Subject: RE: Public Records Request (NC-AUD-25-0594)
Date: Monday, June 2, 2025 at 4:35:20 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Wesleigh Stout
To: AO Records
Attachments: FW_ NCSBE reveals add'l confidential information .pdf, Fwd_ nash speech_Redacted.pdf, Fwd_ Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections.pdf, Mtg with Board of Elections.pdf, Re_ 2024 Popular Vote Trivia.pdf, Re_ 2024 Popular Vote Trivia_2.pdf, RE_ Chief Operating Officer.pdf, Welcome Luke Landis!.pdf

EXTERNAL SENDER

Good afternoon,

Attached, please find the public records that are responsive to your request.

Thank you,

Wesleigh Stout
General Counsel
North Carolina Office of the State Auditor

WARNING: Email correspondence to and from The Office of the State Auditor will be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: AO Records <records@americanoversight.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 10:55 AM
To: Wesleigh Stout <wesleigh.stout@ncauditor.gov>
Subject: Public Records Request (NC-AUD-25-0594)

Dear Public Records Custodian:

Please find attached a request for records under North Carolina's Public Records Act.
Sincerely,

Marwah Adhoob | She/Her
Paralegal | American Oversight
records@americanoversight.org
www.americanoversight.org | @weareoversight

PRR: NC-AUD-25-0594

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From: David Boliek
To: Dave Boliek
Subject: Fwd: nash speech
Date: Thursday, March 20, 2025 5:12:58 PM

Sent from David Boliek's iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Boliek [redacted]
Date: March 19, 2025 at 10:28:47 PM EDT
To: David Boliek [redacted]
Subject: nash speech

Mention Legislators, Sheriff, etc….

You have fantastic representation in Raleigh. Senator Lisa Barnes has been a strong ally for the conservative approach to governing and is a consistent voice for a strong Agriculture community in North Carolina.

Allen Chesser is a rising star in the North Carolina House. I had the opportunity to meet with Representative Chesser a couple of weeks ago to discuss a North Carolina REINS ACT -- a bill that would keep agencies in our state working within the framework of the state constitution and keep state offices and agencies from duplicating services and would help to cut red tape by limiting regulation across state government.

Luke Farley

Brad Briner

Thank you, Thank you, Thank you

Wish we had Republican Governor, etc..
When I was a kid ….

Walked in on January 2nd

Started by cutting DEI out of the Auditor's office.

We've brought members of the State Auditor's back to work in the office.

Maintaining skepticism and a healthy independent mindset is important when taking on an audit project. It's a skill that I believe I've been able to develop after having spent many years as a prosecutor, a private practice attorney and a business person.

— Promises made, promises kept… DMV

— Helene Recovery … House Bill 47
Really… the time to audit a project is when there is a true opportunity to actually be impactful on the

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

project itself… auditing the end is like ….

— NCORR

— Auditing the Auditor

— Technology

— Investigations… Jail… Rapid Response

Best thing I can do for the Republican Party and for North Carolina is run office professional and get impactful results

Board of Elections … Status…

David Foxx Story

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From: Carol Snow
To: Four Eggers; Kevin Lewis
Cc: Dave Boliek
Subject: Fwd: Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections – The White House
Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 9:35:00 PM

RE: https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/03/preserving-and-protecting-the-integrity-of-american-elections/

Identity and US citizenship status of registered voters simply cannot be verified without unique personal identification information (PII) since NC BOEs
a) processed incomplete applications
b) have been removing and continue to remove PII from the registration records when the PII can't be validated.

Mismatch due to name?
Registrants and applicants can obtain the exact name the SSA has on file for them. If citizens can't set up a mySSA account for themselves, the BOE could provide assistance:

https://www.ssa.gov/myaccount/

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From:	cls28655@gmail.com
To:	"Hirsch, Alan"; "Carmon, Jeff"; "Eggers, Stacy"; "Lewis, Kevin"; "Millen, Siobhan"
Cc:	Dave Boliek; "Rep. Donnie Loftis"; "Rep. Dennis Riddell"; John.Torbett@ncleg.gov; "Rep. Erin Pare"; Kanika.Brown@ncleg.gov; Nasif.Majeed@ncleg.gov; Rodney.Pierce@ncleg.gov; Phillip.Rubin@ncleg.gov; bill.ward@ncleg.gov; Dave Boliek
Subject:	FW: NCSBE reveals add"l confidential information
Date:	Wednesday, March 5, 2025 3:05:33 PM

cc: Members of the General Government Appropriations Committee; State Auditor Dave Boliek

Good afternoon.

Please see NextRequest email below, particularly this section:

> "We realized after the fact that we accidentally included confidential voter information in the first file we provided. Federal law and North Carolina law do not allow the Board of Elections to disclose the public agency where a person registered to vote. 52 U.S.C. § 20507(i)(1); N.C.G.S. § 163-82.10(a1). The data file we provided for PRR 24-178 included confidential registration sources for some voters."

Excuse:

> "We regret the oversight as we work hard to fulfill nearly 150 public records requests that accumulated during the very busy 2024 election season. Thank you for your understanding and cooperation."

I'm surmising the NCSBE IT analyst was advised by his superiors to offer this excuse. (Too much work for too few staff members).

1. The State Board of Elections must comply with various laws, including the obligation to respond to Public Records Requests as outlined in NC's Chapter 132.

2. As they serve taxpayers, public agencies must act in a fiscally responsible manner, including by minimizing their costs, in order to perform **mission critical functions** in the most efficient, cost-effective way. (*I didn't make that up – this is from Section 1 of from EO 13589 signed by President Obama on 11/9/2011*).

3. In other words, increasing funding for a public agency may not be the most effective solution. At times, it's necessary to cut unnecessary costs.

4. One expense I raised concerns about regarding the NCSBE was the *travel costs for its executive staff*. Request #23-184, submitted on 12/3/2023, has still not been fulfilled. The request is copied below. If you know me at all, you'd understand that I would raise this same concern even if the Executive Director were hired by a State Board comprised of a majority of Republicans.

5. It seems the NCSBE should focus its public funding to provide enough staff to carry

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

out mission-critical functions, one of which is adhering to NC's Public Records Law. "*It is critical that public agencies understand and follow this law that gives you the right to know what state and local government officials are doing on your behalf. After all, it is your government*." ~NC Open Government Guide, AG Josh Stein

Sincerely,
Carol Snow
Morganton, NC
Burke Co

Request #23-184
12/3/2023

Hello,
I seem to regularly receive automatic messages from Karen Brinson Bell's email account such as the one below. So, if you please, provide the travel itinerary including method of travel for Karen Brinson Bell from 1/1/2021 - time of processing this request, and the meetings and conferences that were attended by Karen Brinson Bell from 1/1/2021 - time of process this request, and the agendas of said meetings and conferences.

"Thank you for your email. I will have limited access to my email the week of November 13-17, while I attend meetings out of town. If you need assistance during this time, please email elections.sboe@ncsbe.gov so NCSBE staff may assist. If this is a legal matter, please email legal.sboe@ncsbe.gov. Thank you and have a great day!"

From: North Carolina State Board of Elections <messages@nextrequest.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:50 AM
To: cls28655@gmail.com
Subject: [Document Released to Requester] North Carolina State Board of Elections public records request #24-178

-- Attach a non-image file and/or reply ABOVE THIS LINE with a message, and it will be sent to staff on this request. --

North Carolina State Board of Elections Public Records

A document has been released for record request #24-178 along with the following message:

Dear Ms. Snow,

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

I'm writing to let you know that we are providing you a new copy of the document in response to your PRR 24-178. We're also respectfully requesting that you permanently delete any copies of the document we previously provided.

We realized after the fact that we accidentally included confidential voter information in the first file we provided. Federal law and North Carolina law do not allow the Board of Elections to disclose the public agency where a person registered to vote. 52 U.S.C. § 20507(i)(1); N.C.G.S. § 163-82.10(a1). The data file we provided for PRR 24-178 included confidential registration sources for some voters.

We have loaded a nonconfidential document responsive to your PRR and are providing it to you. Once you delete the first file containing confidential voter information (and any copies you made), could you please let us know?

We regret the oversight as we work hard to fulfill nearly 150 public records requests that accumulated during the very busy 2024 election season. Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.

Thanks,

Colin Loftin

- UOCAVA_Registrations_and_20241105_Ballot_Requests - update.xlsx

View Request 24-178

https://ncsbe-nc.nextrequest.com/requests/24-178

Document links are valid for one month. After April 5, you will need to sign in to view the document(s).

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT



Questions about your request? Reply to this email or sign in to contact staff at North Carolina State Board of Elections.

Technical support: See our help page

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Subject:	Mtg with Board of Elections - Kim Strach and Brian Neesby
Location:	444
Start:	Thu 2/27/2025 3:30 PM
End:	Thu 2/27/2025 4:30 PM
Show Time As:	Tentative
Recurrence:	(none)
Meeting Status:	Not yet responded
Organizer:	Dave Boliek
Required Attendees:	Dave Boliek; Brent Woodcox; kwstrach@srsconsultingservices.com

Kim, please share with Brian Neesby.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From: Brent Woodcox
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2025 12:15 PM
To: Judy Jefferson
Subject: Accepted: Mtg with Board of Elections - Kim Strach and Brian Neesby

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT


From: Cleta Mitchell
To: Carol Snow
Cc: Jay Langley; William Parker; cc: John Droz; Dr. Stan Young; Rep. Donnie Loftis; Jim Womack; Jay Stobbs; Leon Wilson; Don Curtis; Rufus Edmisten; Sen. Jim Burgin; Karl Landgren; dpbankert; Beth Bottcher; lloydmoody@gmail.com; Rebecca Terrell; Paul Fitts; Gavin B. Rumble; Robert Birch; The Bootery; Chris Holloman; Kevin Evans; Grayson Hodge; crowsnest01@earthlink.net; Fred W. Gerdes; fred morrison; Lynn Hoosier; John Woodard; MajorDaveNC@gmail.com; Bill Piver; Jason Simmons; Research@glennbeck.com; Donnie Harrison; John Hood; Robert Castona; Charles Dingee; Simon Percival; Pamela Mullins; Scott Walter; Linda Harper; Marshall Conrad; AMX; steve sargeant; Hal Weatherman; Mark Siljander; outtafocus28@aol.com; Johnny Hughes; Frank Hurley; Jackson Lohrer; Derrick Nipper; Neal Hunt; Ken Jones; Mick Rankin; John B. Gaither; Christina Crosby; CAROLYNDJOHNSON40@gmail.com; carolyngarris88@gmail.com; Diane.Wheatley@ncleg.gov; Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov; Sen. Norman Sanderson; Howard.Penny@ncleg.gov; Bill.Ward@ncleg.gov; Joe.Pike@ncleg.gov; tim.moffitt@ncleg.gov; Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov; Ted.Alexander@ncleg.gov; Warren.daniel@ncleg.net; Bobby.Hanig@ncleg.gov; Rep. Mike Clampitt; Keith.Kidwell@ncleg.gov; Jay.Adams@ncleg.gov; Jimmy.Dixon@ncleg.gov; Carl.Ford@ncleg.gov; Josh Hurley; granvilleinsurance@yahoo.com; jimmy@silercityautomotive.com; Butch@butchhudsoninsurance.com; Tjovich@raleigh.twcbc.com; mfarless55@gmail.com; Paul Hunt; sammy tnboone.com; benosbun1978@gmail.com; Keith@hiesterautomotive.com; Rob Nissen; LarenL@eclsglobalinc.com; Mitchell Beckwith; mitchbeckwith@protonmail.com; Stephanie Smith; Stephanie Smith; Mattie Rose Crowder; Legalaffairs@abejoneslaw.com; Dave Boliek
Subject: Re: 2024 Popular Vote Trivia
Date: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 10:03:13 AM

There are some fixes needed for this bill but it is a big step.

Cleta Mitchell, Esq.
Senior Legal Fellow
Conservative Partnership Institute
202.431.1950 (cell)
cleta@cletamitchell.com
www.whoscounting.us

> On Mar 5, 2025, at 9:18 AM, Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Thank God for Congressman Pete Sessions. We learned over the last 4 years this legislation would have to come from Congress since the foxes in charge of the henhouse in Raleigh are opposed to this.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT



BREAKING: Congressman Pete Sessions is introducing a bill banning universal mail-in voting and electronic voting machines and shortening the early vote period from months to THREE DAYS. This is a GAME CHANGER! The legislation is called the Make Elections Secure Again Act (MESA)

George (@BehizyTweets)
x.com

BREAKING: Congressman Pete Sessions is introducing a bill banning universal mail-in voting and electronic voting machines and shortening the early vote period from months to THREE DAYS. This is a GAME CHANGER!

The legislation is called the Make Elections Secure Again Act (MESA)

"MESA mandates the exclusive use of hand-marked paper ballots for all federal elections and primaries receiving public funds. This eliminates reliance on vulnerable electronic systems, ensuring a tamper-

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

proof, human-verifiable process that reflects voters' true intent."

"The bill requires every voter to present a government-issued photo such as a driver's license, passport, or military and sign an affidavit in the paper poll book affirming U.S. citizenship and single-voting intent under penalty of felony charges."

"Early in-person voting is limited to three days prior to Election Day- the final Tuesday of voting - streamlining administration and concentrating resources for secure, manageable hand counts, while maintaining voter access."

"Mailed ballots are restricted to active-duty military personnel stationed away from their jurisdiction and voters with physician-certified medical conditions preventing in-person voting."

"MESA mandates paper poll books as the primary voter check-in method and caps precinct sizes at 1,500 registered voters, returning elections to community-based, transparent operations that facilitate efficient hand counting and local oversight." - @PeteSessions.

