corrected MOE downward in Tranches Two and Three per a previous miscalculation.
- We reviewed some previously undetermined cases in Tranche Two. We determined that another twelve were illegally cast ballots, while determining three of them were legal.
- Upon reviewing our data that we collected, we believe that we actually *underreported* our findings. Since The Georgia Report only presented three of the six types of illegal votes being considered, it was more likely that the report understated the number of illegal votes in Georgia because our study was incomplete.

Table of Contents

Disclaimer and Update	2
Key Revisions	2
Project History	4
Six Tranches of Illegal Ballots in Georgia	5
Tranche 1: EABCINV Registered Illegally	6
Subdivisions and Severity Rankings.....	6
Tranche 2: EABCINV Matched to the NCOA Database	8
The NCOA Database Defined	8
Initial NCOA Analysis	8
Scientific Basis for Utilizing the NCOA Database Matching	8
Supplemental Analysis of EABCINV NCOA Matches.....	9
Tranche 3: EABCINV Out of State Subsequent Registrations (OOSSR)	11
Initial OOSSR Analysis.....	11
The Scientific Basis for the Validity of Full Name and Date of Birth Match.....	11
Supplemental Analysis of EABCINV OOSSR Matches	11
The Unexamined Tranches	13
Tranche 4: EDBCINV Illegally Registered	13
Tranche 5: EDBCINV matched to NCOA and OOSSR	13
Tranche 6: Unmatchable Invalid Residencies Among EABCINV and EDBCINV	13
Summary and Conclusion	14
Appendix A.....	15
Example 1:	15
Example 2:	16
Example 3	16

Project History

In the days after the 2020 General Election, many questions were raised about voter fraud.

Given the close margins across many states, Matt Braynard and an assembled team of researchers commenced the Voter Integrity Project to run several experimental analyses designed to determine if illegal ballots had been cast and whether or not the number of them was significant.

The initial project ran as many as seven different procedures across six different states at a total cost of \$591,436. Analyzing Georgia was approximately one sixth of that budget, or \$98,573. This covered the cost of raw data, data processing, and various vendors and call centers that helped with the analysis.

There was an extremely compressed timeline to produce results that could be utilized in litigation and in legislative hearings, or be considered by statewide officials responsible for administering elections and investigating voter fraud.

However, after those deadlines passed and when our initial results never received a fair hearing in a court of law or were thoroughly examined by any elected officials, the Voter Integrity Project, now under the aegis of Look Ahead America, took a deeper dive into the initial findings. Under the leadership of Braynard and LAA's Research Director Ian Camacho, LAA's Research Group, a team of forty highly-trained volunteers, conducted a supplemental investigation into the VIP's data.

This report is the result of the initial and subsequent investigation.

Six Tranches of Illegal Ballots in Georgia

We have identified six tranches of illegal ballots.

Tranche 1: Early and Absentee Ballots Cast In the Names of Voters (EABCIN) registered illegally.

Tranche 2: EABCINV matched to permanent, out-of-state moves in the National Change of Address Database (NCOA). The NCOA database contains records going back as many as four years and as recent as October 1, 2020 at the time we did processed this match in mid-November.

Tranche 3: EABCINV matched to Out of State Subsequent Registrations (OOSSR) using our national voter database (NVD). In these cases, the voter had registered to vote in Georgia and were matched to voters who had subsequently registered to vote in another state.

Tranche 4: Election Day Ballots Cast In the Names of Voters (EDBCINV) registered illegally.

Tranche 5: EDBCINV matched to the NCOA and OOSSR.

Tranche 6: Unmatchable Invalid Residencies Among EABCINV and EDBCINV

Due to the limitations of time, budget, and the inability to have access to necessary government databases, the VIP was only able to analyze the first three tranches.

Tranche 1: EABCINV Registered Illegally

In the state of Georgia, it is illegal for a voter to register with a where they do not live. The VIP matched EABCINV against the known lists of postal facilities and similar (FedEx, UPS, etc.) and similar addresses where individuals could not live. We found that many registrants disguised box numbers as 'Apt' numbers and 'Units.'

