

From: [Karen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: 6-18-21-1.pdf
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 7:31:05 PM
Attachments: [6-18-21-1.pdf](#)

Sent from my iPhone

Privilege Log 9/23/2022

From	To	CC/BCC	Privilege Type	Description
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Sean Kimball	Attorney personnel	12/8/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Doug Logan	Scott Sigman		Attorney personnel	12/8/21 –Discussion of personnel issues 2 emails
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Sean Kimball	Attorney personnel	11/2/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Sean Kimball	Attorney personnel	10/21/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Sean Kimball	Attorney personnel	10/11/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Sean Kimball	Attorney personnel	10/4/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Sean Kimball	Attorney personnel	1/8/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Sean Kimball	Attorney personnel	9/20/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Doug Logan	Scott Sigman		Attorney personnel	9/2/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan		Attorney personnel	9/2/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan		Attorney personnel	9/2/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan		Attorney personnel	8/30/21 –Discussion of personnel issues
Sean Kimball	Doug Logan	Scott Sigman	Attorney personnel	11/1/21 –Discussion of personnel issues 2 emails
Carrie Sharp	Doug Logan	Scott Sigman	Attorney personnel	8/18/21 Discussion of personnel issues 3 emails
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan		Attorney personnel	8/18/21 Discussion of personnel issues 2 emails
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan	Carrie Sharp	Attorney personnel	8/18/21 Discussion of personnel issues 3 emails
Doug Logan	Scott Sigman		Attorney personnel	7/26 Discussion of personnel issues
Bradford Mills	Doug Logan		Attorney personnel	7/21 Discussion of personnel issues 3 emails
Scott Sigman	Doug Logan		Attorney personnel	7/2 Discussion of personnel issues
Doug Logan	Scott Sigman	Aaron Fenzi	Attorney personnel	6/15/21 Discussion of personnel issues
Doug Logan	Scott Sigman		Attorney personnel	6/15/21 Discussion of personnel issues
Bradford Mills	Scott Sigman		Attorney	6/15/21 Discussion of personnel issues

Privilege Log 9/23/2022

			personnel	
Vanessa Nelson	Doug Logan	Todd Sanders	Personnel banking	6/1/21 Online banking passwords
Eric Richardson	Doug Logan		Proprietary	5/28/21 Microsoft teams message divulging copywritten code
Doug Logan	Eric Richardson		Proprietary	5/28/21 Microsoft teams message divulging copywritten code
Doug Logan	Eric Richardson		Proprietary	5/28/21 Microsoft teams message divulging copywritten code
Doug Logan	Eric Richardson		Proprietary	5/28/21 Microsoft teams message divulging copywritten code
Doug Logan	Eric Richardson		Proprietary	5/28/21 Microsoft teams message divulging copywritten code



JONATHAN R. MILLER, III
ATTORNEY AT LAW
PBM 173



5420 New Jesup Hwy
Brunswick, GA 31520
jrmilleratty@gmail.com

912-617-3169
September 23, 2022

VIA EMAIL

tom@statecraftlaw.com, kory@statecraftlaw.com, kbeauchamp@cblawyers.com, rdesai@cblawyers.com, agaona@cblawyers.com, bodneyd@ballardspahr.com, hoffmanc@ballardspahr.com, Jackw@wb-law.com, JordanW@wb-law.com, "Kelley, Matthew E." <KelleyM@ballardspahr.com>, "Lay, Kennison C." <layk@ballardspahr.com>

To Everyone:

For the week I have reviewed 936 emails, etc. of which 784 I am disclosing, 38 are privileged, and 114 are just not relevant to the Arizona audit. There are nine others I wish to discuss with co-counsel before release, but he is not available.

If I have calculated correctly there were 7198 emails/voicemails/ text messages/Microsoft teams messages left to go through, leaving 6,262 to finish, I will attempt to continue to produce at the rate of this last week meaning there should be approximately 6 weeks left to finish this phase of disclosure. I still have not found a way to turn over any relevant signal messages and am asking for help.

The 784 messages I am sending to the Senate will be in several emails as the maximum size I can use is 25mb per email.

Have a great weekend.

Sincerely,

Jonathan R. Miller, III
Attorney at Law

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
Subject: 695 page report/ interview on analysis
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 2:41:04 PM

Mr. Logan / Mr. Pullen:

I am reaching out to you today for comment on the 695 page report on the ballot counts that was released Friday. Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen this morning reported to me their findings of that data.

They say the top line of their review shows that the hand count performed by Cyber Ninjas is off by 316,740 ballots from the Senate's authorized machine count. They describe that as a 15% error rate.

They say that their analysis found 167,524 ballots that the Cyber Ninjas "did not count" with references to various pages in the report showing uncounted boxes.

They say the 695 pages reinforces their prior claims that the count was a fiction that can't be trusted.

I know you responded previously to these criticisms; and at the time told me that the analysis was faulty in part because it was limited to 17 pages. However, I want to make sure you have an opportunity to respond to the new claims built on the entire 695 page report.

As always, I can be reached at 602-316-8395. I expect to publish a story this afternoon. I need to hear back from you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 11:55 AM
To: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: RE: Interview request/

Robert,

I do believe that Randy Pullen talked with you last week and explained that the sheets in his

machine count were pulled before our work was complete. As a result an analysis of those is mostly meaningless. As we publicly relayed at the time the work was being done, we were working on Quality Control when we moved into the green building. That was making sure that every single batch was properly allocated to the right pallet, and the right batch, that there were no double-entries, and that batch numbers were entered properly. With the massive amount of data, this was a particularly challenging and time-consuming task. We not only had to do with the occasional typo from our team; but in some cases the batch number on the manifest, and/or the batch number on the box, and/or the batch number on the batch sheet did not match. When they didn't match we had to be sure we consistently handled it in the same way so that as much as possible so that everything could hopefully match up with the County's data, even when the County's data didn't agree with itself. With a decent percentage of the boxes having batch sheets on the side of the box, rather than separating the batches; and some boxes without any batch separators at all, it would literally be impossible for us to match up our data at the batch level to everything since the batches were not clearly marked. We had to assume the batches were in a certain order that matched the label; then again, not every batch was on the label.

Ray's response in general seems more objective than the last report you sent over; but its still has quite a few assumptions and misunderstandings that make quite a bit of it inaccurate. There is also a clear bias for saying things in a negative way whenever possible.

Your first point is a great example. There is a 263 discrepancy among the two ballot totals between the Presidential race and the Senate race. We identified it, highlighted it and footnoted it to explain it. This amounts to 1/100th of a percent of the total ballots counted; and yet its some huge embarrassment? I think the fact we recorded it as-is instead of just trying to cover it up shows our integrity. There is no perfect handling of 2.1 million ballots, especially with over 1,500 people involved and many of them volunteers. A certain number of clerical errors is expected. The fact the count is different between the Senate and Presidential races is not surprising when you consider we applied the "2 out of 3 counts need to agree, and the 3rd needs to be within 1 per 50 ballots" per race instead of per tally sheet. This meant that often when things had to be retallied because it was out of those thresholds it was a single race that was counted.

Prior criticism that came in, I believe it was from Bennie Smith; stated that hand counting was extremely inaccurate and was routinely off by 2% of the total ballot counts. They utilized it to try and discredit us while we were conducting the work. Our accuracy to the official results actually proves that our hand counting method is extremely accurate and blows those numbers away. I have no doubt that's part of the reason why these "experts" are having a hard time believing they were legitimate. However, its also worth noting that none of these reports were put together by anyone who ever hand counted anything close to 2.1 million ballots, nor conducted an audit anywhere close to the scope of what we did. As a result are they truly the right experts to critique a discrepancy of 1/100th of a percentage point?

I don't disagree with Lutz's comments that the Tally Sheets should be made publicly available; but that is a decision for the Senate to make not us. In totally there was almost 2 petabytes of data collected over the course of this audit. We're still working with the Senate on what of this data they would like to have available and how to get that data to them. The tally sheets is probably the most manageable section of that, representing only 200 GB of data; and will probably be the first section to be sent into their care.

Thanks,
Doug Logan

Chief Executive Officer
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:48 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Interview request/
Importance: High

Doug Logan/ Rod Thomson:

Last week, I sought your comment on an analysis of the ballot hand count authored by “The Audit Guys.” I am reaching out today regarding a new report on the Cyber Ninjas’ audit findings, this time authored by California election auditor Ray Lutz.

I am happy to make Lutz’s report available to you. But I wanted to draw your attention to his core observations. The first: That the Cyber Ninjas reported different totals for races on the same ballot, which Lutz says raises significant questions about your methodologies. Here is the language from his report:

It is interesting to note the somewhat embarrassing reality that the audit did not have the same number of ballots between the two contests being reviewed, the Presidential contest and the Senate contest, losing about 263 ballots in the Senate contest. This does not inspire a great deal of confidence in the hand count, because those ballots were counted at the same time and should have been exactly the same number. It does however speak to the beneficial transparency of the reported result that exposes an internally recorded discrepancy.

Presidential Contest					
	Trump	Biden	Jorgenson	Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	995,404	1,040,873	31,501	20,791	2,088,569
County Canvass	995,665	1,040,774	31,705	21,419	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(261)	99	(204)	(628)	(994)
Senate Contest					
	McSally	Kelly		Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	983,662	1,064,336		40,398	2,088,306
County Canvass		1,064,396		40964	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(541)	(60)		(566)	(1,167)
Machine Paper Ballot Count (Pullen Report)					2,089,442
Machine Ballot Count - Canvass					(121)

As always, I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this issue and other issues Lutz raises before we publish a story about his findings. Is there an explanation for the different totals of ballots counted in the two races? Should that call into question other information raised in your Sept. 24 report to the Senate? Is Lutz wrong to focus on this?

In another section of the report, Lutz seizes on the lack of data offered by the Cyber Ninjas in regard to tally sheets, which he describes as key to any audit:

What We Expected and Did Not Find

This audit was touted as a "forensic" audit, apparently meaning it is in-depth and considers all evidence including physically collected evidence. Merriam-Webster defines "Forensic" as relating to or dealing with the application of scientific knowledge to legal problems.

We expected that the audit would compare, batch to batch, for all 10,341 batches, the vote totals for each of the contest options being audited. The Dominion Voting System designates each ballot processed with a tabulator number, batch number and offset in the batch. Vote counts per candidate for each batch can be easily subtotaled directly from the cast-vote record (CVR) file, and then compared to a hand tally. The audit did not provide any result of such a comparison to the public.

For example, we have a spreadsheet of all the totals of all batches which was derived from the CVR file, and their corresponding pallet and box. The following snippet shows two boxes, each containing 7 batches of about 200 ballots each. It provides the vote counts for each candidate and each batch. These totals should be comparable to the totals from the hand tally. But neither the hand tally sheets nor master spreadsheet were provided and therefore we cannot perform the comparison.

batchid	Blue Sheet	scanner	EV batch	Pallet	Box #	President				Trump	Biden	Jorg.	Senate			McSally	Kelly		
						ballots	votes	writes	ov				uv	votes	writes			ov	uv
03001_00001	102020 p3	H1	265	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	195	0	2	2	79	114	2	197	0	0	2	82	115
03001_00002	102020 p3	H1	237	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	200	0	0	0	64	135	1	198	0	0	2	61	137
03001_00003	102020 p3	H1	305	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	197	0	1	2	83	110	4	200	0	0	0	80	120
03001_00004	102020 p3	H1	244	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	198	0	2	0	82	115	1	197	0	0	3	80	117
03001_00005	102020 p3	H1	243	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	199	1	0	0	87	110	1	198	0	0	1	85	113
03001_00006	102020 p3	H1	333	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	198	0	1	0	78	120	0	197	0	0	2	79	118
03001_00007	102020 p3	H1	292	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	196	0	2	1	84	112	0	197	0	0	2	83	114
03001_00008	102020 p3	H1	219	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	11	189	0	200	0	0	0	11	189
03001_00009	102020 p3	H1	309	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	0	0	1	84	112	3	197	2	0	3	81	114
03001_00010	102020 p3	H1	236	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	196	1	1	2	62	127	6	199	1	0	0	66	132
03001_00011	102020 p3	H1	279	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	2	0	1	49	147	1	196	0	0	4	49	147
03001_00012	102020 p3	H1	245	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	59	139	2	198	0	0	2	58	140
03001_00013	102020 p3	H1	288	27	EVH1/10-20/219	198	195	1	1	2	69	121	4	196	1	0	2	65	130
03001_00014	102020 p3	H1	210	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	199	0	0	0	49	150	0	198	0	0	1	48	150

Lutz goes on to say:

The tally sheets and the reconciliation spreadsheet should be published immediately.

The report of the hand count provides very little detail. But assuming the aggregate sum of the hand count is as stated, we learn of no evidence that the voting machines nor the election management system was hacked. The report does not establish any indication of electronic intrusion or electronic hacking to modify the tabulation, but even if such an intrusion were documented, it is doubtful that such an intrusion would alter the paper ballots. This is an expected benefit of a substantive hand count of paper ballots. Even if concerns remain from an election quality and procedural compliance standpoint, including the complex topic of eligibility, these issues can't change the outcome of the tabulation itself as documented by the paper ballot record.

Can you please address his assessment? Can you explain why these sheets do or do not matter in your opinion?

Because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need your response within the next 24 hours. I appreciate your attention to this. I can be reached at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Anglen, Robert
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:24 AM
To: dlogan@cyberninjas.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Interview request/ analysis calls hand count 'fiction'
Importance: High

Mr. Logan:

Following up on my phone call last night, I wanted to provide you copies of a report by election data analysts Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen. They have conducted an analysis based on data in the Senate's audit report that they say calls into question the hand count of Maricopa County ballots conducted by Cyber Ninjas.

The report says it found a nearly 16K discrepancy in one pallet between the hand count and the machine count of ballots. They use the word "fiction" to describe your work.

I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this report. I can be reached today at 602-316-8395. I do need to hear back from you today.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Natalie McLaughlin](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: 2020 General Canvass SOS
Date: Friday, August 06, 2021 10:40:47 PM
Attachments: [2020 General State Canvass.pdf](#)

blob:https://mail.protonmail.com/d0f145e3-094e-47e9-b7f6-774827e97654

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Ortega, Bob](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Additional query, CNN
Date: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 7:30:17 PM

Mr. Logan – Following up my other questions:

In a promotional video for “The Deep Rig,” (now removed for violating YouTube’s community standards), an anonymous cybersecurity expert says “If we don’t fix our election integrity now, we may no longer have a democracy.”

As I’m sure you know, several local reporters who saw the video around June 3 immediately identified the voice as being yours.

Is that your voice?

Thanks,

Bob Ortega
Senior writer
CNN Investigates
480-820-5046 (Office)
323-646-2693 (Cell)
Twitter: @Bob_Ortega

From: [Internal Audit Services](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Internal Audit Services](#)
Subject: Arizona Audit
Date: Friday, June 11, 2021 3:49:27 PM

Hi Doug,

Big Congrats as you get close to finishing the count of the the last pallet.

If there is anyway that you can include me in the paper examination forensics I would surely appreciate it.

Having been there at the start as a Pod Manager, I would love to be a part at the end in the paper examination forensics, and if not please remember me when you contract with other states. Premature Big congrats on that too as I am sure it will happen for you.

Frankly speaking Doug, have you seen the movie Patton with George C Scott?

Well, I'm not being dramatic but I am patriotic having been captured in Iraq doing what I do, I feel just like the general in the movie.

I am at the right place, at the right time in history, with the right credentials, knowing the right people and I am side lined watching history being made and not part of it.

Doug, if there is anyway, please, get me back in this before it's over.

It is so important to me personally, professionally and patriotically. I know we are not specifically looking for fraud, I understand that, but as a forensic fraud examiner, (if) it is discovered in your final report I want to be able to say I was there, contributed, as this could be the biggest thing in US history that will never happen again in our lives.

Doug, please any consideration to this would be greatly appreciated.

I prayed to God and He told me, in mind and heart, to reach out to you.

Speaking of God, a very close friend of mine passed away in Jacksonville, Florida at the beginning of the week.

Please keep him in your daily prayers: Master Chief Sam Goble, USN Ret. Thanks

Doug, I don't beg but this is too important to me not to ask you personally about the paper examination forensics. Please.

Thanks for any consideration.

Looking forward to hearing back from you.

John

M-561-602-0571 (Direct)*

Ps don't work my GC, Scott Sigman to hard. I see he's grown a beard. He wants to look like me!! Hahaha

John Capizzi, CFE
President & CEO
Internal Audit Services, Inc., Int'l.
Palm Beach: 561-626-7746
Phila: 215-745-1529
www.internalauditservices.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Internal Audit Services](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Internal Audit Services](#); [Scott Sigman](#)
Subject: Arizona Payment per contract
Date: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 12:00:25 AM

06-15-2021

Good Evening Doug,

I reached out to you two weeks ago via text and email but I never heard back from you. Maybe I sent it to your wrong email and phone #??

I just got off a plane and saw a text message. Please be advised, my GC Sigman did not “broker a deal with Wake that would allow you to pay the contractors directly, and have that be something that you could reduce what was owed Wake.” This is above his pay grade. I went to Gene and Chris. I have been around this kind of rodeo between Prime and subcontractors in my dealings with Govt contracts involving military bases, fed bldgs. and embassies worldwide. Anyone with one rodeo under the belt could see what’s what the first week in Arizona.

I reached out to Gene first and he balked on monies outstanding that I presented to him for me and my GC. That being \$8,400 x’s 2 for me and Sigman as Pod Mgrs. I don’t have time to haggle about a difference in an amount owed per contract vs the difference of what he wanted to haggle about \$6000.00. I met him half way and dropped it to \$7,400 to keep things simple. I spend more wining and dining top clients than the difference Gene wanted to haggle about.

I reached out to Chris direct, of which he called me back immediately, and after a very cordial conversation he concurred with me to keep things simple. I asked him to send Sigman an email evidentially acknowledging this agreement. I then instructed Sigman to present this to you along with Chris’s concurrence and blessing to pay Sigman and I and deduct from monies owed.

I believe Chris had a come to the Lord moment to create an opportunity for you and he to take care of all the little people that rescued this project. The ball is in your court to do first for the people that saved this project then you, Aaron, Chris and Gene can haggle between you all.

Doug, if you don’t resolve this now honorably and quietly with contractors you will be responsible for a stain of (you can fill in the blank) that this will bestow on every American patriot that took part in allowing you to complete this endeavor.

Doug, if this is not acceptable now then our (Sigman and I) offer to reduce monies owed \$7,340.00 each is withdrawn and monies owed reverts back to \$8,400.00 per money owed per contract.

Doug, everyone stepped up for you and your associates. Now is the time for you to step up for everyone else that rescued this project for you.

If you agree, let me or Sigman know and we will provide information for Direct Deposit for our outstanding money owed for the first part of the project.

All the Best to you, Love of Country Leads,

John

M-561-602-0571

John Capizzi, CFE

President & CEO

Internal Audit Services, Inc., Int’l.

Phila: 215-745-1529

Palm Beach: 561-626-7746

www.internalauditservices.com

Facebook.com/internalauditservices

Linkedin.com/company/internal-audit-services-inc

Twitter.com/audit_inc

From: [Ruelas, Richard](#)
To: rod@thomsonpr.com; [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Arizona Republic reporter
Date: Monday, June 07, 2021 8:10:13 PM

This is Richard Ruelas, reporter for The Arizona Republic.
I am helping with a story about the QAnon conspiracy ties to the audit in Maricopa County.
Doug Logan had posted a few times about QAnon. Just seeing if there is any comment about whether Logan had followed or believed in Q. Or if any of the theories posited by Q are informing the audit.

I can be reached at the mobile number listed below.
Thank you

Richard Ruelas
reporter

azcentral | The Arizona Republic

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Office: 602-444-8473
Mobile: 602-448-5949
richard.ruelas@arizonarepublic.com
azcentral.com
Twitter: @ruelaswritings

From: [Scott](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Arizonas Maricopa County Audit, what you haven't heard, and MUCH, MUCH MORE!
Date: Monday, November 01, 2021 3:36:21 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Arizona 2020 Forensic Audit - The Rest of The Story.pdf](#)

Arizona's 2020 Forensic Election Senate Audit, what you haven't heard, and MUCH, MUCH MORE!

The Arizona Senate chose Cyber Ninjas, a Florida company owned by Doug Logan, to conduct a complete forensic audit of the Maricopa County 2020 election. This audit consisted of counting all 2.1 million ballots cast in Maricopa County (the 4th largest county in all of the United States), forensically investigating the ballots themselves in addition to investigating the voting machines used in the election.

The MSM's sensational headlines about how Arizona's forensic audit of Maricopa County found 360 more votes for Biden than Trump has captured headlines, and the story ends there for almost every article you read. What they fail to tell you is the real meat of the findings.

WHAT DID THEY FIND? And now, for the rest of the story...

OVER 57K FRAUDULENT BALLOTS!

- There were **57,734 potentially fraudulent ballots** cast in Maricopa County for the 2020 general election. Remember, the vote difference in the 2020 election between Biden and Trump in Arizona was only 10,457 votes.
- [Link to page 5 of 96 on Volume III of Audit Report 09 24 21 with breakdown of potentially fraudulent votes](#)

MCTEC DELETED ENTIRE ELECTION!

- Fortunately, in the AZ Senate audit, a company by the name of CyFIR was contracted to investigate the hardware, machines, tabulators, etc used in the election. CyFIR found and showed that the **Maricopa County Recorder's office actually deleted the entire 2020 General election** results from their system the day before an audit and when the results were reinstalled on the system, approximately **269,000 ballot images were now corrupt and unreadable**, in addition to approximately **30,000 missing ballots!**
- [Link to 56 second video clip from Senate hearing 09 24 21 2:02:06 – 2:03:02](#)
- In addition, Patriots who had been recording and watching the publicly accessible cameras within the inside of this building were able to match time and date stamps of video with the time and date stamps of the deletions CyFIR found and actually have video that has positively identified three (3) individuals on a computer at that moment in the facility who could have deleted the election results! This info has been passed to the Attorney General of Arizona Mark Brnovich for investigation and prosecution. This is a crime and they must be held accountable.
- [Link to 89 second video clip from Senate hearing 09 24 21 1:58:55 – 2:00:24](#)

ELECTIONS MACHINES ACCESSING INTERNET!

- In the Sept. 24th hearing, CyFIR revealed and showed that not only can these ballot machines access the internet, but in Maricopa County **they did access the internet**. In the hearing, CyFIR provided the time & date stamps to prove it as well as the IP addresses of the

computers they connected to!

- [Link to 89 second video clip from Senate hearing 09 24 21 2:09:47 – 2:11:16](#)
- [Link to 57 second video clip from Senate hearing 09 24 21 2:12:00 – 2:12:57](#)

CANVASSING SHOWS UP TO 173K MISSING BALLOTS IN MARICOPA COUNTY!

- During the canvass, individuals were interviewed at their residence that were registered to vote in Maricopa County but whom the county did not record a vote. Of those interviewed, 34.23% of these people said they had actually voted in the 2020 election. **34.23 % of these residents had voted, but no vote was ever registered or recorded for them.** Their vote was missing and not counted in the election... When multiplying 34.23% by the number of registered Voters in Maricopa County that also show “not to have voted”, (505,709 people), **there is a potential 173,000 missing Votes in Maricopa County alone!** Arizona has 14 other counties.
- [Link to the full 11-page Election 2020 Grassroots Canvass Report pdf document](#)

CANVASSING SHOWS OVER 96K GHOST VOTES IN ARIZONA!

- In addition, the Canvass found that across the state of Arizona an **estimated 96,389 mail-in votes were Ghost Votes!** These are votes that were cast under the names of registered voters who were either unknown to the residents of the registered address or who were verified as having moved away before October 2020.
- [Link to the full 11-page Election 2020 Grassroots Canvass Report pdf document](#)

STATE OF ARIZONA STUDY COULD NOT IDENTIFY 58% OF VOTERS AS REAL HUMANS!

- **The State of Arizona, from July 3rd to Sept 4th, 2021, researched the voter identity of 673,560 registered AZ Voters and found that they could not identify 58% or 393,017 as being real human beings.** The State found these “people” could not be identified through either an Arizona MVD driver’s license search, nor could they be identified or found under a federal search with the last 4 numbers of their Social Security #, name and date of birth.
- [Link to Jim Hoft article September 19, 2021 – 58% NO MATCH FOUND in 673,000 Voter IDs](#)

DEMOCRATS THEMSELVES TESTIFYING THAT VOTING MACHINES ARE NOT SECURE!

- Watch Democratic Senators Kamala Harris, Amy Klobuchar, Ron Wyden, and others testify how easily the voting machines can be hacked and how they can be used to alter the outcome of an election.
- [Link to 125 Second video clip montage of Democrats protesting Voting Machines & Election Fraud](#)
- [Link to 136 second video clip where Democrats & experts share Election Security concerns](#)


Election integrity is key and crucial for the 2022 & 2024 Elections. Without it we will have lost control of our Country because whoever is in power will ultimately control the votes. That is a Dictatorship, not a Constitutional Republic.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. **DOWNLOAD** & read the attached **Arizona 2020 Forensic Audit - The Rest of The Story.pdf** document and check out the links provided.
2. **FORWARD** this email to friends, family, fellow Patriots, and even those that hate our country. **As a suggestion, please use BCC (blind carbon copy) if forwarding this email and the attachment to large groups.**
3. **CONTACT** Attorney General Mark Brnovich - AGInfo@azag.gov (602) 542-5025 and request that he follow the law, do what is right, and bring those to justice that have broken the law.
4. **SUPPORT** Lastly, **it is important for everyone to know this audit is not yet fully paid. This audit was not funded by the AZ Senate who agreed to pay only \$150,000 of the total cost.**

This audit **was funded on the backs of Patriots** and cost just short of 9 million dollars to complete. Unfortunately, there is still an outstanding amount of approximately 2.1 million dollars owed to Patriots who extended themselves and their businesses to provide product and services for the Audit because they could not bear the thought of it not being completed. **Doug Logan, the owner of Cyber Ninjas** (the company chosen to run Maricopa County's audit), is ultimately responsible for paying these amounts owed to fellow Patriots. Doug has sacrificed for our country. The Patriots who extended themselves and their businesses have sacrificed for our country. This audit was not done for personal gain. **Doug's life and that of his family have been threatened repeatedly.** Doug's reputation has been and still is repeatedly attacked. His personal business lost many clients and personnel. Doug spent almost 5 months in Arizona away from his family (wife and 11 children) for most of this time. He and countless others have sacrificed to make the AZ Audit a reality. If you have the ability, **even if it's only \$25**, please do what you can to help further freedom and let's help make these Patriots whole that are still owed for their sacrifices for freedom and the Audit. **Please donate to *Voices and Votes* at the link below.** All funds donated will go directly to the Audit debt to pay off Vendors and Patriots still owed for services rendered. Please do what you can, every little bit does help.

[Link to *Voices and Votes* site for Donation](#) (Please select the *Arizona Election Audit* option as shown below)



Where do you want to donate?

- Arizona Election Audit
- Choose a Donation Focus
- General Fund Donation
- Arizona Election Audit
- Pennsylvania
- Wisconsin

America is at a crossroads right now. If our vote means nothing, we are on the slippery slope of losing all of our freedoms. We will witness our great United States of America rapidly fall to Socialism and ultimately to Communism.

Through Election Integrity and fixing the Broken Voting Process, we can ensure that our voices will be not only heard, but counted.

May God continue to bless America...



And now you know the rest of the story...

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Audit talk
Date: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 2:03:16 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Hi Doug and Ron,

We are working on a larger story about the audit. As you know, this was an unprecedented activity – not just in Arizona but for the nation. We are taking a step back and want to talk to everyone who played a part. I’m trying to get insight into the actual day to day operations of the audit. Thought I would see if you would be willing to help?

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Automatic reply: Response to analysis of hand count/ accusations of malfeasance
Date: Friday, November 19, 2021 9:38:05 PM

I'm off until Monday, Nov. 22. Other editors and reporters are around to help. Contact info here: <https://www.azcentral.com/contact/staff/>. Please send news releases and story tips to newstips@arizonarepublic.com.

From: [John Dooley / Pinnacle Productions](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: AZ. Audit Recap Final Cut
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 12:08:57 AM

Here you go Doug.

[https://www.dropbox.com/s/cal6dyzpmt4elqq/AZ.%20Audit%20Recap%20Final%20Cut.mp4?
dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/cal6dyzpmt4elqq/AZ.%20Audit%20Recap%20Final%20Cut.mp4?dl=0)

John Dooley
Pinnacle Productions
O.480-538-5429
C.602-538-5429

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Shiva Ayyadurai](#); [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Ballot envelope analysis
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 6:41:15 PM

I was still hoping to get a response to some questions I have about the early ballot envelope analysis portion of the audit.

Dr. Ayyadurai, there were three slides you presented to Karen Fann and Warren Petersen which you described as blank or likely blank. The signature field on those three images (pages 96, 100 and 101 of your [presentation](#)) was blank. But parts of signatures can clearly be seen on the line directly below the signature field, which is for the voter's phone number, despite the redactions of those lines. And despite the fact that there are clearly signatures behind the redaction box, the box is labeled "phone number." I have attached all three of these images.

Why did you not tell Sens. Fann and Petersen that there were, in fact, signatures on those envelopes? And why did you label those redactions as phone numbers, despite portions of signatures being clearly visible outside the boundaries of those redaction boxes?

This is an extremely serious issue, and calls into credibility everything that you said in your presentation. It's difficult to reach any conclusion other than that you were intentionally untruthful in your testimony and in your report. This would call into question everything you said, and frankly, everything the entire audit team said.

To Doug Logan, can you explain this discrepancy? Will you vouch for Dr. Ayyadurai's work, despite this?

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Karen](#)
To: [Karen Fann](#)
Cc: [Randy Pullen](#); [Douglas Logan](#); [Ken Bennett](#)
Subject: Beyond bamboo and watermarks: The unconventional ways Arizona election auditors are searching for fraud - from The Arizona Republic
Date: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 9:49:23 AM

In this mornings paper

Beyond bamboo and watermarks: The unconventional ways Arizona election auditors are searching for fraud

As the recount wraps up, the focus has shifted to ballot inspection. So what are auditors looking at beyond bamboo and watermarks?

Check out this story on azcentral.com: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2021/06/15/how-arizona-election-auditors-inspecting-maricopa-ballots/7643248002/>

Sent from my iPad

Create invoices, track expenses and collaborate on projects with FreshBooks. [Get Started.](#)



[View Your Estimate](#)

Butcher Block Catering sent you an estimate (0000008)

Butcher Block Catering

From:
To:
Subject:
Date:

[Butcher Block Catering via FreshBooks](#)
[Douglas Logan](#)

Butcher Block Catering has sent you an estimate (0000008)
Monday, June 14, 2021 9:14:21 PM

AZ-SEN-21-0466, 21-0473, 21-0477, 21-0480, 21-0481-Q,
21-0472, 21-0476-Q, 21-0465, 21-0468, 21-0469-T, 21-0640-U-000027

Create invoices, track expenses and collaborate on projects with FreshBooks. [Get Started.](#)



[View Your Estimate](#)

Butcher Block Catering sent you an estimate (0000009)

Butcher Block Catering

From:
To:
Subject:
Date:

[Butcher Block Catering via FreshBooks](#)
[Douglas Logan](#)

Butcher Block Catering has sent you an estimate (0000009)
Monday, June 21, 2021 10:05:21 AM

AZ-SEN-21-0466, 21-0473, 21-0477, 21-0480, 21-0481-Q,
21-0472, 21-0476-Q, 21-0465, 21-0468, 21-0469-T, 21-0640-U-000029

Create invoices, track expenses and collaborate on projects with FreshBooks. [Get Started.](#)



[View Your Estimate](#)

Butcher Block Catering sent you an estimate (0000007)

Butcher Block Catering

From:

[Butcher Block Catering via FreshBooks](#)

Subject:

Butcher Block Catering has sent you an estimate (0000007)

Date:

Saturday, June 05, 2021 4:52:19 PM

AZ-SEN-21-0466, 21-0473, 21-0477, 21-0480, 21-0481-Q, 21-0472, 21-0476-Q, 21-0465, 21-0468, 21-0469-T, 21-0640-U-000031

Create invoices, track expenses and collaborate on projects with FreshBooks. [Get Started.](#)



[View Your Estimate](#)

Butcher Block Catering sent you an estimate (0000005)

Butcher Block Catering

From:
To:
Subject:
Date:

[Butcher Block Catering via FreshBooks](#)
[Douglas Logan](#)

Butcher Block Catering has sent you an estimate (0000005)
Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:02:45 PM

AZ-SEN-21-0466, 21-0473, 21-0477, 21-0480, 21-0481-Q,
21-0472, 21-0476-Q, 21-0465, 21-0468, 21-0469-T, 21-0640-U-000033

From: [Ortega, Bob](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: CNN Interview request
Date: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 3:16:03 PM

I'm a reporter at CNN, working on a story related to you and your company's involvement in the Arizona Senate audit. I'm writing to request an interview, on camera if you are willing. If possible, I'd like to do the interview in person (I am in Phoenix). However, if you prefer a phone interview, that's fine too.