This will seriously go down as one of the greatest pieces of legislation in history. This is the only way to stop the election fraud industrial complex forever.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 4, 2025, at 11:36 AM, Jay Langley <Jay@hpmmail.com> wrote:
>
> AMEN Carol!!!
>
> Jay
>
> J. Jay Langley
> High Performance Marketing
> "For All Your Direct Mail and Printing Needs"
> 158 Windchime Court
> Raleigh, NC 27615
> (919) 870-9915
> E-Mail: Jay@HpmMail.com
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com>
> **Sent:** Tuesday, March 4, 2025 9:38 AM
> **To:** William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
> **Cc:** cc: John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org>; Dr. Stan Young <genetree@bellsouth.net>; Rep. Donnie Loftis <Donnie.Loftis@ncleg.gov>; Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>; Jay Stobbs <coljay69@gmail.com>; Leon Wilson <knong1955@gmail.com>; Don Curtis <dcurtis@curtismedia.com>; Rufus Edmisten <rufus@rufusedmisten.com>; Sen. Jim Burgin <jim.burgin@ncleg.gov>; Karl Landgren <klandgren3333@protonmail.com>; dpbankert <dpbankert@gmail.com>; Beth Bottcher <bbottcher@capitalresearch.org>; lloydmoody@gmail.com; Rebecca Terrell <rterrell@thenewamerican.com>; Jay Langley <Jay@hpmmail.com>; Paul Fitts <pfitts@advantagelending.com>; Gavin B. Rumble <Gavin.Rumble@solidpe.com>; Robert Birch <rmbirch2280@gmail.com>; The Bootery <bootery@esinc.net>; Chris Holloman <ewacounselor@yahoo.com>; Kevin Evans <Kaevans@gmail.com>; Grayson Hodge <graysonhodge@gmail.com>; crowsnest01@earthlink.net; Fred W. Gerdes <fwgerdes@gmail.com>; fred morrison <fredgmorrisonjr@gmail.com>; Lynn Hoosier <thepatriotwagon@gmail.com>; John Woodard

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

<thejohnwoodardshow@gmail.com>; MajorDaveNC@gmail.com; Bill Piver <bill_piver@yahoo.com>; Jason Simmons <jason.simmons@ncgop.org>; Research@glennbeck.com; Donnie Harrison <donnie@donnieharrison.org>; John Hood <john.hood@jwpf.org>; Robert Castona <rcas1542@gmail.com>; Charles Dingee <charles@charlesdingee.com>; Simon Percival <simon.percival@cosaction.com>; Pamela Mullins <pamelamullinsusa@gmail.com>; Scott Walter <SWalter@capitalresearch.org>; Linda Harper <lharp207@gmail.com>; Marshall Conrad <marshallforjcgop@gmail.com>; AMX <amx@reagan.com>; Cleta Mitchell esq <cleta@cletamitchell.com>; steve sargeant <steve.sargeant.ss@gmail.com>; Hal Weatherman <halcweatherman@gmail.com>; Mark Siljander <marksiljander@gmail.com>; outtafocus28@aol.com; Johnny Hughes <idesirepeaceofmind@gmail.com>; Frank Hurley <classa2000@aol.com>; jackson.lohrer@ncauditor.gov; Derrick Nipper <derrick.nipper@ncgop.org>; Neal Hunt <info@nealhunt.com>; Ken Jones <Kjones@deaconjonesautogroup.com>; Mick Rankin <mickr44@hotmail.com>; John B. Gaither <jbgator777@yahoo.com>; Christina Crosby <ccoopercrosby@aol.com>; CAROLYNDJOHNSON40@gmail.com; carolyngarris88@gmail.com; Diane.Wheatley@ncleg.gov; Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov; Sen. Norman Sanderson <Norman.Sanderson@ncleg.gov>; Howard.Penny@ncleg.gov; bill.ward@ncleg.gov; Joe.Pike@ncleg.gov; tim.moffitt@ncleg.gov; Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov; Ted.Alexander@ncleg.gov; Warren.daniel@ncleg.net; Bobby.Hanig@ncleg.gov; Rep. Mike Clampitt <Mike.Clampitt@ncleg.gov>; Keith.Kidwell@ncleg.gov; jay.adams@ncleg.gov; Jimmy.Dixon@ncleg.gov; Carl.Ford@ncleg.gov; Josh Hurley <jhurley@petwants.com>; granvilleinsurance@yahoo.com; jimmy@silercityautomotive.com; Butch@butchhudsoninsurance.com; Tjovich@raleigh.twcbc.com; mfarless55@gmail.com; Paul Hunt <huntgolfshop@yahoo.com>; sammy tnboone.com <Sammy@tnboone.com>; benosbun1978@gmail.com; Keith@hiesterautomotive.com; Rob Nissen <nissenauto@yahoo.com>; LarenL@eclsglobalinc.com; Mitchell Beckwith <mitchbeckwith@cwiretailsystems.com>; mitchbeckwith@protonmail.com; Stephanie Smith <juggernault8@yahoo.com>; Stephanie Smith <Stephanie.smith@leithcars.com>; Mattie Rose Crowder <mrc.isaiah53@gmail.com>; Legalaffairs@abejoneslaw.com; dave.boliek@ncauditor.gov; William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 2024 Popular Vote Trivia

The last person some legislators would want to be the chief elections official of this state is an individual who insists all state election laws and federal civil rights laws are followed… because they fear they can't win their primary or the general if the elections were legally conducted and properly audited.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 4, 2025, at 7:56 AM, William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Dear Carol Snow,
>
> Just for clarification, it was ME who suggested that you be made the next head of the NCSBE in Rep. Jeffrey McNeely's office. McNeely only made an expression on his face that what I said was an interesting and maybe even an amusing idea. I don't remember him saying anything agreeing or disagreeing about the idea.
>
> Here's another idea. One of the recipients of this email is Don Curtis, the owner of WPTF. I think it would be interesting for him to do an interview for his Sunday morning "Carolina Newsmaker" program with you, Jim Womack, and Major Dave regarding election integrity. Also, he should ask questions about the Riggs vs. Griffin hotly contested race. That should make for some good ratings for his 7:00 AM Sunday morning program.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Billy Parker

On Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 10:06 PM Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hey,
>
> Of course I don't know if Rep McNeely said that in all seriousness or if it was said tongue in cheek since he thinks I'm a know-it-all, but there's MUCH more I don't know about running that state agency than what I do know.
>
> If Brooke McGowen becomes the next NCGOP Chair, I'd love to be considered to be part of the state party's election integrity team. Every county GOP needs a vibrant and educated election integrity committee.
>
> Elections belong to the People, not to a bureaucracy. We've foolishly abdicated our responsibility to understand and oversee this process for far too long.
>
> cs
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> > On Mar 3, 2025, at 8:09 PM, William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:
> >
> > Carol,
> >
> > Thank-you for the comments. When I hear people like you and Major Dave speak about our election system, I often realize how little I actually know about the system, especially the internals and behind-the-scenes aspects of the NCSBE. I'm just a numbers guy trying to use the numbers provided by the government to see if anything unusual and possibly fraudulent is happening with our elections. I'm looking at things from a macro level, while many of you are looking at things from a micro level. To get a proper perspective, however, I believe you really have to consider both.
> >
> > You are certainly on top of things with what you do. I was in Representative Jeffrey McNeely's office a week ago sharing my updated statistical information with him. And by the way, he's a pretty sharp person who is also on top of things when it comes to our elections – he mentioned several things to me that I wasn't aware of. Well, I brought up your name and said that "they" ought to appoint you as the head of the NCSBE to replace Karen Brinson Bell. If you are willing to move to Raleigh and take the position, then that would really shake things up.
> >
> > We are all citizens trying to figure things out (and trying to figure out what really happened in 2020). The people who I addressed this email stream to are really a hodgepodge of people. Some are influential politicians and businessmen. Some are average people up and down Main Street who have a real interest in our elections. Some are even Democrats that I'm trying to get to open their eyes as to what is really happening with our elections.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Keep up the good work. And maybe we can get Dave Boliek to realize that already there has been a lot of work done by just average citizens of North Carolina to investigate the NCSBE as he turns his attention to audit that state department.

Billy

On Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 6:26 PM <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hey, Billy-
>
> I'll try to be brief. Just two points.
>
> First, regarding this:
>
> > **Well I have a solution for the mess. Contact each of the 60,000 people. If they can provide the needed missing information for their registration, then that vote gets counted. And if they cannot provide the needed information, then those votes do not get counted. Do a recount with the new numbers, declare a winner, and let's all move down the road.** ~Billy Parker, 3/3/2025
>
> We are in complete agreement. Actually, the NCSBE was implored to obtain the missing registration information with official HAVA Complaints on 10/6/2023, 2/20/2024, 6/3/2024, and 6/24/2024. Joanne Empie also requested this with her HAVA Complaint on 8/6/2024. The required registration information SHOULD HAVE BEEN obtained prior to the 2024 General Election but the State Board of Elections refused.
>
> Secondly, let me clarify my response to these statements because I didn't mean to imply you don't have the right to express your opinion.
>
> > RE: **We are actually looking stupid to many, especially when some still talk about voting machines changing votes – which didn't happen, I believe, in NC.** ~Billy Parker, 2/23/2025
>
> I'm not a scientist, either, but I know many people are *collecting and utilizing research and evidence to deepen and share understanding* of NC's election system. In a broad sense, that's what a scientist does. What I'm trying to say is that none of us should make broad claims about something being true without having the evidence to support it.
>
> I do not know, nor have I ever claimed, that NC's voting machines are flipping votes. There is no evidence to support that's happening. Similarly, there is no evidence to confirm that NC's voting machines are accurately tabulating the votes marked on our ballots. The post-election "audit" conducted in this state is an insulting charade. Therefore, I can't understand why anyone, such as yourself, would claim to believe that voting machines in NC aren't altering votes since no evidence exists to support that belief.
>
> > RE: **We on our side need to get off our soapbox**

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

> **preaching our elections are fraudulent.** ~Billy Parker, 2/23/2025

One definition of fraud, according to Black's Law Dictionary, is "*a knowing misrepresentation or knowing concealment of material fact made to induce another to act to his or her detriment*."

> NC's post-election "audit" is indeed a *misrepresentation* of a statistically significant and sound audit process which is intended to ensure the tabulators are accurately counting our votes. The performative "audits" conducted in NC in each county after Election Day *induce* the electorate to trust the reported results based on incomplete information. When the electorate blindly trusts reported election results that haven't been proven to be accurate, this *harms us*, as we remain unaware of the issues within the system that need to be addressed.
>
> One Co-Chair of the Senate Elections Committee at least partially agreed with the suggestions to correct this process. "*I have spent some time reviewing your 9-point suggestions for a better audit process and believe some of those would be an improvement over current law. I will be recommending that we incorporate some of them into S747. Thanks for your input*." See attached.
>
> However, these recommendations *were not incorporated into S747*. One would have to ask Senator Daniel why the legislation that was written and provided to him was left on the cutting room floor. NC's legislative body is apparently in favor of conducting deceptive post-election audits.

A related synonym for fraudulent is illegitimate, or illegal. I would contend that a registration list that is not legally maintained and administered leads to fraudulent elections.

> It would take me more time than I want to spend on this email to list every **state and federal law** the state and county elections officials **violate** during the registration process, so I'll just list a few off the top of my head. I have the evidence to support each of these claims:

- 52 USC 20701 – Retention and preservation of election records. The Brunswick Co BOE Director admitted in writing they have to **delete voter history records** when one voter's registration record was used to vote twice in an election.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(ii) and (v) – HAVA – NC's registration list **is not** a statewide system allowing local elections officials to obtain immediate electronic access to the information in the statewide list. NC has 100 county registration systems, not one statewide registration system.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(vi) – HAVA – registration

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

applications **are not** entered on an expedited basis, especially during early voting. In fact, the registration list was missing so many registrations for the 2020 General Elections the NCSBE create a new Voter Registration Snapshot in *May 2021*. The problem continued in the 2024 General Election. To attempt to conceal this, the elections officials backdate the registration dates to make it appear the applications were processed earlier than they actually were.

- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(vii) – HAVA – the chief State election official **does not** provide support to the counties so the registrations can be processed on an expedited basis. If she did, there wouldn't be so many registration applications that are sluggishly processed.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(vi) – HAVA – all registration information **is not** entered into the computerized voter registration list. The telephone numbers written on registration applications for the vast majority of the registrations in 13 counties is either missing or bogus. Cell phone numbers uniquely identify voters, making them critical information for locating doubly- and triply-registered voters. Even the NCSBE uses telephone numbers to locate doubly-registered voters. 86% - 100% of the registration records in these counties do not contain the voters' telephone numbers: Wake, Camden, Union, Iredell, Beaufort, Orange, Randolph, Davidson, Rowan, Davie, Mecklenburg, Avery and Stokes.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(ii) – HAVA – the computerized list **does not** contain the name and *registration information* of every legally registered voter in the state. The SEIMS system deletes the voters' personal identifying information when a voter's identity and birth date can't be verified with the data in the DMV or SSA's databases during the verification process.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(iii) and NCGS 163-82.10A – **not all** voters have permanent voter registration numbers (NCID) that remain unchanged. When a voter moves from one county to another, it's not uncommon for the voter to receive a new statewide registration number (NCID). We have a report from the NCSBE which shows a voter's "old NCID" and "new NCID". Remarkably, sometimes a voter's two NCIDs will even be merged together into a third NCID.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(2)(B)(ii) and (a)(4)(B) – there are **not always** a safeguard in place to ensure eligible voters are not removed from the registration list in error. This is due to incomplete registration information. Living voters are erroneously removed as being deceased.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(2)(B)(iii) – **not all** duplicate names are eliminated from the computerized list due to (a) incomplete registration information and (b) flawed and nonexistent methods of locating them. The NCSBE only searches for duplicate DL#s for

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

registrations in Active status (not Inactive or UOCAVA – both statuses make them eligible to vote). The NCSBE doesn't even use the SSN-4 + birth date criteria to locate duplicate registrations.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(5) – **incomplete applications were accepted and processed** for approximately 10 years when NC's voter registration application did not comply with state and federal law. This was the basis of HAVA Complaint #1.
- NCGS 163-82.10(a1) – **not all** voters' dates of birth and email addresses are held in confidence. Dates of birth can be found in the name or registration date fields in the publicly available data. Email addresses can be found in the mailing address fields in the publicly available data. This information could be used by a criminal to request a UOCAVA ballot using these registrations.

I could go on but hopefully you get the picture. My concern is that our families live in a country that functions as a Constitutional Republic, and I wish those serving in the NC's General Assembly agreed.

Sincerely,
Carol Snow
Morganton, NC
Burke Co
828-448-4680

From: William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 2:30 PM
To: Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com>;
Subject: Re: 2024 Popular Vote Trivia

CORRECTION: The email I sent out earlier today has one email address that is no longer good; and I gave an incorrect email address for Dave Boliek, the new state auditor. So anyone wanting to respond to the subject matter can use the addresses on this email instead.

In picking up on some of the comments made, Mrs. Carol Snow said, "Scientists don't make conjectures based on a belief (or hope) that isn't backed up with proof." First of all, I have never said that I'm a "scientist." But what I am is an analysis of numbers involving the subject matter of our elections, which contain many unknowns. I hope that I might have a right to express my opinions involving some of these unknowns; and even if I was a scientist, I would hope I still have this right as well.

In trying to figure out what is happening to our elections, I have taken a slightly different approach from most analysis, where I compare election results to the U.S. Census numbers. By taking this approach, I can say with certainty that something very unusual is happening to our elections. As to what is causing this "unusualness", however, is a different matter and is a subject of

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

debate. For nearly a 50 year period, our elections showed a fairly consistent voting pattern. And from 1952 to 2000, involving a 2-man race, our elections nationally were always within a 2 ½ percent range of the population voting – between 36.9% to 39.4%. Only in 1992 where there was a major third-party contender – Ross Perot did we ever go outside of this range; and only then, it only went up to 40.9%. Then after the 2000 election, we noticed the beginnings of a huge divergence from this past voting pattern, with much of the change taking place with one election cycle – that of 2020. In that very odd election year, 47.8% (way above the previous peak of 39.4%) of the total population voted in basically a two-man race for president; and for North Carolina, that number was way up to 52.9%. One has to scratch one's head and ask if this is the result of election fraud or possibly the result of some other factor(s). This is what I have set out to try to determine over the past 4 years. Then about 2 years ago, I teamed up with Dr. Stan Young – a professor of statistics at NCSU, who has done numerous studies on the 2020 election. My collaboration with Mr. Young involves a project where I had previously gathered election results and population data put into sequential order involving election cycles.

Election Charts:

Dr. Stan Young and I measure election results in terms of the Census data. What we do is to see what percentage of the population votes Republican and what percentage votes Democrat. It's a time analysis, going all the way back to 1948 and up to the present. And when you plot these data points out on a piece of paper and use a trend line (linear regression), it's very easy to see if an election cycle is "usual" or "unusual." Please click onto the 2-page document to see what I'm talking about, where we provide the charts for both North Carolina (page one) and the Nation (page two).