In some cases, these facilities exist at the same addresses of legitimate apartment buildings, however we have scrubbed our list of any potential false positives that could be relate to this. Further, we publicly posted a redacted list of all of these registration addresses (suppressing the voter's name and other personal information) and thousands of members of the public to assist in reviewing this list which helped us also remove a handful of false positives.

Due to time and resource constraints, we did not run this analysis using EDBCINV. However, we did match small number of EDBCINV that had exact matches to addresses that were matched using EABCINV.

In total, we identified 1,401 EABCINV/EDBCINV registered illegally

Subdivisions and Severity Rankings

We have even subdivided this tranche into four groups, ranked in order of the most to least severe in order to determine possible false positives. We have assumed the most charitable explanations and reasons due to a potential clerical error or transcription error, in which the clerk or system transposed the Mailing Address with the Residential Address, in order to anticipate criticisms or explain-away rationale:

(1) P.O. Boxes or non-residential items (i.e. restaurants, factories, etc.) listed in a Residential Address without any corresponding Mailing Address, or having listed itself as the Mailing Address, or with a Mailing Address that leads to another Post Office. There's no reason how this could be anything but intentional and no "mistake" can be attributed to it. Many Mailing Addresses also had false addresses using Suite, Unit or Apartment as well. We found that 1,303 of the 1,401 (93%) fall under this subdivision.

(2) P.O. Boxes or non-residential items listed in a Residential Address, and an out of state address is listed in the Mailing Address. If these were swapped due to clerical error, then using the "corrected" Residential Address these would be illegal in that a voter claiming Georgia residency clearly resides in another state. Furthermore, they also used a fraudulent Residential Address under the guise of an "Apartment," "Unit," or "Suite" to cover an illegal P.O. Box Residential or Mailing Address. We also found many of these cases attempted to hide their out of state Mailing Address by using the city and zip in another state with a Georgia state name (i.e. Santa Fe, GA 87505 instead of Santa Fe, NM 87505). We found that 45 of the 1,401 (3.2%) fall under this subdivision.

(3) P.O. Boxes or non-residential items listed in a Residential Address, and a non-residential Georgia address listed in the Mailing Address. Even if these were swapped due to clerical error, then the non-residential address (e.g. a factory, a restaurant, etc.) still would not qualify as a Residential Address. These would require evidence that a person actually resides onsite. In fact, we attempted to verify whether such cases such as an onsite storage facility manager was listed and mentioned in items such as online reviews or staff postings, and eliminated those cases. To argue that a homeless voter resides there calls into question their ability to pay for and maintain a P.O. Box and what they listed under their contact and billing information when registering at the postal service. It also would not explain why one would list these locations as an “Apartment,” “Unit,” or “Suite” to cover their P.O. Box Residential or Mailing Address. We found that 8 of the 1,401 (0.6%) fall under this subdivision.

(4) P.O. Boxes listed in a Residential Address, and a residential Georgia address listed in the Mailing Address. This would be the least severe of all cases, assuming that of course these addresses really were transposed. These would require an investigation into the original applications for all such cases. Nevertheless, an investigation into why the voters listed their P.O. Boxes as an “Apartment,” “Unit,” or “Suite” demands investigation for answers, especially if one was using it as a legitimate Mailing Address. We found that 45 of the 1,401 (3.2%) fall under this subdivision.

Tranche 2: EABCINV Matched to the NCOA Database

The NCOA Database Defined

The National Change of Address database is maintained by the US Postal Service. It includes individuals who request to have their mail forwarded and includes the individual's original address, their new, forwarding address, and whether or not it is a permanent or temporary move. An individual making a submission to the NCOA database online must submit an address-verified credit card for a token payment as a means of authenticating residency.