Failing that, could you help me with the following questions:

1. Have you been asked by lawmakers or others, based on your work in Arizona, to perform similar audits of the 2020 election in any other states? Are you engaged in any such discussions?
2. In your press conference on April 22, you said, regarding the sources of private funds for the Arizona audit, "I did not want to know; I don't want to be influenced." Who is accounting for funds received and expended by your company and subcontractors for the audit?
3. Do you plan to say how much money private donors have provided to Cyber Ninjas and its subcontractors for the audit in Arizona? And how much Cyber Ninjas and its subcontractors have spent on the audit, beyond the \$150,000 committed by the Arizona Senate? If so, when? If not, why not?
4. On April 11, 2020, Cyber Ninjas took a \$98,322 Covid relief, or PPP loan (loan number 3296437105). In its loan application, the company said it had five employees. Is that correct? Not counting temporary contract workers or consultants, how many full-time employees does Cyber Ninjas have now? Are any of them, besides you, based in Sarasota?
5. On May 28, replying to an email query from my colleague Stephanie Becker, your spokesman, Rod Thomson, wrote that "Mr. Logan recognizes President Biden's results were certified and accepted in accordance with the Constitution. Mr. Logan remains committed to restoring integrity and trust into our election system, which he is demonstrating through the work he is performing here in Maricopa County." Do you disclaim, or still believe, the allegations you made in the document titled "Election Fraud Facts & Details," e.g., that "massive fraud occurred" in the 2020 presidential election, particularly in Fulton and DeKalb counties; that Dominion Voting System's core software originates from intellectual property of Smartmatic, and is linked to Venezuela's Hugo Chavez; and that Dominion's voting software is controlled, through USB Securities, by entities in the People's Republic of China, among other allegations?
6. In its 2020 loan application, and in a previous federal contract, Cyber Ninjas listed its address as 2831 Ringling Boulevard, #121F, Sarasota, FL 34237. This appears to be an apartment in a residential apartment complex. Your contract with the Arizona Senate lists the address for your Legal Department as 5077 Fruitville Road, Suite 109-421, Sarasota, FL 34232. That's a PO box at a UPS store. Does Cyber Ninjas actually have a

physical office address? If so, what is it?

7. Did you reach out to Sen. Karen Fann, or did she reach out to you about doing the audit? Did you submit a formal bid, and if so, on what date?
8. How would you describe your role in reviewing the vote in Antrim County? Can you point to any previous experience with election auditing?

Thanks and regards,

Bob Ortega
Senior writer
CNN Investigates
480-820-5046 (Office)
323-646-2693 (Cell)
Twitter: @Bob_Ortega

From: [Ortega, Bob](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: CNN interview request
Date: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 11:23:11 AM

Hi, Mr. Logan.

I'm a reporter for CNN, working on a story related to the Arizona audit, the non-payment by the Arizona Senate, the ongoing public-records dispute, and your reported decision to shutter Cyber Ninjas as a company.

Could I speak with you about the situation? Could you please let me know the best time and number to reach you, or call me at your convenience on my cell, 323-646-2693?

Thanks very much,

Bob

Bob Ortega
Senior writer
CNN Investigates
480-820-5046 (Office)
323-646-2693 (Cell)
Twitter: @Bob_Ortega

From: [Ortega, Bob](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: CNN query about USAC contract
Date: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 6:37:19 PM

Hi, Mr. Logan.

I'm told that Cyber Ninjas recently lost a contract with the United Services Administration Company, and that you believe that the termination is connected, improperly, to the work you are doing for the Arizona Senate audit.

Is this correct? Could I speak with you about that? If you don't wish to do an interview, but you have any comments to share about the termination and why you think it may be tied to the audit, I'd be happy to present your viewpoint in my next reporting. I'm not on deadline for today, but I would need a response tomorrow, if possible, which would be the same as for the other queries I've sent you these past two days.

Thanks and regards,

Bob

Bob Ortega
Senior writer
CNN Investigates
480-820-5046 (Office)
323-646-2693 (Cell)
Twitter: @Bob_Ortega

From: [Howard, Hope](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Simpson, Jennifer](#); [Howard, Hope](#)
Subject: CNN Request // Doug Logan
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 1:01:52 PM

Hello Mr. Logan,

I hope you are well.

CNN's Jake Tapper is doing a comprehensive, one-hour documentary examining the 2020 presidential election. We are looking into how President Trump's messaging around the voting process may have impacted the results of the election. It's currently scheduled to air in primetime on November 5th.

Jake is eager to include some of President Trump's supporters in his program. He specifically asked to include you in the program and requested that I reach out to you to see if you'd be available to do an interview. Any guidance regarding this request is greatly appreciated. Please let me know if I can answer any questions via phone or at the email below.

Warmest regards,

HOPE HOWARD

CNN Network Bookings Coordinator | **CNN**
M 917.288.7024 | hope.howard@cnn.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: coin
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:48:45 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Can you also please let me know who made and distributed this coin? And who/how many people received it?

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Hansen, Ronald](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Comment on the Democrats' request for documents in Congress
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 5:20:30 PM

Doug:

I'm a reporter with the Arizona Republic. I'm writing about the request from the House Oversight Committee today for documents from your company, and the characterization of you by the committee's chairwoman.

Give me a call or send me a statement on the matter today please. You can reach me at this email and on my cell at 602-471-6622.

Thanks.

rjh

Ronald J. Hansen
National Political Reporter

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602-471-6622
Office: 602-444-4493

ronald.hansen@arizonarepublic.com
[@ronaldjhansen](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Funke, Daniel](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Comment request from USA TODAY (Deadline: July 28 at 12 p..m. ET)
Date: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 5:22:56 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug,

I hope you're doing well. I'm a reporter for USA TODAY and I'm reaching out for a comment for a fact check I'm writing about the ongoing Arizona election audit.

I'm fact-checking the claim that the audit has found 275,000 potential fraudulent ballots in Maricopa County. This claim comes from Liz Harrington, a Trump spokesperson who said it on Fox News. The clip has since circulated on social media: <https://www.instagram.com/p/CR0D1den3qw/>

My question for you: Has the audit produced any evidence to suggest this claim is accurate? Where do you think Harrington may have got the 275,000 figure? Is there any additional information you think would be useful for my fact check?

I expect to file this article tomorrow at 12 p.m. ET. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks so much!



Daniel Funke
Fact Check Reporter
dfunke@usatoday.com
(813) 364-4369

From: [Funke, Daniel](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Comment request from USA TODAY
Date: Friday, July 16, 2021 5:15:16 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug,

I hope you're doing well. I'm a reporter for USA TODAY and I'm reaching out for a comment for a fact check I'm writing related to one of your recent statements.

I'm fact-checking the claim that more than 70,000 mail-in ballots counted in Maricopa County, Arizona, were never sent out. I believe you made this claim during a July 15 briefing at the Arizona Senate.

Maricopa County officials have debunked this claim here:
<https://twitter.com/maricopacounty/status/1415834655752740865>

Would you care to comment for my story, or provide additional evidence? My deadline is tomorrow at 12 p.m. ET.

Thanks!



Daniel Funke
Fact Check Reporter
dfunke@usatoday.com
(813) 364-4369

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Friday, November 05, 2021 7:57:04 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Ortega, Bob](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Cyber Ninjas business address
Date: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 11:56:24 AM

Dear Mr. Logan and Mr. Thomson,
Regarding the query I sent you yesterday about Cyber Ninjas' address at 2831 Ringling Boulevard, in Sarasota. The sale sheet shows that they sold the office in December 2020, and that space is now empty.

Does Cyber Ninjas actually have a new office address? If so, could you tell me what it is?

Thanks and regards,
Bob

Bob Ortega
Senior writer
CNN Investigates
480-820-5046 (Office)
323-646-2693 (Cell)
Twitter: @Bob_Ortega

From: [Karen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Ken Bennett](#); [Randy Pullen](#)
Subject: Cyber Ninjas play by an alarmingly different set of election audit rules - from The Arizona Republic
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2021 10:26:49 AM

Cyber Ninjas play by an alarmingly different set of election audit rules

Compare the rules we in Maricopa County follow on election audits to those the Cyber Ninjas are using. We all should be skeptical of their findings.

Check out this story on azcentral.com: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/2021/07/11/cyber-ninjas-play-different-election-audit-rules-than-maricopa-county/7904069002/>

Sent from my iPad

From: [Thomas Potter](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: daniel.dale@cnn.com; tara.subramaniam@cnn.com; kelli.ward@azgop.org; kfann@azleg.gov; WPetersen@azleg.gov; clint.hickman@maricopa.gov; bill.gates@maricopa.gov; jack.sellers@maricopa.gov; steve.chucri@maricopa.gov; steve.gallardo@maricopa.gov; sidney@federalappeals.com; khobbs@azsos.gov; partners@electionsgroup.com; howard@kleinhendler.com; garrett.archer@abc15.com
Subject: Dead Man Walking
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 10:26:54 AM

Dear Mr. Logan,

Have you ever heard the metaphorical phrase "Dead man walking"?

After reading this news article, it has become perfectly clear what your true intentions are.

<https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/18/politics/fact-check-maricopa-audit-arizona-cyber-ninjas-74000/index.html>

Your "audit" has been revealed as a haphazard attempt to cloud the 2020 election results for Arizona's most populous county in doubt by blowing up totally normal election activity and misreading numbers to falsely insinuate impropriety.

The public has no idea who's paying for your "audit" and who the 1,500 volunteers and 200 paid staff who conducted the "audit" were, but we do know trumpsters have been fundraising for it and that it's being helmed by a conspiracy theorist.

Your ultimate game plan appears to be insinuating fraud without actually proving anything.

This ploy is straight out of Sidney Powell's playbook: Drop dozens of disproven or easily disprovable charges into a report, claim there is a massive cover-up of election fraud, and wave your hands at the big picture even as the charges are easily shown, one by one, to be lies and distortions.

Making hollow claims of being 'beyond reproach' IS vile and evil in and of itself!

Is threatening democracy worth the money you made performing this sham "audit"?

Nazism did not start out in genocide. It began with militias and violent troops disrupting democracy. It's imperative that fascists maintain control of their "Big Lie" propaganda narrative.

Why are you terrorizing the good citizens of this country by participating in this narrative?

Sincerely,
Thomas Potter
Grafton, Ohio

PS In the past 6 months, 99.5% of COVID-19 deaths have been from unvaccinated people.

Being involved in forensic investigations you may be interested in this study too.

ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN GOVERNOR POLITICAL AFFILIATION AND COVID-19

CASES, DEATHS, AND TESTING IN THE UNITED STATES

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7587838>



From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Depreciation costs
Date: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 3:39:55 PM

I saw that you listed \$1.2 million in "depreciation costs" for equipment used in the audit. What equipment does that pertain to? And to whom were those costs paid? That line item is certainly raising a lot of eyebrows today.

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Andrew Stavro](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: diagrams
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2021 10:06:19 PM
Attachments: [Floor Diagram_r7.pdf](#)
[Green Building_r1.pdf](#)
[Floorplan_r8.pdf](#)

Doug,

These are the most relevant drawings.

Andy Stavro / [480.586.6121](tel:480.586.6121) / [Road Dog Show Pros, LLC](#)


From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Todd Sanders](#)
Subject: Douglas Logan shared the folder "Expenses" with you.
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 2:44:56 PM
Attachments: [AttachedImage](#)
[AttachedImage](#)
[AttachedImage](#)




Douglas Logan shared a folder with you

Here's the folder that Douglas Logan shared with you.

 Expenses

 This link only works for the direct recipients of this message.

Open



[Privacy Statement](#)

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Todd Sanders](#)
Subject: Douglas Logan shared the folder "WAKE STUFF" with you.
Date: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 6:59:08 PM
Attachments: [AttachedImage](#)
[AttachedImage](#)
[AttachedImage](#)



Douglas Logan shared a folder with you

Here's the folder that Douglas Logan shared with you.

 WAKE STUFF



This link only works for the direct recipients of this message.

Open



[Privacy Statement](#)

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Draft report on Gateway Pundit
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:33:38 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug and Rod,

Please see this Gateway Pundit story: https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/arizona-audit-final-report-watered-reports-cyber-ninjas-edited-damning-statements-removed-else-removed/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=PostTopSharingButtons&utm_campaign=websitesharingbuttons&fbclid=IwAR2lrsS68uh61Epg7LTrF_SCm7VpDuu4pss7SuvoN4jMwK6no2oTvCzfr4Y

And the "draft report" that Gateway Pundit says they got from Patrick Byrne, linked in the story: https://www.scribd.com/document/527331055/ExecutiveSummary-VersionFinal-092421-Draft#from_embed

The executive summary (dated 9/24) is completely different from the executive summary in the 9/22 draft report that the county received. Please let me know if Doug can verify this was indeed a version of the report at one time. And does he stand by the language here?

Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#); vashiva@echomail.com
Subject: Early ballot envelopes
Date: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 6:10:48 PM

I've got some questions about the claims that Shiva Ayyadurai made during his presentation at the Arizona Senate on Friday.

-Dr. Ayyadurai questioned why the "verified and approved" stamp appeared behind the triangle on some of the EVB envelope images. On the images, the triangles were white with black borders. But on the actual envelopes, the triangle is solid black. According to the Maricopa County Elections Department and to Runbeck Election Services, which prints and scans those envelopes, this is due to binary scanning, which hollows out the coloring inside of those borders to create smaller files and save space on the computers, which is why the stamp doesn't appear within those triangles. Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware of this, and if not, why not?

-Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware that the triangles on the paper envelopes are solid black? If so, why didn't he mention this in his report or his presentation? If not, why not?

-Dr. Ayyadurai questioned why only 10% of early ballot envelopes had "verified and approved" stamps. According to county election officials and others who have worked in the elections department, only signatures that are flagged for additional verification or "curing" end up with those stamps. Most signatures are verified through digital images, which doesn't require election workers to ever see or touch the physical envelopes. Only if there are questions do they actually inspect the paper envelope. And the reason there's a disproportionate number of stamps after Nov. 3 is that the county hired additional people and put additional resources into signature curing, which is legally permitted for five days after the election. Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware of any of this?

-Dr. Shiva flagged signatures that he described as "scribbles" and questioned why they were verified. Signature verification does not, however, depend on legibility of the signature. It depends on whether the signature matches other signatures that the elections department has on file for each voter. And if any signature, scribble or otherwise, doesn't match the signature on file for that voter, elections workers contact that voter to verify the signature. Was Dr. Shiva familiar with or aware of this process when he conducted his evaluation?

-Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware that if an envelope doesn't have a signature, election officials contact the voter to give them an opportunity to sign? Was he aware of how the envelope duplication process works?

To be perfectly frank, Dr. Ayyadurai seems to have not only had no knowledge of how the signature verification process works or what the processes and procedures Maricopa County uses regarding EVBs, he does not appear to have made any effort whatsoever to find out. Runbeck tells me that Dr. Ayyadurai never reached out to the company with any questions. What, if any, efforts did Dr. Ayyadurai take to answer the questions he raised or to familiarize himself with the laws, processes and procedures pertaining to EVBs?

I plan to publish my story around 3p.m. on Thursday (Arizona time).

--

Jeremy Duda

Arizona Mirror

Associate editor

Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Early ballots
Date: Friday, July 16, 2021 12:40:11 PM

Mr. Logan, Maricopa County says your claim that there were more than 74,243 more early ballots counted than sent is due to the fact that many of those early ballots were cast at in-person early voting locations, where ballots are printed on demand for voters. The county essentially says that you don't understand election procedures, and that's leading you to falsely describe commonplace occurrences as suspicious. What's your response? Did that figure take into account the early ballots that were cast in-person at early voting centers?

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Eric Richardson in Teams](#)
To: [Sara Metz](#)
Subject: Eric sent a message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:29:23 PM
Attachments: [ATT00002.png](#)
[ATT00003.png](#)

Hi,

Your teammates are trying to reach you in **Microsoft Teams**.

Eric sent a message in Everyone

reverse shell or bidirectional through anydesk is the winner

[Reply in Teams](#)

Install Microsoft Teams now



iOS



Android

This email was sent from an unmonitored mailbox. Update your email preferences in Teams. [Profile picture](#) > [Settings](#) > [Notifications](#).

© 2019 Microsoft Corporation, One Microsoft Way, Redmond WA 98052-7329
Read our [privacy policy](#)

Microsoft



From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Final Manifest
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 4:31:14 PM
Attachments: [FINAL Manifest All Rows.xlsx](#)

The attached file has all of the pallets and no empty batch fields. I believe this is an accurate representation of the manifests.

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Andrew Stavro](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Field: Camera outage
Date: Friday, June 11, 2021 4:37:24 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot](#)

Update below.

Sent from 480.586.6121


Begin forwarded message:

From: Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@herringnetwork.com>
Date: June 11, 2021 at 1:09:40 PM PDT
To: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroaddog.com>
Subject: RE: Camera outage

Thanks, yeah it is looking like a hiccup some place between the user/CDN Edge and possibly the origin.


Looking at the inbound data usage on the server it clearly started dropping off at around 00:30 and comes back 30min later. This is looking like a partial network outage on the path between the CDN and the origin server. I'll see if I can track it down further to what it specifically was. My guess is the issue was between the CDN origin shield and the origin server but if the issue happened in route i.e. not on either the edgecast network or the datacenter side we may never know exactly where it failed.

[Try out the new interface](#)



Aaron

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroaddog.com>
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 11:54 AM
To: Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@HerringNetwork.com>
Subject: Re: Camera outage



Sent from 480.586.6121

On Jun 11, 2021, at 11:36 AM, Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@herringnetwork.com> wrote:

Do we know exactly what was reported as being down. I.E. the streams or the site itself.

I did just come across this alert in my emails from the CDN this number of 500 errors typically means there was some sort of issue and it came in around 12:30am local. It may be related to the what you are reporting or not. I cannot get the detailed logging for today until tomorrow so I can look into this more on Monday to see what specific error code this was and on what origin it is possible the error here was on a different origin source and had nothing to do with the streams for the audit.

The alert condition is: Status Code : 5XX per second > 10
 The current value of Status Code : 5XX per second is 180.55
 The alert is generated on: Condition Start
 The alert condition has been present for the past 5 minutes

Aaron

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroaddog.com>
 Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 10:49 AM
 To: Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@HerringNetwork.com>
 Subject: Re: Camera outage

Between 12:30am and 1am. We checked you DVR and that looked fine. Wondering if it was an issue with the url.

Sent from 480.586.6121

On Jun 11, 2021, at 9:56 AM, Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@herringnetwork.com> wrote:

Do you know what time they went down I can check the DVR logs to see if anything was recorded or not during that time.

Aaron

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroaddog.com>
 Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 6:56 AM
 To: Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@HerringNetwork.com>

Subject: Camera outage

Aaron,

I just heard all the cameras went down for an hour last night, we are looking into it on our end, but wanted to see if you saw anything on your end.

Sent from 480.586.6121

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-25 08:32:40 - New submission from Contact from the IP 172.58.45.197
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:40:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 12:27 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-25 08:32:40 - New submission from Contact from the IP 172.58.45.197

First & Last Name

Charles Cansler

Email

chuck@uscontrols.net

Phone

(239) 687-8677

Company Name

US CONTROLS LLC

Which service are you in?

General Consulting

Message

Good day,
I'm a software engineer. i would like to help with finding the fraud with the voting machines.

thank you

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-26 19:19:12 - New submission from Contact from the IP 74.67.45.41
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:41:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 12:18 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-26 19:19:12 - New submission from Contact from the IP 74.67.45.41

First & Last Name

M GM

Email

studguinea@hotmail.com

Phone

(000) 000-0000

Company Name

N/A - former military and crim investigator

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

Greetings. I emailed your staff a month ago and no one got back to me. I am a federal retiree and former criminal investigator for a federal LEA(resigned 2011). Today, I am a forensic psychologist (PhD) and a second year law student (2L, JD 2023). I had contacted your organization regarding participation in your forensic audit as a volunteer. I have been in a position of VERY high public trust (also had a TS-SCI, if that gives you a better picture of the caliber of work I have performed). I realize you guys have already started, but I'd like to fly out to Phoenix and give you guys a hand. Will provide all contact info and those who can vet my creds upon request, though I must be in contact with executive leadership in order to do so. I hope to speak with you soon

Thank you.

MGM

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-26 19:32:40 - New submission from Contact from the IP 67.160.38.174
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:41:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 12:18 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-26 19:32:40 - New submission from Contact from the IP 67.160.38.174

First & Last Name

Mark Liptrap

Email

Mark_liptrap@msn.com

Phone

(509) 467-3860

Company Name

Spur Aviation

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

I am retired Fed Ex Captain and want to volunteer in the Arizona Audit. Can you use any extra help? I'm free next week for about two weeks before fire season starts. I may have to cover a contract at Show Low. I can carry beer, pizza and I was a professional window washer in high school and college. Give me a call if you want some help. 509-467-3860

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-27 01:11:41 - New submission from Contact from the IP 207.171.251.122
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:41:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 12:15 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-27 01:11:41 - New submission from Contact from the IP 207.171.251.122

First & Last Name

Ben LaFontaine

Email

ben@rubiconprotection.com

Phone

(360) 560-6966

Company Name

Rubicon Protection

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

We provide security services in the State of Arizona. If your personnel need security for the audit we would love to help.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-27 21:24:18 - New submission from Contact from the IP 98.165.152.58
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:41:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 6:56 AM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-27 21:24:18 - New submission from Contact from the IP 98.165.152.58

First & Last Name

Aaron Bini

Email

aabini@gmail.com

Phone

(415) 606-2464

Company Name

ADP

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

Are there any open positions in Arizona I can apply for?

I am wondering if my either my background in team management or HR can be useful to the company right now. I'm very interested and look forward to hearing back?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-28 00:02:04 - New submission from Contact from the IP 84.17.45.250
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:41:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 11:53 AM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-28 00:02:04 - New submission from Contact from the IP 84.17.45.250

First & Last Name

Michele Morrison

Email

mmorrison@valorsearch.com

Phone

(480) 273-7579

Company Name

[N/A] Valor Executive Search

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

Good Afternoon,

I am a Maricopa County resident available to offer volunteer hours towards the Arizona Audit. By trade, I'm a recruiter / "headhunter". As far as software & computer skills, I'm versed in extensive Boolean-type internet research and I test advanced to expert on your basic office software applications (Powerpoint, Excel, and many more). My background also includes *some* digital marketing & analytics.

I only list the above, should you have a need for any of these skills on your team.

I saw that you are all set for volunteers for now, but was hoping that you could "keep me on the bench". Also, if you are in a position where you may need a slate of future volunteers for this audit, this is a place where you might make use of my volunteer time.

Normally, I'd reach out through LinkedIn (aka Microsoft), but I am aware that Big Tech might be creating hurdles for our Arizona audit. Thus, I thought it best to reach out via your email form.

If you'd like to glance at my background it is here: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/michmor/>

I am ever so hopeful that this audit remains on track. And, I'd love to contribute towards this effort if you can make use of my time.

Many Thanks,
Michele Morrison
480.273.7579 [text or phone]
mmorrison@valorsearch.com

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-29 06:46:55 - New submission from Contact from the IP 68.104.203.99
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:42:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 11:22 AM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-29 06:46:55 - New submission from Contact from the IP 68.104.203.99

First & Last Name

Meaghan Streufert

Email

Meaghan@streufert.com

Phone

(480) 816-9694

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

I would like to know how I can help with the Maricopa audit. I live in Arizona. I have searched the internet and can't find information on how I can help. The live video feed makes it appear that you are understaffed.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-29 09:07:56 - New submission from Contact from the IP 146.184.0.84
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:42:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 11:22 AM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-29 09:07:56 - New submission from Contact from the IP 146.184.0.84

First & Last Name

Greg Seay

Email

gregseay45@yahoo.com

Phone

(480) 227-4535

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

I was involved with the sale of the HP inkjet web presses that Maricopa County used for printing their ballots @ Runbeck Election services.
The HP Inkjet press uses latex inks that require large dryers to dry the ink when printed.
To accurately test the Maricopa ballot for authenticity, the ink on the ballots need to be wetted to see if the ink reactivates or runs.
Hp knows that HP Latex inks do not like water once they have been printed.

I am providing you this information as a possible method to check for ballot authenticity

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-30 07:07:06 - New submission from Contact from the IP 72.216.169.110
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:41:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 6:34 AM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-30 07:07:06 - New submission from Contact from the IP 72.216.169.110

First & Last Name

keith larvick

Email

klarvick@gmail.com

Phone

(602) 503-9697

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

Hello,
I live in Phoenix and I am interested in volunteering on the weekends to help with the Audit. I have worked with the city of Phoenix as a Voter Registerer and 100% believe in the election process. If I can be of any assistance please feel free to contact me at Klarvick@gmail.com or 602-503-9697
Hope I can help! I know you are on a time crunch!
Keith Larvick

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: Motra7@protonmail.com
Subject: FW: 2021-04-30 21:14:42 - New submission from Contact from the IP 12.183.247.202
Date: Friday, July 09, 2021 1:40:00 PM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 12:26 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-04-30 21:14:42 - New submission from Contact from the IP 12.183.247.202

First & Last Name

Candis Ward

Email

Cward8@hotmail.com

Phone

(530) 313-8537

Company Name

Homemaker

Which service are you in?

(Free) Initial Consultation

Message

I would like to help with the Arizona Audit. I am a proud, patriotic American Citizen and feel I need to be helping in some way to verify the validity of the election. Is this a possibility? Please Contact me. If you do it by phone you will have to leave a message as my phone doesn't pick up unknown phone calls.

Thank you,
Candy Ward

From: [Sara Metz](#) on behalf of [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: FW: 2021-07-01 18:31:17 - New submission from Contact from the IP 130.176.28.73
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 3:12:00 PM

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 10:40 AM
To: rod@thomsonpr.com; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-07-01 18:31:17 - New submission from Contact from the IP 130.176.28.73

First & Last Name

Charles Davis

Email

cdavis@insider.com

Phone

(323) 620-6975

Company Name

Insider

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

I am a reporter at Insider.com. Does Cyber Ninjas have any comment on the lawsuit filed this week by The Arizona Republic seeking financial records and communications from the company?

Thanks,

Charles

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Interview request/
Date: Tuesday, October 05, 2021 7:48:37 PM

Doug Logan/ Rod Thomson:

Last week, I sought your comment on an analysis of the ballot hand count authored by “The Audit Guys.” I am reaching out today regarding a new report on the Cyber Ninjas’ audit findings, this time authored by California election auditor Ray Lutz.

I am happy to make Lutz’s report available to you. But I wanted to draw your attention to his core observations. The first: That the Cyber Ninjas reported different totals for races on the same ballot, which Lutz says raises significant questions about your methodologies. Here is the language from his report:

It is interesting to note the somewhat embarrassing reality that the audit did not have the same number of ballots between the two contests being reviewed, the Presidential contest and the Senate contest, losing about 263 ballots in the Senate contest. This does not inspire a great deal of confidence in the hand count, because those ballots were counted at the same time and should have been exactly the same number. It does however speak to the beneficial transparency of the reported result that exposes an internally recorded discrepancy.

Presidential Contest					
	Trump	Biden	Jorgenson	Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	995,404	1,040,873	31,501	20,791	2,088,569
County Canvass	995,665	1,040,774	31,705	21,419	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(261)	99	(204)	(628)	(994)
Senate Contest					
	McSally	Kelly		Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	983,662	1,064,336		40,398	2,088,306
County Canvass		1,064,396		40964	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(541)	(60)		(566)	(1,167)
Machine Paper Ballot Count (Pullen Report)					2,089,442
Machine Ballot Count - Canvass					(121)

As always, I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this issue and other issues Lutz raises before we publish a story about his findings. Is there an explanation for the different totals of ballots counted in the two races? Should that call into question other information raised in your Sept. 24 report to the Senate? Is Lutz wrong to focus on this?

In another section of the report, Lutz seizes on the lack of data offered by the Cyber Ninjas in regard to tally sheets, which he describes as key to any audit:

What We Expected and Did Not Find

This audit was touted as a "forensic" audit, apparently meaning it is in-depth and considers all evidence including physically collected evidence. Merriam-Webster defines "Forensic" as relating to or dealing with the application of scientific knowledge to legal problems.

We expected that the audit would compare, batch to batch, for all 10,341 batches, the vote totals for each of the contest options being audited. The Dominion Voting System designates each ballot processed with a tabulator number, batch number and offset in the batch. Vote counts per candidate for each batch can be easily subtotaled directly from the cast-vote record (CVR) file, and then compared to a hand tally. The audit did not provide any result of such a comparison to the public.

For example, we have a spreadsheet of all the totals of all batches which was derived from the CVR file, and their corresponding pallet and box. The following snippet shows two boxes, each containing 7 batches of about 200 ballots each. It provides the vote counts for each candidate and each batch. These totals should be comparable to the totals from the hand tally. But neither the hand tally sheets nor master spreadsheet were provided and therefore we cannot perform the comparison.

batchid	Blue Sheet	scanner	EV batch	Pallet	Box #	President				Trump	Biden	Jorg.	Senate				McSally	Kelly	
						ballots	votes	writes	ov				uv	votes	writes	ov			uv
03001_00001	102020 p3	H1	265	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	195	0	2	2	79	114	2	197	0	0	2	82	115
03001_00002	102020 p3	H1	237	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	200	0	0	0	64	135	1	198	0	0	2	61	137
03001_00003	102020 p3	H1	305	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	197	0	1	2	83	110	4	200	0	0	0	80	120
03001_00004	102020 p3	H1	244	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	198	0	2	0	82	115	1	197	0	0	3	80	117
03001_00005	102020 p3	H1	243	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	199	1	0	0	87	110	1	198	0	0	1	85	113
03001_00006	102020 p3	H1	333	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	198	0	1	0	78	120	0	197	0	0	2	79	118
03001_00007	102020 p3	H1	292	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	196	0	2	1	84	112	0	197	0	0	2	83	114
03001_00008	102020 p3	H1	219	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	11	189	0	200	0	0	0	11	189
03001_00009	102020 p3	H1	309	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	0	0	1	84	112	3	197	2	0	3	81	114
03001_00010	102020 p3	H1	236	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	196	1	1	2	62	127	6	199	1	0	0	66	132
03001_00011	102020 p3	H1	279	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	2	0	1	49	147	1	196	0	0	4	49	147
03001_00012	102020 p3	H1	245	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	59	139	2	198	0	0	2	58	140
03001_00013	102020 p3	H1	288	27	EVH1/10-20/219	198	195	1	1	2	69	121	4	196	1	0	2	65	130
03001_00014	102020 p3	H1	210	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	199	0	0	0	49	150	0	198	0	0	1	48	150

Lutz goes on to say:

The tally sheets and the reconciliation spreadsheet should be published immediately.

The report of the hand count provides very little detail. But assuming the aggregate sum of the hand count is as stated, we learn of no evidence that the voting machines nor the election management system was hacked. The report does not establish any indication of electronic intrusion or electronic hacking to modify the tabulation, but even if such an intrusion were documented, it is doubtful that such an intrusion would alter the paper ballots. This is an expected benefit of a substantive hand count of paper ballots. Even if concerns remain from an election quality and procedural compliance standpoint, including the complex topic of eligibility, these issues can't change the outcome of the tabulation itself as documented by the paper ballot record.

Can you please address his assessment? Can you explain why these sheets do or do not matter in your opinion?

Because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need your response within the next 24 hours. I appreciate your attention to this. I can be reached at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Anglen, Robert
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:24 AM
To: dlogan@cyberninjas.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Interview request/ analysis calls hand count 'fiction'
Importance: High

Mr. Logan:

Following up on my phone call last night, I wanted to provide you copies of a report by election data analysts Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen. They have conducted an analysis based on data in the Senate's audit report that they say calls into question the hand count of Maricopa County ballots conducted by Cyber Ninjas.

The report says it found a nearly 16K discrepancy in one pallet between the hand count and the machine count of ballots. They use the word "fiction" to describe your work.

I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this report. I can be reached today at 602-316-8395. I do need to hear back from you today.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [todd](#)
Subject: FW: Invoice from StratTech Solutions - Computer Services
Date: Monday, June 07, 2021 11:43:00 AM

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: StratTech Solutions, LLC. <quickbooks@notification.intuit.com>
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 8:40 AM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: accounting@stsz.com; david@stsz.com; cmoore@stsz.com
Subject: Invoice from StratTech Solutions - Computer Services

INVOICE 3505 DETAILS



StratTech Solutions, LLC.

DUE 06/02/2021

\$826,887.73

[Review and pay](#)

Powered by QuickBooks

Dear Cyber Ninja's,

Here's your invoice! We appreciate your prompt payment.

Please send payments to:

StratTech
Christopher Moore
7825 E Gelding Drive
Suite 104
Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Thanks for your business!

Christopher Moore
Director of IT Consulting
StratTech Solutions
480.266.0967

Bill to Cyber Ninja's
5077 Fruitville Rd
Suite 109-421
Sarasota, FL 34232

Ship to Cyber Ninja's
5077 Fruitville Rd
Suite 109-421
Sarasota, FL 34232

Terms Due on receipt

Labor \$235,440.00

Leadership - Daily Rate

6 X \$39,240.00

Labor \$124,800.00

STS Base - Daily Rate

6 X \$20,800.00

Labor \$54,000.00

STS Technical Support - Daily Rate

6 X \$9,000.00

Labor \$89,100.00

Original Counters -Daily Rate

6 X \$14,850.00

Reimbursable Expense Item \$24,629.00

General Expenses - Travel & Hotel

1 X \$24,629.00

Project \$221,167.43

Quote #1790 - Additional 32 PE Tables (Tax Included)

See Quote #1790 Attached for Details

1 X \$221,167.43

Project \$72,404.30

Quote #1791 - Server Backup Infrastructure for New Storage Requirements (Tax Included)

See Quote #1791 Attached for Details

1 X \$72,404.30

Subtotal	\$821,540.73
Shipping	\$5,347.00
Total	\$826,887.73
Balance due	\$826,887.73

Change Order for Week of May 31st.

For ACH please use
Routing Number 122100024
Account Number 586617778

[Review and pay](#)

StratTech Solutions, LLC.

7825 E Gelding Drive , Ste 104 Scottsdale, AZ 85260

accounting@stsaz.com

If you receive an email that seems fraudulent, please check with the business owner before paying.