Starting with page one, you see two charts showing every general election cycle identified as shaded and white vertical bars from 1948 up to present, with the data for 2024 drawn in by hand. On the left side of the charts, you see a scale of what percentage of the population votes Republican for the first chart, and what percentage of the population votes Democrat for the second chart. All the dots and circles scattered about are the actual data points (election results divided by the population). The dot-dash line that you see in the middle is the long-term trend line for the respective parties. (With a divergence of the voting patterns noticed after the 2000 election, it needs to be noted that the linear regression you see is based upon only the data of 1948 to 2000. What you see after this period is simply an extension of that line.) Notice with the Democrats, they have been HUGE outliers to their trend line in the past few cycles. It could be that their trend line has changed after 2000; but if that is the case, then why don't we see a huge change for the Republicans as well? (This change in the trend line is a subject of debate.) At the bottom of the page, you can see all the actual numbers for the recent cycles, going back to 2012 (we didn't have room on the page to put all the years going back to 1948).

What the Charts Show and Don't Show:

These charts show the totality of what is happening to our elections – the total factors and variables affecting our elections. It is simply the total number of Republicans voting divided by the population for the Republican chart; and it is the total number of Democrats voting divided by the population for the Democrat chart. And as such, you can't extract out for just one variable like election fraud. But when one variable represents a major

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

event in an election cycle, then that will show up as a significant change in the data point for that cycle. Examples of this are the entry of a major third-party contender with George Wallace in 1968 and Ross Perot in 1992 – which affected, to some degree, both the Republican and Democrat charts for the respective years; and we even saw a major change in the Arizona charts for the 2000 cycle when much of that state population sat out that general election cycle because of what happened during the primary season involving Bush and McCain. It should also be noted that there is separation between the possible "unusualness" that you see with the charts and knowing the exact cause for any particular election cycle. We believe, however, this is a superior method of analyzing election results because you have a comparison to a trend line and past performance; but there are some limitations as noted to this approach of analysis as well.

Brief Analysis of the 2024 Results:

For North Carolina, Donald Trump got nearly the exact same percentage of the population voting for him in 2024 as he did in 2020. Now Trump's numbers did go up, but the population went up as well over the last 4 years. Both the cycles of 2020 and 2024 were significantly higher than 2016; but he seems to have plateaued at 26.43% and 26.65%. I think this is very interesting, because the pundits on television and even those with the GOP will tell you that Trump made major inroads into the Black and Hispanic populations. I don't deny this as being the case, but with the overall percentage being basically the same over the last two cycles, then that would mean that Trump must have lost support in other sectors of the population. And I would speculate that it probably was with White Professional Men and Women in your Metropolitan counties like Wake and Mecklenburg – that is just my guess. Kamala Harris came down ever so slightly from Joe Biden's level here in NC; but interestingly, she received around 31,000 more votes than Biden; but our population increased by nearly 400,000 over the last 4 years – so as a percentage, she came down a little bit.

For the Nation – the charts on page two, Donald Trump was a very strong candidate. He was above the Upper Tolerance Bound (for both 2020 and 2024). But again, he is topping out at 22.39% and 22.58%. I think the real story, however, of this past election is what you see with the Democrat chart. The Democrats went down, from the point you see for 2020 to the point you see for 2024. A total of 2.61% of the population did not vote for the Democrats this time around versus last time. And that is what put Trump over the top. It's not so much what the Republicans did – they just held steady; but rather, it's what the Democrats did NOT do that allow Trump to become President again.

This is an analysis that you won't get from any other place. The Numbers are what they are. If I'm wrong about any of this, then show me where I'm wrong. Numbers don't usually lie.

Using the Charts to detect Election Fraud:

Again, you can't use these charts to extract out for one thing like election fraud; but you can make numerous observations and even speculations about the matter.

We know for a fact here in North Carolina that there were major changes made involving our elections in between the two cycles of 2020 and 2024. The General Assembly made a number of changes to tighten up election law, and finally the courts allowed for photo ID to be used in elections. So if there had been cheating before, by one or both of the two parties, then we should

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

have seen possibly a decrease level in voting on the charts for 2024.

There are two ways of looking at this involving the Democrat chart for North Carolina: If there had been a lot of cheating by the Democrats before, then their level of voting should have come way down for 2024. But this is not what we see with the charts, with only a slight decrease; and that can easily be attributed to voter apathy by the Democrats much more than for any fraud. So from the chart, one might conclude that there must not have been that much cheating by the Democrats as had been alleged. But there's another way of looking at things as well. It is obvious that there are forces that are increasing the level of voting by the Democrats; and there's no reason to believe those forces suddenly stopped for 2024. And with the changes with election law and the implementation of Photo ID, then that is a force to possibly decrease the level of voting by the Democrats. So the 25.14% that you see drawn in for 2024 on the chart, that is a NET amount when you consider all the forces pushing the voting level up and pushing the voting level down. (The Democrat voting level for 2024 might have been much higher if the law hadn't changed.)

How my Thoughts are Changing about 2020:

I want to go back to the Democrat chart for North Carolina and use that to tell how some of my thoughts are changing about 2020 and possibly the level of election fraud and/or the malfeasance by public officials to change or alter election outcomes. With the data point you see for Joe Biden on the chart, that represented roughly 2.7 million votes; and for the data point along the trend line for 2020, that's 1.7 million votes. So there was a million vote difference between what the Democrats actually received and what the trend line indicated. Three years ago, I would have told you that I thought all of that difference was the result of election fraud; but I don't think that now. I think some of this difference represents fraud/malfeasance, but not ALL of it. I think the trend line has in fact changed for the Democrats starting with the 2004 election and accelerating thereafter. (I also believe this trend line is about to max out and start moving horizontal.) In analyzing what is happening to our elections, I have come to realize that there are at least eight (8) forces that are changing and manipulating our elections; and those are: the government, the political parties, Nonprofit NGOs, Public-Private Partnerships, Media and Big Tech, Changes in Population and Demographics, Immigration, and Advancement in Technology. All of these are changing the political landscape; and they probably have more of an effect on the Democrat vote than the Republican vote. Of the new voter increase since 2000 for here in North Carolina, the Democrats have increased their numbers at twice the rate as the Republicans! And since 2000, our population has increased by nearly 3 million, from 8 million to the current 10.8 million. A lot of this increase has been the result of people moving to the state. And I would contend that the majority of the people moving here are in fact Democrats, with most of them relocating and being concentrated in the metropolitan areas.

Of the one million votes that we see off the trend line for 2020 by the Democrats on the chart provided, I believe anywhere from 100,000 to 300,000 might be the result of some type of election fraud and/or malfeasance. But much of the "fraud" is below the radar screen, where even if you had poll watchers in every precinct and had a full forensic audit done, you wouldn't be able to discover it. There are illegal immigrants in this country who eventually get a driver's license; and once they do that, they often register as voters also – but how would you detect this as fraud

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

just by looking at the voter rolls and registrations? And we know this type of fraud is happening because when these people are called for jury duty, they get out of it by then disclosing that they aren't really citizens. Also, we are a very mobile society, with people often moving from state to state. I wonder how many people moved here to NC and registered to vote, and they also received a mail-in ballot from their previous state. How would you detect that type of fraud? And before Photo ID was implemented, I believe a fair number of people voted in other people's names. Major Dave and others who I know have also noted problems with Same-Day Registrants (SDR). So yes, I believe voter fraud and malfeasance is taking place. But out of 5.6 million votes cast, the total percentage representing this problem is probably quite low – but still possibly enough to change the outcome involving some races.

John Droz mentioned my "*reduced*" belief in the 2020 election malfeasance and that I evidently have not closely studied his list of forty (40) examples of evidence that indicate malfeasance. I don't doubt any of the examples he shows; in fact, I have cited several of the studies with some of the papers I have written over the past few years. I think the work that John Droz, Stan Young, Carol Snow, Major Dave and others have done is excellent in uncovering what has been taking place here in North Carolina and around the country. My issue is the level of the problem; and with me being a resident of NC, I have mostly concerned myself with this state. Again, several years ago, I would have told you that the problem here in NC represented close to a million votes cast, mostly on the Democrat side; now I believe it is a much lower number. In other parts of the country, I believe there are still major problems, especially those states that have ballot drop boxes. While I admit there are still problems with elections in the Ole North State, I do believe the elections here are for the most part up and up and that the current General Assembly has done a good job of making our elections free and fair. For those receiving this email and who are fairly educated about the subject, I just wonder if you believe our elections in North Carolina are mostly free and fair or are they mostly fraudulent? And if they are fraudulent, then just how many votes are being affected in your estimation? And how low would this number need to be before you would say we have free and fair elections?

The Riggs vs. Griffin race for State Supreme Court:

I applaud Carol Snow's efforts through her website/emails of We the People Events (WTP) to educate the people about this very close race and the issues involved. I find her emails to be very informative. It seems to me that the issue is how the voter registrations were filled out and/or the lacking information needed for over 60,000 registrants. And since we really don't have secret ballots for those who vote Early at One-Stop or by Absentee Mail-in, we can actually go in and pull those ballots to match up with the voter registration. Some on the Right would contend that since all the information needed was not filled out correctly, then the votes are invalid. Alternatively, some on the Left would contend that it is only bookkeeping error and that those votes are valid.

Well I have a solution for the mess. Contact each of the 60,000 people. If they can provide the needed missing information for their registration, then that vote gets counted. And if they cannot provide the needed information, then those votes do not get counted. Do a recount with the new numbers, declare a winner, and let's all move down the road.

Recap of Election Trivia involving "Landslides"

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

A number of people have been added to this "new" email, including Dave Boliek – the new state auditor, the state chairman of the GOP, and some members of the General Assembly. There has been a lot of talk by the Republicans about the 2024 election being a "Landslide." Since the newcomers to this conversation have not and do not likely see the original email I sent out involving election trivia, I thought to include it here again so they can see how this past election truly stacks up against other Landslide victories over the past 80 years.

Election Year Landslides	**States Won/Lost**	**Ratio of Margin to Total Vote**
1952: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	39 vs. 9 (48 States)	10.85% (6,700,439 ÷ 61,751,942)
1956: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	41 vs. 7 (48 States)	15.40% (9,551,142 ÷ 62,021,328)
1964: Johnson vs. Goldwater	44 vs. 6 (50 States)	22.58% (15,951,287 ÷ 70,639,284)
1972: Nixon vs. McGovern	49 vs. 1	23.15% (17,995,488 ÷ 77,744,027)
1984: Reagan vs. Mondale	49 vs. 1	18.22% (16,878,120 ÷ 92,653,233)
2004: Bush vs. Kerry*	31 vs. 19	2.46% (3,012,166 ÷ 122,294,846)
2008: Obama vs. McCain*	28 vs. 22	7.27% (9,550,193 ÷ 131,313,820)

* Election years 2004 and 2008 are questionable to even be considered as "Landslide" victories.

Election Years 2024 & 2020	**States Won/Lost**	**Ratio of Margin to Total Vote**
2024: Trump vs. Harris	31 vs. 19	1.47% (2,284,967 ÷ 155,238,302)
2020: Biden vs. Trump	25 vs. 25	4.45% (7,052,770 ÷ 158,383,403)

On Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 1:30 PM William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:

> In picking up on some of the comments made, Mrs. Carol Snow said, "Scientists don't make conjectures based on a belief (or hope) that isn't backed up with proof." First of all, I have never said that I'm a "scientist." But what I am is an analysis of numbers involving the subject matter of our elections, which contain many unknowns. I hope that I might have a right to express my opinions involving some of these unknowns; and even if I was a scientist, I would hope I still have this right as well.
>
> In trying to figure out what is happening to our elections, I have taken a slightly different approach from most analysis, where I compare election results to the U.S. Census numbers. By taking this approach, I can say with certainty that something very unusual is happening to our elections. As to what is causing this "unusualness", however, is a different matter and is a subject of debate. For nearly a 50 year period, our elections showed a fairly consistent voting pattern. And from 1952 to 2000, involving a 2-man race, our elections nationally were always within a 2 ½ percent range of the population voting – between 36.9% to 39.4%. Only in 1992 where there was a major third-party contender – Ross Perot did we ever go outside of this range; and only then, it only went up

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

to 40.9%. Then after the 2000 election, we noticed the beginnings of a huge divergence from this past voting pattern, with much of the change taking place with one election cycle – that of 2020. In that very odd election year, 47.8% (way above the previous peak of 39.4%) of the total population voted in basically a two-man race for president; and for North Carolina, that number was way up to 52.9%. One has to scratch one's head and ask if this is the result of election fraud or possibly the result of some other factor(s). This is what I have set out to try to determine over the past 4 years. Then about 2 years ago, I teamed up with Dr. Stan Young – a professor of statistics at NCSU, who has done numerous studies on the 2020 election. My collaboration with Mr. Young involves a project where I had previously gathered election results and population data put into sequential order involving election cycles.

Election Charts:

Dr. Stan Young and I measure election results in terms of the Census data. What we do is to see what percentage of the population votes Republican and what percentage votes Democrat. It's a time analysis, going all the way back to 1948 and up to the present. And when you plot these data points out on a piece of paper and use a trend line (linear regression), it's very easy to see if an election cycle is "usual" or "unusual." Please click onto the 2-page document to see what I'm talking about, where we provide the charts for both North Carolina (page one) and the Nation (page two).

Starting with page one, you see two charts showing every general election cycle identified as shaded and white vertical bars from 1948 up to present, with the data for 2024 drawn in by hand. On the left side of the charts, you see a scale of what percentage of the population votes Republican for the first chart, and what percentage of the population votes Democrat for the second chart. All the dots and circles scattered about are the actual data points (election results divided by the population). The dot-dash line that you see in the middle is the long-term trend line for the respective parties. (With a divergence of the voting patterns noticed after the 2000 election, it needs to be noted that the linear regression you see is based upon only the data of 1948 to 2000. What you see after this period is simply an extension of that line.) Notice with the Democrats, they have been HUGE outliers to their trend line in the past few cycles. It could be that their trend line has changed after 2000; but if that is the case, then why don't we see a huge change for the Republicans as well? (This change in the trend line is a subject of debate.) At the bottom of the page, you can see all the actual numbers for the recent cycles, going back to 2012 (we didn't have room on the page to put all the years going back to 1948).

What the Charts Show and Don't Show:

These charts show the totality of what is happening to our elections – the total factors and variables affecting our elections. It is simply the total number of Republicans voting divided by the population for the Republican chart; and it is the total number of Democrats voting divided by the population for the Democrat chart. And as such, you can't extract out for just one variable like election fraud. But when one variable represents a major event in an election cycle, then that will show up as a significant change in the data point for that cycle. Examples of this are the entry of a major third-party contender with George Wallace in 1968 and Ross Perot in 1992 – which affected, to some degree, both the Republican

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

and Democrat charts for the respective years; and we even saw a major change in the Arizona charts for the 2000 cycle when much of that state population sat out that general election cycle because of what happened during the primary season involving Bush and McCain. It should also be noted that there is separation between the possible "unusualness" that you see with the charts and knowing the exact cause for any particular election cycle. We believe, however, this is a superior method of analyzing election results because you have a comparison to a trend line and past performance; but there are some limitations as noted to this approach of analysis as well.