Initial NCOA Analysis

VIP matched the entire database of EABCINV as obtained from the state of Georgia through a licensed vendor for matching by the USPS. The matching process is not conducted by the licensed vendor but by the USPS.

The NCOA database only maintains records going back four years, and we did not match any records that filed move notices subsequent to October 2, 2020.

This process identified 15,400 EABCINV who filed permanent, out-of-state changes of residency more than a month prior to the 2020 general election.

Scientific Basis for Utilizing the NCOA Database Matching

The methodology of using NCOA to identify voters who have moved out of state is backed up by research, specifically an article titled "A Brief Yet Practical Guide to Reforming US Voter Registration Systems," which appeared in Election Law Journal and was co-authored by Stephen Ansolabehere, the Frank G. Thompson Professor of Government at Harvard University who is widely published and has a PhD in political Science from Harvard. The article recommends the use of the National Change of Address database to identify voters who are "deadwood" because they moved out of state. From the article:

It is possible to develop comparable metrics of list quality and targets for improving registration lists. An example of a possible metric is the incidence of "Deadwood", (Obsolete records, usually due to a person moving or dying) on Active and Inactive voter lists Using National Change of address (NCOA) and other postal lists, information from marketing firms, past vote records, and the national registration list, Catalyst has identified records that are dead wood. The data reveal that 7.3 percent of all registration records in the United States are "deadwood."

We will also note that NCOA Database Matching was sufficient for Georgia's current Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger. He recently used the NCOA to remove over 100,000 supposedly inactive voters, thus validating our work and methodology.¹ After all, if using the NCOA was

¹https://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/secretary_raffensperger_takes_action_to_uphold_ballot_integrity_with_major_list_maintenance_effort

valid for removing inactive voters, then it would also have utility in removing active (and thus illegally cast) voters. If not a valid methodology, then why use the NCOA to determine and remove inactive voters?

Supplemental Analysis of EABCINV NCOA Matches

While a permanent move out of state is typically grounds to invalidate an individual's right to vote in Georgia, there are exceptions, particularly for members of the US military. There are also cases of false positives, where an individual was not matched correctly by the USPS or where voter did make a permanent move but then moved back.

LAA's Research Group analyzed a randomized sample² from the 15,700 EABCINV NCOA matches and subjected them to further investigation using a variety of public and semi-publicly available tools to find supplemental evidence they had established residency outside the state or if the match was a false positive, either because they had not moved, had moved out but moved back, or because they were still qualified to vote in Georgia despite moving.

These tools included social media websites including Facebook, LinkedIn, and Instagram, property and tax records, court records, and state driver license databases.³

The Research Group evaluated whether or not the EABCINV were military on the basis of proximity to a military base or the use of a military address, or if the individual had a military or similar occupational justification as determined by a LinkedIn record, etc.

In cases where we only found evidence that the individual was still in Georgia and not in the NCOA state, we counted that as a false positive. In cases where we did not find any evidence that they established residency in a new state or still lived in Georgia as of the NCOA match date, we counted that as Undetermined.

Each case was reviewed and validated by an initial researcher, then a senior researcher, then by the Director of Research, and finally by Look Ahead America's Executive Director.

Among the 242 EABCINV NCOA matches in our sample that we could determine, we concluded that 166 (or 1 in 6 of the overall 1,000 raw sample size) were no longer residents of Georgia for greater than thirty days prior to the election, whereas 76 (about 1 in 13) were valid voters.

² All randomized samples used by VIP / LAA's Research Group were generated within MS SQL Database using the NewID function.

³ Among those working on the research were professional private investigators who had access to a limited number of state driver's license databases.

Projecting this to the total EABCINV NCOA matches universe of 15,700, we can conclude that about 10,769 ballots were cast illegally, with the margin of error at (+/-) 5.8% when using a 95% confidence interval.⁴

All of the supplemental research on EABCINV NCOA matches we were able to reach a determination on are included in Appendix B. The entirety of the EABCINV NCOA matches can be found in Appendix C.

⁴ When using 0.678 for p, 0.031002 for sigma p, and a z score of 1.96.