© Intuit, Inc. All rights reserved. [Privacy](#) | [Security](#) | [Terms of Service](#)

From: dlogan@cyberinjas.com
Subject: FW: Letter re Breach of MSA
Date: Friday, September 23, 2022 10:55:18 AM
Attachments: [Letter re Breach of MSA.pdf](#)

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Heather Honey](#)
Subject: FW: LINDA BRICKMAN HERE: 1 of 6 Requested Files: MCRC BOS 111720 Letter, 7 Exhibits and Press Statement, 1ST EMAIL
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 12:44:00 PM
Attachments: [MCRC Letter Emailed to BOS 111720.docx](#)
[EX 1 Dominion - TX report on Dominion Voting System oct2019-sneeringer.pdf](#)
[EX 2 Democratic Senators 120619 Letter Dominion vote switching machines.pdf](#)

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Randy Pullen <rpullen13@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:33 AM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Fwd: LINDA BRICKMAN HERE: 1 of 6 Requested Files: MCRC BOS 111720 Letter, 7 Exhibits and Press Statement, 1ST EMAIL

With best regards,

Randy Pullen

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda Brickman** <luvbug1611@cox.net>
Date: Thu, May 27, 2021 at 9:26 AM
Subject: LINDA BRICKMAN HERE: 1 of 6 Requested Files: MCRC BOS 111720 Letter, 7 Exhibits and Press Statement, 1ST EMAIL
To: Randy Pullen <rpullen13@gmail.com>, <BRYAN@blehmlegal.com>
Cc: LINDA BRICKMAN <luvbug1611@cox.net>

Bryan, Randy,

Please, also pass onto Doug Logan, as I have his phone number but not his email address. This information covers everything I sent to the BOS.

Linda

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: FW: Maricopa County Releases Detailed Report on Senate Inquiry
Date: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 3:38:30 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug and Rod,

I would like to include your response to this report in my story. Please get back to me when you can and feel free to call me anytime at 480-476-0108.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: Maricopa County Elections Department <maricopacountyelections@service.govdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 5, 2022 1:33 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Subject: Maricopa County Releases Detailed Report on Senate Inquiry

Maricopa County Elections Department Logo



Maricopa County Elections Department
Communications Director

[Megan Gilbertson](#) | [602-506-7325](tel:602-506-7325)
mgilbertson@risc.maricopa.gov



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Versión en español Abajo

Correcting the Record: Maricopa County Releases Detailed Report on Senate Inquiry

[Download the report](#)

[Watch the presentation](#)

[Read *Just the Facts*](#)

January 5, 2022 (PHOENIX) — Today, the Maricopa County Elections Department released its report titled, *Correcting the Record: Maricopa County's In-Depth Analysis of the Senate Inquiry*. It's the final word to the Arizona Senate's review of Maricopa County's administration of the November 2020 General Election.

Download the report at [JustTheFacts.Vote](#).

Correcting the Record concluded that nearly every finding by the Senate's contractors included faulty analysis, inaccurate claims, misleading conclusions, and a lack of understanding of federal and state election laws. After an in-depth analysis and review of the reports and presentations by Cyber Ninjas, CyFIR, EchoMail, and the Senate's Audit Liaisons, the Elections Department found:

- 22 were misleading. The claims lead the reader to assume a conclusion that is not supported by the evidence.
- 41 were inaccurate. The claims include flawed or misstated analysis.
- 13 were false. The claims are demonstrably false and can be proven false using materials provided to the Senate.

Election officials from the Elections Department and Office of the Recorder are presenting the detailed findings to the Board of Supervisors and Maricopa County Recorder Stephen Richer today at 1:30 p.m. (Arizona time). Watch it live here: [YouTube.com/MaricopaCountyAZ](https://www.youtube.com/MaricopaCountyAZ). Presenters include:

- Scott Jarrett, Maricopa County Elections Department Director of In-Person Voting & Tabulation
- Celia Nabor, Maricopa County Elections Department Assistant Director of Early Voting
- Janine Petty, Maricopa County Recorder's Office Senior Director of Voter Registration
- Nate Young, Maricopa County Recorder's Office Information Technology Director

"This is a critical time for the American family," **said Board of Supervisors Chairman Bill Gates, District 3.**

"The people who have spent the last year proclaiming our free and fair elections are rigged are lying or delusional. Unfortunately, the Senate's inquiry made things worse by giving partisan auditors a platform to make damaging false claims based on their inexperience and biases. I'm proud of our team for correcting the record with this comprehensive report; for looking deeply into each claim made by Senate contractors so that voters who choose to learn the truth can; and for a commitment to continued improvement that will make a strong election system even stronger."

Post-election audits build trust and promote election integrity when they have bipartisan oversight and are conducted by experienced, unbiased professionals who use well-defined, proven processes. The Senate's election review and its contractors fell far short of those standards and instead promoted disinformation and distrust. The Elections Department's [thorough report](#), commissioned by the Board of Supervisors and Recorder Richer, details those shortcomings and corrects the record.

"This is a technical report that proves what we have said all along – the Maricopa County November 2020 election was conducted fairly and accurately. What is not covered here, but that we should be talking about, is the human cost of what we have seen over the course of the last year. We should be talking about the effect on election workers who, for the grand offense of doing their job, have found themselves personally attacked, profiled online, told that they should be perp-walked, sent to prison, and much worse," **said Recorder Richer.** "Central to our mission has been to defend the countless men and women who offered

their time to make our elections work. This is wrong and dangerous on the most basic level, and we need to promote a future where these ordinary Arizonans aren't attacked when they do their part to make democracy work."

The Maricopa County Elections Department administered the November 2020 General Election with integrity and the results were accurate and reliable. This was proven through statutorily required accuracy tests, court cases, hand counts performed by the political parties, and post-election audits. The Elections Department followed all federal and state election laws.

"No election is perfect, but what our report confirms is the November 2020 General Election in Maricopa County is about as close as you can get," said **Vice Chairman Clint Hickman, District 4**. "A record number of eligible voters participated, their votes were counted as they were cast using proven processes, and both Republicans and Democrats won local and statewide races. If one of your preferred candidates or causes lost in 2020, that's not proof of fraud; that's proof of democracy working."

"I'm so impressed with the diligence and professionalism of our elections staff. We asked them to chase down every claim made by Senate contractors, to see what might be true and what was false or misleading, and they delivered those answers in astounding detail," said **Supervisor Jack Sellers, District 1**. "The facts show the 2020 election was run with integrity and the Senate's 'audit' findings are not to be trusted."

The Senate's review included a series of inaccurate reports and presentations delivered by its contractors on September 24, 2021, which called into question the integrity of Maricopa County employees and the validity of legitimate votes cast by eligible voters. This continuous release of inaccurate information required the County to develop a website to combat misinformation: [JustTheFacts.Vote](#).

"This report reflects the countless hours our election professionals spent correcting the record once again and I am grateful for their efforts and professionalism," said **Supervisor Tom Galvin, District 2**. "The report undoubtedly shows that County staff counted the votes accurately and impartially in a free and fair 2020 General Election and should give voters added confidence that future elections will be conducted with the same professionalism, accuracy and impartiality."

"The Senate's election review was a gigantic waste of time and money all in service of the Big Lie," said **Supervisor Steve Gallardo, District 5**. "We ran free, fair, secure elections in 2020. This report proves it. Again. End of story."

[Read Maricopa County Election Department's analysis of Senate review.](#)

[Watch Maricopa County Elections Department analysis presentation.](#)

[Read Just the Facts.](#)

###

About the Elections Department

Supported by the Board of Supervisors and Recorder's Office, the Elections Department administers city, town, school district, special district, county, state and federal elections in Maricopa County. As the second largest voting jurisdiction in the country, the Elections Department serves more than 2.6 million registered voters. Find out more at [Maricopa.Vote](#).

Aclaración del Informe: Condado Maricopa Publica Informe Detallado sobre la Revisión del Senado

5 de enero, 2022 (PHOENIX) – Hoy, el Departamento de Elecciones del Condado Maricopa publicó su informe titulado *Aclaración del Informe: Análisis Profundo del Condado Maricopa de la Revisión del*

Senado. Es la última palabra a la revisión del Senado de Arizona sobre la administración del Condado Maricopa en la Elección General de noviembre del 2020.

Descargue el informe en [SoloLosHechos.Voto](#)

La Aclaración del Informe concluyó que casi todos los hallazgos de los contratistas del Senado incluían análisis incorrectos, afirmaciones inexactas, conclusiones erróneas y una falta de entendimiento de las leyes electorales federales y estatales. Después de un análisis y revisión en profundidad de los informes y presentaciones de Cyber Ninjas, CyFIR, EchoMail y los intermediarios de la Auditoría del Senado, el Departamento de Elecciones encontró:

- 22 fueron erróneas. Las afirmaciones llevan al lector a asumir una conclusión que no está respaldada por la evidencia.
- 41 eran inexactos. Las declaraciones incluyen un análisis erróneo y puntos débiles.
- 13 eran falsas. Las afirmaciones son demostrablemente falsas y pueden ser probadas falsas utilizando materiales proporcionados al Senado.

Funcionarios electorales del Departamento de Elecciones y la Oficina de Registro presentaran los hallazgos detallados a la Junta de Supervisores y al Registrador del Condado Maricopa Stephen Richer hoy a la 1:30 p.m. (hora de Arizona). Véalo en vivo aquí: [YouTube.com/MaricopaCountyAZ](https://www.youtube.com/MaricopaCountyAZ). Los presentadores incluyen:

- Scott Jarrett, Director de Votación en Persona y Tabulación del Departamento de Elecciones del Condado Maricopa
- Celia Nabor, Subdirector de Votación Temprana del Departamento de Elecciones del Condado Maricopa
- Janine Petty, Directora Senior del Registro de Votantes de la Oficina de Registro del Condado Maricopa
- Nate Young, Director de Tecnología de la Información de la Oficina de Registro del Condado Maricopa

"Este es un momento crítico para la familia Americana," **dijo el Presidente de la Junta de Supervisores, Bill Gates, Distrito 3**. "Las personas que han pasado el último año proclamando que nuestras elecciones libres y justas están alteradas están mintiendo o delirando. Desafortunadamente, la revisión del Senado empeoró las cosas al dar a los auditores partidistas una plataforma para hacer afirmaciones falsas dañinas basadas en su inexperiencia y prejuicios. Estoy orgulloso de nuestro equipo por aclarar con este informe detallado; por profundizar en cada reclamo hecho por los contratistas del Senado para que los votantes que elijan conocer la verdad puedan; y por un compromiso de mejora continua que hará aún un sistema electoral fuerte aún más fuerte."

Las auditorías posteriores a las elecciones crean confianza y promueven la integridad electoral cuando tienen una supervisión bipartidista y son realizadas por profesionales experimentados e imparciales que utilizan procesos bien definidos y probados. La revisión del Senado a la elección y sus contratistas estuvieron muy por debajo de esos estándares y, en cambio, promovieron la desinformación y la desconfianza. El [informe detallado](#) del Departamento de Elecciones, solicitado por la Junta de Supervisores y el Registrador Richer, detalla esas deficiencias y aclara la información proporcionada.

"Este es un informe técnico que demuestra lo que hemos dicho todo el tiempo – la Elección de Noviembre del 2020 del Condado Maricopa se llevó a cabo de manera justa y precisa. Lo que no se detalla aquí, pero deberíamos estar hablando, es el costo humano de lo que hemos visto en el transcurso del año pasado. Deberíamos estar hablando del efecto en los trabajadores electorales que, por la gran ofensa de hacer su trabajo, han sido atacados personalmente, perfilados en línea, diciéndoles que deberían ser llevados a la cárcel, y muchas cosas peores," **dijo el Registrador Richer**. "El centro de nuestra misión ha sido defender a los innumerables hombres y mujeres que ofrecieron su tiempo para que nuestras elecciones funcionaran. Esto es incorrecto y peligroso en el nivel más básico, y necesitamos promover un futuro en el que estos Arizonenses ordinarios no sean atacados cuando hagan su parte para que la democracia funcione."

El Departamento de Elecciones del Condado Maricopa administró la Elección General de noviembre del 2020 con integridad y los resultados fueron precisos y confiables. Esto se comprobó mediante pruebas de exactitud exigidas por la ley, procesos judiciales, conteos manuales realizados por los partidos políticos y

auditorías posteriores a la elección. El Departamento de Elecciones siguió todas las leyes electorales federales y estatales.

"Ninguna elección es perfecta, pero lo que nuestro informe confirma es que la Elección General de noviembre del 2020 en el Condado Maricopa está lo más cerca a lo que se puede llegar," dijo el **Vicepresidente Clint Hickman, Distrito 4**. "Un número récord de votantes elegibles participaron, sus votos se contaron a medida que fueron emitidos utilizando procesos probados, y tanto republicanos como demócratas ganaron las contiendas locales y estatales. Si uno de sus candidatos preferidos o causa perdió en el 2020, eso no es prueba de fraude; eso es prueba de que la democracia funciona."

"Estoy tan impresionado con la diligencia y profesionalidad de nuestro personal electoral. Les pedimos que analizaran cada afirmación hecha por los contratistas del Senado, para ver qué podría ser cierto y qué era falso o incorrecto, y entregaron esas respuestas con asombrosos detalles," dijo el **Supervisor Jack Sellers, Distrito 1**. "Los hechos muestran que la elección del 2020 se llevó a cabo con integridad y los hallazgos de la 'auditoría' del Senado no son de confiar."

La revisión del Senado incluyó una serie de informes inexactos y presentaciones entregadas por sus contratistas el 24 de septiembre del 2021, que pusieron en duda la integridad de los empleados del Condado Maricopa y la validez de los votos legítimos emitidos por los votantes elegibles. Esta publicación continua de información inexacta requirió que el Condado desarrollara un sitio web para combatir la desinformación: [SoloLosHechos.Voto](#).

"Este informe refleja las incontables horas que nuestros profesionales electorales pasaron aclarando el informe una vez más y estoy agradecido por su esfuerzo y profesionalismo," dijo el **Supervisor Tom Galvin, Distrito 2**. "El informe muestra sin duda que el personal del condado contó los votos con precisión e imparcialidad en una Elección General libre y justa en el 2020 y debería dar a los votantes más confianza en que las elecciones futuras se llevarán a cabo con la misma profesionalidad, precisión e imparcialidad."

"La revisión del Senado a la elección fue una gigantesca pérdida de tiempo y dinero al servicio de la Gran Mentira," dijo el **Supervisor Steve Gallardo, Distrito 5**. "Organizamos elecciones libres, justas y seguras en el 2020. Este informe lo demuestra. De nuevo. Fin de la historia."

[Lea el análisis del Departamento de Elecciones del Condado Maricopa sobre la revisión del Senado.](#)

[Vea la presentación del análisis del Departamento de Elecciones del Condado Maricopa.](#)

[Lee Sólo los Hechos.](#)

###

Acerca del Departamento de Elecciones

Con el apoyo de la Junta de Supervisores y la Oficina de Registro, el Departamento de Elecciones administra las elecciones municipales, del pueblo, distritos escolares, distritos especiales, del condado, estatales y federales en el Condado Maricopa. Como la segunda jurisdicción electoral más grande del país, el Departamento de Elecciones atiende a más de 2.6 millones de votantes registrados. Obtenga más información: [Maricopa.Voto](#).

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES:

[Manage Preferences](#) | [Unsubscribe](#) | [Help](#)

This email was sent to jen.fiffeld@azcentral.com using GovDelivery. [Maricopa County](#) • 510 S 3rd Ave • Phoenix, AZ 8500

From: [Barchenger, Stacey](#)
To: rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: FW: Media request - Fann letter
Date: Wednesday, October 27, 2021 6:22:15 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi, this is The Arizona Republic again. Sorry for the second email but I forgot a question. One of my colleagues shared posts on Telegram from Mr. Logan asking for prayers, calls to the media and donations related to the Republic's contempt hearing on Thursday. Are those requests also connected to Senate President Fann's letter, or the timing of it?

Thanks,

Stacey Barchenger
State politics reporter

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Cell: 480-416-5669 | [@sbarchenger](#)
stacey.barchenger@arizonarepublic.com

azcentral.com | The Arizona Republic

From: Barchenger, Stacey
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2021 2:47 PM
To: rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
Subject: Media request - Fann letter

Hi there, I'm a reporter at The Arizona Republic doing a short story about Senate President Fann's letter dated yesterday saying Cyber Ninjas is in breach of its MSA for the audit. Wanted to see if you could comment on the letter generally? (It's in the Senate reading room [here](#).)

And:

How many, if any, records does Cyber Ninjas have yet to turn over to the Senate? When do you anticipate that will happen?

Do you have any thoughts on the timing of this letter and why it was sent now?

Fann writes that Cyber Ninjas is in "material breach of the MSA," do you agree? What are the consequences for a breach of contract?

Anything else the public should know?

Thanks,

Stacey Barchenger
State politics reporter

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Cell: 480-416-5669 | [@sbarchenger](#)
stacey.barchenger@arizonarepublic.com

azcentral.com | The Arizona Republic

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Natalie McLaughlin](#); [Loving Life Liz Harris](#)
Subject: FW: New Subpoenas and Public Record Requests
Date: Wednesday, July 28, 2021 5:30:00 PM
Attachments: [Subpoena \(Maricopa BoS\) Signed.pdf](#)
[Subpoena \(Dominion\) Signed.pdf](#)

This is apparently what went out. These PRR's don't cover a lot of items we were hoping to get answers on.

From: Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 28, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: New Subpoenas and Public Record Requests

Good Afternoon,

Attached are the new subpoenas and public records requests for your reference.

Thank you.

Karen Fann
President of the Senate
Tel: 602.926.5874

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Hand Audit
Date: Saturday, July 10, 2021 8:25:11 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

https://azsos.gov/sites/default/files/2020_General_Maricopa_Hand_Count.pdf

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group



From: [Doug Bock Clark](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Alexandra Berzon](#)
Subject: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18
Date: Friday, March 11, 2022 1:55:16 PM

Dear Mr. Logan,

I'm reaching out because ProPublica and Frontline will soon be releasing an article and documentary that includes a description of your actions as they relate to various attempts to challenge the results of the 2020 presidential election. We appreciate the questions you've answered so far. Now we are reaching the final fact-checking stage of our article.

Please review the following information for accuracy and to provide comments, clarifications or further context. For our story to include your responses, we need to hear back by 1:55 p.m. EST on March 18, 2022. We want to have a full understanding of your responses and any other points or material you'd like for us to consider.

1. Our understanding is that you were a member of a coalition of people working on an effort to prove and publicize the belief that Donald Trump had won the 2020 election. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**
2. Our understanding is that Michael Flynn was the leader of the coalition and that at various times the coalition included you, Patrick Byrne, Sidney Powell, Lin Wood, Phil Waldron, James Penrose, Todd Sanders, Conan Hayes, Seth Keshel and others. It is also our understanding that Rudy Giuliani was a periodic collaborator. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
3. Our understanding is that, starting in November 2020 and through late December 2020, members of this group were present at a plantation in South Carolina owned by Lin Wood or were in close touch with people who gathered at the plantation. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**
4. Our understanding that you were physically present at Wood's plantation in November and December 2020 and served as one of the coalition's cyber security experts. **Is this accurate?**
5. Our understanding is that one of the people you worked with remotely while at the plantation was Ronald Watkins. **Is this accurate?**
6. Our understanding is you served on one of the coalition's two main teams trying to access voting machines, often working alongside James Penrose. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**
7. Our understanding is that Trump campaign staffers around Nov. 15, 2020, vetted

substantial claims that a Venezuelan man made in a video and an affidavit that would be used in the so-called “Kraken” lawsuits and determined them to be baseless, which the staffers shared in an internal memo. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

8. Our understanding is that Phil Waldron in November 2020 shared a list of voting equipment that was circulated to other coalition members and suggested that it be disseminated to state GOPs so that they could start filing injunctions. State GOPs, as well as other entities and individuals, later used portions of this equipment list in legal filings to seek access to Dominion voting machines and to delay certification of the presidential election results. It is also our understanding that the list was used by officials in Arizona as part of their efforts to launch an audit of the election results. **Is this accurate?**
9. Our understanding is that there was a multi-pronged plan devised by the group at the plantation: to use litigation, public persuasion, and access to the voting equipment to reverse the outcome of the 2020 election. **Did you help to devise this plan?**
10. Our understanding is that some people in the coalition were worried that some of the efforts to access voting machines might cross legal boundaries. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
11. Our understanding is that in November you were in Georgia with James Penrose, trying to access voting machines. **Is this accurate?**
12. Our understanding is that while in Georgia you convened briefly with Conan Hayes and Todd Sanders. **Is this accurate?**
13. Our understanding is that for your trip to Georgia you were told that Rudy Giuliani had arranged for a clerk to help you gain access to voting machines. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
14. Our understanding is that the clerk did not help. **Is this accurate?**
15. Our understanding is that James Penrose then tried to persuade elections officials at two offices in Georgia to allow you to examine machines but was unsuccessful. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
16. You have testified that you were involved in examining election irregularities in Antrim County, Michigan, but were not retained by the plaintiff who filed suit in that county over those irregularities, William Bailey. **What was your role in Antrim County? Did you contribute to the ASOG report on Antrim?**
17. Did you review the research of Joshua Merritt, the former Allied Security Operations

Group executive? Did you rely on his research for any of your own reports? **If so, did you vet or fact-check his work in any way?**

18. Our understanding is that although you publicly minimized your role on Lin Wood's plantation, during the weeks after the election emails and other communications show you were reporting directly to Lin Wood. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
19. Our understanding is that at a point in December 2020, members of the coalition no longer had to present evidence that would succeed in court because they could instead use the evidence to appeal directly to state legislatures and then Congress, eventually placing pressure on Mike Pence to stop or delay certification on January 6. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this account?**
20. Our understanding is that the coalition members were also briefing Congressional representatives and publicizing their theories in speeches, on social media and on TV. Our understanding is that the aim was to help create a public outcry that would put pressure on Republican lawmakers to stop or delay certification of the Biden electoral votes. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**
21. Our understanding is that the belief perpetuated by Staci Burk in Arizona that fake ballots had been flown in from Asia was extremely widespread in Arizona. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
22. Our understanding is that in December of 2020 James Penrose had told Burk that he had spent \$75,000 investigating her claims and found that they were false. Our understanding is that that one of many goals of the Arizona audit was to examine the integrity of the paper ballots and figure out whether claims like Burk's were true and that you had auditors scan ballots with UV lights to check if there were bamboo fibers mixed into the paper, which could suggest that they were imported from Asia, among other theories. It also is our understanding that Penrose informed you that Burk's claims were incorrect. It also is our understanding that you proceeded with the investigation of her claims even after Penrose's findings because you said the claims were so widespread that they needed to be publicly disproven. **Did you publicly disprove them? Do you have any other comment or clarification?**
23. Our understanding is that much of the evidence the coalition had collected in December 2020 made its way into reports or talking points or memos that were coming out of the White House via Peter Navarro or from Rudy Giuliani. **Is this accurate?**
24. Our understanding is that the evidence assembled by teams led by Flynn, Byrne, Powell, Wood, Waldron, Giuliani and others was used in the days leading up to January 6, 2021, to try to convince lawmakers that the results of the election were questionable or fraudulent. **Is this accurate?**

25. Our understanding is after the inauguration, you, Michael Flynn, Phil Waldron and Patrick Byrne decided to continue to pursue the investigation of the theory that voting machines were hacked and that “forensic audits” were necessary and worked to build an “election integrity” movement among grassroots groups focused on overhauling electoral systems, which you believed were corrupt. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
26. Our understanding is that after it became public that Karen Fann had [selected](#) Allied Security Operations Group and Phil Waldron to run the audit in early February, she faced criticism that caused her to switch your firm, Cyber Ninjas. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
27. Our understanding is that you believe that the Arizona We the People Alliance were fundamental in making the audit there happen. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this statement?**
28. Our understanding is that the coalition you had led after the election played key roles in many parts of the Arizona audit, with you running it and at least \$7 million coming from organizations overseen by you, Byrne, Powell, Wood and others who worked closely with you. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**
29. Our understanding is that Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai served as a consultant for the audit. **Is this accurate?**
30. Our understanding is that running the Arizona audit involved managing hundreds of workers and volunteers. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this?**
31. Our understanding is that you did not have experience in election work or in managing a project of this size. **Is this accurate?**
32. Our understanding is that ASOG originally said that the audit would take a maximum of 10 days, but the Cyber Ninjas audit ended up taking more than four months. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
33. Our understanding is that elections officials who were observing the audit said the process was marred by basic procedural errors. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
34. Our understanding is that three nationally recognized election experts issued a report saying the audit’s hand count could not be replicated. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
35. Our understanding is that the equipment list used in the audit in Arizona was

originally introduced publicly in a lawsuit filed by Lin Wood and then later appeared in other state auditing efforts including in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Do you know how or by whom it was shared?**

36. Our understanding is that in July, Trump said that 74,000 mail-in ballots in Arizona were counted with no clear record of them ever being sent. This was based on your earlier statement to the legislature. However, our understanding is that your statement was based on an incomplete data set that didn't include all of the mail-ballots sent out and received by Maricopa County, according to the county. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Did you or anyone that you're aware of try to contact Trump to correct the misleading statements or respond to Maricopa County's explanation?**
37. Our understanding is that you presented your final report to the Arizona Senate on Sept. 24, 2021, that said that in recounting ballots by hand you found that Biden had won by 360 more votes than the certified results. **Is this accurate?**
38. Our understanding is that during the hearing you and others, including Dr. Shiva, spent much of the time talking about anomalies that suggested the election was rigged. Maricopa County later came out with a rebuttal showing that of the findings made by Cyber Ninjas, 7 were false, 23 inaccurate and 9 misleading. It said the Cyber Ninjas report "made faulty and inaccurate conclusions about more than 53,000 ballots in 22 different categories." **What is your response to the Maricopa County report about your findings? Do you have any other comments or clarification?**
39. Our understanding is that many of the specifics that members of the coalition were presenting — including interpretations of data from Antrim County, Michigan; the information from the Venezuelan security officer about the corruption of the Dominion Voting Systems; and the suggestion of impropriety in the Arizona audit — have been debunked and discredited in extensive reports from Republican-led experts and teams. These include the Michigan Republican legislators in the case of Antrim County, the Trump campaign staff in the case of the Venezuelan report, and the Maricopa County Elections Department (led by a Republican recorder) in the case of the Arizona audit. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**
40. Our understanding is that the consensus among government agencies and former administration officials, such as former Attorney General William Barr, is that no evidence of widespread election fraud has emerged. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this? Do you continue to believe the election was stolen and if so why? Have you ever wavered on this belief? What is your response to the commonly expressed criticism that spreading the idea that the election was stolen is undermining faith in American democracy?**

I'm available during normal working hours at doug.clark@propublica.org or 678.243.0784.

Thank you,

Doug Bock Clark

From: Kyra Haas

[Douglas Logan](#)

To: Interview request from Arizona Capitol Times


Subject: Interview request from Arizona Capitol Times

Date: Monday, January 10, 2022 5:06:15 PM

Hi Doug,

I appreciate you taking my call today. The Arizona Capitol Times is owned by Bridge Tower Media and does not have any publications in Florida. Here is a link to the company's website that shows the publications owned by the company: <https://bridgetowermedia.com/markets/?location=fl>. I know you spoke briefly with one of my editors, Wayne Schutsky, last week but no one from our paper has spoken to you in the past few days.

Here is a link to my author page on our publication's website: <https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/author/kyrahaas/>. You can see all of my articles there.



My cellphone number is (785) 550-5261.

Thanks,
Kyra

Kyra Haas
Reporter | Arizona Capitol Times
O: 602-889-7132
C: 785-550-5261

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
Subject: Interview request today/ 695 page report/ analysis
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 2:41:11 PM

Mr. Logan / Mr. Pullen:

I am reaching out to you for comment on the 695 page ballot count report released by the Senate on Friday. This morning, Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen offered their analysis on the data.

They say their top line finding was that the Cyber Ninjas' hand count was off by 316,740 ballots from the Senate's machine count. They said it represented a 15% error rate.

They also said they found 167, 524 ballots that the Cyber Ninjas "did not count." (this was based on analysis of boxes that were different from the machine count by 25 ballots or more). They pointed to specific pages showing the failure to count boxes.

They say their findings reinforce their previous claims that the hand count was fiction and cannot be trusted.

I know you responded to their early criticisms, which in part you said were faulty because they relied only on a small portion (17 pages) of the 695 page report. However, I wanted to give you an additional chance to discuss the latest analysis given it is based on the full report, and offer any rebuttal.

I can be reached at 602-316-8395. I am planning to publish a story this afternoon and need to hear back from you today.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 11:55 AM
To: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: RE: Interview request/

Robert,

I do believe that Randy Pullen talked with you last week and explained that the sheets in his machine count were pulled before our work was complete. As a result an analysis of those is mostly meaningless. As we publicly relayed at the time the work was being done, we were working on Quality Control when we moved into the green building. That was making sure that every single batch was properly allocated to the right pallet, and the right batch, that there were no double-entries, and that batch numbers were entered properly. With the massive amount of data, this was a particularly challenging and time-consuming task. We not only had to do with the occasional typo from our team; but in some cases the batch number on the manifest, and/or the batch number on the box, and/or the batch number on the batch sheet did not match. When they didn't match we had to be sure we consistently handled it in the same way so that as much as possible so that everything could hopefully match up with the County's data, even when the County's data didn't agree with itself. With a decent percentage of the boxes having batch sheets on the side of the box, rather than separating the batches; and some boxes without any batch separators at all, it would literally be impossible for us to match up our data at the batch level to everything since the batches were not clearly marked. We had to assume the batches were in a certain order that matched the label; then again, not every batch was on the label.

Ray's response in general seems more objective than the last report you sent over; but its still has quite a few assumptions and misunderstandings that make quite a bit of it inaccurate. There is also a clear bias for saying things in a negative way whenever possible.

Your first point is a great example. There is a 263 discrepancy among the two ballot totals between the Presidential race and the Senate race. We identified it, highlighted it and footnoted it to explain it. This amounts to $1/100^{\text{th}}$ of a percent of the total ballots counted; and yet its some huge embarrassment? I think the fact we recorded it as-is instead of just trying to cover it up shows our integrity. There is no perfect handling of 2.1 million ballots, especially with over 1,500 people involved and many of them volunteers. A certain number of clerical errors is expected. The fact the count is different between the Senate and Presidential races is not surprising when you consider we applied the "2 out of 3 counts need to agree, and the 3rd needs to be within 1 per 50 ballots" per race instead of per tally sheet. This meant that often when things had to be retallied because it was out of those thresholds it was a single race that was counted.

Prior criticism that came in, I believe it was from Bennie Smith; stated that hand counting was extremely inaccurate and was routinely off by 2% of the total ballot counts. They utilized it to try and discredit us while we were conducting the work. Our accuracy to the official results actually proves that our hand counting method is extremely accurate and blows those numbers away. I have no doubt that's part of the reason why these "experts" are having a hard time believing they were legitimate. However, its also worth noting that none of these reports were put together by anyone who ever hand counted anything close to 2.1 million ballots, nor conducted an audit anywhere close to the scope of what we did. As a result are they truly the right experts to critique a discrepancy of $1/100^{\text{th}}$ of a percentage point?

I don't disagree with Lutz's comments that the Tally Sheets should be made publicly available; but that is a decision for the Senate to make not us. In totally there was almost 2 petabytes of data collected over the course of this audit. We're still working with the Senate on what of this data they would like to have available and how to get that data to them. The tally sheets is probably the most manageable section of that, representing only 200 GB of data; and will probably be the first section to be sent into their care.

Thanks,

Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:48 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Interview request/
Importance: High

Doug Logan/ Rod Thomson:

Last week, I sought your comment on an analysis of the ballot hand count authored by “The Audit Guys.” I am reaching out today regarding a new report on the Cyber Ninjas’ audit findings, this time authored by California election auditor Ray Lutz.

I am happy to make Lutz’s report available to you. But I wanted to draw your attention to his core observations. The first: That the Cyber Ninjas reported different totals for races on the same ballot, which Lutz says raises significant questions about your methodologies. Here is the language from his report:

It is interesting to note the somewhat embarrassing reality that the audit did not have the same number of ballots between the two contests being reviewed, the Presidential contest and the Senate contest, losing about 263 ballots in the Senate contest. This does not inspire a great deal of confidence in the hand count, because those ballots were counted at the same time and should have been exactly the same number. It does however speak to the beneficial transparency of the reported result that exposes an internally recorded discrepancy.

Presidential Contest					
	Trump	Biden	Jorgenson	Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	995,404	1,040,873	31,501	20,791	2,088,569
County Canvass	995,665	1,040,774	31,705	21,419	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(261)	99	(204)	(628)	(994)
Senate Contest					
	McSally	Kelly		Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	983,662	1,064,336		40,398	2,088,396
County Canvass		1,064,396		40964	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(541)	(60)		(566)	(1,167)
Machine Paper Ballot Count (Pullen Report)					2,089,442
Machine Ballot Count - Canvass					(121)

As always, I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this issue and other issues Lutz raises before we publish a story about his findings. Is there an explanation for the different totals of ballots counted in the two races? Should that call into question other information raised in your Sept. 24 report to the Senate? Is Lutz wrong to focus on this?

In another section of the report, Lutz seizes on the lack of data offered by the Cyber Ninjas in regard to tally sheets, which he describes as key to any audit:

What We Expected and Did Not Find

This audit was touted as a "forensic" audit, apparently meaning it is in-depth and considers all evidence including physically collected evidence. Merriam-Webster defines "Forensic" as relating to or dealing with the application of scientific knowledge to legal problems.

We expected that the audit would compare, batch to batch, for all 10,341 batches, the vote totals for each of the contest options being audited. The Dominion Voting System designates each ballot processed with a tabulator number, batch number and offset in the batch. Vote counts per candidate for each batch can be easily subtotaled directly from the cast-vote record (CVR) file, and then compared to a hand tally. The audit did not provide any result of such a comparison to the public.