Brief Analysis of the 2024 Results:

For North Carolina, Donald Trump got nearly the exact same percentage of the population voting for him in 2024 as he did in 2020. Now Trump's numbers did go up, but the population went up as well over the last 4 years. Both the cycles of 2020 and 2024 were significantly higher than 2016; but he seems to have plateaued at 26.43% and 26.65%. I think this is very interesting, because the pundits on television and even those with the GOP will tell you that Trump made major inroads into the Black and Hispanic populations. I don't deny this as being the case, but with the overall percentage being basically the same over the last two cycles, then that would mean that Trump must have lost support in other sectors of the population. And I would speculate that it probably was with White Professional Men and Women in your Metropolitan counties like Wake and Mecklenburg – that is just my guess. Kamala Harris came down ever so slightly from Joe Biden's level here in NC; but interestingly, she received around 31,000 more votes than Biden; but our population increased by nearly 400,000 over the last 4 years – so as a percentage, she came down a little bit.

For the Nation – the charts on page two, Donald Trump was a very strong candidate. He was above the Upper Tolerance Bound (for both 2020 and 2024). But again, he is topping out at 22.39% and 22.58%. I think the real story, however, of this past election is what you see with the Democrat chart. The Democrats went down, from the point you see for 2020 to the point you see for 2024. A total of 2.61% of the population did not vote for the Democrats this time around versus last time. And that is what put Trump over the top. It's not so much what the Republicans did – they just held steady; but rather, it's what the Democrats did NOT do that allow Trump to become President again.

This is an analysis that you won't get from any other place. The Numbers are what they are. If I'm wrong about any of this, then show me where I'm wrong. Numbers don't usually lie.

Using the Charts to detect Election Fraud:

Again, you can't use these charts to extract out for one thing like election fraud; but you can make numerous observations and even speculations about the matter.

We know for a fact here in North Carolina that there were major changes made involving our elections in between the two cycles of 2020 and 2024. The General Assembly made a number of changes to tighten up election law, and finally the courts allowed for photo ID to be used in elections. So if there had been cheating before, by one or both of the two parties, then we should have seen possibly a decrease level in voting

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

on the charts for 2024.

There are two ways of looking at this involving the Democrat chart for North Carolina: If there had been a lot of cheating by the Democrats before, then their level of voting should have come way down for 2024. But this is not what we see with the charts, with only a slight decrease; and that can easily be attributed to voter apathy by the Democrats much more than for any fraud. So from the chart, one might conclude that there must not have been that much cheating by the Democrats as had been alleged. But there's another way of looking at things as well. It is obvious that there are forces that are increasing the level of voting by the Democrats; and there's no reason to believe those forces suddenly stopped for 2024. And with the changes with election law and the implementation of Photo ID, then that is a force to possibly decrease the level of voting by the Democrats. So the 25.14% that you see drawn in for 2024 on the chart, that is a NET amount when you consider all the forces pushing the voting level up and pushing the voting level down. (The Democrat voting level for 2024 might have been much higher if the law hadn't changed.)

How my Thoughts are Changing about 2020:

I want to go back to the Democrat chart for North Carolina and use that to tell how some of my thoughts are changing about 2020 and possibly the level of election fraud and/or the malfeasance by public officials to change or alter election outcomes. With the data point you see for Joe Biden on the chart, that represented roughly 2.7 million votes; and for the data point along the trend line for 2020, that's 1.7 million votes. So there was a million vote difference between what the Democrats actually received and what the trend line indicated. Three years ago, I would have told you that I thought all of that difference was the result of election fraud; but I don't think that now. I think some of this difference represents fraud/malfeasance, but not ALL of it. I think the trend line has in fact changed for the Democrats starting with the 2004 election and accelerating thereafter. (I also believe this trend line is about to max out and start moving horizontal.) In analyzing what is happening to our elections, I have come to realize that there are at least eight (8) forces that are changing and manipulating our elections; and those are: the government, the political parties, Nonprofit NGOs, Public-Private Partnerships, Media and Big Tech, Changes in Population and Demographics, Immigration, and Advancement in Technology. All of these are changing the political landscape; and they probably have more of an effect on the Democrat vote than the Republican vote. Of the new voter increase since 2000 for here in North Carolina, the Democrats have increased their numbers at twice the rate as the Republicans! And since 2000, our population has increased by nearly 3 million, from 8 million to the current 10.8 million. A lot of this increase has been the result of people moving to the state. And I would contend that the majority of the people moving here are in fact Democrats, with most of them relocating and being concentrated in the metropolitan areas.

Of the one million votes that we see off the trend line for 2020 by the Democrats on the chart provided, I believe anywhere from 100,000 to 300,000 might be the result of some type of election fraud and/or malfeasance. But much of the "fraud" is below the radar screen, where even if you had poll watchers in every precinct and had a full forensic audit done, you wouldn't be able to discover it. There are illegal immigrants in this country who eventually get a driver's license; and once they do

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

that, they often register as voters also – but how would you detect this as fraud just by looking at the voter rolls and registrations? And we know this type of fraud is happening because when these people are called for jury duty, they get out of it by then disclosing that they aren't really citizens. Also, we are a very mobile society, with people often moving from state to state. I wonder how many people moved here to NC and registered to vote, and they also received a mail-in ballot from their previous state. How would you detect that type of fraud? And before Photo ID was implemented, I believe a fair number of people voted in other people's names. Major Dave and others who I know have also noted problems with Same-Day Registrants (SDR). So yes, I believe voter fraud and malfeasance is taking place. But out of 5.6 million votes cast, the total percentage representing this problem is probably quite low – but still possibly enough to change the outcome involving some races.

John Droz mentioned my "*reduced*" belief in the 2020 election malfeasance and that I evidently have not closely studied his list of forty (40) examples of evidence that indicate malfeasance. I don't doubt any of the examples he shows; in fact, I have cited several of the studies with some of the papers I have written over the past few years. I think the work that John Droz, Stan Young, Carol Snow, Major Dave and others have done is excellent in uncovering what has been taking place here in North Carolina and around the country. My issue is the level of the problem; and with me being a resident of NC, I have mostly concerned myself with this state. Again, several years ago, I would have told you that the problem here in NC represented close to a million votes cast, mostly on the Democrat side; now I believe it is a much lower number. In other parts of the country, I believe there are still major problems, especially those states that have ballot drop boxes. While I admit there are still problems with elections in the Ole North State, I do believe the elections here are for the most part up and up and that the current General Assembly has done a good job of making our elections free and fair. For those receiving this email and who are fairly educated about the subject, I just wonder if you believe our elections in North Carolina are mostly free and fair or are they mostly fraudulent? And if they are fraudulent, then just how many votes are being affected in your estimation? And how low would this number need to be before you would say we have free and fair elections?

The Riggs vs. Griffin race for State Supreme Court:

I applaud Carol Snow's efforts through her website/emails of We the People Events (WTP) to educate the people about this very close race and the issues involved. I find her emails to be very informative. It seems to me that the issue is how the voter registrations were filled out and/or the lacking information needed for over 60,000 registrants. And since we really don't have secret ballots for those who vote Early at One-Stop or by Absentee Mail-in, we can actually go in and pull those ballots to match up with the voter registration. Some on the Right would contend that since all the information needed was not filled out correctly, then the votes are invalid. Alternatively, some on the Left would contend that it is only bookkeeping error and that those votes are valid.

Well I have a solution for the mess. Contact each of the 60,000 people. If they can provide the needed missing information for their registration, then that vote gets counted. And if they cannot provide the needed information, then those

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

votes do not get counted. Do a recount with the new numbers, declare a winner, and let's all move down the road.

Recap of Election Trivia involving "Landslides"

A number of people have been added to this "new" email, including Dave Bolick – the new state auditor, the state chairman of the GOP, and some members of the General Assembly. There has been a lot of talk by the Republicans about the 2024 election being a "Landslide." Since the newcomers to this conversation have not and do not likely see the original email I sent out involving election trivia, I thought to include it here again so they can see how this past election truly stacks up against other Landslide victories over the past 80 years.

Election Year Landslides	States Won/Lost	Ratio of Margin to Total Vote
1952: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	39 vs. 9 (48 States)	10.85% (6,700,439 ÷ 61,751,942)
1956: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	41 vs. 7 (48 States)	15.40% (9,551,142 ÷ 62,021,328)
1964: Johnson vs. Goldwater	44 vs. 6 (50 States)	22.58% (15,951,287 ÷ 70,639,284)
1972: Nixon vs. McGovern	49 vs. 1	23.15% (17,995,488 ÷ 77,744,027)
1984: Reagan vs. Mondale	49 vs. 1	18.22% (16,878,120 ÷ 92,653,233)
2004: Bush vs. Kerry*	31 vs. 19	2.46% (3,012,166 ÷ 122,294,846)
2008: Obama vs. McCain*	28 vs. 22	7.27% (9,550,193 ÷ 131,313,820)

* Election years 2004 and 2008 are questionable to even be considered as "Landslide" victories.

Election Years 2024 & 2020	States Won/Lost	Ratio of Margin to Total Vote
2024: Trump vs. Harris	31 vs. 19	1.47% (2,284,967 ÷ 155,238,302)
2020: Biden vs. Trump	25 vs. 25	4.45% (7,052,770 ÷ 158,383,403)

On Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 11:51 AM Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:

> Ty, John.
>
> The Ridicule page in their playbook doesn't work against citizens who have no aspiration to gain votes, anyone's approval, recognition or funding. Elon Musk summed it up crudely, but precisely: IDGAF.
>
> Guess they need to find a new play to run to stop or silence some of us.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> > On Feb 24, 2025, at 10:54 AM, John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org> wrote:

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Carol:

TY.

A primary strategy of the Left is to ridicule those who ask questions or find fault with the Left's tactics.

Since there were ZERO meaningful required post-election audits for ANY US precinct in 2020, what's stupid is to believe that there was no consequential fraud anywhere. Just adjusting the results from a few precincts in four states could completely change the results.

Oh, in 2020 there were three special post-election audits done — and ALL THREE catastrophically failed. For that and MUCH more see this.

regards,

john droz, jr.
Election-integrity.info

On Feb 24, 2025, at 10:23 AM, <cls28655@gmail.com> <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:

This paragraph jumped out at me:

> **We on our side need to get off our soapbox preaching our elections are fraudulent. We are actually looking stupid to many, especially when some still talk about voting machines changing votes – which didn't happen, I believe, in NC. Yes, there is some fraud taking place (which I don't have time or space to adequately talk about now), but we need to explore other explanations as to what is actually happening to our elections.**

1. I couldn't care less if I

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

look stupid to others. I will search for the truth regardless of what people think of me. I'm often reminded of the Chernobyl disaster – the scientists demanded to find and expose the truth regardless of the cost.

2. We have no earthly idea if votes were flipped by the computerized election systems in NC since the post-election audit selection process is (a) flawed, and (b) only the top race on the ballot is audited by the flawed selection process. The vast majority of races on the vast majority of ballots are NEVER hand counted to determine the accuracy of the magic tabulators' reported results. The recount selection process is equally flawed. Less than 400 absentee by mail ballots out of 1 million were hand counted for the Newby-Beasley recount - Graham Co was the only county selected to recount their ABM ballots by hand. "machines changing votes – which didn't happen, I believe," Scientists don't make conjectures based on a belief (or hope) that isn't backed up with proof. Berger/Moore REFUSED to allow a complete audit of even one county to prove the NCSBE's alleged results were accurate. A legislative committee could have subpoenaed the election records for one county. That suggestion was met with a firm NO.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From: classa2000@aol.com <classa2000@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2025 11:28 PM
To: John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org>; Dr. Stan Young <genetree@bellsouth.net>; Rep. Donnie Loftis <donnie.loftis@ncleg.gov>; Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>; Jay Stobbs <coljay69@gmail.com>; Leon Wilson <knong1955@gmail.com>; Don Curtis <dcurtis@curtismedia.com>; Rufus Edmisten <rufus@rufusedmisten.com>; Sen. Jim Burgin <jim.burgin@ncleg.gov>; Karl Landgren <klandgren3333@protonmail.com>; dpbankert <dpbankert@gmail.com>; Beth Bottcher <bbottcher@capitalresearch.org>; lloydmoody@gmail.com; Rebecca Terrell <rterrell@thenewamerican.com>; Jay Langley <jay@hpmmail.com>; Paul Fitts <pfitts@advantagelending.com>; Gavin B. Rumble <gavin.rumble@solidpe.com>; Robert Birch <rmbirch2280@gmail.com>; The Bootery <bootery@esinc.net>; Chris Holloman <ewacounselor@yahoo.com>; Kevin Evans <kaevans@gmail.com>; Grayson Hodge <graysonhodge@gmail.com>; crowsnest01@earthlink.net; Fred W. Gerdes <fwgerdes@gmail.com>; fred morrison <fredgmorrisonjr@gmail.com>; Lynn Hoosier <thepatriotwagon@gmail.com>; John Woodard <thejohnwoodardshow@gmail.com>; majordavenc@gmail.com; Bill Piver <bill_piver@yahoo.com>; Jason Simmons

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

<jason.simmons@ncgop.org>;
Carol Snow
<cls28655@gmail.com>; research@glennbeck.com;
Donnie Harrison
<donnie@donnieharrison.org>;
John Hood
<john.hood@jwpf.org>; Robert
Castona <rcas1542@gmail.com>;
Charles Dingee
<charles@charlesdingee.com>;
Simon Percival
<simon.percival@cosaction.com>;
Pamela Mullins
<pamelamullinsusa@gmail.com>; swalter@capitalresearch.org;
Linda Harper
<lharp207@gmail.com>; Marshall
Conrad
<marshallforjcgop@gmail.com>;
AMX <amx@reagan.com>; Cleta
Mitchell
<cleta@cletamitchell.com>; steve
sargeant
<steve.sargeant.ss@gmail.com>;
Halcweatherman
<halcweatherman@gmail.com>;
Mark Siljander
<marksiljander@gmail.com>; outtafocus28@aol.com;
Johnny Hughes
<idesirepeaceofmind@gmail.com>;
William Parker
<parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 2024 Popular Vote
Trivia

Hi folks,

in view of True The Vote's big-data analysis of cell phone traces, and in view of the videos of nighttime stuffing of ballot drop boxes, and in view of Heritage Foundation's (Hans von Spakovsky's) very large compendium of successfully prosecuted ballot fraud cases, and in view of all Democrat governors' and judges' resistance to voter ID, voter rolls cleanup, and absentee ballot deadlines plus signature verifications, I do believe we can be confident that the 2020 election was stolen.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Frank Hurley

On Sunday, February 23, 2025 at 09:05:20 PM EST, William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:

> John,
>
> My views about what happened in 2020 are changing from what I originally thought after the election. I still do believe election fraud played a part in the election, where fraud levels were elevated (in some states) to the point of even changing the outcome of elections, but I don't believe the fraud was as high as once believed. I witnessed some things with my own eyes at the Early voting sites during the 2022 Midterms that have changed some of my views about our elections – I witnessed a lot of Democrats voting. Also I have come to realize that there were (are) other factors and forces involved to change and manipulate our elections. On our website, I list those forces – eight (8) of them. But let me just cite 2 of them here: The government is changing our election with things like early and one-stop voting. Think about it. All these rural (many Liberal) churches, and they all have a church bus, now have three weeks to gather up their parishioners to take them to the polls. And they don't even have to take them to their individual precincts; the govt. has made it real easy to bus all these people to the one and two one-stop sites in the county. Even changes in technology are altering our elections. Again, think about it. The woman sitting at home on welfare with several children would have never thought about going to the polls to stand in line for two hours to vote 20 years ago; but now, she can dial a few numbers on her smartphone and have an absentee ballot delivered where she votes from the comfort of her living

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

room. All these things are changing the election landscape – and they don't necessarily involve fraud.