Tranche 3: EABCINV Out of State Subsequent Registrations (OOSSR)

Initial OOSSR Analysis

The Voter Integrity Project assembled a national voter database and then matched it to the EABCIN database using full name and date of birth. Because many states, including Georgia, do not make date of birth public, we relied on four third-party data vendors to append full date of birth, and we did not attempt to match any records where we did not have a full date of birth. In cases where there was a match, we compared the voter registration date in Georgia to the registration date in the second state. If the second state registration date was subsequent to the Georgia registration date, that individual invalidated their ability to vote in Georgia per state statute.

We identified 4,926 of these EABCINV of voters with Out of State Subsequent Registrations (OOSSR) after excluding any EABCINV that had been matched by the NCOA process.

The Scientific Basis for the Validity of Full Name and Date of Birth Match

An article titled “ADGN: An Algorithm for Record Linkage Using Address, Date of Birth, Gender, and Name” in *Statistics and Public Policy*, also authored by Mr. Ansolabehere, states the following in his analysis of a database for the state of Texas:

Either Name and Date of Birth or Name and address identifies nearly all individuals in a database uniquely. 99.6% are unique with Date of birth and name.

While Ansolabehere and Eitan Hersh’s later 2017 study does not mention NCOA as a method to tentatively remove inactive voters or ascribe illegal voting, it states: “that exact matches using combinations A, D, G, and N produce a rate of matches comparable to 9-Digit Social Security Number.”⁵ That produces a good rate of matching. Additionally, if a voter is removed from a registration database, then the voter has recourse if this action was done incorrectly although it still means the voter is ineligible and any ballot cast by this voter (before remedy) is illegal.

When taken with the original Shaw, Ansolabehere, and Stewart (2015) study, this actually reinforces the methodology of using the NCOA and the ADGN methodology.

Supplemental Analysis of EABCINV OOSSR Matches

The LAA Research Group took a randomized sample of the OOSSR matches and attempted to validate or invalidate them using the same research tools utilized in the supplemental analysis of the EABCINV NCOA analysis.

⁵ Ansolabehere, Stephen and Eitan D Hersh. 2017. “ADGN: An Algorithm for Record Linkage Using Address, Date of Birth, Gender, and Name.” *Statistics and Public Policy* 4(1): Abstract.

As with the NCOA analysis, each case was reviewed and validated by an initial researcher, then a senior researcher, then by the Director of Research, and finally by Look Ahead America's Executive Director.

The objective of the supplemental research was to determine if there was any evidence the voter really moved or if they had left but then moved back. The Research Group identified many individuals who moved away from Georgia but then moved back. In other cases, false positives were identified where the individual had no apparent tie to the subsequent state and the match was likely inaccurate.

Several redacted examples of the thoroughness of the supplemental research done by the Research Group to determine a voter's status may be found in Appendix A.

The supplemental research concluded that, of the 170 EABCINV on we could reach a determination, only 29 ballots were illegitimate.

Of the 4,926 ballots in this tranche, we concluded that 17.4%, or 857, were cast illegally with a margin of error of (+/-) 5.56% with a 95% confidence interval.⁶

⁶ When using 0.171 for p, 0.0288493 for sigma p, and a z score of 1.96.

The Unexamined Tranches

Given our findings, there is beyond a reasonable doubt many more illegally cast ballots in the tranches were unable to examine due to limits of manpower, time, budget, and access. In nearly all cases, the state government, if it chose to, could research these tranches that we could not using tools the state has (full dates of birth, voter registration records, etc.) that we do not possess.

Tranche 4: EDBCINV Illegally Registered

Tranche 1 only evaluated ballots cast early or absentee ballots who had registered at illegal addresses, and a small number of election day ballots that matched exactly to those addresses, because the only the list voters who cast early and absentee ballots were available when the VIP was conducting this analysis. There are inevitably more such illegal ballots to be found by evaluating the registration addresses of those marked as casting ballots on Election Day.