For example, we have a spreadsheet of all the totals of all batches which was derived from the CVR file, and their corresponding pallet and box. The following snippet shows two boxes, each containing 7 batches of about 200 ballots each. It provides the vote counts for each candidate and each batch. These totals should be comparable to the totals from the hand tally. But neither the hand tally sheets nor master spreadsheet were provided and therefore we cannot perform the comparison.

batchid	Blue Sheet	scanner	EV batch	Pallet	Box #	President				Trump	Biden	Jorg.	Senate			McSally	Kelly		
						ballots	votes	writes	ov	uv	votes	votes	votes	votes	writes	ov	uv	votes	votes
03001_00001	102020 p3	H1	265	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	195	0	2	2	79	114	2	197	0	0	2	82	115
03001_00002	102020 p3	H1	237	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	200	0	0	0	64	135	1	198	0	0	2	61	137
03001_00003	102020 p3	H1	305	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	197	0	1	2	83	110	4	200	0	0	0	80	120
03001_00004	102020 p3	H1	244	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	198	0	2	0	82	115	1	197	0	0	3	80	117
03001_00005	102020 p3	H1	243	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	199	1	0	0	87	110	1	198	0	0	1	85	113
03001_00006	102020 p3	H1	333	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	198	0	1	0	78	120	0	197	0	0	2	79	118
03001_00007	102020 p3	H1	292	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	196	0	2	1	84	112	0	197	0	0	2	83	114
03001_00008	102020 p3	H1	219	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	11	189	0	200	0	0	0	11	189
03001_00009	102020 p3	H1	309	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	0	0	1	84	112	3	197	2	0	3	81	114
03001_00010	102020 p3	H1	236	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	196	1	1	2	62	127	6	199	1	0	0	66	132
03001_00011	102020 p3	H1	279	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	2	0	1	49	147	1	196	0	0	4	49	147
03001_00012	102020 p3	H1	245	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	59	139	2	198	0	0	2	58	140
03001_00013	102020 p3	H1	288	27	EVH1/10-20/219	198	195	1	1	2	69	121	4	196	1	0	2	65	130
03001_00014	102020 p3	H1	210	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	199	0	0	0	49	150	0	198	0	0	1	48	150

Lutz goes on to say:

The tally sheets and the reconciliation spreadsheet should be published immediately.

The report of the hand count provides very little detail. But assuming the aggregate sum of the hand count is as stated, we learn of no evidence that the voting machines nor the election management system was hacked. The report does not establish any indication of electronic intrusion or electronic hacking to modify the tabulation, but even if such an intrusion were documented, it is doubtful that such an intrusion would alter the paper ballots. This is an expected benefit of a substantive hand count of paper ballots. Even if concerns remain from an election quality and procedural compliance standpoint, including the complex topic of eligibility, these issues can't change the outcome of the tabulation itself as documented by the paper ballot record.

Can you please address his assessment? Can you explain why these sheets do or do not matter in your opinion?

Because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need your response within the next 24 hours. I appreciate your attention to this. I can be reached at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Anglen, Robert
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:24 AM
To: dlogan@cyberninjas.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Interview request/ analysis calls hand count 'fiction'
Importance: High

Mr. Logan:

Following up on my phone call last night, I wanted to provide you copies of a report by election data analysts Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen. They have conducted an analysis based on data in the Senate's audit report that they say calls into question the hand count of Maricopa County ballots conducted by Cyber Ninjas.

The report says it found a nearly 16K discrepancy in one pallet between the hand count and the machine count of ballots. They use the word "fiction" to describe your work.

I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this report. I can be reached today at 602-316-8395. I do need to hear back from you today.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
Subject: Interview request/ analysis calls hand count "fiction"
Date: Thursday, September 30, 2021 1:23:51 PM
Attachments: [Expanded Box and Batch Counts from Pullen Report_09272021.xlsx](#)
[Review of Machine Count Report_Final.pdf](#)

Mr. Logan:

Following up on my phone call last night, I wanted to provide you copies of a report by election data analysts Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen. They have conducted an analysis based on data in the Senate's audit report that they say calls into question the hand count of Maricopa County ballots conducted by Cyber Ninjas.

The report says it found a nearly 16K discrepancy in one pallet between the hand count and the machine count of ballots. They use the word "fiction" to describe your work.

I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this report. I can be reached today at 602-316-8395. I do need to hear back from you today.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Logan interview
Date: Thursday, October 21, 2021 3:05:16 PM

Mr. Logan,

I saw that you sat down for an interview with Lyle Rapacki, and I was wondering if you'd be willing to speak with me.

Obviously, I've been very critical of your work, and I'm sure you're no fan of my reporting. But if you're willing to stand by your work, answering questions from critics rather than people who are already on your side could go a long way toward showing the public that your audit was legitimate. If your work is as good as you claim it to be, then surely it can stand up to scrutiny. If you're not willing to answer questions from critics and your work can't stand up to scrutiny, I think most people will wonder why they should take this audit seriously.

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Andrew Stavro](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: logistics
Date: Wednesday, June 09, 2021 2:15:01 PM

Rental for a trailer is going to be about \$1000 a month (\$250 a week) plus .15 cents a mile, if we can find one. We have our 36' available but I'm not sure everything is going to fit into it. If it does then great, we are covered. To buy a new trailer with a lift gate it's \$60K out the door. I don't think it's going to come to that, just want you to have all the information.

Semi trackers are running about \$1600 a week before fuel and driver right now. I have called two vendors already(Velocity and Rider) and both companies have "blackouts" on tractors right now, meaning we can't get them. Again, semi tractors can cost approx. \$120-\$150 to purchase, then you have DOT and IFTA which is a pain.

So my next step is to reach out to logistic companies like Stage Call and Rocket Cargo to see what their rates are for transport and storage.

I'm sure I know the answer to this, but do you have any time frame on how long we would be storing this equipment before it goes to the next venue? And what the next state might be?

I'll keep looking around for options.

Andy Stavro / [480.586.6121](tel:480.586.6121) / [Road Dog Show Pros, LLC](#)

From: [Donald Hiatt](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 12:17:02 PM

--

AZ Legislature: No Sine Die until the Audit Results are Published and write real laws to reform Election Integrity!

"Wisdom is forged through the furnace of experience. Don Hiatt"
"Traditions are threads that bind generations together. Don Hiatt"

Regards!
Don Hiatt

480-786-9292

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Maricopa County ballots
Date: Monday, July 19, 2021 12:04:57 PM

Rod, I wanted to check back in on the numbers that Doug Logan presented about Maricopa County ballots last week, especially the 74,000 early ballots he said had no records showing that they were actually mailed out. Based on the reporting I've seen and the I've talked to, it seems like there's nothing suspicious about those ballots at all, and that Mr. Logan erred when he suggested that those ballots were suspicious. I've got a few questions.

How did Mr. Logan or other members of the audit team reach those numbers?

Why didn't Mr. Logan know that those ballots weren't suspicious and had been properly cast?

Why did he suggest that they might be suspicious?

I know the county has refused to cooperate with the audit team. Who else did the audit team reach out to or speak with to discuss those numbers and determine whether those ballots were legitimate?

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Maricopa County report
Date: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 4:58:14 PM

Mr. Logan, do you have any response to the report that Maricopa County issued today regarding your audit of the 2020 election? Their conclusion was essentially that almost every claim you and your team made was either inaccurate, misleading or outright false.

<https://recorder.maricopa.gov/justthefacts/pdf/Correcting%20The%20Record%20-%20January%202022%20Report.pdf>

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Jordan Williams](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Media Comment Re: Karen Fann Letter
Date: Thursday, September 16, 2021 3:59:19 PM

Hello Mr. Logan,

My name is Jordan Williams and I am a reporter for The Hill. We're covering Sen. Fann's letter to you asking to turn over records related to the Maricopa County Audit. I wanted to know if you had any comments on this?

<https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/arizona/2021/09/15/arizona-audit-karen-fann-asks-cyber-ninjas-hand-over-records/8352371002/>

--

Jordan Williams

Breaking News Reporter, The Hill

jwilliams@thehill.com

(C) 240-419-0272

@JordanNichelleW

From: [Jordan Williams](#)
To: [Legal](#)
Subject: Media Comment Re: Karen Fann Letter
Date: Thursday, September 16, 2021 3:59:17 PM

Hello ,

My name is Jordan Williams and I am a reporter for The Hill. We're covering Sen. Fann's letter to you asking to turn over records related to the Maricopa County Audit. I wanted to know if the company has any comments on this?

<https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/arizona/2021/09/15/arizona-audit-karen-fann-asks-cyber-ninjas-hand-over-records/8352371002/>

--

Jordan Williams

Breaking News Reporter, The Hill

jwilliams@thehill.com

(C) 240-419-0272

@JordanNichelleW

From: [Barchenger, Stacey](#)
To: rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Media request - Fann letter
Date: Wednesday, October 27, 2021 5:47:19 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi there, I'm a reporter at The Arizona Republic doing a short story about Senate President Fann's letter dated yesterday saying Cyber Ninjas is in breach of its MSA for the audit. Wanted to see if you could comment on the letter generally? (It's in the Senate reading room [here](#).)

And:

How many, if any, records does Cyber Ninjas have yet to turn over to the Senate? When do you anticipate that will happen?

Do you have any thoughts on the timing of this letter and why it was sent now?

Fann writes that Cyber Ninjas is in "material breach of the MSA," do you agree? What are the consequences for a breach of contract?

Anything else the public should know?

Thanks,

Stacey Barchenger
State politics reporter

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Cell: 480-416-5669 | [@sbarchenger](#)
stacey.barchenger@arizonarepublic.com

azcentral.com | The Arizona Republic

From: [Funke, Daniel](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Media request from USA TODAY
Date: Friday, September 24, 2021 3:03:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug,

I hope you're doing well. I'm a reporter for USA TODAY and I'm reaching out for a comment for a fact check I'm writing about the recent Arizona audit results.

I'm fact-checking a claim from former President Donald Trump that the results indicate there was fraud affecting the outcome of Arizona's election. Here's his statement, for context:

<https://www.instagram.com/p/CUNeZfLAPxi/>

As I understand it, the audit upheld Joe Biden's win in the state:

<https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2021/09/23/arizona-audit-draft-report-confirms-biden-beat-trump-2020/5835521001/>

My question for you: What do you make of the veracity of this claim? Did your audit find that fraud affected the outcome of Arizona's election?

Thanks!



Daniel Funke
Fact Check Reporter
dfunke@usatoday.com
(813) 364-4369

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:53:24 PM

then I think you can do it from there

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:27 AM

he wasn't the only one that got it

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:10:03 AM

Working on them now

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:09:53 AM

By any chance do you have any fixes to the three issues I listed?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:53:38 PM

Yeah, Resource isn't an option

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:37 AM

I also sent it to Heather and Andy

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:54:31 PM

alt click on maricopafilemove in the solution explorer

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:27:01 AM

I pushed up fixes for two and three

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:44 AM

Andy is no longer here.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:50 AM

I don't think Heather was testing anything

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:54:33 PM

then add item

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:27:18 AM

when you say sdcard, you do actually mean an sdcard in a card reader in hte laptop

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:57 AM

I don't know these things

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:33:22 AM

Douglas Logan, silly question, but was the card write locked?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:55:04 PM

then web

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:40:21 AM

So I literally can't find and sdcard so I am going to pick one up

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:57:18 AM

Heather was the one at first that was going to sort of lead this

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:55:06 PM

then json


From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:49:45 AM

Sorry, just got out of meetings here. Yes, in production it will be an actual sdcard in a laptop. I believe that what was also configured on the local machine, but I will double-check.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:57:59 AM

I'm not sure how that got miscommunicated. Heather was helping with bits of this, but she's never been the lead.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:55:51 PM
Attachments: [0-eus-d1-38bfclf0cf620e500fe7a62c6a3022cf](#)



From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:50:07 AM

I mean, it writes to every directory correctly for me

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:58:21 AM

lead wasn't the right word

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:56:33 PM

I have it in the project, but I don't see it on the debug app

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:50:18 AM

but I don't have an actual sd card at the moment

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:58:35 AM

but she has been involved since the beginning and is the one sending feature requests

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:56:45 PM

So I figured I was doing something wrong.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:57:09 PM

yeah, this part always gets me

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:50:24 AM

shockingly

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:59:04 AM

in any case whatever, it is what it is

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:57:51 PM

once you add it like this, you ought to be able to call it as if the file was in the current directory

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:56:13 AM

I confirmed they were trying to write to an actual sdcard. This time when they test problems I told them to point that item to an sdcard and confirm it doesn't work, and then point it to a local folder and confirm it now works (e.g. Its something specific to it being an sdcard)

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:59:16 AM

I think there are still threading issues

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:56:19 AM

I will let you know.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:58:11 PM

that is how I added the class but that is apparently different than adding a data file

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:01:54 PM

there are two things happening that I think are combining for the problem

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:56:50 AM

Also, I've been told the button for "not a ballot" is actually a pretty big deal and will most definitely be the first enhancement.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:58:18 PM

That's what I did and it wasn't happy

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:02:42 PM

the first issue I think there is when you load the json, you are setting the selected index which is triggering the write_config method which can cause issues with the config reading and possibly load

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:58:19 PM

LOL

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:57:01 AM

yeah

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:03:39 PM

and I am still not convinced that processing associations is working as we expect when the threads start flying

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:59:24 PM

Could not find file 'C:\dev\src\election-file-watcher\bin\Debug\manifest.json'

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:57:14 AM

they want it compressed and embedded into a pdf

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:10:44 PM

We did a LOT of speed tests.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Laith Ellis](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:59:45 PM

OKay

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:10:39 PM

They were working great before the not-a-ballot stuff.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:57:23 AM

a front and a back image

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:11:15 PM

There is a bottleneck in the speed of the Onchange events at a certain point, but that was the only issue.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:59:45 PM

Hmmm

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:58:18 AM

I see no reason it wouldn't write to an sdcard unless it is write protected

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:04:19 PM

Where are not ballots going to go?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:11:36 PM

They have to pause when there are 45 images in the folder for things to catch up.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:58:30 AM

its just file io

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:58:42 AM



but everything else has been a pita so why not

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:11:46 PM

Due to the queue of the onchange

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:05:11 PM

I'd kind of like the idea of them at the folder level above the batch folder.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:12:00 AM

Hey, I found an sdcard and I can write fine to it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:11:59 PM

But if they did, it all processed fine and was associated properly.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:05:26 PM

So they're still in the "box" but not in the "batch".

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:12:13 AM

my first suspicion is write protection


From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:12:21 PM

cool, then I am fine with saying they are associated properly

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:05:35 PM

But not sure the best way to do that with your configurable path stuff you have.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:25:14 AM
Attachments: [0-wus-d8-189eb5c1c9648dae3686805329ec0d0a](#)



From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:22:17 PM

any idea why?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:06:02 PM

yeah

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:22:13 PM

only when end batch is used

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:06:13 PM

figuring that out myself

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:25:20 AM

That happened when clicking the Process Remaining button

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:25:33 AM

I will check

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:06:49 PM

I think I am going to set a specific not ballot path

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:22:02 PM

ok so no files get moved to the ignored files list during normal adding


From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:24:53 PM

yeah

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:06:33 PM

what to do here

From: [David L. Lewis](#)
To: [Sen. Markwayne Mullins](#)
Subject: [Household Taxpayers' Message](#)
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021, 11:28:53 AM
Attachments: [Group of email\(s\) from David L. Lewis to Sen. Markwayne Mullins](#)



Happens when the sdcard isn't inserted

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:29:10 AM

Sdcard is working today though

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:06:30 PM

that is kind of where I am at

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:24:49 PM

The ignored file list?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:29:15 AM

When inserted

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:13:29 PM

and only code for those features/bugs is on them

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:24:44 PM

When I added what back in?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:24:07 PM

I don't know what problem you were trying to solve when you added it back in

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:13:18 PM

I am also starting to move my branching into feature/feature-name and bug/bug-name naming

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:51:01 AM

pushed a fix up for process remainin

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:21:27 PM

I figured it out

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:01:20 PM

What I just pulled doesn't build.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:25:25 PM

It avoided the delete action from triggering when the code deleted files at the end after a the copy.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:22:01 PM

json?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:01:45 PM

what?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:25:46 PM

That was giving loops

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:22:20 PM

Yeah, you can add something as a resource within the Project Properties page

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:01:51 PM

how is that even possible

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:26:30 PM

wonder why it doesn't create loops in the onchange movenextfile call

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:01:55 PM

clean and rebuild maybe?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 1:01:03 PM

if there is something in the middle of the stack

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:22:45 PM

Once its there a standard syntax references it

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:02:05 PM

I built it and sent to people lol

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:25:24 PM

OKay, JSON is fully parsed into objects and we have the complete list loaded. That is returned to Dev.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 1:01:14 PM

it doesn't know if it is not a ballot

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:59:12 PM

how do we handle processassociations when the program restarts?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:02:20 PM

You must not have pushed a change

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:25:31 PM

I think I have meetings the rest of the day...

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:58:40 PM

some more

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:03:28 PM

yeah that is weird

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:26:06 PM

My thought was to simplify the UI to:

Pallet

Box

Batch

With selecting Pallet limiting the options for Box, and selecting Box limiting the options in Batch

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:26:17 PM

And no capability to add anything not in the list....

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:58:36 PM

so we need to think about this not a ballot

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:03:38 PM

it didn't push when I said commit and push

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:03:43 PM

it is now

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 1:26:46 PM

But **maybe** a way to edit the JSON depending on how its packaged and trigger a refresh on it.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:58:28 PM

ok

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:07:09 PM

I can build just fine

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 2:32:05 PM

ok

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:02:11 PM

if you want the not ballots to go to a dir above the 'batch' folder, that would just be the share drive right?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:07:04 PM

that is weird

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 2:32:29 PM

I think I have the reading configs fixed so that it isn't triggering a bunch of writing configs while it is reading it

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:01:28 PM

Right now, the files get moved to share drive->named folder


From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 2:34:21 PM

when we have a 'stable' release candidate, we need to do a good job of making sure master gets updated with the latest stable commit

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:06:09 PM

Same error still

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:00:46 PM
Attachments: [0-eus-d3-2b798b963b944ffa03fb5353b322e115](#)



From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 2:33:15 PM

If we want to do not a ballot, then we need to store the associations in json as well

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:00:12 PM

so my question

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:00:39 PM

Okay, process remaining I think is being goofed up by the events. It's pausing and other weirdness

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:00:10 PM

lol

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:54:15 PM

Strange, it works fine for me

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 2:32:45 PM

I also disabled not-a-ballot because this requires more thought

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:54:27 PM

With the whole queue in place

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:10:03 PM

and didn't take any of hte new stuff lol

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 9:27:47 PM

I have also been doing some research on threading applications and .net offers thread safe collections like ConcurrentDictionary so perhaps switching associations to something like that will help too

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:09:54 PM

lol, I just realized my old config loaded

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:54:43 PM

I am thinking we need to have a flag is-processing

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:07:04 AM

Awesome, thanks!

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:54:55 PM

And that turns off the ondelete handler

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:09:30 AM

I still see the ballot drop-down in what I pulled.
Is that correct?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:09:12 PM

I'd want it to go under boxname

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:09:07 PM

I have it going to:
boxname\batch (Though it takes many more variables to do that)

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:10:59 AM

yes

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:05:33 PM

Where is the defintion supposed to be (WHat line number)?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 3:08:49 PM

Look at the default folder

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:11:03 AM

it is just disabled

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:06:46 PM

I'm going to try and reproduce the process files error, but I need working source to do that...

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:14:36 PM

1282

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:11:44 AM

I didn't see the point in redoing the design when the feature isn't that far from being off

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:34:56 PM

Okay, I'm back for a bit.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:35:01 PM

Any success?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:12:05 AM

I am thinking that we may need to change the config over to json and then store the associations in the config.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:15:05 PM

the worst part is it is just a hack

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:46:01 PM

intesting

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:15:30 PM

for some reason, procesremaining always sets the count to -1

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:12:37 AM

otherwise, if there is a not ballot in the queue, I don't know how we know it is not a ballot

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:46:17 PM

LOL

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:57:13 AM

isn't it once person on a machine scanning images?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:30:03 PM

a couple things wrong in process remaining

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:30:08 PM

we didn't check if it was ready

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:56:14 AM

how could they get that behind?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:46:25 PM

Is that "in testing" or "interesting"

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:30:16 PM

and we didn't increment the sequence

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:46:36 PM

lol

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:55:32 AM

e.g. When they're moving quickly, they get 45 images behind and have to pause or everything freaks out.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:31:56 PM

I have that fixed and just need to figure out why it things one is ready when it isn't

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 11:55:12 AM

The Onchange / ondelete events are a bottleneck for the software. I'm not sure if there is a good way to fix that.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:46:38 PM

in testin

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:03:49 PM

Douglas Logan, I just pushed what I think is a fix for process remaining

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:46:52 PM

I was on the phone with my fil

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:13 PM

There are two people (DLSR and microscope)

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:46:57 PM

he got popped by a scammer

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:04:01 PM

it also removed the need for that function because I fixed the counts.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:23 PM

Its the application that's that far behind

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:47:04 PM

ugh

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:04:13 PM

Woot!

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:24 PM

Not the person

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:47:10 PM

You aren't doing anything with the form layout yet are you?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:35 PM

I udnerstand

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:04:49 PM

I don't know how many times I ahve said, I fixed the counts

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:40 PM

Its moving every 4th ballot; but the events get queued up or something

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Caleb Gould](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:47:13 PM

amazing

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:04:58 PM

I'm still not sure why it happened

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:47:25 PM

'cuz I'm about to make some changes

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:05:28 PM

but it was a threading issue where we were running a foreach loop and then another thread was modifying the iterator in the foreach loop

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:45 PM

I just meant how could it all get that behind for processing

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:56:17 PM

So, I figured out the file move problem...

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:47:31 PM

did I push up my feature branch

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:57 PM

I don't know.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:47:33 PM

because I did

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:57:23 PM

With processing the queue it starts with a queue of stuff to move. However, while going through that loop the associations loses entries, and therefore loses a count. As a result it ends up with one trio left behind.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 12:59:59 PM

Trying to figure out more

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:48:25 PM

I just pushed feature/not-a-branch but I forgot where I was

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:57:44 PM

You can reproduce it with three trios in the folder and hitting "Process Remaining"

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:00:25 PM

BTW, when you make an EXE, please make it from Build -> Publish MaricopaFileMove .

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:58:11 PM

I'm trying to fix it now, but if you have any immediate ideas, definitely let me know.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:00:32 PM

I am wondering if we just used the onchanged and on deleted to add to the queue

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:48:45 PM

I didn't merge it into development as I now there are likely issues with it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:50:03 PM

Okay, we'll I haven't done much with the form yet.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:00:35 PM

The EXE does NOT work by itself with the libraries being used.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:58:17 PM

LOts of smaller functions I don't know what they do yet

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:02:00 PM

Hmmm, I thought I fixed that.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:00:58 PM

that's weird, I grabbed that one but maybe not

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:50:20 PM

Let's get what you have merged in and I will redo the 15 minutes I have on re-organziing this.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:50:36 PM

Are you ready to merge yet? (I guess you said "in testing")

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:01:14 PM

David has nor anyone else has been able to run anything you sent.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:03:31 PM

Looks like its specifically caused because the OnDeleted is triggered on the move?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:01:19 PM

That's why I asked you before to create a published app

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:04:15 PM

I put a flag in to stop doing the ondelete while moving files

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:51:25 PM

I think I was fixing the last issues that pass my basic usage testing

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:01:30 PM

It works so much better with an installer.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:54:59 PM

yeah

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:04:32 PM

Is that code returned?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:55:03 PM

looks like it is doing ok

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:01:32 PM

that's nice to know now

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:05:02 PM

commit 46832c1fca5262c3dda4569c2cbdf8242186b05d

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:05:09 PM

Is that your latest?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:57:13 PM

so this is where I am leaning right now

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:55:08 PM

merging now

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:11:02 PM

I'm not sure. Not exactly home.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:58:17 PM

we change the associations collection to an ObservableCollection. This has an OnCollectionChanged event that gets triggered each time the collection is changed

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:56:56 PM

ok I pushed it up

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:59:34 PM

This way, we can monitor the directory for files and when one is changed, it will trigger the file onchange event to ONLY add or remove the association. Then we have the watcher on the collection actually do the file moving

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:57:03 PM

I don't think you need to redo anything

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:12:44 PM

Okay, I'll take a shot at fixing it.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:57:17 PM

I think you can merge these gui changes in

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 1:59:59 PM

this should free the filewatcher from doing any moving and just making associations

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:12:55 PM

I don't immediately see a flag passed... trying to figure out how to even do that.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:42:57 PM

Figure of speech

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:57:20 PM

ooo mybe not

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 2:00:14 PM

all the file moving will happen somewhere else

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 2:03:26 PM

my assumption is that the file watcher can only spawn one thread and has to do everything through that thread. I am not sure if it spawns a new thread for each event or not

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:43:07 PM

Search for doing_move

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:58:13 PM

hmm... not seeing a GUI change in what I pulled

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:43:18 PM

It should disable ondelete

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:58:19 PM

I should see a drop-down now, right?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 2:52:45 PM

That makes sense and could work

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:58:21 PM

try again

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:02:58 PM

I am still not exactly sure how to manage the not a ballot other than keeping a record in the config file

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:15:51 PM

I have it fixed. I used your "ignore_files" to do it; since that wasn't used otherwise



From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:58:34 PM

the first push failed because you had sent some up since I pulled earlier

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:29:17 AM

Yes, I got everything working

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Jim Matysek](#); [Caleb Gould](#); [Corey Foster](#); [Sara Metz](#); [Phillip Jones](#); [Laith Ellis](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:47:00 PM
Attachments: [0-eus-d8-fa76acbffa4ddf537a164c31d650eeb1](#)

Selected photo



From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 5:19:50 PM

What is not a batch

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:29:33 AM

I need a tag for the batch date, but that's it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:59:06 PM

Got it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:29:36 AM

Working on that now.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 5:18:51 PM

The issue is it didn't diassociate the PNG on the change of the type.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:59:13 PM

I didn't put the popup in before it moved it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 5:18:37 PM

Because its "not a batch" it is a finished association

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:59:25 PM

but that shouldn't interfere with anything you need to do

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:29:46 AM

Much easier to do after some sleep 

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:29:51 AM

I went to bed at 8:15pm last night

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 5:18:15 PM

Hmm, I am not sure I ever ended the batch with an unfinished association.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:59:35 PM

I see it now.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:29:52 AM

Yes

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 5:14:58 PM

Okay, if you add a PNG to a folder, then make it not-a-ballot and add two more images... then hit "end batch"... the PNG stays; but the count on PNG now says 0

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 5:59:49 PM

I'll add that in too

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:04:54 PM

When we pick one of the "no-ballot" names; does the name from the drop-down become part of the name?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 4:38:32 PM

You should be able to

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:31:52 AM

If I ask you to do something on a weekend, or some other craziness and I act like its "normal"; please realize its just because I don't know what day it is. Hopefully I won't make or almost make that mistake again.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 4:37:47 PM

Okay, what happens if I edit the table and set "Not_ballot" to "Ballot"? Can I now add a PNG?

What if I do the opposite? Does it lose / dissasociate the PNG with the item?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:05:19 PM

I have a merge tag for it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:34:40 AM

Just remind me what day it is 

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:55:27 AM

At the park with the dogs atm

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 4:05:52 PM

Yes because it reads config

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:05:24 PM

so it can

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 4:05:06 PM

Is that expected?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:55:57 AM

Enjoy your weekend. I've got this 

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:05:29 PM

but I did not add it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 4:04:55 PM

Right off the bat, I have a png file within the folder and it doesn't register / count it on startup.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:13:50 AM

Ah it's ok

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:05:48 PM

I mean, I did not alter the naming convention but I did create the tag

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:05:55 PM

Where are they saved now? Same location as the ballots?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:58:52 PM

I could be lying but I don't think so.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:14:16 AM

But I will let you know if I can't

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:16:12 AM



From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:58:43 PM

The only UI change would be enabling ballot dropdown

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:06:13 PM

I conveniently trim off the last directory

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:16:26 AM

I'm fighting with a CBO box not updating a value on change **sigh**

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:58:12 PM

Well, that **should** make it easier 

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:06:18 PM

of share location

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:46:27 AM

Use value committed

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:58:01 PM

It just doesn't have yours

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:06:22 PM

so that should be the box

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:57:55 PM

I have not made any ui changes

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:06:43 PM

Okay, I'm modifying the GUI now.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:46:47 AM

It isn't supposed to trigger on programming value changes

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:06:54 PM

so, just for your knowledge

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:47:05 AM

I was using it at one point but thought it was causing issues

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:57:24 PM

Its not huge

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:52:48 AM

```
private void cboTable__SelectionChangeCommitted(object sender, EventArgs e)
{
    this._table = cboTable.Text;
    this._write_config();
}
```

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:07:12 PM

if you call get directory on a directory, it gives you the parent directory of hte directory

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:57:09 PM



From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:52:54 AM

Yeah, that's not working... kind of confused

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:07:35 PM

Interesting

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:57:04 PM

ugg.. this diverged quite a bit from the UI I had done...

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:55:25 PM

I don't think I added it to the label now that you mention it.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 6:09:53 PM

how many times can I say directory

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:54:03 AM

Redid it from the GUI... works now

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:54:55 PM

NOTBALLOT

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 7:58:42 PM

Hey Eric

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:54:05 AM

Whatever

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:24:02 AM

Okay, I'm about ready to throw this thing out the window...

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:54:44 PM

Its not under "Merge Tags"

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 7:58:48 PM

Something is broken with your "not a ballot"

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:54:35 PM

What is the tag for the ballot / not a ballet for the file name?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:24:14 AM

BATCHNUM won't substitute on the files... but it looks like the rest of the substitutions...

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 7:59:00 PM

Even if "ballot" is chosen, it doesn't pair them in 3's.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:37:08 AM

Any idea why build_file_name_prefix is only called from process remaining?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 7:59:01 PM

Not surprising

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:50:13 PM

vstudio is ok

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:16:04 PM

Mistake maybe?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:50:07 PM

vscodes is pretty good

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 7:59:14 PM

That is surprising

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 7:59:46 PM

I just pushed to Development

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:17:49 PM

I figured out the problem... it was my fault.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:50:02 PM

I hate it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:17:59 PM

I thought something wasn't being replaced because %% was left over...

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:49:53 PM

github has a gui

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:15:08 PM

I'm going to need you to fix the "not-a-ballot" sometime before 7am AZ time (10am AZ Time), if at all possible; or to take out your not-a-ballot stuff.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:15:22 PM

I think it is fixed now

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:18:06 PM

Turned out I had left extra %% in the template

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:49:52 PM

LOL, didn't even know it was there.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:49:40 PM

in vstudio

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:18:07 PM

sigh

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:15:36 PM

Did you push those changes?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:18:17 PM

I know that feeling

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:49:30 PM

Is that a git GUI?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:15:49 PM

doing some checks before testing

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:48:56 PM

is another way


From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:18:32 PM

That was waaaay too much time.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:16:04 PM

trying to figure out if it I back up an undo too many times

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:48:46 PM
Attachments: [0-eus-d11-0cb9b567676981d42e39e50b526b1d78](#)



From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 3:42:34 PM

Can you give me a hint on how you're pulling the values from "Associations" to determine the isFoldable or whatever?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:16:14 PM

and lost the config updates

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:17:54 PM

Can you please signal a setup utility (Build -> Publish) to David Perkins when this is done so this can be further tested?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:48:32 PM

Looky there... another branch

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 6:58:05 PM

Quick question... how do you choose what columns would display in the datagrid?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:43:56 PM

Um, are you sure you tested yours?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:57:39 PM

Do you see the getters and setters that are set up on association?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:47:57 PM

I think git branch --remote

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:44:10 PM

I have really weird errors on start

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:47:33 PM

git fetch --all
git branch

I should see it in the list, right?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:58:08 PM

Sorry I was learning my new grill on some grouper

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:47:49 PM

Pretty sure

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:58:15 PM

I figured it out

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:46:47 PM

Really?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:46:25 PM

I'm not seeing your branch

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:58:46 PM

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:48:19 PM

clearing my config helped

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:43:36 PM

Still inline

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:48:29 PM

but the watch/active button doesn't seem to change states

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:48:45 PM

...or I thought I did... its all screwy again


From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:42:28 PM

or is it still inline?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 9:07:27 PM

ok, my mrege broke it so I aborted all that

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:48:48 PM

What is up with this code 

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:42:22 PM

Does the config association version offload the moving out of the watching thread now so its multi-threaded?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:48:48 PM

LOL

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 9:07:45 PM

I hate vstudio and will be changing to vscode tomororw

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:58:51 PM

I suspect threading issues

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 9:07:54 PM

maybe

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 3:42:03 PM

That's a good point on the multiple moves.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:59:08 PM

I suspect the same

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 9:27:17 PM

I sent out an updated build

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:55:16 PM

Say increase the queue to 6 And then process 3. That gives the app three more associations to catchup before it has to move again

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:59:13 PM

Fixing it is another thing though

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 12:47:07 AM

Thank you

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:54:19 PM

Also, I think you might be able to reduce the bottleneck of file watching if you increase the size of the queue and then process more at once

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:35:01 AM

Okay, we're having a lot of issues with the "not-a-ballot"

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:59:38 PM

I agree

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:37:00 PM

Have you had a chance to try a build with the association written to config?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:35:23 AM

Its prevented us from pushing out that updated software which we really needed out this morning.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:00:03 PM

The issue I have is it seems to work for a few runs so I send it off

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:23:30 PM

ok

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:17:23 PM

Based on what I'm seeing the likelihood of someone accidentally leaving something in not-a-ballot for a long time is relatively high.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 9:48:48 AM

Okay, I moved the current build over to "Master". I **think** we're in pretty good shape.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:35:48 AM

If you set something to "not a ballot"; it now treats the next file it moves as not-a-ballot rather than the one you just flagged.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:36:12 AM

That's weird

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 9:49:02 AM

Going to test this morning...

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:16:50 PM

We're talking about 1-2 things per 200+

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:36:17 AM

it worked on mine

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:16:40 PM

I don't see any reason NOT to prompt each time "not-a-ballot" is processed to confirm it should be not-a-ballot though...

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 9:49:54 AM

I'm getting a list of the box -> batch connections for an update, they REALLY need the "not a ballot" processing, and it would be good if we had validation that would prevent moving if of things if any of the fields are missing.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:36:33 AM

Load three normal ballots with 3 images

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:16:25 PM

Its possible we would have two not-a-ballots in a row; probably not more than that though.