Now, I don't believe all 81 million votes that Biden received were totally and all legitimate; but let me play devil's advocate and explain how it is possible for someone to have received 81 million votes (which many Republicans don't think was possible). It's actually easy to understand how it's possible. When we have elections, on average only about 60% of the registered voters actually show up to vote; and this number can easily and often does go up or down by 5+% per election cycle. Well if you run that number up to 75% of registered voters actually voting, then there are enough numbers for one side to get 81 million votes. With Covid and people sitting around the house doing nothing, and getting the government to send out a bunch of mail-in ballots, then it's possible to run that number up to 75% (which it was in NC for 2020 – a historical high). By the way, we need to get rid of the mail-in absentee ballot as a convenient method of voting!

Some of the biggest changes with elections involve demographic changes of sorts – the difference between the small cities and towns in the mostly rural areas of NC (about 85% of NC) versus the large metropolitan cities like Raleigh and Charlotte. The metropolitan cities are becoming super magnets for Democrat voters. And I think it is because of two basic reasons. One is the expansion of the welfare state; and with the large cities, you have a wider availability of government services. Also it has to do with how new housing is being built. When you go to Raleigh and the Triangle, there are multi-story apartment buildings being built everywhere. Well, I will contend that the average

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Republican prefers single-family homeownership (which there is a shortage of this type of affordable housing in the larger cities), and many Democrats prefer apartment living in the big cities (which now there is an ample supply of). Thus with these changes, more Democrats are moving in the state than Republicans.

We on our side need to get off our soapbox preaching our elections are fraudulent. We are actually looking stupid to many, especially when some still talk about voting machines changing votes – which didn't happen, I believe, in NC. Yes, there is some fraud taking place (which I don't have time or space to adequately talk about now), but we need to explore other explanations as to what is actually happening to our elections.

Billy

On Sun, Feb 23, 2025 at 7:47 PM John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org> wrote:

> Stan:
>
> The mantra from the Left is that the deviant quantity of Dem votes in 2020 is attributable to:
>
> 1 - Biden doing a better job of messaging, *and*
> 2 - the Dems doing a better job of getting out the vote.
>
> However, your detailed Report "*Presidential Election Contrast Analysis*" completely disproves those claims.
>
> The primary explanation left after those are dismissed is **malfeasance**.
>
> regards,
>
> john
>
> <image001.jpg>
>
> On Feb 23,

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

2025, at 7:39 PM, Stan Young <genetree@bellsouth.net> wrote:

Billy, John et al.:
A good statistical case can be made that 2020 D is sufficiently aberrant to warrant explanation.
Stan

Stan and Pat Young
919 782 2759

On Sunday, February 23, 2025 at 07:27:49 PM EST, John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org> wrote:

Billy:

My apologies for not double-checking the graph I was sent.

Below the 2024 amounts are corrected.

I'll repeat what I said earlier, as it is still valid, based on the updated graph:

> The big picture is that the

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

number of Dem votes in 2020 was HIGHLY suspect.

Here I listed forty (40) examples of evidence that their numbers were inaccurate.

Significant time and effort was invested by thousands of good people to plug many of these — and it appears that they were successful.

regards,

john

<Screenshot 2025-02-15 at 7.09.40 PM.jpeg>

On Feb 23, 2025, at 7:15 PM, William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:

John,

As I stated in the

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

PS section, your graph is incorrect as for the blue and red bars representing 2024 - with the Dems at 66 million and the Reps at 71 million. The correct levels are 75 million for the Dems. and 77 million for the Reps. If you don't believe me, then look up the 2024 results online.

Anyway, graphs such as you presented are misleading because they don't take into

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

account the changing population numbers. For instance, you can't compare the 2000 election totals to the 2024 election totals, because the population is completely different. This is why the time analysis study that Stan and I are doing in order to compare one cycle to another is first done by dividing the election results by the population in order to measure the level of voting in the population. (The population

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

can double over time, but the percentages that the Reps. and Dems. vote, adjusted for increase/decrease in population, should be similar over time.)

Billy

On Sun, Feb 23, 2025 at 6:22 PM John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org> wrote:

> Billy:
>
> You are throwing out more stats. How about the significance of the one I showed you?
>
> john
>
> <Screenshot 2025-02-15 at 7.09.40 PM.jpeg>
>
> On Feb 23,

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

2025, at 4:20 PM, William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Stan Young, John Droz, and others:

In addition to the margin being only 2,284,967 votes, here are a few other stats regarding the 2024 General Elections that you might want to consider:

States Won by both Candidates:

Donald Trump won a total of 31 states, and they are as following: AL, AK, AZ, AR, FL,

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

GA,
ID,
IN,
IA,
KS,
KY,
LA,
MI,
MS,
MO,
MT,
NE,
NV,
NC,
ND,
OH,
OK,
PA,
SC,
SD,
TN,TX,
UT,
WV,
WI,
and
WY.

Kamala Harris won a total of 19 states plus the District of Columbia; and they are as following:
CA,
CO,
CT,
DE,
DC,
HI,
IL,
ME,
MD,
MA,
MN,
NH,
NJ,
NM,
NY,
OR,
RI,VT,
VA,
and
WA.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Republican/Democrat Vote Gains or Losses:

Donald Trump generally saw across the board gains in Republican vote totals over the 2020 numbers; but there were 10 states where the vote totals decreased slightly for the Republicans. Eight (8) of these were states that Trump actually won overall; those having waning numbers but still in Trump's win column are AK, AR, KS, LA, MS, WV, WI, and

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

WY. (It should be noted that both MS and WV had decreasing population numbers.) The two (2) where Trump lost the state and there was a decrease in Republican vote totals are OR and WA.

Kamala Harris generally saw across the board losses in Democrat vote totals over the 2020 numbers; but again, there were exceptions to the rule with actual pick up numbers, ever so slightly,

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

for the Democrats in 6 states. Only one was a state where she actually won, and that was ME (Maine). The other 5 where there was an increase in Democrat votes, but where Trump won overall, are the states of GA, NV, NC, UT, and WI.

There was only a 2,284,967 marginal vote difference nationally between the two candidates, with generally slight gains/losses for

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

the two parties in moststates. And the states where we saw huge losses for the Democrats were actually traditional Blue Democrat states, such as California and New York. As pointed out previously, California saw a whopping 1,834,071 decrease in the Democrat vote, and New York saw a rather huge decrease of 611,790 votes for the Democrats this time around.

Landslide Victory???

Pundits in

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

the media and even with the GOP have branded the 2024 election as a "Landslide Victory." I would agree that it was "impressive" and that Trump even has a "mandate" from the people, but it is pushing the envelope, I believe, to classify the election as a "landslide." If it was a landslide victory, then it was one of the weakest over the past 80

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

years – during a period known as the Modern American Political Era. As you can see with the chart(s) below, the total number of states won in 2024 is at the bottom of the list; and the Margins, in terms of the total vote, was the smallest compared with other landslide victories in history.

Billy Parker

My only agenda is the TRUTH.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Election Year Landslides	States Won/Lost	Ratio of Margin to Total Vote
1952: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	39 vs. 9 (48 States)	10.85% (6,700,439 ÷ 61,751,942)
1956: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	41 vs. 7 (48 States)	15.40% (9,551,142 ÷ 62,021,328)
1964: Johnson vs. Goldwater	44 vs. 6 (50 States)	22.58% (15,951,287 ÷ 70,639,284)
1972: Nixon vs. McGovern	49 vs. 1	23.15% (17,995,488 ÷ 77,744,027)
1984: Reagan vs. Mondale	49 vs. 1	18.22% (16,878,120 ÷ 92,653,233)
2004: Bush vs. Kerry*	31 vs. 19	2.46% (3,012,166 ÷ 122,294,846)
2008: Obama vs. McCain*	28 vs. 22	7.27% (9,550,193 ÷ 131,313,820)

* Election years 2004 and 2008 are questionable to even be considered as “Landslide” victories.

Election Years 2024 & 2020	States Won/Lost	Ratio of Margin to Total Vote
2024: Trump vs. Harris	31 vs. 19	1.47% (2,284,967 ÷ 155,238,302)
2020: Biden vs. Trump	25 vs. 25	4.45% (7,052,770 ÷ 158,383,403)

PS: The

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Blue and Red bars for 2024 presented in the previous email sent to me seem to be in error! I believe the Dems (blue bar) should be at 75 million and the Reps (red bar) should be at 77 million on that chart for 2024.

On Fri, Feb 21, 2025 at 4:44 PM John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org> wrote:

> Billy:
>
> The big picture is that the number of

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Dem votes in 2020 was HIGHLY suspect.

Here I listed forty (40) examples of evidence that their numbers were inaccurate.

Significant time and effort was invested by thousands of good people to plug many of these — and it appears that they were successful.

regards,

john

<Screenshot 2025-02-15 at 7.09.40 PM.jpeg>

On Feb 21, 2025, at 4:14 PM, William Parker

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

<parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
wrote:

Stan
Young,
(copy
to
others)

Trump
won
the
popular
vote
by
just
2,284,967
votes.

An
argument
could
be
made
that
both
California
and
New
York
allowed
Trump
to
win
the
popular
vote.
Unlike
most
states,
those
two
states
had huge decreases
in
Democrat
votes:

California
-
1,834,071
less
Democrat
Votes
from
2020
levels
New
York
- 611,790 less
Democrat
Votes
from
2020
levels

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

| | | |

From:	Carol Snow
To:	Chairman@durhamgop.com
Cc:	Christina Crosby; Jay Langley; William Parker; cc: John Droz; Dr. Stan Young; Rep. Donnie Loftis; Jim Womack; Jay Stobbs; Leon Wilson; Don Curtis; Rufus Edmisten; Sen. Jim Burgin; Karl Landgren; dpbankert; Beth Bottcher; lloydmoody@gmail.com; Rebecca Terrell; Paul Fitts; Gavin B. Rumble; Robert Birch; The Bootery; Chris Holloman; Kevin Evans; Grayson Hodge; crowsnest01@earthlink.net; Fred W. Gerdes; fred morrison; Lynn Hoosier; John Woodard; MajorDaveNC@gmail.com; Bill Piver; Jason Simmons; Research@glennbeck.com; Donnie Harrison; John Hood; Robert Castona; Charles Dingee; Simon Percival; Pamela Mullins; Scott Walter; Linda Harper; AMX; Cleta Mitchell esq; steve sargeant; Hal Weatherman; Mark Siljander; outtafocus28@aol.com; Johnny Hughes; Frank Hurley; Jackson Lohrer; Derrick Nipper; Neal Hunt; Ken Jones; Mick Rankin; John B. Gaither; CAROLYNDJOHNSON40@gmail.com; carolyngarris88@gmail.com; Diane.Wheatley@ncleg.gov; Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov; Sen. Norman Sanderson; Howard.Penny@ncleg.gov; bill.ward@ncleg.gov; Joe.Pike@ncleg.gov; tim.moffitt@ncleg.gov; Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov; Ted.Alexander@ncleg.gov; Warren.daniel@ncleg.net; Bobby.Hanig@ncleg.gov; Rep. Mike Clampitt; Keith.Kidwell@ncleg.gov; jay.adams@ncleg.gov; Jimmy.Dixon@ncleg.gov; Carl.Ford@ncleg.gov; Josh Hurley; granvilleinsurance@yahoo.com; jimmy@silercityautomotive.com; Butch@butchhudsoninsurance.com; Tjovich@raleigh.twcbc.com; mfarless55@gmail.com; Paul Hunt; sammy tnboone.com; benosbun1978@gmail.com; Keith@hiesterautomotive.com; Rob Nissen; LarenL@eclsglobalinc.com; Mitchell Beckwith; mitchbeckwith@protonmail.com; Stephanie Smith; Stephanie Smith; Mattie Rose Crowder; Legalaffairs@abejoneslaw.com; Dave Boliek
Subject:	Re: 2024 Popular Vote Trivia
Date:	Saturday, March 8, 2025 7:32:50 PM
Attachments:	favicon.ico.xhtml

Christina,

I'm pretty sure federal and state law dictates what should happen with voters whose registrations were processed even though their applications were incomplete. This is the procedure that should been followed all along as far as I can tell. See below.

I'd guess it's pretty embarrassing to elections officials and state legislators that elections have not been legally conducted in this state for at least 10 years. Hopefully the DOJ will take notice.

First, we need to know what reg info is required to be provided by the applicant on the registration application.

Answer: All reg info is required except race, ethnicity, gender, phone number and party preference. Unfortunately, one must do back flips to determine the answer to a simple question, but this is not unusual for Chapter 163 (imo).

163-82.4(a)

"The county board shall make a
diligent effort to complete for the registration records any information requested on the form that the applicant does not complete, but no application shall be denied because an applicant does not state race, ethnicity, gender, or telephone number."

163-82.4(d)

"If the applicant fails to declare a preference for a party or for unaffiliated status, that person shall be listed as "unaffiliated", except that if the

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

person is already registered to vote in the county and that person's registration already
contains a party affiliation, the county board shall not change the registrant's status to "unaffiliated" unless the registrant clearly indicates a desire in accordance with G.S. 163-82.17
for such a change."

What should happen if the applicant didn't provide all required info?

Sec 303(a)(5)(A) of HAVA (52 USC 21083) states the application should not even be processed unless
- the applicant provided their DL#, if a DL had been issued to the applicant, or
- they provided their SSN4, if a DL had not been issued, or
- the applicant indicates they have neither number (which applies only to those who live completely off the grid, such as those in the Amish community).

Individuals who left the identification section completely blank on NC's registration application were illegally registered, according to HAVA.

However, state law doesn't appear to be consistent with HAVA. One would think this is a problem since federal civil rights law likely trumps state election law.

163-82.4(f)
INCOMPLETE REG INFO on Election Day?
They should vote a provisional ballot. Reject the provisional ballot if the voter still doesn't provide the required info by the day before canvass day.

This official list of registered voters list isn't merely a list of neighborhood book club members. Instead, the list determines who's verifiably eligible to vote in federal and state elections. It's a pretty danged important list.

If you can't tell, I'm pretty frustrated with the members of our General Assembly, especially since it has been led for years by members of the same political party in which I'm registered. I expected more from Republicans.

cs

G.S. 163-82.4
ncleg.gov

52 USC 21083: Computerized statewide voter registration list requirements and requirements for voters who register by mail
uscode.house.gov

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 8, 2025, at 6:07 PM, Christina Crosby <chairman@durhamgop.com> wrote:
>
> Good afternoon,
>
> I don't know if you ever found anything in 2024, then maybe this is still the suggested methodology, but I would think that, no matter what, every county should be prepared for the action needed to correct Voter rolls as quickly as possible. It doesn't seem productive to make a big to-do at each individual county board directly when we know what needs to be done. A coordinated effort to find and take action on all registrations that don't meet the criteria in place today as soon as the boards change 3-2 in our favor. In Durham County we have municipal elections coming up in September. We are hoping to prepare notifications to voters who do not have the proper identification and give them time to correct their registration before we make them in active. Each county chair should be ready to swap out their representatives if they are not on board. We all have to be prepared to add a third member to each of our boards and name a chair person. That may not come until July 1, but we should be ready to give people 30 to 45 days notice to present their proper proof for their registration to remain active. We also need to be prepared to convert anyone to inactive who may not come in by the set deadline.
>
> Christina Crosby
> Durham Co Republican Party Chair
>
> On Wed, Mar 5, 2025 at 4:44 PM Christina Crosby <ccoopercrosby@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Removing Mr. Conrad, per his request.
>>
>> Each county is responsible for its own data and should already be cleaning up their databases, and not wait for the direction from the state board because this is already law.
>>
>> If your county data is correct, the state data is correct.
>>
>> One of our Durham county BOE board members is looking into getting the Durham data corrected well in advance of our next election (Sept 2025).
>>
>> We never needed the state board's permission to bring county rolls in compliance with the laws. The law changed in 2004 and still applies to active voters who registered prior to then. Anyone registered since then and still missing the 2 data points can be attributed to the application failing to require

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

it. The SBE has updated the registration form since. You should not be met with resistance, since you are following the law.