Tranche 5: EDBCINV matched to NCOA and OOSSR

Our NCOA and OOSSR analysis was only conducted on early and absentee voters. Given the intensity of the election that would induce non-residents to travel to a battleground state as well as the proximity of voters who live just across Georgia's borders, this analysis is also likely to yield additional illegally cast ballots if conducted on the Election Day voter list.

Tranche 6: Unmatchable Invalid Residencies Among EABCINV and EDBCINV

Both the NCOA and OOSSR processes had suffered from built-in limitations to our ability to identify illegally cast ballots.

The NCOA database from the postal service only goes back four years, so any voter who filed a permanent move notice out of state before then would have been flagged.

OOSSR was dependent on an accurate date of birth match. Not only were we unable to get an accurate date of birth match on many records in Georgia's voter file, we were missing dates of birth on many in our national file where few states released a voter's full date of birth, and our process required a date of birth on both sides to generate a match.

Further, because of our insistence on an exact name matches in addition to the date of birth, we missed many who may have abbreviated their middle name in one state and not the other, or those who changed their surname between moves or registrations.

Finally, we would be unable to detect voters who did permanently move out of Georgia but did not file an NCOA at all or register to vote in their new state.

Summary and Conclusion

We established that the following numbers of illegal ballots were cast in each of the following tranches when using a 95% confidence interval:

	Initial Analysis	Percentage Invalid	Likely Projected	Margin of Error (+/-)
Tranche 1	1,401	100.0%	1,401	0%
Tranche 2	15,700	68.6%	10,769	5.80%
Tranche 3	4,926	17.1%	840	5.56%
Tranche 4	??	??	??	??
Tranche 5	??	??	??	??
Tranche 6	??	??	??	??

The total not accounting for any illegal ballots in Tranches 4, 5, and 6, is 13,010.

The margin of victory in the 2020 Presidential Election in Georgia was 11,769.

Having revisited this data, we still conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that the deserved winner of the state of Georgia in the 2020 Presidential Election is unknowable.

Appendix A

The following examples highlight the supplemental research performed by LAA's Research Group. All examples are redacted.

Example 1:

That Individual One works in both states we do not dispute, hence the NCOA flag and the connection to both states. We only are concerned here with the legality of the vote in Georgia based on state residency. We did not claim that Individual One even committed voter fraud, rather that the vote cast in Georgia was illegal. We also did not claim that a double voter or double registration occurred in Alabama (as that would place Individual One in the OOSSR group) in this example.

There is no doubt that this is the same person per our records, however, as we have the birthday, address and 2020 whereabouts confirmed.

As per the NCOA registration, however, Individual One did move to Alabama in March 2020. In fact, there is a notable shift on the social media accounts from being based in Georgia until late February 2020 to Alabama at the start of March. Individual One currently sells and operates from Alabama as of this writing.

If Individual One's business is indeed primarily based in Georgia, then why did Individual One file a national change of address filing to Alabama as well as change the mailing address on their Georgia voter roll to the state of Alabama? Individual One is clearly not in the military, nor a student, nor a federal employee, does not have debilitating medical conditions requiring travel, nor acts as a caretaker and so would not qualify under any absentee exemptions. We stand by our determination in this example.

Goes by name [Redacted] and has [Redacted] LLC;
[https://opencorporates.com/companies/us_ga/\[Redacted\]](https://opencorporates.com/companies/us_ga/[Redacted]);
[https://www.linkedin.com/in/\[Redacted\]/](https://www.linkedin.com/in/[Redacted]/) ;
[https://www.thmtk.com/al/\[Redacted\]](https://www.thmtk.com/al/[Redacted]) ;
[https://www.pinterest.com/pin/\[Redacted\]](https://www.pinterest.com/pin/[Redacted]) ;
[https://www.thumbtack.com/al/\[Redacted\]](https://www.thumbtack.com/al/[Redacted]);
[Redacted];
[https://www.imdb.com/name/\[Redacted\]](https://www.imdb.com/name/[Redacted]);
[https://www.federalpay.org/paycheckprotection-](https://www.federalpay.org/paycheckprotection-program/[Redacted])
[program/\[Redacted\]](https://www.facebook.com/[Redacted]/about/?ref=page_internal)
[https://www.facebook.com/\[Redacted\]/about/?ref=page_internal](https://www.facebook.com/[Redacted]/about/?ref=page_internal))