From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 9:50:01 AM

I think tat that point we're pretty much done.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:36:48 AM

Then select a "not a ballot" and do two images.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 9:50:12 AM

If you're able to do any of that today 

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:16:00 PM

Based on the prompt we'd also change the dropdowns / etc. to match.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 1:15:23 PM

"if the application is set to notaballot, what happens when a png is dropped into the folder?" --
Not a ballots should be infrequent, can we prompt how the behavior works and do different
things based on how things go?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:36:54 AM

Then hit "End Batch"

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 10:22:50 AM

I'll definitely be looking at it

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:37:01 AM

All of the microscope images are left in the folder


From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:51:00 AM

The application is sitting on the feature/not-a-ballot branch

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:10:42 AM

I have some questions for you about the not a ballot

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:22:53 AM

Wow, I really don't know what day-of-the-week it is. I apparently didn't send it last night, but I had a few things I was going to ask you to get into the program today. Glad I missed that  I just realized it was Saturday a few minutes ago.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:50:30 AM

Do we just pause?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:39:08 AM

seems to work perfectly here

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:50:21 AM

what happens if the camera person drops in another notaballot?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:28:57 AM

Nice, you got it working?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:39:14 AM

I have one png left

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:29:04 AM

I just want it to get to beta lol

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:40:42 AM

Shouldn't you not have any png's left?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:50:02 AM

do we update the dropdown to say ballot?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:41:06 AM

Sorry, I dragged two batches of three in

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:49:51 AM

do we create a new association that is a ballot?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:59:16 AM

I also have the same issues that you did about resources not being available within hte current context and I can't build it

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:59:21 AM

what did you do to correct that?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:48:11 AM

I have an error about json.net reference not found

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:49:34 AM

if the application is set to notaballot, what happens when a png is dropped into the folder?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:48:59 AM

I need your help in determining the rules the watcher needs to take into a account

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:48:13 AM

any idea?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:03:38 AM

Did you download and add a reference to the EnterpriseLibrary? If you did, is there any reason you didn't add it to the repo?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:50:02 AM

You can remove it. I thought I got rid of that.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:12:59 AM

I have no idea what you are talking about with an enterprise library

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:48:41 AM

it is almost complete

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:50:06 AM

I used a different library

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Friday, June 04, 2021 10:48:29 AM

Douglas Logan, I just pushed up another change to feature not a ballot

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:12:36 AM

I have this

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 5:40:45 PM

but lots more to go

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:12:33 AM

Get some rest

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:50:56 AM

So I have no issues with files getting left behind

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:51:15 AM

but I have issues with them not going to the right folders

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 5:40:36 PM

the not-a-ballot part isn't working yet but I reading and writing the associations to config is

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:29:00 AM

The LogWriter is in the enterprise library

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 5:40:11 PM

this has storing associations in the config so we can use not-a-ballot

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:29:52 AM

Which you appear to have to download. It also has Using Microsoft.Practices.something else

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:52:02 AM

It will work perfect a couple of times, and then not

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:52:58 AM

I know you guys needed it this morning but if no one leaves feedback there is not much I can do

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 5:39:41 PM

ok, I pushed up feature/not-a-ballot branch

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:30:15 AM

Which is in the enterprise library

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:55:30 AM

They couldn't get the EXE to run that you gave last night.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:54:46 PM

it cannot be slower than file io

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:43:22 AM

Oops

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:43:28 AM

Yeah, I did add the logging.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:54:30 PM

sqlite would be fine

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:55:37 AM

I don't know why they didn't say something.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:01 AM

David did, I asked him a few things and no one else said it didn't run

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:54:15 PM

That's kind of why I was wondering if something like a firedb would work, if it was fast enough.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:43:36 AM

I thought I added it to the project; but I might not have committed that.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:17 AM

David was the only one who did anything with it

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:53:45 PM

so every time it is paused and unpaused, all that gets wiped out

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:43:45 AM

But I am not sure why it wouldn't have added the reference

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:53:31 PM

That would work accept, load associations just rebuilds the associations based on files in the dir

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:18:10 PM

I'd much rather write code

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:43:54 AM

Speaking of which, the logging to file has been HUGE in identifying problems with the few instances of this we've deployed.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:53:02 PM

You'd still have to fix the counting / rations.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:44:02 AM

Unless it doesn't being the ref into the project

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 8:18:06 PM

I have to go entertain senators 

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:52:47 PM

In associations, couldn't you just have it setup so there was a "type" for the association?

On the adding of an image, you'd also double-check that association.

If its not-a-ballot then any microscope check always returns true, aka is_ready is true?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:44:27 AM

*bring

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:44:29 AM

I have only been committing the .cs files due to all the noise

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:44:38 AM

Its probably in the actual project file.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:44:42 AM

Yeah, I am going to fix the ignore

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:45:09 AM

I would think if it was in the project then I wouldn't get ref errors

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:45:41 AM

Repull

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:46:53 AM

I think that did it.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:47:29 AM

I didn't want to do anything as I assumed it was something easy.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:47:41 AM

In any case, if you need me to do anything with this, let me know.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:48:59 AM

I've got a list of the boxes and the batches. I'm going to be adding a JSON file for that.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:49:19 AM

That will then allow us to tie the box to the batch and have them pre-filled out.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:49:45 AM

cool, what ended up fixing the threading issue?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:49:55 AM

presuming it was a threading issue

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:50:04 AM

Right now when they hit the space bar for the OBS to capture the microscopes, they are occasionally entering that into the batch field. This is creating crazy folders and really messing things up.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:50:27 AM

oof, yeah I can see that being an issue

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:50:49 AM

They also aren't noticing when the auto move stops, and are going 40+ ballots farther as if all is well....

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:50:59 AM

yeah

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:05 AM

one of the things I was going to do was the status bar

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:05 AM

So we need to add some "danger Will Robinson" type stuff so they don't do that.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:08 AM

with an error mesasge

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:22 AM

I did that, but for some reason its not always putting a status in.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:25 AM

I am thinking of forcing a message box

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:36 AM

And it will save them a lot of time to have a way to process "not a ballot"

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:37 AM

if we stop, it means there is an issue

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:50 AM

Yeah, that makes sense.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:51:58 AM

so I wanted to talk about not a ballot

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:52:43 AM

They said when it is set as not a ballot, the front and back will be compressed and inserted into a pdf and written to the share drive

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:53:14 AM

will it not have a microscope image, if not, how do we handle that without the not a ballot button triggering a special procedure

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:53:34 AM

LOL, we're not doing all that extra processing.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:53:45 AM

yeah

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:53:47 AM

so what do we do?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:53:53 AM

just move over as normal?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:53:54 AM

We just need to put it in a different place and name it differently so we know its not a ballot.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:54:05 AM

gotcha

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:54:23 AM

but how would we trigger without a microscope?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:54:45 AM

I kind of like the idea of a drop down which signifies what it is rather than just not-a-ballot, because most of that stuff is known. Having a catch-all "other" is fine.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:55:44 AM

Dropdown->Ballot,Other?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:55:51 AM

for now anyway?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:55:57 AM

BTW, as a temp fix while we get this other stuff in; I was thinking of possibly having a button which "locks" or "unlocks" the box / batch settings.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:56:47 AM

Dropdown -> Ballot, Batch Sheet, Tally Sheet, Other

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:57:24 AM

With some control in place where if you choose anything besides "Ballot" it asks you to confirm before processing the item.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:57:38 AM

SO you can't accidentally leave it on "not a ballot"

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:58:00 AM

And to confirm: do not-a-ballots have all three images?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:58:24 AM

No

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:58:29 AM

At most they'd have front-back.

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:58:40 AM

We can require front-back always if needed.

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:59:26 AM

so, user sets program to not a ballot, scans front, scans back

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 10:59:49 AM

then on change of ballot type, we add that association to the queue?

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 11:01:15 AM

If its not-a-ballot and has a front-back, then its "is_ready"

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:52:18 PM

Do you know how to properly embed a JSON into a project like this, and then how to reference it?

From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:52:51 PM

The short answer is no

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 10:27:07 PM

Numbering not updating when a file is moved

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Eric Richardson](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:56:22 AM

Who else were you expecting to hear from?

















From: [Eric Richardson](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Microsoft Teams Message
Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021 12:53:15 PM

but I think you right click in the solution explorer -> Add Resource

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Missing Document
Date: Thursday, June 17, 2021 6:36:33 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Folders > Maricopa > Data > 20210115 - 32GB USB > IV - Additional Documents Provided By County Court Documents

 IV - Additional Documents Provided By County Court Documents More Options

<input type="checkbox"/>	Name ▲	Size	Uploaded	Creator
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IV.B. Final November 2020 General Election Day and Emergency Voting Plan 9-16-20.pdf	1 MB	4/12/21	D. Logan
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IV.C. Hands on Outline 9.15.pdf	105 KB	4/12/21	D. Logan
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IV.D. Tabulator Aid_9.14.20.pdf	147 KB	4/12/21	D. Logan
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IVE SOS - Pre Logic and Accuracy.pdf	589 KB	4/12/21	D. Logan
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IV.F. SOS - Post Logic and Accuracy.pdf	1 MB	4/12/21	D. Logan
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IV.G. Final Certification Letter - Dominion DS 5.5-B.PDF	62 KB	4/12/21	D. Logan
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IV.H. 2020 Arizona Secretary of State Election Cycle - Voting Equipment list.pdf	64 KB	4/12/21	D. Logan
<input type="checkbox"/>	  IV.I. SOS - Certified Vote Tabulating Equipment.pdf	133 KB	4/12/21	D. Logan

If the ShareFile contains all of the records from the County, they did not send you **IV.A. Final General Election Manual** I am not sure if this document would be different than the EPM that I have been using as my source, but it would be interesting to compare the two.

Thanks,
H.

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171
www.Haystack.Group



From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: New Finding - HAVA Violations
Date: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 10:52:57 AM
Attachments: [Finding - First Time Voters .docx](#)

Here you go. This also needs legal confirmation—waiting for Stefanie to let me know if she is aware of a loophole that would exempt them from the HAVA requirement.

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: New Finding - Real Time Provisionals (not in EPM)
Date: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 11:45:34 AM
Attachments: [Finding - Real Time Provisional Ballot.docx](#)

I have asked Stefanie to verify the violation of the law here as well.

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: New Finding - Runbeck Call
Date: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 10:24:51 AM
Attachments: [Finding - Runbeck Call .docx](#)

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Internal Audit Services](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Andre C McCOY](#)
Cc: [Internal Audit Services](#); [Scott Sigman](#)
Subject: News brief of Sexual Harrassment
Date: Saturday, July 03, 2021 6:43:27 PM

Good Evening Doug/Andre,

I just saw the news clip regarding sexual harassment and hostile work place allegations.

I hope you know this and have acted already, but if not, FYI - any allegation of this nature no matter how farfetched, (Must) be formally investigated and documented by Labor and Employment Law mandate in all States. If you have not put together a case file in proper investigative format on this matter, I can help you with this as this is something my firm handles somewhat frequently.

(All) investigative actions to include dates, time, location, interviews, written statements of alleged victim(s), suspect(s), witness(s), management that you have spoken to telephonically or in person must be properly documented. Additionally, any corrective action regarding the matter under investigation to include verbal, written reprimands up to and including termination(s) must also be properly documented should you get called to question and by the sound of the news clip you probably will.

Best and Happy 4th of July!!

John
M-561-602-0571 (Direct)*

John Capizzi, CFE
President & CEO
Internal Audit Services, Inc., Int'l.
Phila: 215-745-1529
Palm Beach: 561-626-7746
www.internalauditservices.com
[Facebook.com/internalauditservices](https://www.facebook.com/internalauditservices)
[Linkedin.com/company/internal-audit-services-inc](https://www.linkedin.com/company/internal-audit-services-inc)
[Twitter.com/audit_inc](https://twitter.com/audit_inc)

From: [Andrew Stavro](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Online DVR
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 11:43:16 AM

Doug,

I can't see anything out of the ordinary but if you want to take a look, here is what you need to see it.

Download VLC Player:

<https://www.videolan.org/vlc/>

Once installed, go to "File", then "Open Network", then paste the address below:

https://cdn.klowdtv.net/803B48A/AZAudit_West/live/AZAuditSource1_ABR/playlist_dvr_range-1626987600-7200.m3u8

then hit "Open" at the bottom of the dialogue box, not the Open Stream button

If you want to look at other clips, you can do that the following way. First thing is to go to the Epoch Time Converter page. Here you can enter the time and date of what you want to see, then it will convert it to Epoch time.

<https://www.epochconverter.com>

once you do that, copy the time code that it gives you and just place it into the link above. Below, is the portion you would be replacing. The -3600 is the duration. 3600 is essentially an hour of time.

https://cdn.klowdtv.net/803B48A/AZAudit_West/live/AZAuditSource1_ABR/playlist_dvr_range-1626548400-3600.m3u8

it sounds like a pain, but once you get it going it's pretty straight forward. When you start playing a clip, it may be fuzzy for the first 30 seconds or so, it just needs to cache in and it will clean up.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Andy Stavro / **480.586.6121** / Road Dog Show Pros, LLC

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Pending Issues
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2021 6:46:56 PM
Attachments: [Machine Count - Senate Process v2.docx](#)

Hi Doug,

Attached is the procedure for the Machine Count. Bryan and Randy both signed off on it. I believe that Randy was working with Carol to recruit some volunteers to start the process tomorrow. After the jogger is delivered, I am hoping that Randy will do some accuracy testing before making a final decision about using the machine count. I am concerned that adding an inaccurate count to the mix will create unnecessary issues. Sharyn and Michele have volunteered to be the verifiers/recorders for the machine counting if Randy goes forward with it. Both will be there on Monday. The tech will be there in the afternoon to train people to use the jogger and the machine counter. I gave Randy the necessary files on a USB drive. I have to do training for a client on Tuesday and Wednesday but will be able to come back as early as Thursday.

- I am working on a summary of duplicate issues so you will have good information to provide on Thursday. Maybe we can schedule some time to discuss it on Wednesday evening?
- If you have a chance, can you please upload some other images with the serial number to your ShareFile or send via email? I can't properly download from Signal.
- Did you get the batch number from Jovan? Even the box ID would be helpful if he can't determine the batch.
- Are you (or is someone) doing a count of the ballot images to compare to the CVR count? They should be the same but...you never know.
- If you are able to locate Suzanne's number, that would be great.

Thanks,
Heather

[Heather Honey](#)

Phone: 717.288.7171
www.Haystack.Group

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Platinum Ballot Finding
Date: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 4:30:32 PM
Attachments: [Findings - Platinum.docx](#)

The numbers for the EV33 still need to be checked but otherwise this is good to go. I realize that this is a bit late but I had an appointment and just got back to my computer.

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Sara Metz](#)
To: [conan](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Possible Threat 7/19.21
Date: Monday, July 19, 2021 12:25:25 PM

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 12:24 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-07-17 16:01:07 - New submission from Contact from the IP 64.252.141.75

First & Last Name

eat shit

Email

eatshist@trumpsucksass.com

Phone

(468) 776-9980

Company Name

Don't Knock on My Door

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

. . . or I'll blow your fucking head off with my 2nd amendment.

From: [Sara Metz](#)
To: [conan](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Possible Threat
Date: Monday, July 19, 2021 12:16:43 PM

Hello, please see below, first one we've had come though online in a while.

Sara

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 12:16 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-07-18 16:37:36 - New submission from Contact from the IP 130.176.28.73

First & Last Name

marge dory

Email

dory1234567abc@yahoo.com

Phone

(256) 334-5612

Which service are you in?

General Contact

Message

After long and careful consideration, and after weighing the pros and cons for several months, I have decided that I am going to kill someone who works for Cyber Ninjas. I haven't yet decided when, or exactly how, but I can tell you this: the killing will take place within the next twelve months, and it will like an accident (such as a car accident, an electrocution, or my favorite, an accidental drowning). I have killed before. I will kill again. I like killing.

From: [Sara Metz](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [conan](#)
Subject: Possible Threat
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 3:11:36 PM

No real name, but obviously an IP address.

Sara

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 3:09 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-07-23 19:47:37 - New submission from Contact from the IP 130.176.5.165

First & Last Name

Doug Logan Hitler

Email

mikehuntyourass@gmail.com

Phone

(314) 926-6798

Company Name

ANTI CYBERNINJAS LLC

Which service are you in?

- Cyber Red Team

Message

Why you think nobody takes you seriously? Because you are full of shit up to your ears and who would take you seriously with all your UNVERIFIED claims that no court has backed you on because they are JUST BIG LIES. I hope those like you push things in CIVIL WAR II. If you do I and all my friends look forward to KILLING white racist rich cunts like you AND seizing all your money and burning you house to the ground. Keep up that good work, because WAR, DEALTH, and destruction is also on my agenda for the future, my trigger finger is itching to GET YOU and others like you on the noose (Hanging you is what that means). Have a good death, my enemy and we will cheer. Ding Dong the witch will soon be dead.

From: [Sara Metz](#)
To: [conan](#)
Subject: Possible Threat?
Date: Friday, August 20, 2021 1:44:00 PM

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2021 1:43 PM
To: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Sara Metz <smetz@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: 2021-08-19 22:11:30 - New submission from Contact from the IP 70.132.48.74

First & Last Name

Doug Logan Hitler

Email

idiot-Nazi@yahoo.com

Phone

(314) 926-5020

Company Name

ANTI CYBERNINJAS LLC

Which service are you in?

- Computer Based Training

Message

You idiots still at it, even after you made a fool of yourself one more time. You couldn't admit your own ass trying to find hemorrhoids. I can't wait for the second "CIVIL WAR" that you want so badly want to start. Because then it will be legal to "KILL" assholes like you. Let's do it my trigger finger is itching to be busy getting rid of TRAITORS like you and MAGA's in general that are behind this insurrection/rebellion movement. US REAL patriots will "GET YOU ALL" sooner or later. Keep it up if you want to DIE. I most certainly want you to DIE and can't wait to take my shots at you.

Have a NATZI good day and please push this into WAR (I like war and do want it to happen sooner than later).

From: [Adam Klasfeld](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Press Inquiry: Arizona audit
Date: Friday, September 24, 2021 12:12:02 PM

Dear Mr. Logan:

Do you have any comment on the draft report on the Arizona audit confirming President Biden's victory and even expanding his lead in Maricopa County?

I would appreciate a quick response.

Thank you,
Adam

--

Adam Klasfeld
Managing editor, Law&Crime
Host of the Law&Crime podcast: "Objections: with Adam Klasfeld"
adamklasfeld@lawandcrime.com
www.lawandcrime.com
201.755.4272 (cell/Signal/WhatsApp)
Twitter: [@KlasfeldReports](#)

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Public records request
Date: Thursday, January 06, 2022 2:23:14 PM
Attachments: [Records request-Cyber Ninjas 11-10-21.pdf](#)

In light of Judge Hannah's ruling today, I am resubmitting the public records request I previously submitted on Nov. 10. Please acknowledge receipt of this request.

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Public records request
Date: Wednesday, November 10, 2021 12:24:57 PM
Attachments: [Records request-Cyber Ninjas 11-10-21.pdf](#)

Please acknowledge receipt of this public records request, which I'm filing pursuant to the Arizona Court of Appeals' Nov. 10, 2021, decision in *Cyber Ninjas v Hannah*.

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
Subject: Question on audit contract/ deliverables
Date: Thursday, October 28, 2021 2:32:01 PM

Hi, Mr. Logan:

I hope this message finds you well. I've just finished reading your email to Arizona Senate Pres. Karen Fann on the issue of the aggregate spreadsheet, and I'd like to take you up on your offer to answer any questions.

In the email, you noted that providing the aggregate data wasn't "a deliverable" under your contract with the Senate. I am hoping you can explain why you don't think this was required under the contract. I am also hoping you can explain what you do consider "deliverable" under the Senate contract.

Yes, I have reviewed the master services agreement and the statement of work. Those documents lead me to ask:

- When was the hand count actually completed.
- Why did it take more than a month from your Sept. 24 report to the Senate to the time you provided the spreadsheet data?
- Why was it in your original plan to provide the data if it was never part of a deliverable?
- What other non-deliverables did you hope to provide to the Senate?
- Is there any part of the contract that is outstanding?
- What are the ways you believe Cyber Ninjas met its contract goals?
- Why wouldn't the specific numbers – the tally sheets connected to the hand count – be required under the contract?
- Do you believe the spreadsheets as you describe them reflect the same numbers you reported to the Senate on Sept. 24 with regard to the outcomes of the presidential and senate races in Maricopa County?
- Are there any outstanding deliverables evinced in the contract?

As always, I appreciate your timely response to my questions. As you know, I am a reporter working on deadline and need to hear back from you within 24 hours. I can be reached at 602-316-8395 if you would like to discuss this.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Archer, Garrett](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Question regarding aggregation sheets used for the hand count
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 2:23:20 PM

Good Afternoon Mr. Logan,

As posted in the AZCentral last night, Larry Moore claims that the hand count numbers released by the audit are not backed by anything. He is making this claim based on the public records release of the machine count tables. I've spoken with Randy who has told me that Moore is making an error by using this table. He told me that you have data that would refute Moore's claim. Do you have the data Pullen is referring to and if so would you be willing to share it?

Thank you,

Garrett Archer
ABC15 Specialty Producer
515 N 44th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85008
P: 602.685.6327
Garrett.Archer@abc15.com

Scripps Media, Inc., certifies that its advertising sales agreements do not discriminate on the basis of race or ethnicity. All advertising sales agreements contain nondiscrimination clauses.

From: [Jim Hoft](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Jim Hoft](#)
Subject: Questions on Your Statements
Date: Friday, October 08, 2021 3:39:35 PM
Attachments: [jkjpmfkmphfcbjak.png](#)

Hi Doug:

To be totally honest, while I believe Trump and the country were bamboozled, I really do strive to always get the story right. The truth is what it is, and I'm not interested in publishing falsehoods for obvious ethical and moral reasons. I'm not trying to be inflammatory, but I'm frustrated because I feel like there is a great deal of confusion, here, where there ought not be.

I remember considering whether or not I should ask to record our conversation. I don't recall asking for your permission (because if I had, I would have certainly recorded the call). However, I do not have an audio recording.

For the sake of clarity, I will refer to the report containing the executive summary decertification language as the "**draft report**" throughout this email. It is my understanding now that there were several drafts, but for our purposes here, I think we're trying to get on the same page re this particular one.

After our conversation, I wrote this article (28 Sept. 2021): <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/threatened-exclusive-interview-douglas-logan-cyber-ninjas-arizona-senate-forensic-audit/>

In that article, I recounted my recollection of what you had told me:

Doug Logan told us that one of the draft reports that was floating around the internet was not from the Cyber Ninjas. It was a fraud! This report included language that Doug recommended the Arizona Senate to decertify the November election.

Doug assured us he never had this language in any of his reports. *It was made up!*

I then noted that the draft report we had originally published was fake: [caption] "This statement [the conclusion in the executive summary] above was from a fake report released on the internet."

I then further wrote, based on our conversation:

Doug told us today that this early report was a hoax. His team never wrote that report and it appears someone took his letterhead and used it to create their own fake report. Doug told us that he is not going to reveal at this time who they think is behind the fake report.

So to recap, the quotes above made several key points:

1. You told me that the draft report was not from Cyber Ninjas;
2. You told me it was a fraud;
3. No Cyber Ninjas report contained this language;
4. The draft report was a hoax;
5. Your team never wrote that report;
6. It appeared to you that someone took your letterhead and used it to create a falsified report;
7. You had an idea who it was but would not say whom you believed had forged the report. [I say 'forged' here, because if it didn't come from you or your team, and if it was a fraud, a hoax, then what else could it be, given that it had your letterhead on it?]

Now, if any of those points are incorrect, I stand ready to be corrected because I have no motive but to get the story right. After posting this article, I really didn't expect much more on this subject. And this is primarily because the above seven (7) points were further corroborated by statements that your PR Firm, Thomsen, circulated to AZ media outlets, discussed below.

See here: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/laurieroberts/2021/09/28/cyber-ninjas-audit-report-not-fake-lie-wont-die/5902082001/>

The gossip rag [Gateway Pundit] published what it claimed was an early draft of the Cyber Ninjas' audit report, one that concludes Arizona's "election results should not be certified and the reported results are not reliable."

But that language was nowhere to be found in the audit drafts obtained by real reporters on Thursday or in the final report released Friday by the Arizona Senate.

Rather than verifying that its "draft report" was real, the GP gossip site just went with it, as did other conservative blogs.

The draft isn't real. But that won't stop the lie

Their scoop quickly turned to poop when the Arizona Capitol Times Wayne Schutsky confirmed on Monday that the draft audit cited by the Gateway Pundit and other conservative blogs is not real.

"This is a fake document," Senate audit liaison Randy Pullen told Schutsky in a text message.

Meanwhile, the Cyber Ninjas disputed the draft report touted by GP, calling it "absolutely false."

"It was not written by Cyber Ninjas CEO Doug Logan, nor was it in any version that was ever sent or shown to the Senate for review," the auditors' statement said. "Specifically, this false version of the Executive Summary states, 'the election should not be certified'."

So AZ Central's interpretation of statements from your firm is materially the same as what I wrote above, and it quotes your firm as having stated:

- a) that the draft report was "absolutely false";
- b) it was not written by yourself, nor was it in any version circulated to the Senate; and
- c) again, that the draft report and executive summary were false.

And AZ Free News wrote something similar, here: <https://azfreenews.com/2021/09/gateway-pundit-published-falsified-draft-of-maricopa-county-audit-report/>

A purported draft of the Maricopa County election audit report calling for decertification has been circulating online since the official audit report on Friday. This version of the audit report called for decertification of the 2020 election results. *The Gateway Pundit*, a right-leaning news outlet, originally published the purported draft. In a press release response on Monday, the auditing company Cyber Ninjas asserted that the draft and its recommendations of decertification weren't real.

The *Gateway Pundit* draft is not the same draft audit report leaked to media outlets last Friday prior to the Senate presentation. That draft audit report is valid, whereas the one in which Cyber Ninjas recommended decertification isn't valid.

This "draft" of the audit report was uploaded to Scribd by Jim Hoft, founder and editor-in-chief of *Gateway Pundit*. It was then reported on by Joe Hoft, Jim's twin brother, in an article published Sunday afternoon, "Arizona Audit Final Report Was Watered Down: Reports from Cyber Ninjas Were Edited, Most Damning Statements Removed – What Else Was Removed?"

AZ Free News reached out to *Gateway Pundit* to inquire about the origins of this draft report. They didn't offer a response by press time.

The PR team for Cyber Ninjas, the Thomson Group, issued a statement on Monday that the draft audit report from *Gateway Pundit* was falsified and wasn't from Cyber Ninjas.

There is a false version of the Executive Summary of the Maricopa County Forensic Election Audit report that is circulating. This false version claims to be an earlier version of the Cyber Ninjas Executive Summary, but because of supposed threats from the Senate, it was not used. This is absolutely false.

The exact origins to the Executive Summary found at the following scribd link are unknown. But it was not written by Cyber Ninjas CEO Doug Logan, nor was it any version that was ever sent or shown to the Senate for review. Specifically, this false version of the Executive Summary states, 'the election should not be certified.'

This was not written by Cyber Ninjas. It is Cyber Ninjas' perspective that whether an election should or should not be certified is to be determined by the legislature, and not auditors. The audit team's job is to supply all the facts and findings surrounding the election and recommend legislative reforms.

So this article quotes from a statement issued by Thomson PR on 28 Sept. 2021, which stated:

- (i) The draft report is a fraud;
- (ii) it purports to contain an earlier draft of the Executive Summary;
- (iii) The origins of the draft report are unknown;
- (iv) the draft report was not written by Doug Logan;
- (v) the draft report was not circulated to the Senate;
- (vi) The draft report was not authored by anyone at Cyber Ninjas.



So far, everything was consistent, by my reckoning.

However, you can imagine my surprise when I listened to your podcast with Joe Oltmann:

<https://rumble.com/vnf092-cyber-ninjas-ceo-tells-congress-to-fork-off-and-joins-us-instead.html>

At time stamp 1:06:00, Joe asks if you if the draft report was authored by someone on your team. You confirmed that it WAS drafted by someone on your team.

So I'm just following the logic trail where it goes. If I'm incorrect, please set me straight. And, as you saw above, we were happy to correct our reporting of the matter because we want to be truthful, and if we're wrong, we own up to it. And this remains the case.

But, your PR firm and you, to my recollection of our conversation, all completely disavowed the draft report as a total fraud and something which did not originate from your team.

Then, on the Oltmann podcast, you stated that it did indeed originate from someone on your team. As a result of this, we ran our article: <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/10/breaking-exclusive-doug-logan-now->

[admits-draft-report-published-gateway-pundit-authentic-legitimate-telling-gateway-pundit-fake/](#)

The language may be harsh, but I honestly don't know how else to convey the information based on how things have played out and your own statements, particularly through Thomson, with me, and with Oltmann. We [and many other outlets] were told that the draft report was a total fabrication [and led to believe that it was some rogue forgery by some malicious party].

To be fair, I think it's only appropriate for you to explain this, and also to both identify who authored the language at issue in the draft report, and who they work for.

I am happy to discuss this - I'm happy to record this time for clarity's sake.

Thanks,

Jim

#####



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Seth Grove](#); [Russ Diamond](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#); andy@polytechpub.com
Subject: Recommendations for Verbiage
Date: Monday, June 14, 2021 11:48:03 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Good Morning,

Please see recommendation below based on Doug's experience working in this space.

"All computer systems with access to or from the internet or are otherwise made available to the public must go through vulnerability and penetration testing a minimum of once every fiscal year by a qualified third party. This assessment and penetration testing should be conducted from every entry point available to any non-state employee and should include both manual and automated testing by a team with at least one individual that holds the Offensive Security Certified Professional (OSCP), the GIAC Penetration Tester (GPEN); or who has more than 5 years of full-time experience conducting offensive security engagements, such as penetration testing. The third party vendor must agree and be willing to sign a statement at the conclusion of the vulnerability assessment outlining any factors that may have limited the effectiveness of the testing; or stating that there were no factors that prevented effective and complete testing from being completed and the resulting report is an accurate representation of the risk. The third party report will identify vulnerabilities that could be exploited to compromise network security controls and provide actionable remediation recommendations.

Applications deployed for use by the state must meet the then current OWASP Application Security Verification Standard Level 2 requirements. Any applications associated with elections or handling personally identifiable information must meet the Level 3 requirements of this standard. Full compliance with this standard must be fully validated by a qualified third party vendor before an application is deployed and a minimum of once every 5 years, with all provisions applicable to manual application penetration testing confirmed on years where the full standard is not validated.

To be a qualified third party vendor allowed to conduct Application Security Verification Standard (ASVS) assessment or the manual application penetration testing; the company must conduct a minimum of \$500,000 in annual revenue specifically in the area of application security. In addition, the assessment team must have at least one member who holds the Offensive Security Web Expert (OSWE), the GIAC Web Application Penetration Tester (GWAPT), or has more than 5 years of full-time experience specifically conducting offensive application security engagements. In the case of complex applications, the third party vendor must also hold expertise assessing applications within the same subject matter."

Please let us know if you have any questions or if you need any additional details.

Thank you,
Heather

Phone: 717.288.7171
www.Haystack.Group



From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
Subject: request for interview/ comment
Date: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 2:27:54 PM

Hi, Doug:

I am reaching out to you today regarding a story I am working on concerning Cyber Ninjas. Among the topics I plan to address are:

- The court ordered fines, which today reached \$200,000 (only counting business days) for failure to turn over audit-related records
- Your text messages to Karen Fann regarding the status of your company and any responses she might have provided to you (her public position is that she did not respond to you in any format)
- Your involvement in the creation of Akolytos LLC (if any). To be completely transparent, I have no records showing your name on corporation filings despite reports in blogs and the Washington Post. I can see that the company address is the same as Cyber Ninjas, but that appears to be a postal box used by a corporation registrar)
- A directive by Fann mailed yesterday to audit subcontractors requiring them to preserve documents related to their work

As always, I want to thank you for your time. Because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need to hear back from you today. I can be reached at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); KFANN@azleg.gov; rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
Subject: Response to analysis of hand count/ accusations of malfeasance
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 2:15:26 PM

Hello:

I want to make sure you have ample time to respond to a new analysis of the hand count numbers by Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen.

Their analysis is based on the nearly 80,000 pages of vote/ tally data released by the Senate on Nov. 1. They conclude that the data shows the numbers were made up and are not supported.

A link to their report can be found here: <https://docs.real-audits.org/s/iJFMEiz3jHBE9Bt>

Their report makes several claims about the nature of the audit, which they concluded was meaningless. They say the numbers reported to the Senate on Sept. 24 cannot be replicated or verified.

Among their claims:

- Sen. Karen Fann and the Cyber Ninjas “tried” to hand count 2.1 million ballots and proved a couple of things.
- They were not able to accurately hand count either the number of ballots cast in the Maricopa County 2020 General Election or the votes on those ballots, and
- They spent about \$9 million over 7 months, so far, and have proven absolutely nothing.
- The Ninjas were convinced that the auditors could not trust anything the county said and the Dominion election management system could not count the ballots or the votes correctly or had been manipulated so that the official results were not valid.
- This presumption was fatal to the validity of the “forensic audit”. It caused them to never actually audit the election results but rather to attempt to create a new result that the public would accept. Unfortunately, the procedures they followed and the records they kept and relied on to announce results were so erroneous that nothing they reported could be relied on by the public.

Their report follows two other reports in October that Mr. Logan and Mr. Pullen said were

built on faulty assumptions and incomplete data.

This raises several issues that I hope you will address:

- Since the latest report is built on the definitive data about the hand count, do you agree with the assessment?
- Explain why/ why not you believe their analysis is wrong.
- Is there data that remains outstanding that you believe would neuter the findings? If so, what?
- Identify anything misleading in the report.
- How do you each respond to individual accusations leveled against you in the summary? That includes one alleging Sens. Fann, Eddie Farnsworth and Warren Peteresn “ abused their offices by becoming involved in a conspiracy initially intended to allow Donald Trump to remain in power through a series of largely aspirational extra-constitutional processes.”

As always, I want to make sure you have the information before I begin writing any story. However, because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need to hear back from you within 24 hours.