There should be no waiting on this action. If you want your county data right you have to start now. Once it is correct we are all set at the state.

Thanks,
Christina Crosby, Chair
Durham County Republican Party

> On Mar 5, 2025, at 10:00 AM, Marshall Conrad <marshallforjcgop@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> How did I get on this thread? UNSUBSCRIBE!
>
> On Wed, Mar 5, 2025 at 9:18 AM Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:
>> Thank God for Congressman Pete Sessions. We learned over the last 4 years this legislation would have to come from Congress since the foxes in charge of the henhouse in Raleigh are opposed to this.
>>
>> <GlPOqsRacAAxbFN.jpg>
>>
>> BREAKING: Congressman Pete Sessions is introducing a bill banning universal mail-in voting and electronic voting machines and shortening the early vote period from months to THREE DAYS. This is a GAME CHANGER! The legislation is called the Make Elections Secure Again Act (MESA)
>>
>> George (@BehizyTweets)
>> x.com
>>
>> BREAKING: Congressman Pete Sessions is introducing a bill banning universal mail-in voting and electronic voting machines and shortening the early vote period from months to THREE DAYS. This is a GAME CHANGER!
>>
>> The legislation is called the Make Elections Secure Again Act (MESA)

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

"MESA mandates the exclusive use of hand-marked paper ballots for all federal elections and primaries receiving public funds. This eliminates reliance on vulnerable electronic systems, ensuring a tamper-proof, human-verifiable process that reflects voters' true intent."

"The bill requires every voter to present a government-issued photo such as a driver's license, passport, or military and sign an affidavit in the paper poll book affirming U.S. citizenship and single-voting intent under penalty of felony charges."

"Early in-person voting is limited to three days prior to Election Day- the final Tuesday of voting -streamlining administration and concentrating resources for secure, manageable hand counts, while maintaining voter access."

"Mailed ballots are restricted to active-duty military personnel stationed away from their jurisdiction and voters with physician-certified medical conditions preventing in-person voting."

"MESA mandates paper poll books as the primary voter check-in method and caps precinct sizes at 1,500 registered voters, returning elections to community-based, transparent operations that facilitate efficient hand counting and local oversight." - @PeteSessions.

This will seriously go down as one of the greatest pieces of legislation in history. This is the only way to stop the election fraud industrial complex forever.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 4, 2025, at 11:36 AM, Jay Langley <Jay@hpmmail.com> wrote:
>
> AMEN Carol!!!
>
> Jay
>
> J. Jay Langley
> High Performance Marketing

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

"For All Your Direct Mail and Printing Needs"
158 Windchime Court

Raleigh, NC 27615
(919) 870-9915
E-Mail: Jay@HpmMail.com

From: Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 9:38 AM
To: William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
Cc: cc: John Droz <aaprjohn@northnet.org>; Dr. Stan Young <genetree@bellsouth.net>; Rep. Donnie Loftis <Donnie.Loftis@ncleg.gov>; Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>; Jay Stobbs <coljay69@gmail.com>; Leon Wilson <knong1955@gmail.com>; Don Curtis <dcurtis@curtismedia.com>; Rufus Edmisten <rufus@rufusedmisten.com>; Sen. Jim Burgin <jim.burgin@ncleg.gov>; Karl Landgren <klandgren3333@protonmail.com>; dpbankert <dpbankert@gmail.com>; Beth Bottcher <bbottcher@capitalresearch.org>; lloydmoody@gmail.com; Rebecca Terrell <rterrell@thenewamerican.com>; Jay Langley <Jay@hpmmail.com>; Paul Fitts <pfitts@advantagelending.com>; Gavin B. Rumble <Gavin.Rumble@solidpe.com>; Robert Birch <rmbirch2280@gmail.com>; The Bootery <bootery@esinc.net>; Chris Holloman <ewacounselor@yahoo.com>; Kevin Evans <Kaevans@gmail.com>; Grayson Hodge <graysonhodge@gmail.com>; crowsnest01@earthlink.net; Fred W. Gerdes <fwgerdes@gmail.com>; fred morrison <fredgmorrisonjr@gmail.com>; Lynn Hoosier <thepatriotwagon@gmail.com>; John Woodard <thejohnwoodardshow@gmail.com>; MajorDaveNC@gmail.com; Bill Piver <bill_piver@yahoo.com>; Jason Simmons <jason.simmons@ncgop.org>; Research@glennbeck.com; Donnie Harrison

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

<donnie@donnieharrison.org>; John Hood <john.hood@jwpf.org>; Robert Castona <rcas1542@gmail.com>; Charles Dingee <charles@charlesdingee.com>; Simon Percival <simon.percival@cosaction.com>; Pamela Mullins <pamelamullinsusa@gmail.com>; Scott Walter <SWalter@capitalresearch.org>; Linda Harper <lharp207@gmail.com>; Marshall Conrad <marshallforjcgop@gmail.com>; AMX <amx@reagan.com>; Cleta Mitchell esq <cleta@cletamitchell.com>; steve sargeant <steve.sargeant.ss@gmail.com>; Hal Weatherman <halcweatherman@gmail.com>; Mark Siljander <marksiljander@gmail.com>; outtafocus28@aol.com; Johnny Hughes <idesirepeaceofmind@gmail.com>; Frank Hurley <classa2000@aol.com>; jackson.lohrer@ncauditor.gov; Derrick Nipper <derrick.nipper@ncgop.org>; Neal Hunt <info@nealhunt.com>; Ken Jones <Kjones@deaconjonesautogroup.com>; Mick Rankin <mickr44@hotmail.com>; John B. Gaither <jbgator777@yahoo.com>; Christina Crosby <ccoopercrosby@aol.com>; CAROLYNDJOHNSON40@gmail.com; carolyngarris88@gmail.com; Diane.Wheatley@ncleg.gov; Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov; Sen. Norman Sanderson <Norman.Sanderson@ncleg.gov>; Howard.Penny@ncleg.gov; bill.ward@ncleg.gov; Joe.Pike@ncleg.gov; tim.moffitt@ncleg.gov; Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov; Ted.Alexander@ncleg.gov; Warren.daniel@ncleg.net; Bobby.Hanig@ncleg.gov; Rep. Mike Clampitt <Mike.Clampitt@ncleg.gov>; Keith.Kidwell@ncleg.gov; jay.adams@ncleg.gov; Jimmy.Dixon@ncleg.gov; Carl.Ford@ncleg.gov; Josh Hurley <jhurley@petwants.com>; granvilleinsurance@yahoo.com; jimmy@silercityautomotive.com; Butch@butchhudsoninsurance.com; Tjovich@raleigh.twcbc.com; mfarless55@gmail.com; Paul Hunt <huntgolfshop@yahoo.com>; sammy tnboone.com <Sammy@tnboone.com>; benosbun1978@gmail.com; Keith@hiesterautomotive.com; Rob Nissen <nissenauto@yahoo.com>; LarenL@eclsglobalinc.com; Mitchell Beckwith

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

<mitchbeckwith@cwiretailsystems.com>; mitchbeckwith@protonmail.com; Stephanie Smith <juggernault8@yahoo.com>; Stephanie Smith <Stephanie.smith@leithcars.com>; Mattie Rose Crowder <mrc.isaiah53@gmail.com>; Legalaffairs@abejoneslaw.com; dave.boliek@ncauditor.gov; William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 2024 Popular Vote Trivia

The last person some legislators would want to be the chief elections official of this state is an individual who insists all state election laws and federal civil rights laws are followed… because they fear they can't win their primary or the general if the elections were legally conducted and properly audited.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 4, 2025, at 7:56 AM, William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Dear Carol Snow,
>
> Just for clarification, it was ME who suggested that you be made the next head of the NCSBE in Rep. Jeffrey McNeely's office. McNeely only made an expression on his face that what I said was an interesting and maybe even an amusing idea. I don't remember him saying anything agreeing or disagreeing about the idea.
>
> Here's another idea. One of the recipients of this email is Don Curtis, the owner of WPTF. I think it would be interesting for him to do an interview for his Sunday morning "Carolina Newsmaker" program with you, Jim Womack, and Major Dave

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

regarding election integrity. Also, he should ask questions about the Riggs vs. Griffin hotly contested race. That should make for some good ratings for his 7:00 AM Sunday morning program.

Billy Parker

On Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 10:06 PM Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hey,
>
> Of course I don't know if Rep McNeely said that in all seriousness or if it was said tongue in cheek since he thinks I'm a know-it-all, but there's MUCH more I don't know about running that state agency than what I do know.
>
> If Brooke McGowen becomes the next NCGOP Chair, I'd love to be considered to be part of the state party's election integrity team. Every county GOP needs a vibrant and educated election integrity committee.
>
> Elections belong to the People, not to a bureaucracy. We've foolishly abdicated our responsibility to understand and oversee this process for far too long.
>
> cs

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 3, 2025, at 8:09 PM, William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Carol,
>
> Thank-you for the comments. When I hear people like you and Major Dave speak about our election system, I often realize how little I actually know about the system, especially the internals and behind-the-scenes aspects of the NCSBE. I'm just a numbers guy trying to use the numbers provided by the government to see if anything unusual and possibly fraudulent is happening with our elections. I'm looking at things from a macro level, while many of you are looking at things from a micro level. To get a proper perspective, however, I believe you really have to consider both.
>
> You are certainly on top of things with what you do. I was in Representative Jeffrey McNeely's office a week ago sharing my updated statistical information with him. And by the way, he's a pretty sharp person who is also on top of things when it comes

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

to our elections – he mentioned several things to me that I wasn't aware of. Well, I brought up your name and said that "they" ought to appoint you as the head of the NCSBE to replace Karen Brinson Bell. If you are willing to move to Raleigh and take the position, then that would really shake things up.

We are all citizens trying to figure things out (and trying to figure out what really happened in 2020). The people who I addressed this email stream to are really a hodgepodge of people. Some are influential politicians and businessmen. Some are average people up and down Main Street who have a real interest in our elections. Some are even Democrats that I'm trying to get to open their eyes as to what is really happening with our elections.

Keep up the good work. And maybe we can get Dave Boliek to realize that already there has been a lot of work done by just average citizens of North Carolina to investigate the NCSBE as he turns his attention to audit that state department.

Billy

On Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 6:26 PM <cls28655@gmail.com> wrote:

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Hey, Billy-

I'll try to be brief. Just two points.

First, regarding this:

> **Well I have a solution for the mess. Contact each of the 60,000 people. If they can provide the needed missing information for their registration, then that vote gets counted. And if they cannot provide the needed information, then those votes do not get counted. Do a recount with the new numbers, declare a winner, and let's all move down the road.** ~Billy Parker, 3/3/2025

We are in complete agreement. Actually, the NCSBE was implored to obtain the missing registration information with official HAVA Complaints on 10/6/2023, 2/20/2024, 6/3/2024, and 6/24/2024. Joanne Empie also

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

requested this with her HAVA Complaint on 8/6/2024. The required registration information SHOULD HAVE BEEN obtained prior to the 2024 General Election but the State Board of Elections refused.

Secondly, let me clarify my response to these statements because I didn't mean to imply you don't have the right to express your opinion.

> RE: **We are actually looking stupid to many, especially when some still talk about voting machines changing votes – which didn't happen, I believe, in NC.** ~Billy Parker, 2/23/2025

I'm not a scientist, either, but I know many people are *collecting and utilizing research and evidence to deepen and share understanding* of NC's election system. In a broad sense, that's what a scientist does. What I'm trying to say is that none of us should make broad claims about something being true without having the evidence to support it.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

I do not know, nor have I ever claimed, that NC's voting machines are flipping votes. There is no evidence to support that's happening. Similarly, there is no evidence to confirm that NC's voting machines are accurately tabulating the votes marked on our ballots. The post-election "audit" conducted in this state is an insulting charade. Therefore, I can't understand why anyone, such as yourself, would claim to believe that voting machines in NC aren't altering votes since no evidence exists to support that belief.

> RE: **We on our side need to get off our soapbox preaching our elections are fraudulent.** ~Billy Parker, 2/23/2025

One definition of fraud, according to Black's Law Dictionary, is "*a knowing misrepresentation or knowing concealment of material fact made to induce another to act to his or her detriment*."

> NC's post-election "audit" is indeed a *misrepresentation*

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

of a statistically significant and sound audit process which is intended to ensure the tabulators are accurately counting our votes. The performative "audits" conducted in NC in each county after Election Day *induce* the electorate to trust the reported results based on incomplete information. When the electorate blindly trusts reported election results that haven't been proven to be accurate, this *harms us*, as we remain unaware of the issues within the system that need to be addressed.

One Co-Chair of the Senate Elections Committee at least partially agreed with the suggestions to correct this process. "*I have spent some time reviewing your 9-point suggestions for a better audit process and*

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

believe some of those would be an improvement over current law. I will be recommending that we incorporate some of them into S747. Thanks for your input." See attached.

However, these recommendations *were not incorporated into S747*. One would have to ask Senator Daniel why the legislation that was written and provided to him was left on the cutting room floor. NC's legislative body is apparently in favor of conducting deceptive post-election audits.

A related synonym for fraudulent is illegitimate, or illegal. I would contend that a registration list that is not legally maintained and administered leads to fraudulent elections.

It would take me more time than I want to spend on

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

this email to list every **state and federal law** the state and county elections officials **violate** during the registration process, so I'll just list a few off the top of my head. I have the evidence to support each of these claims:

- 52 USC 20701 – Retention and preservation of election records. The Brunswick Co BOE Director admitted in writing they have to **delete voter history records** when one voter's registration record was used to vote twice in an election.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(ii) and (v) – HAVA – NC's registration list **is not** a statewide system allowing local elections officials to obtain immediate electronic access to the information in the statewide list. NC has 100 county registration systems, not one statewide registration

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

system.

- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(vi) – HAVA – registration applications **are not** entered on an expedited basis, especially during early voting. In fact, the registration list was missing so many registrations for the 2020 General Elections the NCSBE create a new Voter Registration Snapshot in *May 2021*. The problem continued in the 2024 General Election. To attempt to conceal this, the elections officials backdate the registration dates to make it appear the applications were processed earlier than they actually were.
- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(vii) – HAVA – the chief State election official **does not** provide support to the counties so the registrations can be processed on an expedited basis. If she did, there wouldn't be so many registration applications that

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

				are sluggishly processed. • 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(vi) – HAVA – all registration information **is not** entered into the computerized voter registration list. The telephone numbers written on registration applications for the vast majority of the registrations in 13 counties is either missing or bogus. Cell phone numbers uniquely identify voters, making them critical information for locating doubly- and triply-registered voters. Even the NCSBE uses telephone numbers to locate doubly-registered voters. 86% - 100% of the registration records in these counties do not contain the voters' telephone numbers: Wake, Camden, Union, Iredell, Beaufort, Orange, Randolph, Davidson, Rowan, Davie, Mecklenburg, Avery and Stokes. • 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(ii) –

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

HAVA – the computerized list **does not** contain the name and *registration information* of every legally registered voter in the state. The SEIMS system deletes the voters' personal identifying information when a voter's identity and birth date can't be verified with the data in the DMV or SSA's databases during the verification process.