Example 2:

Individual Two graduated from a bachelor's program in May 2019, which was based in Florida. Individual Two therefore no longer qualified using a student status after that point, nor could legally claim absentee status as Individual Two was not a federal employee, nor in the military, nor had a debilitating condition requiring travel, nor acted as a caretaker.

We have photographic evidence of Individual Two holding up an acceptance letter to a graduate school in Virginia dated March 2020 with the Florida residential address clearly visible on the paper and the home itself in the background. If this were a redirected mailing address, then it would show the Georgia address listed in the Residential Address.

Normally we would agree that Individual Two could legally claim an absentee voter status as a student, except that Individual Two had been out of school for a full year and was living out of state while no longer enrolled in any university as a student nor working as a federal employee.

Additionally, Individual Two did not file a change of address until July 2020, meaning that Individual Two lived in Florida from May 2019 to July 2020 and not as a student. Individual Two did not begin school until Fall 2020 (late September) per the acceptance letter. Individual Two could not claim the parent's residence in Georgia (the Registration Address) because Individual Two did not reside there. As mentioned earlier, the address used on the acceptance letter was that of the Florida location.

While Individual Two does not appear to have registered to vote in Florida nor Virginia, the evidence is overwhelming that Individual Two resided in another state for over a year while claiming residence in Georgia for voting purposes. Given that Individual Two was a resident of Florida for over a year before filing the NCOA from Georgia to Virginia – and not Florida – and not a student, then this would make that vote in Georgia illegal as Individual Two should have been registered to vote in Florida prior to changing to Virginia per state law.

[https://twitter.com/\[Redacted\]](https://twitter.com/[Redacted])

[https://www.linkedin.com/\[Redacted\]](https://www.linkedin.com/[Redacted])

[https://www.facebook.com/\[Redacted\]](https://www.facebook.com/[Redacted])

No longer is in FL but is in VA out of state

Example 3

In our voter's case, the Georgia voter did not have a Florida mailing address on the voter rolls. Individual Three also has an NCOA record with a date of October 1, 2020. Individual Three did not appear to have a connection to another voter with the same name in Florida.

The voter that the Research Group reviewed does not own the Georgia address nor the Florida address. Individual Three's daughter and son-in-law do own the Florida address, however, and the daughter uses one of Individual Three's legal last names, a different name than that shown

on the voter record. This is because Individual registered to vote using a maiden name and has not updated the voter record since.

Additionally, Individual Three's daughter's Florida driver's license shows an October 2, 2020 date of registration – one day after the family filed the NCOA. Also, Individual Three's son-in-law has a US Air Force connection, and there is a military base next to the Georgia address. Furthermore, a prior address was at a Washington state joint base address, which also explains the Washington state area code in the phone numbers that both Individual Three and the daughter each have. It seems that Individual Three follows the young couple whenever they move. The vote would be illegal as Individual Three is not in the military nor the spouse of someone in the military.

[https://www.melissa.com/v2/lookups/personator/?fullName=\[Redacted\]](https://www.melissa.com/v2/lookups/personator/?fullName=[Redacted])

Former WA address: [Redacted]

Florida address owned by daughter and son-in-law:

[https://qpublic.schneidercorp.com/application.aspx?AppID=\[Redacted\]](https://qpublic.schneidercorp.com/application.aspx?AppID=[Redacted])

Connected to daughter, as she has same last name [Redacted].

Daughter [Redacted] FL dl issued 10/2/2020.

[Redacted] is Airforce/Military.