If you wish to reach me directly, feel free to call at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Anglen, Robert](#)
Subject: Response to Maricopa County, questions
Date: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 1:47:48 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Cyber Ninjas Response - Maricopa County Analysis of Senate Report.pdf](#)

Hi Doug and Rod,

We just received a copy of Cyber Ninjas' response to the county's response of the Cyber Ninjas' audit results (attached).

We are wondering if you could please update us on when Cyber Ninjas will be providing to the Senate all of your work product – including all of your spreadsheets containing the hand count and ballot inspection results – that would provide proof of your findings in the audit report. It would seem that providing all of your work product would help back up your findings and claims.

Also, there has been an assertion that the hand count results in the final report Cyber Ninjas provided to the Senate were not finalized. Can you please let us know if that is the case, and if so, when the results from the hand count will be final and publicly available?

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Response to Maricopa County
Date: Thursday, October 21, 2021 2:05:30 PM

I understand that Cyber Ninjas has issued a response to Maricopa County. I have what I'm told is the original version, but I hear there's an updated version that you've drafted?

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Randy Pullen](#)
To: [Anglen, Robert](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#); rod@thomsonpr.com; [Tulumello, Kathy](#)
Subject: Re: 695 page report/ interview on analysis
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 4:23:46 PM

Hi Robert,

This is no different than what I sent to you before regarding Pallet 15.. Cyber Ninjas was not finished with their reconciliation of their hand count when we started the machine count Doug Logan provided the counts on boxes that they had completed their reconciliation. Reconciling is a common part of any audit you are performing. Once again, Mr. White and Mr. Moore are overreaching on their conclusions. Have a nice day!

With best regards,

Randy Pullen

On Mon, Oct 11, 2021 at 11:41 AM Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com> wrote:

Mr. Logan / Mr. Pullen:

I am reaching out to you today for comment on the 695 page report on the ballot counts that was released Friday. Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen this morning reported to me their findings of that data.

They say the top line of their review shows that the hand count performed by Cyber Ninjas is off by 316,740 ballots from the Senate's authorized machine count. They describe that as a 15% error rate.

They say that their analysis found 167,524 ballots that the Cyber Ninjas "did not count" with references to various pages in the report showing uncounted boxes.

They say the 695 pages reinforces their prior claims that the count was a fiction that can't be trusted.

I know you responded previously to these criticisms; and at the time told me that the analysis was faulty in part because it was limited to 17 pages. However, I want to make sure you have an opportunity to respond to the new claims built on the entire 695 page report.

As always, I can be reached at 602-316-8395. I expect to publish a story this afternoon. I need to hear back from you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen

Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 11:55 AM
To: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: RE: Interview request/

Robert,

I do believe that Randy Pullen talked with you last week and explained that the sheets in his machine count were pulled before our work was complete. As a result an analysis of those is mostly meaningless. As we publicly relayed at the time the work was being done, we were working on Quality Control when we moved into the green building. That was making sure that every single batch was properly allocated to the right pallet, and the right batch, that there were no double-entries, and that batch numbers were entered properly. With the massive amount of data, this was a particularly challenging and time-consuming task. We not only had to do with the occasional typo from our team; but in some cases the batch number on the manifest, and/or the batch number on the box, and/or the batch number on the batch sheet did not match. When they didn't match we had to be sure we consistently handled it in the same way so that as much as possible so that everything could hopefully match up with the County's data, even when the County's data didn't agree with itself. With a decent percentage of the boxes having batch sheets on the side of the box, rather than

separating the batches; and some boxes without any batch separators at all, it would literally be impossible for us to match up our data at the batch level to everything since the batches were not clearly marked. We had to assume the batches were in a certain order that matched the label; then again, not every batch was on the label.

Ray's response in general seems more objective than the last report you sent over; but its still has quite a few assumptions and misunderstandings that make quite a bit of it inaccurate. There is also a clear bias for saying things in a negative way whenever possible.

Your first point is a great example. There is a 263 discrepancy among the two ballot totals between the Presidential race and the Senate race. We identified it, highlighted it and footnoted it to explain it. This amounts to 1/100th of a percent of the total ballots counted; and yet its some huge embarrassment? I think the fact we recorded it as-is instead of just trying to cover it up shows our integrity. There is no perfect handling of 2.1 million ballots, especially with over 1,500 people involved and many of them volunteers. A certain number of clerical errors is expected. The fact the count is different between the Senate and Presidential races is not surprising when you consider we applied the "2 out of 3 counts need to agree, and the 3rd needs to be within 1 per 50 ballots" per race instead of per tally sheet. This meant that often when things had to be retallied because it was out of those thresholds it was a single race that was counted.

Prior criticism that came in, I believe it was from Bennie Smith; stated that hand counting was extremely inaccurate and was routinely off by 2% of the total ballot counts. They utilized it to try and discredit us while we were conducting the work. Our accuracy to the official results actually proves that our hand counting method is extremely accurate and blows those numbers away. I have no doubt that's part of the reason why these "experts" are having a hard time believing they were legitimate. However, its also worth noting that none of these reports were put together by anyone who ever hand counted anything close to 2.1 million ballots, nor conducted an audit anywhere close to the scope of what we did. As a result are they truly the right experts to critique a discrepancy of 1/100th of a percentage point?

I don't disagree with Lutz's comments that the Tally Sheets should be made publicly available; but that is a decision for the Senate to make not us. In totally there was almost 2 petabytes of data collected over the course of this audit. We're still working with the Senate on what of this data they would like to have available and how to get that data to them. The tally sheets is probably the most manageable section of that, representing only 200 GB of data; and will probably be the first section to be sent into their care.

Thanks,

Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:48 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Interview request/
Importance: High

Doug Logan/ Rod Thomson:

Last week, I sought your comment on an analysis of the ballot hand count authored by “The Audit Guys.” I am reaching out today regarding a new report on the Cyber Ninjas’ audit findings, this time authored by California election auditor Ray Lutz.

I am happy to make Lutz’s report available to you. But I wanted to draw your attention to his core observations. The first: That the Cyber Ninjas reported different totals for races on the same ballot, which Lutz says raises significant questions about your methodologies. Here is the language from his report:

It is interesting to note the somewhat embarrassing reality that the audit did not have the same number of ballots between the two contests being reviewed, the Presidential contest and the Senate contest, losing about 263 ballots in the Senate contest. This does not inspire a great deal of confidence in the hand count, because those ballots were counted at the same time and should have been exactly the same number. It does however speak to the beneficial transparency of the reported result that exposes an internally recorded discrepancy.

Presidential Contest					
	Trump	Biden	Jorgenson	Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	995,404	1,040,873	31,501	20,791	2,088,569
County Canvass	995,665	1,040,774	31,705	21,419	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(261)	99	(204)	(628)	(994)
Senate Contest					
	McSally	Kelly		Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	983,662	1,064,336		40,398	2,088,306
County Canvass		1,064,396		40964	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(541)	(60)		(566)	(1,167)
Machine Paper Ballot Count (Pullen Report)					2,089,442
Machine Ballot Count - Canvass					(121)

As always, I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this issue and other issues Lutz raises before we publish a story about his findings. Is there an explanation for the different totals of ballots counted in the two races? Should that call into question other information raised in your Sept. 24 report to the Senate? Is Lutz wrong to focus on this?

In another section of the report, Lutz seizes on the lack of data offered by the Cyber Ninjas in regard to tally sheets, which he describes as key to any audit:

What We Expected and Did Not Find

This audit was touted as a "forensic" audit, apparently meaning it is in-depth and considers all evidence including physically collected evidence. Merriam-Webster defines "Forensic" as relating to or dealing with the application of scientific knowledge to legal problems.

We expected that the audit would compare, batch to batch, for all 10,341 batches, the vote totals for each of the contest options being audited. The Dominion Voting System designates each ballot processed with a tabulator number, batch number and offset in the batch. Vote counts per candidate for each batch can be easily subtotaled directly from the cast-vote record (CVR) file, and then compared to a hand tally. The audit did not provide any result of such a comparison to the public.

For example, we have a spreadsheet of all the totals of all batches which was derived from the CVR file, and their corresponding pallet and box. The following snippet shows two boxes, each containing 7 batches of about 200 ballots each. It provides the vote counts for each candidate and each batch. These totals should be comparable to the totals from the hand tally. But neither the hand tally sheets nor master spreadsheet were provided and therefore we cannot perform the comparison.

batchid	Blue Sheet	scanner	EV batch	Pallet	Box #	President				Trump	Biden	Jorg	Senate				McSally	Kelly	
						ballots	votes	writesins	ov	uv	votes	votes	votes	votes	writesins	ov	uv	votes	votes
03001_00001	102020 p3	H1	265	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	195	0	2	2	79	114	2	197	0	0	2	82	115
03001_00002	102020 p3	H1	237	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	200	0	0	0	64	135	1	198	0	0	2	61	137
03001_00003	102020 p3	H1	305	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	197	0	1	2	83	110	4	200	0	0	0	80	120
03001_00004	102020 p3	H1	244	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	198	0	2	0	82	115	1	197	0	0	3	80	117
03001_00005	102020 p3	H1	243	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	199	1	0	0	87	110	1	198	0	0	1	85	113
03001_00006	102020 p3	H1	333	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	198	0	1	0	78	120	0	197	0	0	2	79	118
03001_00007	102020 p3	H1	292	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	196	0	2	1	84	112	0	197	0	0	2	83	114
03001_00008	102020 p3	H1	219	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	11	189	0	200	0	0	0	11	189
03001_00009	102020 p3	H1	309	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	0	0	1	84	112	3	197	2	0	3	81	114
03001_00010	102020 p3	H1	236	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	196	1	1	2	62	127	6	199	1	0	0	66	132
03001_00011	102020 p3	H1	279	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	2	0	1	49	147	1	196	0	0	4	49	147
03001_00012	102020 p3	H1	245	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	59	139	2	198	0	0	2	58	140
03001_00013	102020 p3	H1	288	27	EVH1/10-20/219	198	195	1	1	2	69	121	4	196	1	0	2	65	130
03001_00014	102020 p3	H1	210	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	199	0	0	0	49	150	0	198	0	0	1	48	150

Lutz goes on to say:

The tally sheets and the reconciliation spreadsheet should be published immediately.

The report of the hand count provides very little detail. But assuming the aggregate sum of the hand count is as stated, we learn of no evidence that the voting machines nor the election management system was hacked. The report does not establish any indication of electronic intrusion or electronic hacking to modify the tabulation, but even if such an intrusion were documented, it is doubtful that such an intrusion would alter the paper ballots. This is an expected benefit of a substantive hand count of paper ballots. Even if concerns remain from an election quality and procedural compliance standpoint, including the complex topic of eligibility, these issues can't change the outcome of the tabulation itself as documented by the paper ballot record.

Can you please address his assessment? Can you explain why these sheets do or do not matter in your opinion?

Because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need your response within the next 24 hours. I appreciate your attention to this. I can be reached at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen

Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Anglen, Robert
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:24 AM
To: dlogan@cyberninjas.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Interview request/ analysis calls hand count 'fiction'
Importance: High

Mr. Logan:

Following up on my phone call last night, I wanted to provide you copies of a report by election data analysts Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen. They have conducted an analysis

based on data in the Senate's audit report that they say calls into question the hand count of Maricopa County ballots conducted by Cyber Ninjas.

The report says it found a nearly 16K discrepancy in one pallet between the hand count and the machine count of ballots. They use the word "fiction" to describe your work.

I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this report. I can be reached today at 602-316-8395. I do need to hear back from you today.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen

Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Another Carnival suspicion
Date: Thursday, April 29, 2021, 3:42:25 PM
Attachments: [redacted]


Pretty close I believe but I haven't mapped it yet.
Just been looking at the numbers and ip's.

On 4/29/21 1:47 PM, Sara Metz wrote:
Is that near where the audit is happening ?

Get Outlook for [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021, 3:42:25 PM
To: Sara Metz [redacted]
Subject: Re: Another Carnival suspicion

I found it...



On 4/29/21 12:36 PM, coan wrote:
I want to get to the bottom of the carnival references...

On 4/29/21 11:51 AM, Sara Metz wrote:
Call to cancel carnival event we believe a false flag is being planned. Be safe out there and Godspeed. Thank you for your patriotism.

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: RE: Audit talk
Date: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 2:03:47 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Rod, obviously I meant Rod. I am sure you get that a lot, and I'm sure it's super annoying. Sorry!

From: Fifield, Jen
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 11:03 AM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Audit talk

Hi Doug and Ron,

We are working on a larger story about the audit. As you know, this was an unprecedented activity – not just in Arizona but for the nation. We are taking a step back and want to talk to everyone who played a part. I'm trying to get insight into the actual day to day operations of the audit. Thought I would see if you would be willing to help?

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

From: [John Dooley/Pinnacle Productions](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: RE: AZ. Audit Recap
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 12:33:26 PM

You're very welcome Doug. I wish we had more time so we could've put out a better message, but I trust God will do the rest. Take care, John

John Dooley
Pinnacle Productions
7517 E. Mariposa Grande Dr.
Scottsdale, AZ. 85255
O.480-538-5429
C.602-538-5429

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 10:59 PM
To: John Dooley / Pinnacle Productions <pinnacle1@cox.net>
Cc: Patrick Weaver <pweaver@americaproject.com>
Subject: RE: AZ. Audit Recap

This looks great! Thank-you!

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: John Dooley / Pinnacle Productions <pinnacle1@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 6:34 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Patrick Weaver <pweaver@americaproject.com>
Subject: AZ. Audit Recap

Hey Doug,

Here's the link to download the recap video. It's the best we can do under the circumstances. I hope it serves you well. Take care, John

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/ptx7254nltigvvy/AZ.%20Audit%20Recap.mp4?dl=0>

John Dooley
Pinnacle Productions
O.480-538-5429
C.602-538-5429

From: [Karen](#)
To: [Randy Pullen](#)
Cc: [Karen Fann](#); [Douglas Logan](#); [Ken Bennett](#)
Subject: Re: Beyond bamboo and watermarks: The unconventional ways Arizona election auditors are searching for fraud
- from The Arizona Republic
Date: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 9:59:34 AM

Login. fannm@cableone.net
Password. readpaper

Sent from my iPad

On Jun 16, 2021, at 6:50 AM, Randy Pullen <rpullen13@gmail.com> wrote:

I do not subscribe to it.
With best regards,

Randy Pullen

On Wed, Jun 16, 2021 at 6:49 AM Karen <fannm@cableone.net> wrote:

In this mornings paper

Beyond bamboo and watermarks: The unconventional ways Arizona election auditors are searching for fraud

As the recount wraps up, the focus has shifted to ballot inspection. So what are auditors looking at beyond bamboo and watermarks?

Check out this story on [azcentral.com](https://www.azcentral.com):
<https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2021/06/15/how-arizona-election-auditors-inspecting-maricopa-ballots/7643248002/>

Sent from my iPad

From: Douglas Logan
To: Andrew Stavro
Subject: RE: Camera outage
Date: Friday, June 11, 2021 6:41:00 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot](#)

Thanks!

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroadddog.com>
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 1:37 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Fwd: Camera outage

Update below.

Sent from 480.586.6121


Begin forwarded message:

From: Aaron Cornils <aaron.cornils@herringnetwork.com>
Date: June 11, 2021 at 1:09:40 PM PDT
To: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroadddog.com>
Subject: RE: Camera outage

Thanks, yeah it is looking like a hiccup some place between the user/CDN Edge and possibly the origin.


Looking at the inbound data usage on the server it clearly started dropping off at around 00:30 and comes back 30min later. This is looking like a partial network outage on the path between the CDN and the origin server. I'll see if I can track it down further to what it specifically was. My guess is the issue was between the CDN origin shield and the origin server but if the issue happened in route i.e. not on either the edgecast network or the datacenter side we may never know exactly where it failed.

[Try out the new interface](#)



Aaron

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroadddog.com>
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 11:54 AM
To: Aaron Cornils <aaron.cornils@herringnetwork.com>
Subject: Re: Camera outage



Sent from 480.586.6121

On Jun 11, 2021, at 11:36 AM, Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@herringnetwork.com> wrote:

Do we know exactly what was reported as being down. I.E. the streams or the site itself.

I did just come across this alert in my emails from the CDN this number of 500 errors typically means there was some sort of issue and it came in around 12:30am local. It may be related to the what you are reporting or not. I cannot get the detailed logging for today until tomorrow so I can look into this more on Monday to see what specific error code this was and on what origin it is possible the error here was on a different origin source and had nothing to do with the streams for the audit.

The alert condition is: Status Code : 5XX per second > 10
 The current value of Status Code : 5XX per second is 180.55
 The alert is generated on: Condition Start
 The alert condition has been present for the past 5 minutes

Aaron

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroaddog.com>
 Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 10:49 AM
 To: Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@HerringNetwork.com>
 Subject: Re: Camera outage

Between 12:30am and 1am. We checked you DVR and that looked fine. Wondering if it was an issue with the url.

Sent from 480.586.6121

On Jun 11, 2021, at 9:56 AM, Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@herringnetwork.com> wrote:

Do you know what time they went down I can check the DVR logs to see if anything was recorded or not during that time.

Aaron

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroaddog.com>
 Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 6:56 AM

To: Aaron Cornils <Aaron.Cornils@HerringNetwork.com>
Subject: Camera outage

Aaron,

I just heard all the cameras went down for an hour last night, we are looking into it on our end, but wanted to see if you saw anything on your end.

Sent from 480.586.6121

From: [Howard, Hope](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: CNN Request // Doug Logan
Date: Monday, October 04, 2021 9:42:06 AM

Hi Mr. Logan,

I hope you've had a good weekend. I wanted to circle back on this request and see if you have decided if you are interested in participating. Again, feel free to reach out if you have any other questions.

Thank you,

HOPE HOWARD

CNN Network Bookings Coordinator | **CNN**
M 917.288.7024 | hope.howard@cnn.com

From: "Howard, Hope" <hope.howard@cnn.com>
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 at 1:01 PM
To: "dlogan@cyberninjas.com" <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: "Simpson, Jennifer" <jennifer.simpson@cnn.com>, "Howard, Hope" <hope.howard@cnn.com>
Subject: CNN Request // Doug Logan

Hello Mr. Logan,

I hope you are well.

CNN's Jake Tapper is doing a comprehensive, one-hour documentary examining the 2020 presidential election. We are looking into how President Trump's messaging around the voting process may have impacted the results of the election. It's currently scheduled to air in primetime on November 5th.

Jake is eager to include some of President Trump's supporters in his program. He specifically asked to include you in the program and requested that I reach out to you to see if you'd be available to do an interview. Any guidance regarding this request is greatly appreciated. Please let me know if I can answer any questions via phone or at the email below.

Warmest regards,

HOPE HOWARD

CNN Network Bookings Coordinator | **CNN**
M 917.288.7024 | hope.howard@cnn.com

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Fifield, Jen](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:58:46 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jen,

My “unwillingness” to speak was a contract requirement that I don’t speak to the media until the report was published. I’m surprised with all your coverage of the audit you never read the contract and saw that. The signed NDA is part of the contract.

As it turns out, that was a great contract provision, however; as it let me see who was really objective and who just used my lack of

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 10:54 AM
To: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

I respect your decision. But I also wonder how we are supposed to tell your side when you won’t talk. For example, for the profile I wrote of Doug. I had to rely on everyone else but Doug because of his unwillingness to speak. It makes it much more difficult to tell all sides when one side won’t speak.
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the

following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Rod Thomson](#)
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:18:52 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

And you only got me because I talked to Zach.

Just for your information, although this feels like beating my head against a brick wall: If you had treated Doug, Cyber Ninjas and the audit team fairly for the past six months, we would have been happy to have taken more time to communicate with you on a regular basis. But your body of reporting is crystal clear: Anti-audit, anti-Cyber Ninjas, anti-Doug Logan. I've spelled this out to you in specifics in the past. Based on those conversations with you, you obviously do not believe that. The fact that you cannot see your own severe bias on this story, is all the more reason we cannot trust or take time on these responses. The fact that you will build a story using what, in other media contexts, would be disparaged as a "disgruntled employee", (rightly or wrongly) is all the more reason. We could explain what is wrong in those statements you related, but you would still report them along with the storyline you already have established, under a headline and lead already established, (as you've done repeatedly, and you're hardly alone) and then include somewhere below a comment from us and think you have been fair and balanced. But readers will have the exact impression the story is desired to leave. So there is no point. And that is on your reporting, Jen. I'm truly sorry you cannot see this, for you and because you are an avatar for why Americans have historically low trust in the media.

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:54 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

I respect your decision. But I also wonder how we are supposed to tell your side when you won't talk. For example, for the profile I wrote of Doug. I had to rely on everyone else but Doug because of his unwillingness to speak. It makes it much more difficult to tell all sides when one side won't speak.

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source

one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,

Jen

Jen Fifield

Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter

The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Rod Thomson](#)
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:51:12 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,

Jen

Jen Fifield

Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter

The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Monday, November 08, 2021 5:31:21 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug,

I just heard your voicemail (left Saturday, sorry I missed that earlier) telling me to not publish the statement that Rod sent over. Could you let me know if there is a statement you would like me to use instead?

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 9:19 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

And you only got me because I talked to Zach.

Just for your information, although this feels like beating my head against a brick wall: If you had treated Doug, Cyber Ninjas and the audit team fairly for the past six months, we would have been happy to have taken more time to communicate with you on a regular basis. But your body of reporting is crystal clear: Anti-audit, anti-Cyber Ninjas, anti-Doug Logan. I've spelled this out to you in specifics in the past. Based on those conversations with you, you obviously do not believe that. The fact that you cannot see your own severe bias on this story, is all the more reason we cannot trust or take time on these responses. The fact that you will build a story using what, in other media contexts, would be disparaged as a "disgruntled employee", (rightly or wrongly) is all the more reason. We could explain what is wrong in those statements you related, but you would still report them along with the storyline you already have established, under a headline and lead already established, (as you've done repeatedly, and you're hardly alone) and then include somewhere below a comment from us and think you have been fair and balanced. But readers will have the exact impression the story is desired to leave. So there is no point. And that is on your reporting, Jen. I'm truly sorry you cannot see this, for you and because you are an avatar for why Americans have historically low trust in the media.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:54 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

I respect your decision. But I also wonder how we are supposed to tell your side when you won't talk. For example, for the profile I wrote of Doug. I had to rely on everyone else but Doug because of his unwillingness to speak. It makes it much more difficult to tell all sides when one side won't speak.

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter

The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:47:43 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:54:11 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

I respect your decision. But I also wonder how we are supposed to tell your side when you won't talk. For example, for the profile I wrote of Doug. I had to rely on everyone else but Doug because of his unwillingness to speak. It makes it much more difficult to tell all sides when one side won't speak.
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,

Jen

Jen Fifield

Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Tuesday, November 09, 2021 5:14:40 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug,

Thank you for your thoughts. It's nice to hear from you.

With CJ, she told me she was fired before you did – she wanted me to know. That is why I feel comfortable using it in my story.

Regarding your thoughts on my coverage, I'm disappointed. I'd love to hear what in specific you felt was inaccurate about my reporting, considering I never received a request for any corrections from you, Rod, Karen Fann or any other audit leadership. I do believe I fairly and accurately represented both sides of the story in every story I wrote. And no, that doesn't mean that I write any kind of story that is entirely positive about the audit (just like I didn't write any story that was entirely negative). That's journalism. Those right-wing media outlets you mention are not journalism in any shape or form. I hope you do not truly believe that.

I do believe that Rod put out many public statements on your behalf since the audit began, so not sure how that keeps you in compliance with your NDA. Selective enforcement, I guess. Similar to selective responsiveness to public records requests. If the audit was so transparent, why is it that your company will not provide all relevant communications? I guess the livestreamed OANN videos should tell us everything we need to know, and we are supposed to trust you – not trust but verify, like real journalists do.

Thanks again,
Jen

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 9, 2021 8:33 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

For background, the concern was with publishing the fact CJ was fired, which it sounds like you're running with anyway. CJ is just a kid and doesn't need every time someone from here on out searches for her name for the rest of her life to have the first thing pop up is an article that talks about how she was fired. I'd rather have no comment than be a part of that, even if it is true.

If I thought there was a chance what I said was going to be properly represented I might consider making another comment; but Rod pretty well explains what we've seen time and time again with this audit. You clearly think what we did was wrong, and you're trying to make your career on discrediting the work we've done. With all the time you spent at the coliseum you have first hand experience on the professional way things were run, yet I have yet to see that in a single article. The type of reporting you and many others do now is why being a reporter has gone from a prestigious occupation, to one step below a used car salesman.

If you truly don't see your own bias; I'd recommend you write a persuasive article for your own private consumption that talks about why the audit was a good idea and all of the things that were done well with it. If you get stuck, research and read articles and broadcasts by people you disagree with. It will help you understand the other view point, which will help truly make you an unbiased reporter. There is so much information out there to support a balanced viewpoint. You didn't need to talk to me to get that perspective.

BTW, my contract with the Senate had an NDA that forbid me from talking with the media until after the report was published. The contract was public, and this fact was conveyed to the media on multiple occasions. I don't know why you keep pushing the narrative that, "I was unwilling to speak".

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 5:31 PM
To: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Hi Doug,

I just heard your voicemail (left Saturday, sorry I missed that earlier) telling me to not publish the statement that Rod sent over. Could you let me know if there is a statement you would like me to use instead?

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 9:19 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>

Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

And you only got me because I talked to Zach.

Just for your information, although this feels like beating my head against a brick wall: If you had treated Doug, Cyber Ninjas and the audit team fairly for the past six months, we would have been happy to have taken more time to communicate with you on a regular basis. But your body of reporting is crystal clear: Anti-audit, anti-Cyber Ninjas, anti-Doug Logan. I've spelled this out to you in specifics in the past. Based on those conversations with you, you obviously do not believe that. The fact that you cannot see your own severe bias on this story, is all the more reason we cannot trust or take time on these responses. The fact that you will build a story using what, in other media contexts, would be disparaged as a "disgruntled employee", (rightly or wrongly) is all the more reason. We could explain what is wrong in those statements you related, but you would still report them along with the storyline you already have established, under a headline and lead already established, (as you've done repeatedly, and you're hardly alone) and then include somewhere below a comment from us and think you have been fair and balanced. But readers will have the exact impression the story is desired to leave. So there is no point. And that is on your reporting, Jen. I'm truly sorry you cannot see this, for you and because you are an avatar for why Americans have historically low trust in the media.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:54 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

I respect your decision. But I also wonder how we are supposed to tell your side when you won't talk. For example, for the profile I wrote of Doug. I had to rely on everyone else but Doug because of his unwillingness to speak. It makes it much more difficult to tell all sides when one side won't speak.

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>

Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 8:51 AM

To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>

Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>

Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Tuesday, November 09, 2021 10:31:52 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jen,

For background, the concern was with publishing the fact CJ was fired, which it sounds like you're running with anyway. CJ is just a kid and doesn't need every time someone from here on out searches for her name for the rest of her life to have the first thing pop up is an article that talks about how she was fired. I'd rather have no comment than be a part of that, even if it is true.

If I thought there was a chance what I said was going to be properly represented I might consider making another comment; but Rod pretty well explains what we've seen time and time again with this audit. You clearly think what we did was wrong, and you're trying to make your career on discrediting the work we've done. With all the time you spent at the coliseum you have first hand experience on the professional way things were run, yet I have yet to see that in a single article. The type of reporting you and many others do now is why being a reporter has gone from a prestigious occupation, to one step below a used car salesman.

If you truly don't see your own bias; I'd recommend you write a persuasive article for your own private consumption that talks about why the audit was a good idea and all of the things that were done well with it. If you get stuck, research and read articles and broadcasts by people you disagree with. It will help you understand the other view point, which will help truly make you an unbiased reporter. There is so much information out there to support a balanced viewpoint. You didn't need to talk to me to get that perspective.

BTW, my contract with the Senate had an NDA that forbid me from talking with the media until after the hearing. The contract was public, and this fact was conveyed to the media on multiple occasions. I don't know why you keep pushing the narrative that, "I was unwilling to speak".

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 5:31 PM
To: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Hi Doug,

I just heard your voicemail (left Saturday, sorry I missed that earlier) telling me to not publish the statement that Rod sent over. Could you let me know if there is a statement you would like me to use instead?

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 9:19 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

And you only got me because I talked to Zach.

Just for your information, although this feels like beating my head against a brick wall: If you had treated Doug, Cyber Ninjas and the audit team fairly for the past six months, we would have been happy to have taken more time to communicate with you on a regular basis. But your body of reporting is crystal clear: Anti-audit, anti-Cyber Ninjas, anti-Doug Logan. I've spelled this out to you in specifics in the past. Based on those conversations with you, you obviously do not believe that. The fact that you cannot see your own severe bias on this story, is all the more reason we cannot trust or take time on these responses. The fact that you will build a story using what, in other media contexts, would be disparaged as a "disgruntled employee", (rightly or wrongly) is all the more reason. We could explain what is wrong in those statements you related, but you would still report them along with the storyline you already have established, under a headline and lead already established, (as you've done repeatedly, and you're hardly alone) and then include somewhere below a comment from us and think you have been fair and balanced. But readers will have the exact impression the story is desired to leave. So there is no point. And that is on your reporting, Jen. I'm truly sorry you cannot see this, for you and because you are an avatar for why Americans have historically low trust in the media.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:54 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

I respect your decision. But I also wonder how we are supposed to tell your side when you won't talk. For example, for the profile I wrote of Doug. I had to rely on everyone else but Doug because of his unwillingness to speak. It makes it much more difficult to tell all sides when one side won't speak.

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

|
--
Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Rod Thomson](#)
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Friday, November 05, 2021 9:30:00 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,

Jen

Jen Fifield

Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter

The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

--

Rod Thomson I President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons
Date: Tuesday, November 09, 2021 10:32:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jen,

For background, the concern was with publishing the fact CJ was fired, which it sounds like you're running with anyway. CJ is just a kid and doesn't need every time someone from here on out searches for her name for the rest of her life to have the first thing pop up is an article that talks about how she was fired. I'd rather have no comment than be a part of that, even if it is true.

If I thought there was a chance what I said was going to be properly represented I might consider making another comment; but Rod pretty well explains what we've seen time and time again with this audit. You clearly think what we did was wrong, and you're trying to make your career on discrediting the work we've done. With all the time you spent at the coliseum you have first hand experience on the professional way things were run, yet I have yet to see that in a single article. The type of reporting you and many others do now is why being a reporter has gone from a prestigious occupation, to one step below a used car salesman.

If you truly don't see your own bias; I'd recommend you write a persuasive article for your own private consumption that talks about why the audit was a good idea and all of the things that were done well with it. If you get stuck, research and read articles and broadcasts by people you disagree with. It will help you understand the other view point, which will help truly make you an unbiased reporter. There is so much information out there to support a balanced viewpoint. You didn't need to talk to me to get that perspective.

BTW, my contract with the Senate had an NDA that forbid me from talking with the media until after the report was published. The contract was public, and this fact was conveyed to the media on multiple occasions. I don't know why you keep pushing the narrative that, "I was unwilling to speak".

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 5:31 PM
To: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: RE: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Hi Doug,

I just heard your voicemail (left Saturday, sorry I missed that earlier) telling me to not publish the statement that Rod sent over. Could you let me know if there is a statement you would like me to use instead?

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 9:19 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

And you only got me because I talked to Zach.

Just for your information, although this feels like beating my head against a brick wall: If you had treated Doug, Cyber Ninjas and the audit team fairly for the past six months, we would have been happy to have taken more time to communicate with you on a regular basis. But your body of reporting is crystal clear: Anti-audit, anti-Cyber Ninjas, anti-Doug Logan. I've spelled this out to you in specifics in the past. Based on those conversations with you, you obviously do not believe that. The fact that you cannot see your own severe bias on this story, is all the more reason we cannot trust or take time on these responses. The fact that you will build a story using what, in other media contexts, would be disparaged as a "disgruntled employee", (rightly or wrongly) is all the more reason. We could explain what is wrong in those statements you related, but you would still report them along with the storyline you already have established, under a headline and lead already established, (as you've done repeatedly, and you're hardly alone) and then include somewhere below a comment from us and think you have been fair and balanced. But readers will have the exact impression the story is desired to leave. So there is no point. And that is on your reporting, Jen. I'm truly sorry you cannot see this, for you and because you are an avatar for why Americans have historically low trust in the media.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:54 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

I respect your decision. But I also wonder how we are supposed to tell your side when you won't talk. For example, for the profile I wrote of Doug. I had to rely on everyone else but Doug because of his unwillingness to speak. It makes it much more difficult to tell all sides when one side won't speak.

Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

My statement reflects why we won't be saying more.

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 10:47 AM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod,

Please let me know if Doug can respond to the claims in detail. We want to include his thoughts on all of this. We are including in our story that CJ was fired.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on thoughts about Doug from CJ Parsons

Jen,

Here is our response. You may attribute it to me. Please print all of it.

"Our experience has been that you and the Arizona Republic write what you have predetermined to write, regardless of what we say. Our comments, no matter how fact-based, don't change the story that is often based on only comments from someone else. But it is hardly a sign of good journalism to cite as a credible source one of the few people fired from the audit. Most of what you are going to write on this is inaccurate. But regardless of what we say, you will run it anyway. Because that has been the case all along."

Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

On Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 7:57 PM Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com> wrote:

Hi Rod and Doug,

I just left Rod a voicemail. We are including thoughts from CJ Parsons about Doug in our longer story about the audit. She said she was a manager working near his desk for a short period. She said he often asked her questions about election procedures. She said it seemed like he was trying to find something wrong with how the county did the election and he often seemed disappointed when there were easy explanations. She said Doug kept to the back area for the most part and his lack of being on the floor had the subcontractors (Wake/StratTech) fighting for power and making decisions for themselves, which led to conflict. She also said the following

Parsons said when organizers added a third shift of workers, Logan told her not to tell the Secretary of State's Office when it would happen. He didn't want to start something new and have the office's observers there to see it, she said.

She also told me this: Managers determined one worker took tally sheets and a flash drive with data home with him. They recommended Logan fire him. The worker remained on the job, Parsons said.