- 52 USC 21083(a)(1)(A)(iii) and NCGS 163-82.10A – **not all** voters have permanent voter registration numbers (NCID) that remain unchanged. When a voter moves from one county to another, it's not uncommon for the voter to receive a new statewide registration number (NCID). We have a report from the NCSBE which shows a voter's "old NCID" and "new NCID". Remarkably, sometimes a voter's two

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

				NCIDs will even be merged together into a third NCID. • 52 USC 21083(a)(2)(B)(ii) and (a)(4)(B) – there are **not always** a safeguard in place to ensure eligible voters are not removed from the registration list in error. This is due to incomplete registration information. Living voters are erroneously removed as being deceased. • 52 USC 21083(a)(2)(B)(iii) – **not all** duplicate names are eliminated from the computerized list due to (a) incomplete registration information and (b) flawed and nonexistent methods of locating them. The NCSBE only searches for duplicate DL#s for registrations in Active status (not Inactive or UOCAVA – both statuses make them eligible to vote). The NCSBE doesn't even use the SSN-4 + birth date criteria to locate duplicate

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

registrations.

- 52 USC 21083(a)(5) – **incomplete applications were accepted and processed** for approximately 10 years when NC's voter registration application did not comply with state and federal law. This was the basis of HAVA Complaint #1.
- NCGS 163-82.10(a1) – **not all** voters' dates of birth and email addresses are held in confidence. Dates of birth can be found in the name or registration date fields in the publicly available data. Email addresses can be found in the mailing address fields in the publicly available data. This information could be used by a criminal to request a UOCAVA ballot using these registrations.

I could go on but hopefully you get the picture. My concern is that our families live in a country that functions as a Constitutional Republic, and I wish

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

those serving in the NC's General Assembly agreed.

Sincerely,

Carol Snow

Morganton, NC

Burke Co

828-448-4680

From: William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 3, 2025 2:30 PM
To: Carol Snow <cls28655@gmail.com>;
Subject: Re: 2024 Popular Vote Trivia

CORRECTION: The email I sent out earlier today has one email address that is no longer good; and I gave an incorrect email address for Dave Boliek, the new state auditor. So anyone wanting to respond to the subject matter can use the addresses on this email instead.

In picking up on some of the comments made, Mrs. Carol Snow said, "Scientists don't make

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

conjectures based on a belief (or hope) that isn't backed up with proof." First of all, I have never said that I'm a "scientist." But what I am is an analysis of numbers involving the subject matter of our elections, which contain many unknowns. I hope that I might have a right to express my opinions involving some of these unknowns; and even if I was a scientist, I would hope I still have this right as well.

In trying to figure out what is happening to our elections, I have taken a slightly different approach from most analysis, where I compare election results to the U.S. Census numbers. By taking this approach, I can say with certainty that something very unusual is happening to our elections. As to what is causing this "unusualness", however, is a different matter and is a subject of debate. For nearly a 50 year period, our elections showed a fairly consistent voting pattern. And from 1952 to 2000, involving a 2-man race, our elections nationally were always within a 2 ½ percent range of the population voting – between 36.9% to 39.4%. Only in 1992 where there was a major third-party contender – Ross Perot did we ever go outside of this range;

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

and only then, it only went up to 40.9%. Then after the 2000 election, we noticed the beginnings of a huge divergence from this past voting pattern, with much of the change taking place with one election cycle – that of 2020. In that very odd election year, 47.8% (way above the previous peak of 39.4%) of the total population voted in basically a two-man race for president; and for North Carolina, that number was way up to 52.9%. One has to scratch one's head and ask if this is the result of election fraud or possibly the result of some other factor(s). This is what I have set out to try to determine over the past 4 years. Then about 2 years ago, I teamed up with Dr. Stan Young – a professor of statistics at NCSU, who has done numerous studies on the 2020 election. My collaboration with Mr. Young involves a project where I had previously gathered election results and population data put into sequential order involving election cycles.

Election Charts:

Dr. Stan Young and I measure election results in terms of the Census data. What we do is to see what percentage of the population votes Republican and what

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

percentage votes Democrat. It's a time analysis, going all the way back to 1948 and up to the present. And when you plot these data points out on a piece of paper and use a trend line (linear regression), it's very easy to see if an election cycle is "usual" or "unusual." Please click onto the 2-page document to see what I'm talking about, where we provide the charts for both North Carolina (page one) and the Nation (page two).

Starting with page one, you see two charts showing every general election cycle identified as shaded and white vertical bars from 1948 up to present, with the data for 2024 drawn in by hand. On the left side of the charts, you see a scale of what percentage of the population votes Republican for the first chart, and what percentage of the population votes Democrat for the second chart. All the dots and circles scattered about are the actual data points (election results divided by the population). The dot-dash line that you see in the middle is the long-term trend line for the respective parties. (With a divergence of the voting patterns noticed after the 2000 election, it needs to be noted that the linear regression you see is based upon only the data

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

of 1948 to 2000. What you see after this period is simply an extension of that line.) Notice with the Democrats, they have been HUGE outliers to their trend line in the past few cycles. It could be that their trend line has changed after 2000; but if that is the case, then why don't we see a huge change for the Republicans as well? (This change in the trend line is a subject of debate.) At the bottom of the page, you can see all the actual numbers for the recent cycles, going back to 2012 (we didn't have room on the page to put all the years going back to 1948).

What the Charts Show and Don't Show:

These charts show the totality of what is happening to our elections – the total factors and variables affecting our elections. It is simply the total number of Republicans voting divided by the population for the Republican chart; and it is the total number of Democrats voting divided by the population for the Democrat chart. And as such, you can't extract out for just one variable like election fraud. But when one variable represents a major event in an election cycle, then that will show up as a significant change in the

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

data point for that cycle. Examples of this are the entry of a major third-party contender with George Wallace in 1968 and Ross Perot in 1992 – which affected, to some degree, both the Republican and Democrat charts for the respective years; and we even saw a major change in the Arizona charts for the 2000 cycle when much of that state population sat out that general election cycle because of what happened during the primary season involving Bush and McCain. It should also be noted that there is separation between the possible "unusualness" that you see with the charts and knowing the exact cause for any particular election cycle. We believe, however, this is a superior method of analyzing election results because you have a comparison to a trend line and past performance; but there are some limitations as noted to this approach of analysis as well.

Brief Analysis of the 2024 Results:

For North Carolina, Donald Trump got nearly the exact same percentage of the population voting for him in 2024 as he did in 2020. Now Trump's numbers did go up, but the population went up as well over the last 4

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

years. Both the cycles of 2020 and 2024 were significantly higher than 2016; but he seems to have plateaued at 26.43% and 26.65%. I think this is very interesting, because the pundits on television and even those with the GOP will tell you that Trump made major inroads into the Black and Hispanic populations. I don't deny this as being the case, but with the overall percentage being basically the same over the last two cycles, then that would mean that Trump must have lost support in other sectors of the population. And I would speculate that it probably was with White Professional Men and Women in your Metropolitan counties like Wake and Mecklenburg – that is just my guess. Kamala Harris came down ever so slightly from Joe Biden's level here in NC; but interestingly, she received around 31,000 more votes than Biden; but our population increased by nearly 400,000 over the last 4 years – so as a percentage, she came down a little bit.

For the Nation – the charts on page two, Donald Trump was a very strong candidate. He was above the Upper Tolerance Bound (for both 2020 and 2024). But again, he is topping out at 22.39% and

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

22.58%. I think the real story, however, of this past election is what you see with the Democrat chart. The Democrats went down, from the point you see for 2020 to the point you see for 2024. A total of 2.61% of the population did not vote for the Democrats this time around versus last time. And that is what put Trump over the top. It's not so much what the Republicans did – they just held steady; but rather, it's what the Democrats did NOT do that allow Trump to become President again.

This is an analysis that you won't get from any other place. The Numbers are what they are. If I'm wrong about any of this, then show me where I'm wrong. Numbers don't usually lie.

Using the Charts to detect Election Fraud:

Again, you can't use these charts to extract out for one thing like election fraud; but you can make numerous observations and even speculations about the matter.

We know for a fact here in North Carolina that there were major changes made involving our elections in between the two cycles of 2020 and 2024. The General Assembly made a

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

number of changes to tighten up election law, and finally the courts allowed for photo ID to be used in elections. So if there had been cheating before, by one or both of the two parties, then we should have seen possibly a decrease level in voting on the charts for 2024.

There are two ways of looking at this involving the Democrat chart for North Carolina: If there had been a lot of cheating by the Democrats before, then their level of voting should have come way down for 2024. But this is not what we see with the charts, with only a slight decrease; and that can easily be attributed to voter apathy by the Democrats much more than for any fraud. So from the chart, one might conclude that there must not have been that much cheating by the Democrats as had been alleged. But there's another way of looking at things as well. It is obvious that there are forces that are increasing the level of voting by the Democrats; and there's no reason to believe those forces suddenly stopped for 2024. And with the changes with election law and the implementation of Photo ID, then that is a force to possibly decrease the level of voting by the Democrats. So the

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

25.14% that you see drawn in for 2024 on the chart, that is a NET amount when you consider all the forces pushing the voting level up and pushing the voting level down. (The Democrat voting level for 2024 might have been much higher if the law hadn't changed.)

How my Thoughts are Changing about 2020:

I want to go back to the Democrat chart for North Carolina and use that to tell how some of my thoughts are changing about 2020 and possibly the level of election fraud and/or the malfeasance by public officials to change or alter election outcomes. With the data point you see for Joe Biden on the chart, that represented roughly 2.7 million votes; and for the data point along the trend line for 2020, that's 1.7 million votes. So there was a million vote difference between what the Democrats actually received and what the trend line indicated. Three years ago, I would have told you that I thought all of that difference was the result of election fraud; but I don't think that now. I think some of this difference represents fraud/malfeasance, but not ALL of it. I think the trend line has in fact changed for the Democrats starting with

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

the 2004 election and accelerating thereafter. (I also believe this trend line is about to max out and start moving horizontal.) In analyzing what is happening to our elections, I have come to realize that there are at least eight (8) forces that are changing and manipulating our elections; and those are: the government, the political parties, Nonprofit NGOs, Public-Private Partnerships, Media and Big Tech, Changes in Population and Demographics, Immigration, and Advancement in Technology. All of these are changing the political landscape; and they probably have more of an effect on the Democrat vote than the Republican vote. Of the new voter increase since 2000 for here in North Carolina, the Democrats have increased their numbers at twice the rate as the Republicans! And since 2000, our population has increased by nearly 3 million, from 8 million to the current 10.8 million. A lot of this increase has been the result of people moving to the state. And I would contend that the majority of the people moving here are in fact Democrats, with most of them relocating and being concentrated in the metropolitan areas.

Of the one million votes

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

that we see off the trend line for 2020 by the Democrats on the chart provided, I believe anywhere from 100,000 to 300,000 might be the result of some type of election fraud and/or malfeasance. But much of the "fraud" is below the radar screen, where even if you had poll watchers in every precinct and had a full forensic audit done, you wouldn't be able to discover it. There are illegal immigrants in this country who eventually get a driver's license; and once they do that, they often register as voters also – but how would you detect this as fraud just by looking at the voter rolls and registrations? And we know this type of fraud is happening because when these people are called for jury duty, they get out of it by then disclosing that they aren't really citizens. Also, we are a very mobile society, with people often moving from state to state. I wonder how many people moved here to NC and registered to vote, and they also received a mail-in ballot from their previous state. How would you detect that type of fraud? And before Photo ID was implemented, I believe a fair number of people voted in other people's names. Major Dave and others who I know have

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

also noted problems with Same-Day Registrants (SDR). So yes, I believe voter fraud and malfeasance is taking place. But out of 5.6 million votes cast, the total percentage representing this problem is probably quite low – but still possibly enough to change the outcome involving some races.

John Droz mentioned my "*reduced*" belief in the 2020 election malfeasance and that I evidently have not closely studied his list of forty (40) examples of evidence that indicate malfeasance. I don't doubt any of the examples he shows; in fact, I have cited several of the studies with some of the papers I have written over the past few years. I think the work that John Droz, Stan Young, Carol Snow, Major Dave and others have done is excellent in uncovering what has been taking place here in North Carolina and around the country. My issue is the <u>level</u> of the problem; and with me being a resident of NC, I have mostly concerned myself with this state. Again, several years ago, I would have told you that the problem here in NC represented close to a million votes cast, mostly on the Democrat side; now I believe it is a much lower number. In other parts of the

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

country, I believe there are still major problems, especially those states that have ballot drop boxes. While I admit there are still problems with elections in the Ole North State, I do believe the elections here are for the most part up and up and that the current General Assembly has done a good job of making our elections free and fair. For those receiving this email and who are fairly educated about the subject, I just wonder if you believe our elections in North Carolina are mostly free and fair or are they mostly fraudulent? And if they are fraudulent, then just how many votes are being affected in your estimation? And how low would this number need to be before you would say we have free and fair elections?

The Riggs vs. Griffin race for State Supreme Court:

I applaud Carol Snow's efforts through her website/emails of We the People Events (WTP) to educate the people about this very close race and the issues involved. I find her emails to be very informative. It seems to me that the issue is how the voter registrations were filled out and/or the lacking information needed for over 60,000 registrants. And since

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

we really don't have secret ballots for those who vote Early at One-Stop or by Absentee Mail-in, we can actually go in and pull those ballots to match up with the voter registration. Some on the Right would contend that since all the information needed was not filled out correctly, then the votes are invalid. Alternatively, some on the Left would contend that it is only bookkeeping error and that those votes are valid.

Well I have a solution for the mess. Contact each of the 60,000 people. If they can provide the needed missing information for their registration, then that vote gets counted. And if they cannot provide the needed information, then those votes do not get counted. Do a recount with the new numbers, declare a winner, and let's all move down the road.

Recap of Election Trivia involving "Landslides"

A number of people have been added to this "new" email, including Dave Boliek – the new state auditor, the state chairman of the GOP, and some members of the General Assembly. There has been a lot of talk by the Republicans

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

about the 2024 election being a “Landslide.” Since the newcomers to this conversation have not and do not likely see the original email I sent out involving election trivia, I thought to include it here again so they can see how this past election truly stacks up against other Landslide victories over the past 80 years.