She also provided a security list and staff list of those working in the audit and with access.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on any of this by tomorrow if possible.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

|
--
Rod Thomson | President

The Thomson Group

rod@thomsonpr.com

www.thomsonpr.com

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Depreciation costs
Date: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 3:44:00 PM

Or is that not an actual expense that was paid to someone?

Furthermore, can you provide more details on who specifically received the \$5.2m in payroll and labor costs, who was paid \$627,000 for professional services, and how the audit team racked up \$543,000 in travel expenses?

On Tue, Nov 2, 2021 at 12:39 PM Jeremy Duda <jduda@azmirror.com> wrote:

I saw that you listed \$1.2 million in "depreciation costs" for equipment used in the audit. What equipment does that pertain to? And to whom were those costs paid? That line item is certainly raising a lot of eyebrows today.

--

Jeremy Duda

Arizona Mirror

Associate editor

Cell: (602) 315-3108

--

Jeremy Duda

Arizona Mirror

Associate editor

Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [pinnacle1](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: RE: Douglas Logan has shared the folder "Training" with you.
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 1:50:18 AM

Thanks Doug.

John Dooley
Pinnacle Productions
C. 602-538-5429

----- Original message -----

From: Douglas Logan <mail@sf-notifications.com>
Date: 7/11/21 10:39 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: pinnacle1@cox.net
Subject: Douglas Logan has shared the folder 'Training' with you.



Douglas Logan has shared the folder **Training** with you.

Note From Douglas:

I've added you to a folder

To access this folder, you must first activate your account and set your personal password.

[> Click here to activate your account and view this folder](#)

ShareFile is a tool for sending, receiving, and organizing your business files online. It can be used as a password-protected area for sharing information with clients and partners, and it's an easy way to send files that are too large to e-mail.

Trouble with the above link? You can copy and paste the following URL into your web browser:

<https://cyberninjas.sharefile.com/f/fo3b2cc0-3ac3-44f6-b37b-4e40cfe53714?a=42de162df05af361>

Powered By Citrix ShareFile 2021

From: [John Dooley / Pinnacle Productions](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: kimcarpenter865@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Douglas Logan has shared the folder "Training" with you.
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 2:06:39 AM
Attachments: [CF92319CB5AF44229A47008E4224753F.png](#)

Hey Doug, Scott wanted me to send you a sample of what he has in mind for Kim's shoot tomorrow.

John Dooley
Pinnacle Productions
O.480-538-5429
C.602-538-5429

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 10:39 PM
To: pinnacle1@cox.net
Subject: Douglas Logan has shared the folder 'Training' with you.



Douglas Logan has shared the folder **Training** with you.

Note From Douglas:

I've added you to a folder

To access this folder, you must first activate your account and set your personal password.

[Click here to activate your account and view this folder](#)

ShareFile is a tool for sending, receiving, and organizing your business files online. It can be used as a password-protected area for sharing information with clients and partners, and it's an easy way to send files that are too large to e-mail.

Trouble with the above link? You can copy and paste the following URL into your web browser:

<https://cyberninjas.sharefile.com/f/fo3b2cc0-3ac3-44f6-b37b-4e40cfe53714?a=42de162df05af361>

Powered By [Citrix ShareFile 2021](#)

From: [pinnacle1](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: RE: Douglas Logan has shared the folder "Training" with you.
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 2:45:20 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

Actually we're going to shoot him green screen and then we can put any color behind him you want. White would probably work best.

John Dooley
Pinnacle Productions
C. 602-538-5429

----- Original message -----

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Date: 7/11/21 11:19 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: John Dooley / Pinnacle Productions <pinnacle1@cox.net>
Cc: kimcarpenter865@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Douglas Logan has shared the folder 'Training' with you.

So, you're going to film him on a white background? Works for me!

Thanks,

Doug Logan

Chief Executive Officer

Cyber Ninjas

(o) (941)-3-NINJAS

(c) (941)-404-0360

From: John Dooley / Pinnacle Productions <pinnacle1@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 11:07 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: kimcarpenter865@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Douglas Logan has shared the folder 'Training' with you.

Hey Doug, Scott wanted me to send you a sample of what he has in mind for Kim's shoot

tomorrow.

John Dooley

Pinnacle Productions

O.480-538-5429

C.602-538-5429

From: [Douglas Logan](#)

Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 10:39 PM

To: pinnacle1@cox.net

Subject: Douglas Logan has shared the folder 'Training' with you.

Cyber Ninjas



Douglas Logan has shared the folder **Training** with you.

Note From Douglas:

I've added you to a folder

To access this folder, you must first activate your account and set your personal password.

[> Click here to activate your account and view this folder](#)

ShareFile is a tool for sending, receiving, and organizing your business files online. It can be used as a password-protected area for sharing information with clients and partners, and it's an easy way to send files that are too large to e-mail.

Trouble with the above link? You can copy and paste the following URL into your web browser:

<https://cyberninjas.sharefile.com/f/fo3b2cc0-3ac3-44f6-b37b-4e40cfe53714?a=42de162df05af361>

Powered By [Citrix ShareFile 2021](#)

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#); [Karen Fann](#)
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:26:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

No, I do not believe that was in any version of the Executive Summary I wrote. I'm not even sure offhand what that is adding together.

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:21 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Thank you for your response. If you'd like to clarify further, I wondered if you wrote that "57,734 ballots with serious issues were identified in the audit."

Jen

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Jen,

The Executive Summary went through several drafts and changes, but the one referenced at the Scribd link is not one I ever wrote, nor was it ever part of our drafts reviewed with the Senate. I do not know its origins, but since it utilized my letter head I'm assuming it was written by someone who was contributing to the report at some point in time. The fact some language is shared means they likely reviewed the Executive Summary I wrote. No copy of the Executive Summary written by me ever directly stated the election should not be certified or should be decertified. I personally don't think it's my role to make that call or even that suggestion. That is something that should be determined by the legislature. My job was to relay the facts found during the audit and to provide advice on legislative reform.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
M: 941-404-0360
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Hi Doug and Rod,

Please see this Gateway Pundit story. https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/arizona-audit-final-report-watered-reports-cyber-ninjas-edited-damning-statements-removed-else-removed/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=PostTopSharingButtons&utm_campaign=websitesharingbuttons&fbclid=IwAR2lrSS68uh61Epg7LTrF_Scm7VpDuw4pss7SuvoN4jMwK6no2oTvCZfr4Y

And the “draft report” that Gateway Pundit says they got from Patrick Byrne, linked in the story: https://www.scribd.com/document/527331055/ExecutiveSummary-VersionFinal-092421-Draft#from_embed

The executive summary (dated 9/24) is completely different from the executive summary in the 9/22 draft report that the county received. Please let me know if Doug can verify this was indeed a version of the report at one time. And does he stand by the language here?

Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#); [Karen Fann](#)
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:21:11 PM
Attachments: [images002.png](#)

Thank you for your response. If you'd like to clarify further, I wondered if you wrote that "57,734 ballots with serious issues were identified in the audit."

Jen

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Jen,

The Executive Summary went through several drafts and changes, but the one referenced at the Scribd link is not one I ever wrote, nor was it ever part of our drafts reviewed with the Senate. I do not know its origins, but since it utilized my letter head I'm assuming it was written by someone who was contributing to the report at some point in time. The fact some language is shared means they likely reviewed the Executive Summary I wrote. No copy of the Executive Summary written by me ever directly stated the election should not be certified or should be decertified. I personally don't think it's my role to make that call or even that suggestion. That is something that should be determined by the legislature. My job was to relay the facts found during the audit and to provide advice on legislative reform.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
M: 941-404-0360
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Hi Doug and Rod,

Please see this Gateway Pundit story. https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/arizona-audit-final-report-watered-reports-cyber-ninjas-edited-damning-statements-removed-else-removed/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=PostTopSharingButtons&utm_campaign=websitesharingbuttons&fbclid=IwAR2lRS68uh61Epg7LTrF_Scm7VpDuuw4pss7SuvoN4jMwK6no2oTvCZfr4Y

And the "draft report" that Gateway Pundit says they got from Patrick Byrne, linked in the story: https://www.scribd.com/document/527331055/ExecutiveSummary-VersionFinal-092421-Draft#from_embed

The executive summary (dated 9/24) is completely different from the executive summary in the 9/22 draft report that the county received. Please let me know if Doug can verify this was indeed a version of the report at one time. And does he stand by the language here?

Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#); [Karen Fann](#)
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:34:32 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Weird. If you're willing, please share your version you did write, that is closest to this, so I can make the comparison for a story I'll write on it.

Jen

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:27 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

No, I do not believe that was in any version of the Executive Summary I wrote. I'm not even sure offhand what that is adding together.

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:21 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Thank you for your response. If you'd like to clarify further, I wondered if you wrote that "57,734 ballots with serious issues were identified in the audit."

Jen

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Jen,

The Executive Summary went through several drafts and changes, but the one referenced at the Scribd link is not one I ever wrote, nor was it ever part of our drafts reviewed with the Senate. I do not know its origins, but since it utilized my letter head I'm assuming it was written by someone who was contributing to the report at some point in time. The fact some language is shared means they likely reviewed the Executive Summary I wrote. No copy of the Executive Summary written by me ever directly stated the election should not be certified or should be decertified. I personally don't think it's my role to make that call or even that suggestion. That is something that should be determined by the legislature. My job was to relay the facts found during the audit and to provide advice on legislative reform.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
M: 941-404-0360
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Hi Doug and Rod,

Please see this Gateway Pundit story: https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/arizona-audit-final-report-watered-reports-cyber-ninjas-edited-damning-statements-removed-else-removed/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=PostTopSharingButtons&utm_campaign=websitesharingbuttons&fbclid=IwAR2lRS568uh61Eqq7LTrF_Scm7VpDuuw4pss7Suvon4jMwK6no2oTvCz7r4Y

And the "draft report" that Gateway Pundit says they got from Patrick Byrne, linked in the story: https://www.scribd.com/document/527331055/ExecutiveSummary-VersionFinal-092421-Draft#from_embed

The executive summary (dated 9/24) is completely different from the executive summary in the 9/22 draft report that the county received. Please let me know if Doug can verify this was indeed a version of the report at one time. And does he stand by the language here?

Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fiffield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFiffield](https://twitter.com/JenAFiffield)
azcentral.com

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Fifield, Jen](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:03:53 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jen,

The Executive Summary went through several drafts and changes, but the one referenced at the Scribd link is not one I ever wrote, nor was it ever part of our drafts reviewed with the Senate. I do not know its origins, but since it utilized my letter head I'm assuming it was written by someone who was contributing to the report at some point in time. The fact some language is shared means they likely reviewed the Executive Summary I wrote. No copy of the Executive Summary written by me ever directly stated the election should not be certified or should be decertified. I personally don't think it's my role to make that call or even that suggestion. That is something that should be determined by the legislature. My job was to relay the facts found during the audit and to provide advice on legislative reform.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
M: 941-404-0360
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Hi Doug and Rod,

Please see this Gateway Pundit story. https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/arizona-audit-final-report-watered-reports-cyber-ninjas-edited-damning-statements-removed-else-removed/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=PostTopSharingButtons&utm_campaign=websitesharingbuttons&fbclid=IwAR2lrSS68uh61Epg7LTrF_ScM7VpDuw4pss7SuvoN4jMwK6no2oTvCZfr4Y

And the "draft report" that Gateway Pundit says they got from Patrick Byrne, linked in the story: https://www.scribd.com/document/527331055/ExecutiveSummary-VersionFinal-092421-Draft#from_embed

The executive summary (dated 9/24) is completely different from the executive summary in the 9/22 draft report that the county received. Please let me know if Doug can verify this was indeed a version of the report at one time. And does he stand by the language here?

Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#); [Karen Fann](#)
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:25:46 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:21 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Thank you for your response. If you'd like to clarify further, I wondered if you wrote that "57,734 ballots with serious issues were identified in the audit."

Jen

From: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Cc: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Jen,

The Executive Summary went through several drafts and changes, but the one referenced at the Scribd link is not one I ever wrote, nor was it ever part of our drafts reviewed with the Senate. I do not know its origins, but since it utilized my letter head I'm assuming it was written by someone who was contributing to the report at some point in time. The fact some language is shared means they likely reviewed the Executive Summary I wrote. No copy of the Executive Summary written by me ever directly stated the election should not be certified or should be decertified. I personally don't think it's my role to make that call or even that suggestion. That is something that should be determined by the legislature. My job was to relay the facts found during the audit and to provide advice on legislative reform.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
M: 941-404-0360
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Hi Doug and Rod,

Please see this Gateway Pundit story. https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/arizona-audit-final-report-watered-reports-cyber-ninjas-edited-damning-statements-removed-else-removed/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=PostTopSharingButtons&utm_campaign=websitesharingbuttons&fbclid=IwAR2lrSS68uh61Epg7LTrF_ScM7VpDuw4pss7SuvoN4jMwK6no2oTvCZfr4Y

And the “draft report” that Gateway Pundit says they got from Patrick Byrne, linked in the story: https://www.scribd.com/document/527331055/ExecutiveSummary-VersionFinal-092421-Draft#from_embed

The executive summary (dated 9/24) is completely different from the executive summary in the 9/22 draft report that the county received. Please let me know if Doug can verify this was indeed a version of the report at one time. And does he stand by the language here?

Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Cc: [Rod Thomson](#); [Karen Fann](#)
Subject: RE: Draft report on Gateway Pundit
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 6:05:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jen,

The Executive Summary went through several drafts and changes, but the one referenced at the Scribd link is not one I ever wrote, nor was it ever part of our drafts reviewed with the Senate. I do not know its origins, but since it utilized my letter head I'm assuming it was written by someone who was contributing to the report at some point in time. The fact some language is shared means they likely reviewed the Executive Summary I wrote. No copy of the Executive Summary written by me ever directly stated the election should not be certified or should be decertified. I personally don't think its my role to make that call or even that suggestion. That is something that should be determined by the legislature. My job was to relay the facts found during the audit and to provide advice on legislative reform.

Thanks,

Doug Logan

Chief Executive Officer

M: 941-404-0360

O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Draft report on Gateway Pundit

Hi Doug and Rod,

Please see this Gateway Pundit story. https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/09/arizona-audit-final-report-watered-reports-cyber-ninjas-edited-damning-statements-removed-else-removed/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=PostTopSharingButtons&utm_campaign=websitesharingbuttons&fbclid=IwAR2lrSS68uh61Epg7LTrF_Scm7VpDuw4pss7SuvoN4jMwK6no2oTvCZfr4Y

And the "draft report" that Gateway Pundit says they got from Patrick Byrne, linked in the story: https://www.scribd.com/document/527331055/ExecutiveSummary-VersionFinal-092421-Draft#from_embed

The executive summary (dated 9/24) is completely different from the executive summary in the 9/22 draft report that the county received. Please let me know if Doug can verify this was indeed a version of the report at one time. And does he stand by the language here?

Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#); vashiva@echomail.com
Subject: Re: Early ballot envelopes
Date: Thursday, September 30, 2021 4:55:26 PM

Also, when Dr. Ayyadurai was discussing duplicate envelopes, he stated, "Each of those voters submitted two ballots," which is completely untrue and suggests a lack of basic understanding about the duplication process. Those voters did not submit two ballots. It doesn't even mean they submitted two envelopes. If the election workers are unable to verify a signature, but the voter confirms they signed it, that same envelope is stamped as "approved" and then re-scanned by the system. Again, why did Dr. Ayyadurai not consult with anyone who knew enough about Maricopa County election procedures to explain this?

On Wed, Sep 29, 2021 at 3:10 PM Jeremy Duda <jduda@azmirror.com> wrote:

I've got some questions about the claims that Shiva Ayyadurai made during his presentation at the Arizona Senate on Friday.

-Dr. Ayyadurai questioned why the "verified and approved" stamp appeared behind the triangle on some of the EVB envelope images. On the images, the triangles were white with black borders. But on the actual envelopes, the triangle is solid black. According to the Maricopa County Elections Department and to Runbeck Election Services, which prints and scans those envelopes, this is due to binary scanning, which hollows out the coloring inside of those borders to create smaller files and save space on the computers, which is why the stamp doesn't appear within those triangles. Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware of this, and if not, why not?

-Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware that the triangles on the paper envelopes are solid black? If so, why didn't he mention this in his report or his presentation? If not, why not?

-Dr. Ayyadurai questioned why only 10% of early ballot envelopes had "verified and approved" stamps. According to county election officials and others who have worked in the elections department, only signatures that are flagged for additional verification or "curing" end up with those stamps. Most signatures are verified through digital images, which doesn't require election workers to ever see or touch the physical envelopes. Only if there are questions do they actually inspect the paper envelope. And the reason there's a disproportionate number of stamps after Nov. 3 is that the county hired additional people and put additional resources into signature curing, which is legally permitted for five days after the election. Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware of any of this?

-Dr. Shiva flagged signatures that he described as "scribbles" and questioned why they were verified. Signature verification does not, however, depend on legibility of the signature. It depends on whether the signature matches other signatures that the elections department has on file for each voter. And if any signature, scribble or otherwise, doesn't match the signature on file for that voter, elections workers contact that voter to verify the signature. Was Dr. Shiva familiar with or aware of this process when he conducted his evaluation?

-Was Dr. Ayyadurai aware that if an envelope doesn't have a signature, election officials contact the voter to give them an opportunity to sign? Was he aware of how the envelope duplication process works?

To be perfectly frank, Dr. Ayyadurai seems to have not only had no knowledge of how the signature verification process works or what the processes and procedures Maricopa County uses regarding EVBs, he does not appear to have made any effort whatsoever to find out. Runbeck tells me that Dr. Ayyadurai never reached out to the company with any questions. What, if any, efforts did Dr. Ayyadurai take to answer the questions he raised or to familiarize himself with the laws, processes and procedures pertaining to EVBs?

I plan to publish my story around 3p.m. on Thursday (Arizona time).

--

Jeremy Duda

Arizona Mirror

Associate editor

Cell: (602) 315-3108

--

Jeremy Duda

Arizona Mirror

Associate editor

Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Doug Bock Clark](#)
Cc: [Alexandra Berzon](#)
Subject: RE: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18
Date: Friday, March 18, 2022 9:50:00 AM

Doug,

This was all extremely disappointing to read. I probably shouldn't even bother responding because how clear of a negative narrative you're weaving here verses just covering the facts like you said your article was going to do. If you truly think that this is just "covering the facts", I don't think you're anywhere close to seeing your own bias which is clearly coming out in all of these statements.

I'm not an attorney, but a number of these are off enough it certainly could be pushing the line on defamation. You're probably skirting that line enough that a court would be unlikely to act, but is that really how you want to represent your publication?

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Doug Bock Clark <Doug.Bock.Clark@propublica.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 1:55 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Alexandra Berzon <Alexandra.Berzon@propublica.org>
Subject: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18

Dear Mr. Logan,

I'm reaching out because ProPublica and Frontline will soon be releasing an article and documentary that includes a description of your actions as they relate to various attempts to challenge the results of the 2020 presidential election. We appreciate the questions you've answered so far. Now we are reaching the final fact-checking stage of our article.

Please review the following information for accuracy and to provide comments, clarifications or further context. For our story to include your responses, we need to hear back by 1:55 p.m. EST on March 18, 2022. We want to have a full understanding of your responses and any other points or material you'd like for us to consider.

1. Our understanding is that you were a member of a coalition of people working on an

effort to prove and publicize the belief that Donald Trump had won the 2020 election.
Do you have any comments or clarification?

This is factually incorrect, as I've stated in our conversations multiple times. I worked with people who were trying to figure out what happened with the last election, and dig into the details to know the truth of what happened. If it confirmed the election results were valid and good, that was the best outcome. To this day there a lot of anomalies that re not explained by anyone.

2. Our understanding is that Michael Flynn was the leader of the coalition and that at various times the coalition included you, Patrick Byrne, Sidney Powell, Lin Wood, Phil Waldron, James Penrose, Todd Sanders, Conan Hayes, Seth Keshel and others. It is also our understanding that Rudy Giuliani was a periodic collaborator. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

This is factually untrue, as I've stated to you. Michael Flynn absolutely was NOT the leader in all of this. It was a grassroots effort where various individuals worked together at various points in time; with various levels of association. Flynn wasn't even on the scene at first. As I've stated, the word "coalition" is NOT accurate. Some of the individuals listed worked closely together, some were loosely affiliated.

3. Our understanding is that, starting in November 2020 and through late December 2020, members of this group were present at a plantation in South Carolina owned by Lin Wood or were in close touch with people who gathered at the plantation. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

I've already covered all of this in my interviews. Based on the first two bullets, it sounds like what I said was ignored. As an example, there was very little coordination between Patrick Byrne for the majority of the time at the plantation, and he was only there very briefly. Phil was never at the plantation, and did not work closely. Todd and Conan were not at the plantation, and were not coordinated heavily. I think the word coalition is categorically false, as I've stated before. It doesn't seem like you care what is real, based on these questions and wording, you have an agenda and you're going to print it.

4. Our understanding that you were physically present at Wood's plantation in November and December 2020 and served as one of the coalition's cyber security experts. **Is this accurate?**

No, that is not correct. I was not a member of a coalition; nor was anything organized for me to be listed as one of the “Cyber Security experts”.

5. Our understanding is that one of the people you worked with remotely while at the plantation was Ronald Watkins. **Is this accurate?**

No, this is not accurate. Asking someone if they have any Dominion documentation is not “working with them”, unless you’re a reporter trying to distort the facts to support the story you want to tell. Talking to someone a couple of times does not entail “working with them”.

6. Our understanding is you served on one of the coalition's two main teams trying to access voting machines, often working alongside James Penrose. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

There was not any “two main teams”. As if this was some organized operation. I don’t even know what “other team” you’d be talking about. I did work closely with Jim.

7. Our understanding is that Trump campaign staffers around Nov. 15, 2020, vetted substantial claims that a Venezuelan man made in a video and an affidavit that would be used in the so-called “Kraken” lawsuits and determined them to be baseless, which the staffers shared in an internal memo. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I don’t know anything about this.

8. Our understanding is that Phil Waldron in November 2020 shared a list of voting equipment that was circulated to other coalition members and suggested that it be disseminated to state GOPs so that they could start filing injunctions. State GOPs, as well as other entities and individuals, later used portions of this equipment list in legal filings to seek access to Dominion voting machines and to delay certification of the presidential election results. It is also our understanding that the list was used by officials in Arizona as part of their efforts to launch an audit of the election results. **Is this accurate?**

I don't know anything about this.

9. Our understanding is that there was a multi-pronged plan devised by the group at the plantation: to use litigation, public persuasion, and access to the voting equipment to reverse the outcome of the 2020 election. **Did you help to devise this plan?**

This is categorically wrong. There was never a goal to reverse the election. There was a goal to figure out what happened in the election. There was also never any type of long-term strategy plan, as I've talked about, or the organization of multiple steps or whatever. This was a grassroots effort where there was rarely much of a plan beyond a week at a time; let alone some master plan on some way to use litigation, public persuasion, and access to voting equipment to some specific end.

10. Our understanding is that some people in the coalition were worried that some of the efforts to access voting machines might cross legal boundaries. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I don't know what you're talking about. We were always concerned about doing things in a legal and law abiding way, absolutely. I don't know what you're referencing about "legal boundaries". If you're referencing the "hunting license", yes, we thought that wasn't supported and something that shouldn't happen.

11. Our understanding is that in November you were in Georgia with James Penrose, trying to access voting machines. **Is this accurate?**

Yes, this is accurate. We were trying to get counties to work with us to allow us to capture forensic images.

12. Our understanding is that while in Georgia you convened briefly with Conan Hayes and Todd Sanders. **Is this accurate?**

I believe this is accurate.

13. Our understanding is that for your trip to Georgia you were told that Rudy Giuliani had arranged for a clerk to help you gain access to voting machines. **Do you**

have any comment or clarification?

The is absolutely wrong. Our contact wasn't the clerk at the location you're talking about, and it wasn't arranged by Giuliani. This is something that had worked out of some contacts and relationships that people at the plantation had been building. Myself included.

14. Our understanding is that the clerk did not help. Is this accurate?

This is wrong. The clerk was never involved. I believe there were phone calls to that level when we were finally in Georgia, but no one who actually had the authority to grant access to the voting machines would agree to let us access them. This was the problem with some of the early arrangements, we prematurely went to the site without the permission from the appropriate level of people to grant access because some enthusiastic person who was involved in the local elections thought they could get us access. After this trip, this stuff was vetted a lot more closely. Again, this trip had NOTHING to do with Guiliani.

15. Our understanding is that James Penrose then tried to persuade elections officials at two offices in Georgia to allow you to examine machines but was unsuccessful. Do you have any comment or clarification?

We had multiple counties we spoke to besides this county, and were actively working to try to convince someone to give us access to capture forensic images. There were conversations with more than two, and yes, Jim often was involved to try and do the convincing.

16. You have testified that you were involved in examining election irregularities in Antrim County, Michigan, but were not retained by the plaintiff who filed suit in that county over those irregularities, William Bailey. What was your role in Antrim County? Did you contribute to the ASOG report on Antrim?

This was all covered in our interviews in quite some detail. I was not involved in any part of the writing of the ASOG report. The Antrim attorney's gave permission for me to view the Antrim data about 12 hrs before the ASOG report was finally released. I found a couple of technical things that I gave to Jim, who I believe gave to ASOG and were integrated into the report. I later, at the request of the Antrim attorney's, did a full write-up from my company Cyber Ninjas. That was a completely separate report.

17. Did you review the research of Joshua Merritt, the former Allied Security Operations Group executive? Did you rely on his research for any of your own reports? If so, did you vet or fact-check his work in any way?

No, I have never reviewed the reports from Joshua Merritt at any point in time. I can't

comment on them. Didn't he do a report in Colorado? If that's the one you're talking about, my report was done and completed way before that was even a thought.

18. Our understanding is that although you publicly minimized your role on Lin Wood's plantation, during the weeks after the election emails and other communications show you were reporting directly to Lin Wood. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

There was not a "reporting structure". We were all volunteers trying to get things done. I helped whoever I could help get things done, but I did originally come to the plantation to help Lin Wood. I don't know what you're talking about in me "publically minimizing my role at Lin Wood's plantation". I didn't have a leadership role. I helped out wherever I could to try and figure out what the truth is.

19. Our understanding is that at a point in December 2020, members of the coalition no longer had to present evidence that would succeed in court because they could instead use the evidence to appeal directly to state legislatures and then Congress, eventually placing pressure on Mike Pence to stop or delay certification on January 6. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this account?**

This is categorically false for all the reasons I've listed across these other responses. There was no long-term plan. Everything was all day-by-day and week by week, with groups loosely associated with each other. Not to mention, there was still attempts to progress with court cases after December, so if this was even remotely true; why did that happen?

20. Our understanding is that the coalition members were also briefing Congressional representatives and publicizing their theories in speeches, on social media and on TV. Our understanding is that the aim was to help create a public outcry that would put pressure on Republican lawmakers to stop or delay certification of the Biden electoral votes. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**

The goal was always to have a proper investigation into what happened. Every last decision was always about that investigation, not about "preventing certification". This narrative is absolutely wrong, and absolutely inaccurate to what was taking place. Individuals had various theories or ideas how under the law an investigation could be conducted, but the goal was always an investigation so that the truth could be validated.

21. Our understanding is that the belief perpetuated by Staci Burk in Arizona that fake ballots had been flown in from Asia was extremely widespread in Arizona. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Yes, that is true.

22. Our understanding is that in December of 2020 James Penrose had told Burk that he had spent \$75,000 investigating her claims and found that they were false. Our understanding is that that one of many goals of the Arizona audit was to examine the integrity of the paper ballots and figure out whether claims like Burk's were true and that you had auditors scan ballots with UV lights to check if there were bamboo fibers mixed into the paper, which could suggest that they were imported from Asia, among other theories. It also is our understanding that Penrose informed you that Burk's claims were incorrect. It also is our understanding that you proceeded with the investigation of her claims even after Penrose's findings because you said the claims were so widespread that they needed to be publicly disproven. **Did you publicly disprove them? Do you have any other comment or clarification?**

I'm going to rephrase this stuff to make this more accurate. There are quite a few details and certainly the focus, which is wrong in this.

Penrose hired private investigators who looked into Staci Burk's claims that several hundred thousand ballots had been flown into from Asia. He told me that the PI's had determined that this story all originated back to a single person who worked at the airport who had come up with the story to troll his conservative friends. He stated that there was no solid evidence found to support Staci Burk's claims. As a result, I walked into the audit expecting this specific problem was probably not a real concern.

However, the audit was designed to try to look into any possible way that an election might be manipulated, to show if this did or did not happen. The end goal was to support legislative reform that would improve the overall integrity of elections, and would restore the American public's trust in the election system either by confirming things were working fine, or identifying gaps that needed to be fixed.

One of the ways an election could be manipulated is by the injection of illegitimate ballots into the system. The paper examination portion of the audit was designed to capture indicators of several different ways this could happen. In doing so it could easily validate or refute any claims that ballots were flown in from Asia. One of the things the paper examination did was categorized paper fibers to determine the number of paper types, and the composition of those paper types. This information could then be compared against known paper types used in the election to potentially identify any unexplained papers. Anything unexplained could hopefully be explained by the County, or at a bare minimum legislation could be passed to be sure there was an explanation in the future.

Paper in Asia is typically made of bamboo rather than the pulp from trees. As a result, if we're tracking paper fibers; we definitely would identify the oddity of paper fibers that represented bamboo. This was not why we were looking at paper fibers, but it is something that looking at paper fibers would help determine. Since our goal was to fix any potential issues through legislation, and increase faith in the elections; looking at this was important.

This had nothing to do with the UV lights. There is no paper characteristic of bamboo that shows up in UV lights. UV lights cause things like the MIC to stand out more, and would show any watermarks, and in some cases show unique aspects of the paper composition. As a result the UV lights has nothing to do with this specific question.

23. Our understanding is that much of the evidence the coalition had collected in December 2020 made its way into reports or talking points or memos that were coming out of the White House via Peter Navarro or from Rudy Giuliani. **Is this accurate?**

I do not believe this is accurate, but I do not have any first hand knowledge on this. There was a pretty clear separation between what we did on the plantation and Giuliani's team.

24. Our understanding is that the evidence assembled by teams led by Flynn, Byrne, Powell, Wood, Waldron, Giuliani and others was used in the days leading up to January 6, 2021, to try to convince lawmakers that the results of the election were questionable or fraudulent. **Is this accurate?**

The evidence was always used to try to get a proper investigation to happen in order to see what happened. It was believed that what was found suggested a fraudulent election, but the goal was for the actual counting of ballots or other forms of investigation that would prove things one way or another. Attempts were made to get lawmakers onboard to allow that sort of investigation to take place.

25. Our understanding is after the inauguration, you, Michael Flynn, Phil Waldron and Patrick Byrne decided to continue to pursue the investigation of the theory that voting machines were hacked and that "forensic audits" were necessary and worked to build an "election integrity" movement among grassroots groups focused on overhauling electoral systems, which you believed were corrupt. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Going back over 5 years, the Defcon Voting Machine Hacking Village has issued report-after-report every single year showing significant vulnerabilities in voting machines. There have been various Congressional reports supporting this over the years, initiated by both sides of the aisle. It's a well proven fact that our voting machines are vulnerable. The only question is if they were actually exploited this election cycle or in past elections.

When over 47% of American's feel an election is rigged, our democracy is failing. It doesn't even matter if that is real, the believe that its not real is sufficient to cause our country to collapse. The way you answer that is with increased transparency and audits, not by closing every avenue for examination. For years, every single publicly traded company is required to go through an audit annually to ensure integrity. It

increases public confidence in those institutions, it does not undermine them. Every audit finds things that needs to be fixed. Our election systems should go through the same types of checks. Doing so does not undermine Democracy, but very well be the only thing that will save it.

As a result, I absolutely support continued forensic audits. The legislation I proposed in my report; and at the Pima County hearing clearly shows my commitment to legislative reform. I've never once said that voting machines were hacked. There are statistical anomalies that could be explained by some form of manipulation at the voting machine level. I believe that should be fully looked into, and that our systems should be made even more robust. Continuous improvement never hurt anything.

26. Our understanding is that after it became public that Karen Fann had [selected](#) Allied Security Operations Group and Phil Waldron to run the audit in early February, she faced criticism that caused her to switch your firm, Cyber Ninjas. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I do not believe any firm was ever selected before Cyber Ninjas, but I don't know anything about this. I think this goes way beyond what the facts can actually support and dives into quite a bit of speculation.

27. Our understanding is that you believe that the Arizona We the People Alliance were fundamental in making the audit there happen. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this statement?**

Yes, I believe this is accurate. We the People Alliance is solely interested in figuring out the truth and serving our Country. They have no other agenda or aim.

28. Our understanding is that the coalition you had led after the election played key roles in many parts of the Arizona audit, with you running it and at least \$7 million coming from organizations overseen by you, Byrne, Powell, Wood and others who worked closely with you. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**

The term "coalition" is wrong, as I've told Doug beforehand and as my responses have indicated. In any case, even in your use of the word, I never "led" anything besides the audit. It is not a surprise that organizations that had been founded to support election integrity and wanted an audit backed us financially to make that happen. These individuals trusted that I would have integrity in the work I did, and trusted us to do a fair examination.

29. Our understanding is that Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai served as a consultant for the audit. **Is this accurate?**

No, this is absolutely wrong. Dr. Shiva was not consulted at any point in time in the audit over any details whatsoever. Randy Pullen wanted him to count the votes based on the Dominion images. My conversations with him were only in that regard. Later on the Senate decided to hire him to look at the envelope images. I gave him some data he could use in his examination. At no point did he consult with us or provide advice in any format.

30. Our understanding is that running the Arizona audit involved managing hundreds of workers and volunteers. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this?**

Yes, there were over 1,500 people involved in the Arizona audit.

31. Our understanding is that you did not have experience in election work or in managing a project of this size. **Is this accurate?**

No project this big is all about an individual. While I personally had been involved in the evaluation of the Antrim voting machines as part of the Cyber Ninjas report issue, I also had a lot of people who have been very involved in elections that I consulted with and had working on the audit. We also had individuals who had worked on similarly massive projects in the past that helped run the operations. No one had ever done anything close to what we did. This is the first forensic election audit that has ever happened. As a result, in that respect, this was new.