Election Year Landslides	**States Won/Lost**	**Ratio of Margin to Total Vote**
1952: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	39 vs. 9 (48 States)	10.85% (6,700,439 ÷ 61,751,942)
1956: Eisenhower vs. Stevenson	41 vs. 7 (48 States)	15.40% (9,551,142 ÷ 62,021,328)
1964: Johnson vs. Goldwater	44 vs. 6 (50 States)	22.58% (15,951,287 ÷ 70,639,284)
1972: Nixon vs. McGovern	49 vs. 1	23.15% (17,995,488 ÷ 77,744,027)
1984: Reagan vs. Mondale	49 vs. 1	18.22% (16,878,120 ÷ 92,653,233)
2004: Bush vs. Kerry*	31 vs. 19	2.46% (3,012,166 ÷ 122,294,846)
2008: Obama vs. McCain*	28 vs. 22	7.27% (9,550,193 ÷ 131,313,820)

* Election years 2004 and 2008 are questionable to even be considered as “Landslide” victories.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Election Years 2024 & 2020	States Won/Lost	Ratio of Margin to Total Vote
2024: Trump vs. Harris	31 vs. 19	1.47% (2,284,967 ÷ 155,238,302)
2020: Biden vs. Trump	25 vs. 25	4.45% (7,052,770 ÷ 158,383,403)

On Mon, Mar 3, 2025 at 1:30 PM William Parker <parkerinraleigh@gmail.com> wrote:

> In picking up on some of the comments made, Mrs. Carol Snow said, “Scientists don’t make conjectures based on a belief (or hope) that isn’t backed up with proof.” First of all, I have never said that I’m a “scientist.” But what I am is an analysis of numbers involving the subject matter of our elections, which contain many unknowns. I hope that I might have a right to express my opinions involving some of these unknowns; and even if I was a scientist, I would hope I still have this right as well.
>
> In trying to figure out

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

what is happening to our elections, I have taken a slightly different approach from most analysis, where I compare election results to the U.S. Census numbers. By taking this approach, I can say with certainty that something very unusual is happening to our elections. As to what is causing this "unusualness", however, is a different matter and is a subject of debate. For nearly a 50 year period, our elections showed a fairly consistent voting pattern. And from 1952 to 2000, involving a 2-man race, our elections nationally were always within a 2 ½ percent range of the population voting – between 36.9% to 39.4%. Only in 1992 where there was a major third-party contender – Ross Perot did we ever go outside of this range; and only then, it only went up to 40.9%. Then after the 2000 election, we noticed the beginnings of a huge divergence from this past voting pattern, with much of the change taking place with one election cycle – that of 2020. In that very odd election year, 47.8% (way above the previous peak of 39.4%) of the total

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

population voted in basically a two-man race for president; and for North Carolina, that number was way up to 52.9%. One has to scratch one's head and ask if this is the result of election fraud or possibly the result of some other factor(s). This is what I have set out to try to determine over the past 4 years. Then about 2 years ago, I teamed up with Dr. Stan Young – a professor of statistics at NCSU, who has done numerous studies on the 2020 election. My collaboration with Mr. Young involves a project where I had previously gathered election results and population data put into sequential order involving election cycles.

Election Charts:

Dr. Stan Young and I measure election results in terms of the Census data. What we do is to see what percentage of the population votes Republican and what percentage votes Democrat. It's a time analysis, going all the way back to 1948 and up to the present. And when you plot these data points out on a piece of paper and use a trend line (linear regression), it's very

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

easy to see if an election cycle is "usual" or "unusual." Please click onto the 2-page document to see what I'm talking about, where we provide the charts for both North Carolina (page one) and the Nation (page two).

Starting with page one, you see two charts showing every general election cycle identified as shaded and white vertical bars from 1948 up to present, with the data for 2024 drawn in by hand. On the left side of the charts, you see a scale of what percentage of the population votes Republican for the first chart, and what percentage of the population votes Democrat for the second chart. All the dots and circles scattered about are the actual data points (election results divided by the population). The dot-dash line that you see in the middle is the long-term trend line for the respective parties. (With a divergence of the voting patterns noticed after the 2000 election, it needs to be noted that the linear regression you see is based upon only the data of 1948 to 2000. What you see after this period is simply

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

an extension of that line.) Notice with the Democrats, they have been HUGE outliers to their trend line in the past few cycles. It could be that their trend line has changed after 2000; but if that is the case, then why don't we see a huge change for the Republicans as well? (This change in the trend line is a subject of debate.) At the bottom of the page, you can see all the actual numbers for the recent cycles, going back to 2012 (we didn't have room on the page to put all the years going back to 1948).

What the Charts Show and Don't Show:

These charts show the totality of what is happening to our elections – the total factors and variables affecting our elections. It is simply the total number of Republicans voting divided by the population for the Republican chart; and it is the total number of Democrats voting divided by the population for the Democrat chart. And as such, you can't extract out for just one variable like election fraud. But when one variable represents a major event in an

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

election cycle, then that will show up as a significant change in the data point for that cycle. Examples of this are the entry of a major third-party contender with George Wallace in 1968 and Ross Perot in 1992 – which affected, to some degree, both the Republican and Democrat charts for the respective years; and we even saw a major change in the Arizona charts for the 2000 cycle when much of that state population sat out that general election cycle because of what happened during the primary season involving Bush and McCain. It should also be noted that there is separation between the possible "unusualness" that you see with the charts and knowing the exact cause for any particular election cycle. We believe, however, this is a superior method of analyzing election results because you have a comparison to a trend line and past performance; but there are some limitations as noted to this approach of analysis as well.

Brief Analysis of the 2024 Results:

For North Carolina,

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

					Donald Trump got nearly the exact same percentage of the population voting for him in 2024 as he did in 2020. Now Trump's numbers did go up, but the population went up as well over the last 4 years. Both the cycles of 2020 and 2024 were significantly higher than 2016; but he seems to have plateaued at 26.43% and 26.65%. I think this is very interesting, because the pundits on television and even those with the GOP will tell you that Trump made major inroads into the Black and Hispanic populations. I don't deny this as being the case, but with the overall percentage being basically the same over the last two cycles, then that would mean that Trump must have lost support in other sectors of the population. And I would speculate that it probably was with White Professional Men and Women in your Metropolitan counties like Wake and Mecklenburg – that is just my guess. Kamala Harris came down ever so slightly from Joe Biden's level here in NC; but interestingly, she received around 31,000 more votes than Biden; but our

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

population increased by nearly 400,000 over the last 4 years – so as a percentage, she came down a little bit.

For the Nation – the charts on page two, Donald Trump was a very strong candidate. He was above the Upper Tolerance Bound (for both 2020 and 2024). But again, he is topping out at 22.39% and 22.58%. I think the real story, however, of this past election is what you see with the Democrat chart. The Democrats went down, from the point you see for 2020 to the point you see for 2024. A total of 2.61% of the population did not vote for the Democrats this time around versus last time. And that is what put Trump over the top. It's not so much what the Republicans did – they just held steady; but rather, it's what the Democrats did NOT do that allow Trump to become President again.

This is an analysis that you won't get from any other place. The Numbers are what they are. If I'm wrong about any of this, then show me where I'm wrong. Numbers don't usually lie.

Using the Charts to detect Election

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Fraud:

Again, you can't use these charts to extract out for one thing like election fraud; but you can make numerous observations and even speculations about the matter.

We know for a fact here in North Carolina that there were major changes made involving our elections in between the two cycles of 2020 and 2024. The General Assembly made a number of changes to tighten up election law, and finally the courts allowed for photo ID to be used in elections. So if there had been cheating before, by one or both of the two parties, then we should have seen possibly a decrease level in voting on the charts for 2024.

There are two ways of looking at this involving the Democrat chart for North Carolina: If there had been a lot of cheating by the Democrats before, then their level of voting should have come way down for 2024. But this is not what we see with the charts, with only a slight decrease; and that can easily be attributed to voter

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

apathy by the Democrats much more than for any fraud. So from the chart, one might conclude that there must not have been that much cheating by the Democrats as had been alleged. But there's another way of looking at things as well. It is obvious that there are forces that are increasing the level of voting by the Democrats; and there's no reason to believe those forces suddenly stopped for 2024. And with the changes with election law and the implementation of Photo ID, then that is a force to possibly decrease the level of voting by the Democrats. So the 25.14% that you see drawn in for 2024 on the chart, that is a NET amount when you consider all the forces pushing the voting level up and pushing the voting level down. (The Democrat voting level for 2024 might have been much higher if the law hadn't changed.)

How my Thoughts are Changing about 2020:

I want to go back to the Democrat chart for North Carolina and use that to tell how some of my thoughts

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

are changing about 2020 and possibly the level of election fraud and/or the malfeasance by public officials to change or alter election outcomes. With the data point you see for Joe Biden on the chart, that represented roughly 2.7 million votes; and for the data point along the trend line for 2020, that's 1.7 million votes. So there was a million vote difference between what the Democrats actually received and what the trend line indicated. Three years ago, I would have told you that I thought all of that difference was the result of election fraud; but I don't think that now. I think some of this difference represents fraud/malfeasance, but not ALL of it. I think the trend line has in fact changed for the Democrats starting with the 2004 election and accelerating thereafter. (I also believe this trend line is about to max out and start moving horizontal.) In analyzing what is happening to our elections, I have come to realize that there are at least eight (8) forces that are changing and manipulating our elections; and those are: the government,

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

				the political parties, Nonprofit NGOs, Public-Private Partnerships, Media and Big Tech, Changes in Population and Demographics, Immigration, and Advancement in Technology. All of these are changing the political landscape; and they probably have more of an effect on the Democrat vote than the Republican vote. Of the new voter increase since 2000 for here in North Carolina, the Democrats have increased their numbers at twice the rate as the Republicans!

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From: Brent Woodcox
To: Keita N. Cannon
Subject: RE: Chief Operating Officer
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2025 4:56:00 PM
Attachments: image011.png
image016.png
image017.png
image018.png
image019.png

Agency	Employee Name	Job Title	Position Title	Current Salary
Department of Adult Correction	Phillip Craig Sykes Jr	Correction Enterprise Director II	Chief Operating Officer	$100,349.00
Department of Commerce	Joyce E Jarrett	OCOB Executive	Chief Operating Officer	$131,325.00
Department of Health and Human Services	Olga C Propst	Human Services Facility Asst Dir III	Chief Operating Officer (COO)	$137,549.00
Department of Health and Human Services	Sarah Allen Gregosky	DHB-Sr. Program Manager	Chief Operating Officer	$177,160.00
Department of Insurance	Amber Cronk May	Administrator Industrial Commission	Chief Operating Officer	$150,603.00
Department of Transportation	Douglas A Vogt	NCSPA CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	NCSPA-Chief Operating Officer	$261,201.00
State Board of Elections	Sanford D Chancellor	Program Director II	Chief Operating Officer	$115,406.00

From: Keita N. Cannon <Keita.Cannon@ncauditor.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 3:33 PM
To: Brent Woodcox <brent.woodcox@ncauditor.gov>
Subject: Re: Chief Operating Officer

Just because I have an annoying habit of liking to solve puzzles... can you tell me a few of the people you looked up so I can see what I can decipher? If you get a chance; I know you are extremely busy. But the data that OSC is reporting out needs to be clean and decipherable to all and not cause confusion to folks who may be looking for answers...

Keita Cannon, SPHR, CPM

Director, Human Resources

North Carolina Office of the State Auditor

20601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699

Web: https://www.auditor.nc.gov/

Email: keita.cannon@ncauditor.gov

UNBIASED. IMPACTFUL. IRREFUTABLE.

NCOSA Office of the State Auditor

-

WARNING: Email correspondence to and from The Office of the State Auditor will be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.


From: Brent Woodcox <brent.woodcox@ncauditor.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 2:57 PM
To: Keita N. Cannon <Keita.Cannon@ncauditor.gov>
Subject: RE: Chief Operating Officer

If we need to use the Deputy Secretary/Commissioner II, that's fine. I still don't really understand how there are 1400 different classifications and COO isn't one them. State government, I guess.

Also, I use the NCOSC database to look at employee salaries and it shows a differentiation between job title and position title but apparently neither of those equate to classification.

From: Keita N. Cannon <Keita.Cannon@ncauditor.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 11:09 AM
To: Brent Woodcox <brent.woodcox@ncauditor.gov>
Subject: Re: Chief Operating Officer

Also, in asking about what titles people use for COO (and you have listed Insurance and this is timely), their HR Director responded:



Justice also responded:

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

Wong, Tina
To: Keita N. Cannon

Reply | Reply all | Forward

Thu 2/27/2025 10:39 AM

We use the Deputy Sec/ Commissioner II for the Chief of Staff (if non attorney). If there's a COO that reports to the Chief of Staff, we've also used Deputy Sec/ Comm I.
If an Attorney, we have used a classification in the Legal pay plan.

Tina Wong, SHRM-SCP
Human Resources | OEB #125

Keita Cannon, SPHR, CPM

Director, Human Resources

North Carolina Office of the State Auditor

20601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699

Web: https://www.auditor.nc.gov/

Email: keita.cannon@ncauditor.gov

UNBIASED. IMPACTFUL. IRREFUTABLE.

NCOSA Office of the State Auditor

-

WARNING: Email correspondence to and from The Office of the State Auditor will be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Brent Woodcox <brent.woodcox@ncauditor.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 10:48 AM
To: Keita N. Cannon <Keita.Cannon@ncauditor.gov>
Subject: Re: Chief Operating Officer

Can you clarify with me what is the difference between a job title, a position title, and a classification? I see that Commerce, Insurance, DHHS and NCSBE all have position titles of Chief Operating Officer.

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Keita N. Cannon <Keita.Cannon@ncauditor.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 10:30:52 AM
To: Brent Woodcox <brent.woodcox@ncauditor.gov>
Subject: Re: Chief Operating Officer

Gotcha. Just a couple of quick things...

Unfortunately, there is no Chief Operating Officer state classification. Would you be opposed to me reallocating the *Assistant State Audit Director* and using the same classification we used previously when a former employee was to have assumed this role - ***Deputy Secretary/Commissioner II***? This would be the same classification as Charles and Beth but it applies based on the class concept, and I can qualify Mr. Rogers under this title. I will look around for a different title, as well as ask my colleagues what they use for this role (if they have it), but I am good with the DSC II.

Also, the position is currently classified as *exempt managerial*. I will need to change this classification to **exempt policymaking** in order to avoid posting the position for the 5 business day minimum.

You probably don't really care about this minutia, but just in case there is something I may not be aware of, I want to be certain I put in before your eyes. Thanks!

Keita Cannon, SPHR, CPM

Director, Human Resources

North Carolina Office of the State Auditor

20601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699

Web: https://www.auditor.nc.gov/

Email: keita.cannon@ncauditor.gov

UNBIASED. IMPACTFUL. IRREFUTABLE.

NCOSA Office of the State Auditor

-

WARNING: Email correspondence to and from The Office of the State Auditor will be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From: Brent Woodcox <brent.woodcox@ncauditor.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 9:59 AM
To: Keita N. Cannon <Keita.Cannon@ncauditor.gov>
Subject: Chief Operating Officer

Keita,

I want to reclassify Assistant State Audit Director (Position #8832) to be a Chief Operating Officer position. In terms of org chart, I want to continue to have Quality Assurance and Professional Development to report to the new COO. And I want to move the IT team and the Data Analytics team under the new COO. For this position, I want to send an offer letter to Ryan Rogers (information attached). The salary for the position should be set at $160,000. The start date should be April 7. Please let me know if I can answer any questions.

Thanks,
Brent

Brent Woodcox
Chief of Staff

North Carolina Office of the State Auditor
Phone: 919-807-7654
20601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699
Web: https://www.auditor.nc.gov/
Email: brent.woodcox@ncauditor.gov

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT

From: Brent Woodcox
To: Randy Brechbiel
Subject: Welcome Luke Landis!
Date: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 8:25:00 AM

Today is the first day for our new Deputy General Counsel Luke Landis. Luke comes to us from the Department of Public Instruction where he was mentored by former OSA General Counsel Tim Hoegemeyer. Luke also served in the judicial branch as a clerk to Judge Jefferson Griffin on the North Carolina Court of Appeals. Luke is well-qualified to join our legal team and I hope you will join me in extending him a warm welcome to our office!

AMERICAN OVERSIGHT