32. Our understanding is that ASOG originally said that the audit would take a maximum of 10 days, but the Cyber Ninjas audit ended up taking more than four months. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I don't know much about this. Its my understanding that ASOG's proposal for an audit was not a complete audit but a partial one. As a result, its not a surprise there would be significant differences in the time it would take.

33. Our understanding is that elections officials who were observing the audit said the process was marred by basic procedural errors. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Former election officials who volunteered and worked at the audit were absolutely amazed by our process and the way things were conducted. Individuals placed by Katie Hobbs, who had actively tried to shut down the audit, had reports which had disparaging remarks to say about the audit. Some of those individuals had more positive things to say privately.

With Mark Elias advertising that he'd hired 70 attorneys to shutdown the audit, and him not being successful; shows that we were doing things correctly. If our process was so marred or problematic, someone would have been able to come up with an excuse to shut us down.

Probably too late to talk to him, but why don't you ask Garland Favorito about our process. He's been active in the election space for quite some time.

34. Our understanding is that three nationally recognized election experts issued a report saying the audit's hand count could not be replicated. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Those "nationally recognized election experts" and their "report", is clearly written with extreme biased that is evident to anyone that reads a few sentences of it. Without ever asking any questions to clarify anything in our reports or in our findings, they came to some pretty crazy conclusions off of their results. If they couldn't replicate the data, maybe they should have asked a few questions to get clarity on how things were done? If they had a genuine interest in determining what was done, they would have. However, they were just one of the many examples of people trying to capitalize on the attention the audit got.

35. Our understanding is that the equipment list used in the audit in Arizona was originally introduced publicly in a lawsuit filed by Lin Wood and then later appeared in other state auditing efforts including in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Do you know how or by whom it was shared?**

I don't know anything about this.

36. Our understanding is that in July, Trump said that 74,000 mail-in ballots in Arizona were counted with no clear record of them ever being sent. This was based on your earlier statement to the legislature. However, our understanding is that your statement was based on an incomplete data set that didn't include all of the mail-ballots sent out and received by Maricopa County, according to the county. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Did you or anyone that you're aware of try to contact Trump to correct the misleading statements or respond to Maricopa County's explanation?**

This is addressed in our final report and has been talked about publicly several times. I have never talked with Trump.

37. Our understanding is that you presented your final report to the Arizona Senate on Sept. 24, 2021, that said that in recounting ballots by hand you found that Biden had won by 360 more votes than the certified results. **Is this accurate?**

Our hand counts of the ballots provided found no material difference between the final certified results and what we tallied when hand counting. This does not mean that every ballot counted was legitimate, which is a misrepresentation that the media has information.

38. Our understanding is that during the hearing you and others, including Dr. Shiva, spent much of the time talking about anomalies that suggested the election was rigged. Maricopa County later came out with a rebuttal showing that of the findings made by Cyber Ninjas, 7 were false, 23 inaccurate and 9 misleading. It said the Cyber Ninjas report “made faulty and inaccurate conclusions about more than 53,000 ballots in 22 different categories.” **What is your response to the Maricopa County report about your findings? Do you have any other comments or clarification?**

We provided a rebuttal to Maricopa County’s responses within days of its release a few weeks after the hearing. Maricopa County has never responded to our rebuttal, or attempted to address the issues we raised in that rebuttal.

39. Our understanding is that many of the specifics that members of the coalition were presenting — including interpretations of data from Antrim County, Michigan; the information from the Venezuelan security officer about the corruption of the Dominion Voting Systems; and the suggestion of impropriety in the Arizona audit — have been debunked and discredited in extensive reports from Republican-led experts and teams. These include the Michigan Republican legislators in the case of Antrim County, the Trump campaign staff in the case of the Venezuelan report, and the Maricopa County Elections Department (led by a Republican recorder) in the case of the Arizona audit. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

This is absolutely not accurate. No one has ever refuted my Cyber Ninjas Antrim County report. No one has even attempted to, because its based on fact. Likewise, many of our findings from the Arizona Audit are being reviewed and looked into by the Attorney General. If they had been refuted, that wouldn’t be happening. On the contrary, Maricopa County has used misdirection in their responses; rather than respond to our claims with any factual data head-on. I can’t speak on all the other reports or data I was not a part of putting together.

40. Our understanding is that the consensus among government agencies and former administration officials, such as former Attorney General William Barr, is that no evidence of widespread election fraud has emerged. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this? Do you continue to believe the election was stolen and if so why? Have you ever wavered on this belief? What is your response to the commonly expressed criticism that spreading the idea that the election was stolen is undermining faith in American democracy?**

The idea that there is some overreaching consensus on this in government agencies is absolutely false. I’ve spoken to people in the government who wanted to do investigations

and were politically shut down. I've talked with other people who has more examples of this happening. You certainly are not going to find something if you don't look to see if it is there. As I've mentioned before, audits increase confidence and integrity and there should be absolutely no reason they shouldn't continue to be done.

I have always pushed for a proper examination into the anomalies of the election, and more generically for processes that will help ensure the integrity going forward. If you ask me for my opinion on whether this election had fraud in it, I absolutely believe that it did. The question is if that fraud was significant enough to impact the election one way or another. As close as this last election was, it wouldn't take much to make a significant difference. At the same point we can't make decisions as a nation based on opinions, no matter how logical they are. We need proper investigations to be done and completed, and those need to influence what is done going forward. I am very much looking forward to the Attorney General's report based on what we and others turned over to him. I also think its imperative, regardless of what happened this election cycle, that we focus on making our election systems more robust. The American people need to have trust in their election system, and that happens with transparency and improvements; not in simply stating "There is nothing to see here". Shutting down audits and freedom of speech under the guise that this speech is "undermining American democracy" is absolutely un-American. This is the sort of response China or Russia would have. Here in our country the problem should be addressed by MORE transparency, and MORE audits; and allowing citizens to see this for themselves.

I'm available during normal working hours at doug.clark@propublica.org or 678.243.0784.

Thank you,

Doug Bock Clark

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Doug Bock Clark](#)
Cc: [Alexandra Berzon](#)
Subject: RE: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18
Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 10:37:00 AM

To be clear, I do not authorize any comments or quotes from me. The only way you can utilize information from me is from a background standpoint.

From: Douglas Logan
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2022 9:51 AM
To: Doug Bock Clark <Doug.Bock.Clark@propublica.org>
Cc: Alexandra Berzon <Alexandra.Berzon@propublica.org>
Subject: RE: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18

Doug,

This was all extremely disappointing to read. I probably shouldn't even bother responding because how clear of a negative narrative you're weaving here verses just covering the facts like you said your article was going to do. If you truly think that this is just "covering the facts", I don't think you're anywhere close to seeing your own bias which is clearly coming out in all of these statements.

I'm not an attorney, but a number of these are off enough it certainly could be pushing the line on defamation. You're probably skirting that line enough that a court would be unlikely to act, but is that really how you want to represent your publication?

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Doug Bock Clark <Doug.Bock.Clark@propublica.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 1:55 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Alexandra Berzon <Alexandra.Berzon@propublica.org>
Subject: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18

Dear Mr. Logan,

I'm reaching out because ProPublica and Frontline will soon be releasing an article and documentary that includes a description of your actions as they relate to various attempts to challenge the results of the 2020 presidential election. We appreciate the questions you've answered so far. Now we are reaching the final fact-checking stage of our article.

Please review the following information for accuracy and to provide comments, clarifications or further context. For our story to include your responses, we need to hear back by 1:55 p.m. EST on March 18, 2022. We want to have a full understanding of your responses and any other points or material you'd like for us to consider.

1. Our understanding is that you were a member of a coalition of people working on an effort to prove and publicize the belief that Donald Trump had won the 2020 election. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

This is factually incorrect, as I've stated in our conversations multiple times. I worked with people who were trying to figure out what happened with the last election, and dig into the details to know the truth of what happened. If it confirmed the election results were valid and good, that was the best outcome. To this day there a lot of anomalies that re not explained by anyone.

2. Our understanding is that Michael Flynn was the leader of the coalition and that at various times the coalition included you, Patrick Byrne, Sidney Powell, Lin Wood, Phil Waldron, James Penrose, Todd Sanders, Conan Hayes, Seth Keshel and others. It is also our understanding that Rudy Giuliani was a periodic collaborator. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

This is factually untrue, as I've stated to you. Michael Flynn absolutely was NOT the leader in all of this. It was a grassroots effort where various individuals worked together at various points in time; with various levels of association. Flynn wasn't even on the scene at first. As I've stated, the word "coalition" is NOT accurate. Some of the individuals listed worked closely together, some were loosely affiliated.

3. Our understanding is that, starting in November 2020 and through late December 2020, members of this group were present at a plantation in South Carolina owned by Lin Wood or were in close touch with people who gathered at the plantation. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

I've already covered all of this in my interviews. Based on the first two bullets, it sounds like what I said was ignored. As an example, there was very little coordination between Patrick Byrne for the majority of the time at the plantation, and he was only there very briefly. Phil was never at the plantation, and did not work closely. Todd and Conan were not at the plantation, and were not coordinated heavily. I think the word coalition is categorically false, as I've stated before. It doesn't seem like you care what is real, based on these questions and wording, you have an agenda and you're going to print it.

4. Our understanding that you were physically present at Wood’s plantation in November and December 2020 and served as one of the coalition’s cyber security experts. **Is this accurate?**

No, that is not correct. I was not a member of a coalition; nor was anything organized for me to be listed as one of the “Cyber Security experts”.

5. Our understanding is that one of the people you worked with remotely while at the plantation was Ronald Watkins. **Is this accurate?**

No, this is not accurate. Asking someone if they have any Dominion documentation is not “working with them”, unless you’re a reporter trying to distort the facts to support the story you want to tell. Talking to someone a couple of times does not entail “working with them”.

6. Our understanding is you served on one of the coalition's two main teams trying to access voting machines, often working alongside James Penrose. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

There was not any “two main teams”. As if this was some organized operation. I don’t even know what “other team” you’d be talking about. I did work closely with Jim.

7. Our understanding is that Trump campaign staffers around Nov. 15, 2020, vetted substantial claims that a Venezuelan man made in a video and an affidavit that would be used in the so-called “Kraken” lawsuits and determined them to be baseless, which the staffers shared in an internal memo. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I don’t know anything about this.

8. Our understanding is that Phil Waldron in November 2020 shared a list of voting equipment that was circulated to other coalition members and suggested that it be disseminated to state GOPs so that they could start filing injunctions. State GOPs, as well as other entities and individuals, later used portions of this equipment list in legal filings to seek access to Dominion voting machines and to delay certification of the presidential election results. It is also our understanding that the list was used by officials in Arizona as part of their efforts to launch an audit of the election results. **Is this accurate?**

I don't know anything about this.

9. Our understanding is that there was a multi-pronged plan devised by the group at the plantation: to use litigation, public persuasion, and access to the voting equipment to reverse the outcome of the 2020 election. **Did you help to devise this plan?**

This is categorically wrong. There was never a goal to reverse the election. There was a goal to figure out what happened in the election. There was also never any type of long-term strategy plan, as I've talked about, or the organization of multiple steps or whatever. This was a grassroots effort where there was rarely much of a plan beyond a week at a time; let alone some master plan on some way to use litigation, public persuasion, and access to voting equipment to some specific end.

10. Our understanding is that some people in the coalition were worried that some of the efforts to access voting machines might cross legal boundaries. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I don't know what you're talking about. We were always concerned about doing things in a legal and law abiding way, absolutely. I don't know what you're referencing about "legal boundaries". If you're referencing the "hunting license", yes, we thought that wasn't supported and something that shouldn't happen.

11. Our understanding is that in November you were in Georgia with James Penrose, trying to access voting machines. **Is this accurate?**

Yes, this is accurate. We were trying to get counties to work with us to allow us to capture forensic images.

12. Our understanding is that while in Georgia you convened briefly with Conan Hayes and Todd Sanders. **Is this accurate?**

I believe this is accurate.

13. Our understanding is that for your trip to Georgia you were told that Rudy Giuliani had arranged for a clerk to help you gain access to voting machines. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

The is absolutely wrong. Our contact wasn't the clerk at the location you're talking about, and

it wasn't arranged by Giuliani. This is something that had worked out of some contacts and relationships that people at the plantation had been building. Myself included.

14. Our understanding is that the clerk did not help. **Is this accurate?**

This is wrong. The clerk was never involved. I believe there were phone calls to that level when we were finally in Georgia, but no one who actually had the authority to grant access to the voting machines would agree to let us access them. This was the problem with some of the early arrangements, we prematurely went to the site without the permission from the appropriate level of people to grant access because some enthusiastic person who was involved in the local elections thought they could get us access. After this trip, this stuff was vetted a lot more closely. Again, this trip had NOTHING to do with Guiliani.

15. Our understanding is that James Penrose then tried to persuade elections officials at two offices in Georgia to allow you to examine machines but was unsuccessful. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

We had multiple counties we spoke to besides this county, and were actively working to try to convince someone to give us access to capture forensic images. There were conversations with more than two, and yes, Jim often was involved to try and do the convincing.

16. You have testified that you were involved in examining election irregularities in Antrim County, Michigan, but were not retained by the plaintiff who filed suit in that county over those irregularities, William Bailey. **What was your role in Antrim County? Did you contribute to the ASOG report on Antrim?**

This was all covered in our interviews in quite some detail. I was not involved in any part of the writing of the ASOG report. The Antrim attorney's gave permission for me to view the Antrim data about 12 hrs before the ASOG report was finally released. I found a couple of technical things that I gave to Jim, who I believe gave to ASOG and were integrated into the report. I later, at the request of the Antrim attorney's, did a full write-up from my company Cyber Ninjas. That was a completely separate report.

17. Did you review the research of Joshua Merritt, the former Allied Security Operations Group executive? Did you rely on his research for any of your own reports? **If so, did you vet or fact-check his work in any way?**

No, I have never reviewed the reports from Joshua Merritt at any point in time. I can't comment on them. Didn't he do a report in Colorado? If that's the one you're talking about, my report was done and completed way before that was even a thought.

18. Our understanding is that although you publicly minimized your role on Lin Wood's plantation, during the weeks after the election emails and other communications show you were reporting directly to Lin Wood. **Do you have any**

comment or clarification?

There was not a “reporting structure”. We were all volunteers trying to get things done. I helped whoever I could help get things done, but I did originally come to the plantation to help Lin Wood. I don’t know what you’re talking about in me “publically minimizing my role at Lin Wood’s plantation”. I didn’t have a leadership role. I helped out wherever I could to try and figure out what the truth is.

19. Our understanding is that at a point in December 2020, members of the coalition no longer had to present evidence that would succeed in court because they could instead use the evidence to appeal directly to state legislatures and then Congress, eventually placing pressure on Mike Pence to stop or delay certification on January 6. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this account?**

This is categorically false for all the reasons I’ve listed across these other responses. There was no long-term plan. Everything was all day-by-day and week by week, with groups loosely associated with each other. Not to mention, there was still attempts to progress with court cases after December, so if this was even remotely true; why did that happen?

20. Our understanding is that the coalition members were also briefing Congressional representatives and publicizing their theories in speeches, on social media and on TV. Our understanding is that the aim was to help create a public outcry that would put pressure on Republican lawmakers to stop or delay certification of the Biden electoral votes. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**

The goal was always to have a proper investigation into what happened. Every last decision was always about that investigation, not about “preventing certification”. This narrative is absolutely wrong, and absolutely inaccurate to what was taking place. Individuals had various theories or ideas how under the law an investigation could be conducted, but the goal was always an investigation so that the truth could be validated.

21. Our understanding is that the belief perpetuated by Staci Burk in Arizona that fake ballots had been flown in from Asia was extremely widespread in Arizona. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Yes, that is true.

22. Our understanding is that in December of 2020 James Penrose had told Burk that he had spent \$75,000 investigating her claims and found that they were false. Our understanding is that that one of many goals of the Arizona audit was to examine the integrity of the paper ballots and figure out whether claims like Burk’s were true and that you had auditors scan ballots with UV lights to check if there were bamboo fibers mixed into the paper, which could suggest that they were imported from Asia, among other theories. It also is our understanding that Penrose informed you that Burk’s claims were incorrect. It also is our understanding that you proceeded with the

investigation of her claims even after Penrose's findings because you said the claims were so widespread that they needed to be publicly disproven. **Did you publicly disprove them? Do you have any other comment or clarification?**

I'm going to rephrase this stuff to make this more accurate. There are quite a few details and certainly the focus, which is wrong in this.

Penrose hired private investigators who looked into Staci Burk's claims that several hundred thousand ballots had been flown into from Asia. He told me that the PI's had determined that this story all originated back to a single person who worked at the airport who had come up with the story to troll his conservative friends. He stated that there was no solid evidence found to support Staci Burk's claims. As a result, I walked into the audit expecting this specific problem was probably not a real concern.

However, the audit was designed to try to look into any possible way that an election might be manipulated, to show if this did or did not happen. The end goal was to support legislative reform that would improve the overall integrity of elections, and would restore the American public's trust in the election system either by confirming things were working fine, or identifying gaps that needed to be fixed.

One of the ways an election could be manipulated is by the injection of illegitimate ballots into the system. The paper examination portion of the audit was designed to capture indicators of several different ways this could happen. In doing so it could easily validate or refute any claims that ballots were flown in from Asia. One of the things the paper examination did was categorized paper fibers to determine the number of paper types, and the composition of those paper types. This information could then be compared against known paper types used in the election to potentially identify any unexplained papers. Anything unexplained could hopefully be explained by the County, or at a bare minimum legislation could be passed to be sure there was an explanation in the future.

Paper in Asia is typically made of bamboo rather than the pulp from trees. As a result, if we're tracking paper fibers; we definitely would identify the oddity of paper fibers that represented bamboo. This was not why we were looking at paper fibers, but it is something that looking at paper fibers would help determine. Since our goal was to fix any potential issues through legislation, and increase faith in the elections; looking at this was important.

This had nothing to do with the UV lights. There is no paper characteristic of bamboo that shows up in UV lights. UV lights cause things like the MIC to stand out more, and would show any watermarks, and in some cases show unique aspects of the paper composition. As a result the UV lights has nothing to do with this specific question.

23. Our understanding is that much of the evidence the coalition had collected in December 2020 made its way into reports or talking points or memos that were coming out of the White House via Peter Navarro or from Rudy Giuliani. **Is this accurate?**

I do not believe this is accurate, but I do not have any first hand knowledge on this. There was a pretty clear separation between what we did on the plantation and Giuliani's team.

24. Our understanding is that the evidence assembled by teams led by Flynn, Byrne, Powell, Wood, Waldron, Giuliani and others was used in the days leading up to January 6, 2021, to try to convince lawmakers that the results of the election were questionable or fraudulent. **Is this accurate?**

The evidence was always used to try to get a proper investigation to happen in order to see what happened. It was believed that what was found suggested a fraudulent election, but the goal was for the actual counting of ballots or other forms of investigation that would prove things one way or another. Attempts were made to get lawmakers onboard to allow that sort of investigation to take place.

25. Our understanding is after the inauguration, you, Michael Flynn, Phil Waldron and Patrick Byrne decided to continue to pursue the investigation of the theory that voting machines were hacked and that "forensic audits" were necessary and worked to build an "election integrity" movement among grassroots groups focused on overhauling electoral systems, which you believed were corrupt. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Going back over 5 years, the Defcon Voting Machine Hacking Village has issued report-after-report every single year showing significant vulnerabilities in voting machines. There have been various Congressional reports supporting this over the years, initiated by both sides of the aisle. It's a well proven fact that our voting machines are vulnerable. The only question is if they were actually exploited this election cycle or in past elections.

When over 47% of American's feel an election is rigged, our democracy is failing. It doesn't even matter if that is real, the believe that its not real is sufficient to cause our country to collapse. The way you answer that is with increased transparency and audits, not by closing every avenue for examination. For years, every single publicly traded company is required to go through an audit annually to ensure integrity. It increases public confidence in those institutions, it does not undermine them. Every audit finds things that needs to be fixed. Our election systems should go through the same types of checks. Doing so does not undermine Democracy, but very well be the only thing that will save it.

As a result, I absolutely support continued forensic audits. The legislation I proposed in my report; and at the Pima County hearing clearly shows my commitment to legislative reform. I've never once said that voting machines were hacked. There are statistical anomalies that could be explained by some form of manipulation at the voting machine level. I believe that should be fully looked into, and that our systems should be made even more robust. Continuous improvement never hurt anything.

26. Our understanding is that after it became public that Karen Fann had [selected](#) Allied Security Operations Group and Phil Waldron to run the audit in early February, she faced criticism that caused her to switch your firm, Cyber Ninjas. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I do not believe any firm was ever selected before Cyber Ninjas, but I don't know anything about this. I think this goes way beyond what the facts can actually support and dives into quite a bit of speculation.

27. Our understanding is that you believe that the Arizona We the People Alliance were fundamental in making the audit there happen. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this statement?**

Yes, I believe this is accurate. We the People Alliance is solely interested in figuring out the truth and serving our Country. They have no other agenda or aim.

28. Our understanding is that the coalition you had led after the election played key roles in many parts of the Arizona audit, with you running it and at least \$7 million coming from organizations overseen by you, Byrne, Powell, Wood and others who worked closely with you. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**

The term "coalition" is wrong, as I've told Doug beforehand and as my responses have indicated. In any case, even in your use of the word, I never "led" anything besides the audit. It is not a surprise that organizations that had been founded to support election integrity and wanted an audit backed us financially to make that happen. These individuals trusted that I would have integrity in the work I did, and trusted us to do a fair examination.

29. Our understanding is that Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai served as a consultant for the audit. **Is this accurate?**

No, this is absolutely wrong. Dr. Shiva was not consulted at any point in time in the audit over any details whatsoever. Randy Pullen wanted him to count the votes based on the Dominion images. My conversations with him were only in that regard. Later on the Senate decided to hire him to look at the envelope images. I gave him some data he could use in his examination. At no point did he consult with us or provide advice in any format.

30. Our understanding is that running the Arizona audit involved managing hundreds of workers and volunteers. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this?**

Yes, there were over 1,500 people involved in the Arizona audit.

31. Our understanding is that you did not have experience in election work or in managing a project of this size. **Is this accurate?**

No project this big is all about an individual. While I personally had been involved in the

evaluation of the Antrim voting machines as part of the Cyber Ninjas report issue, I also had a lot of people who have been very involved in elections that I consulted with and had working on the audit. We also had individuals who had worked on similarly massive projects in the past that helped run the operations. No one had ever done anything close to what we did. This is the first forensic election audit that has ever happened. As a result, in that respect, this was new.

32. Our understanding is that ASOG originally said that the audit would take a maximum of 10 days, but the Cyber Ninjas audit ended up taking more than four months. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I don't know much about this. Its my understanding that ASOG's proposal for an audit was not a complete audit but a partial one. As a result, its not a surprise there would be significant differences in the time it would take.

33. Our understanding is that elections officials who were observing the audit said the process was marred by basic procedural errors. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Former election officials who volunteered and worked at the audit were absolutely amazed by our process and the way things were conducted. Individuals placed by Katie Hobbs, who had actively tried to shut down the audit, had reports which had disparaging remarks to say about the audit. Some of those individuals had more positive things to say privately.

With Mark Elias advertising that he'd hired 70 attorneys to shutdown the audit, and him not being successful; shows that we were doing things correctly. If our process was so marred or problematic, someone would have been able to come up with an excuse to shut us down.

Probably too late to talk to him, but why don't you ask Garland Favorito about our process. He's been active in the election space for quite some time.

34. Our understanding is that three nationally recognized election experts issued a report saying the audit's hand count could not be replicated. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

Those "nationally recognized election experts" and their "report", is clearly written with extreme biased that is evident to anyone that reads a few sentences of it. Without ever asking any questions to clarify anything in our reports or in our findings, they came to some pretty crazy conclusions off of their results. If they couldn't replicate the data, maybe they should have asked a few questions to get clarity on how things were done? If they had a genuine interest in determining what was done, they would have. However, they were just one of the many examples of people trying to capitalize on the attention the audit got.

35. Our understanding is that the equipment list used in the audit in Arizona was originally introduced publicly in a lawsuit filed by Lin Wood and then later appeared in other state auditing efforts including in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Do you know how or by whom it was shared?**

I don't know anything about this.

36. Our understanding is that in July, Trump said that 74,000 mail-in ballots in Arizona were counted with no clear record of them ever being sent. This was based on your earlier statement to the legislature. However, our understanding is that your statement was based on an incomplete data set that didn't include all of the mail-ballots sent out and received by Maricopa County, according to the county. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Did you or anyone that you're aware of try to contact Trump to correct the misleading statements or respond to Maricopa County's explanation?**

This is addressed in our final report and has been talked about publicly several times. I have never talked with Trump.

37. Our understanding is that you presented your final report to the Arizona Senate on Sept. 24, 2021, that said that in recounting ballots by hand you found that Biden had won by 360 more votes than the certified results. **Is this accurate?**

Our hand counts of the ballots provided found no material difference between the final certified results and what we tallied when hand counting. This does not mean that every ballot counted was legitimate, which is a misrepresentation that the media has information.

38. Our understanding is that during the hearing you and others, including Dr. Shiva, spent much of the time talking about anomalies that suggested the election was rigged. Maricopa County later came out with a rebuttal showing that of the findings made by Cyber Ninjas, 7 were false, 23 inaccurate and 9 misleading. It said the Cyber Ninjas report "made faulty and inaccurate conclusions about more than 53,000 ballots in 22 different categories." **What is your response to the Maricopa County report about your findings? Do you have any other comments or clarification?**

We provided a rebuttal to Maricopa County's responses within days of its release a few weeks after the hearing. Maricopa County has never responded to our rebuttal, or attempted to address the issues we raised in that rebuttal.

39. Our understanding is that many of the specifics that members of the coalition were presenting — including interpretations of data from Antrim County, Michigan; the information from the Venezuelan security officer about the corruption of the Dominion Voting Systems; and the suggestion of impropriety in the Arizona audit — have been debunked and discredited in extensive reports from Republican-led experts and teams. These include the Michigan Republican legislators in the case of Antrim County, the Trump campaign staff in the case of the Venezuelan report, and

the Maricopa County Elections Department (led by a Republican recorder) in the case of the Arizona audit. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

This is absolutely not accurate. No one has ever refuted my Cyber Ninjas Antrim County report. No one has even attempted to, because its based on fact. Likewise, many of our findings from the Arizona Audit are being reviewed and looked into by the Attorney General. If they had been refuted, that wouldn't be happening. On the contrary, Maricopa County has used misdirection in their responses; rather than respond to our claims with any factual data head-on. I can't speak on all the other reports or data I was not a part of putting together.

40. Our understanding is that the consensus among government agencies and former administration officials, such as former Attorney General William Barr, is that no evidence of widespread election fraud has emerged. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this? Do you continue to believe the election was stolen and if so why? Have you ever wavered on this belief? What is your response to the commonly expressed criticism that spreading the idea that the election was stolen is undermining faith in American democracy?**

The idea that there is some overreaching consensus on this in government agencies is absolutely false. I've spoken to people in the government who wanted to do investigations and were politically shut down. I've talked with other people who has more examples of this happening. You certainly are not going to find something if you don't look to see if it is there. As I've mentioned before, audits increase confidence and integrity and there should be absolutely no reason they shouldn't continue to be done.

I have always pushed for a proper examination into the anomalies of the election, and more generically for processes that will help ensure the integrity going forward. If you ask me for my opinion on whether this election had fraud in it, I absolutely believe that it did. The question is if that fraud was significant enough to impact the election one way or another. As close as this last election was, it wouldn't take much to make a significant difference. At the same point we can't make decisions as a nation based on opinions, no matter how logical they are. We need proper investigations to be done and completed, and those need to influence what is done going forward. I am very much looking forward to the Attorney General's report based on what we and others turned over to him. I also think its imperative, regardless of what happened this election cycle, that we focus on making our election systems more robust. The American people need to have trust in their election system, and that happens with transparency and improvements; not in simply stating "There is nothing to see here". Shutting down audits and freedom of speech under the guise that this speech is "undermining American democracy" is absolutely un-American. This is the sort of response China or Russia would have. Here in our country the problem should be addressed by MORE transparency, and MORE audits; and allowing citizens to see this for themselves.

I'm available during normal working hours at doug.clark@propublica.org or 678.243.0784.

Thank you,

Doug Bock Clark

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Doug Bock Clark](#)
Cc: [Alexandra Berzon](#)
Subject: RE: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18
Date: Friday, March 18, 2022 8:01:28 AM

Doug,

From: Doug Bock Clark <Doug.Bock.Clark@propublica.org>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 1:55 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Alexandra Berzon <Alexandra.Berzon@propublica.org>
Subject: IMPORTANT: Fact-checking for ProPublica article / Response required by March 18

Dear Mr. Logan,

I'm reaching out because ProPublica and Frontline will soon be releasing an article and documentary that includes a description of your actions as they relate to various attempts to challenge the results of the 2020 presidential election. We appreciate the questions you've answered so far. Now we are reaching the final fact-checking stage of our article.

Please review the following information for accuracy and to provide comments, clarifications or further context. For our story to include your responses, we need to hear back by 1:55 p.m. EST on March 18, 2022. We want to have a full understanding of your responses and any other points or material you'd like for us to consider.

1. Our understanding is that you were a member of a coalition of people working on an effort to prove and publicize the belief that Donald Trump had won the 2020 election. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

This is factually incorrect, as I've stated in our conversations multiple times. I worked with people who were trying to figure out what happened with the last election, and dig into the details to know the truth of what happened. If it confirmed the election results were valid and good, that was the best outcome. To this day there a lot of anomalies that re not explained by anyone.

2. Our understanding is that Michael Flynn was the leader of the coalition and that at various times the coalition included you, Patrick Byrne, Sidney Powell, Lin Wood, Phil Waldron, James Penrose, Todd Sanders, Conan Hayes, Seth Keshel and others.

It is also our understanding that Rudy Giuliani was a periodic collaborator. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

This is factually untrue, as I've stated to you. Michael Flynn absolutely was NOT the leader in all of this. It was a grassroots effort where various individuals worked together at various points in time; with various levels of association. Flynn wasn't even on the scene at first. As I've stated, the word "coalition" is NOT accurate. Some of the individuals listed worked closely together, some were loosely affiliated.

3. Our understanding is that, starting in November 2020 and through late December 2020, members of this group were present at a plantation in South Carolina owned by Lin Wood or were in close touch with people who gathered at the plantation. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

I've already covered all of this in my interviews. Based on the first two bullets, it sounds like what I said was ignored. As an example, there was very little coordination between Patrick Byrne for the majority of the time at the plantation, and he was only there very briefly. Phil was never at the plantation, and did not work closely. Todd and Conan were not at the plantation, and were not coordinated heavily. I think the word coalition is categorically false, as I've stated before. It doesn't seem like you care what is real, based on these questions and wording, you have an agenda and you're going to print it.

4. Our understanding that you were physically present at Wood's plantation in November and December 2020 and served as one of the coalition's cyber security experts. **Is this accurate?**

No, that is not correct. I was not a member of a coalition; nor was anything organized for me to be listed as one of the "Cyber Security experts".

5. Our understanding is that one of the people you worked with remotely while at the plantation was Ronald Watkins. **Is this accurate?**

No, this is not accurate. Asking someone if they have any Dominion documentation is not "working with them", unless you're a reporter trying to distort the facts to support the story you want to tell. Talking to someone a couple of times does not entail "working with them".

6. Our understanding is you served on one of the coalition's two main teams trying to access voting machines, often working alongside James Penrose. **Do you have any comments or clarification?**

There was not any "two main teams". As if this was some organized operation. I don't even know what "other team" you'd be talking about. I did work closely with Jim.

7. Our understanding is that Trump campaign staffers around Nov. 15, 2020, vetted substantial claims that a Venezuelan man made in a video and an affidavit that would be used in the so-called "Kraken" lawsuits and determined them to be baseless, which the staffers shared in an internal memo. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

I don't know anything about this.

8. Our understanding is that Phil Waldron in November 2020 shared a list of voting equipment that was circulated to other coalition members and suggested that it be disseminated to state GOPs so that they could start filing injunctions. State GOPs, as well as other entities and individuals, later used portions of this equipment list in legal filings to seek access to Dominion voting machines and to delay certification of the presidential election results. It is also our understanding that the list was used by officials in Arizona as part of their efforts to launch an audit of the election results. **Is this accurate?**

I don't know anything about this.

9. Our understanding is that there was a multi-pronged plan devised by the group at the plantation: to use litigation, public persuasion, and access to the voting equipment to reverse the outcome of the 2020 election. **Did you help to devise this plan?**

This is categorically wrong. There was never a goal to reverse the election. There was a goal to figure out what happened in the election. There was also never any type of long-term strategy

plan, as I've talked about, or the organization of multiple steps or whatever. There was never a viewpoint beyond about a week at a time.

10. Our understanding is that some people in the coalition were worried that some of the efforts to access voting machines might cross legal boundaries. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

11. Our understanding is that in November you were in Georgia with James Penrose, trying to access voting machines. **Is this accurate?**

12. Our understanding is that while in Georgia you convened briefly with Conan Hayes and Todd Sanders. **Is this accurate?**

13. Our understanding is that for your trip to Georgia you were told that Rudy Giuliani had arranged for a clerk to help you gain access to voting machines. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

14. Our understanding is that the clerk did not help. **Is this accurate?**

15. Our understanding is that James Penrose then tried to persuade elections officials at two offices in Georgia to allow you to examine machines but was unsuccessful. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

16. You have testified that you were involved in examining election irregularities in Antrim County, Michigan, but were not retained by the plaintiff who filed suit in that

county over those irregularities, William Bailey. **What was your role in Antrim County? Did you contribute to the ASOG report on Antrim?**

17. Did you review the research of Joshua Merritt, the former Allied Security Operations Group executive? Did you rely on his research for any of your own reports? **If so, did you vet or fact-check his work in any way?**

18. Our understanding is that although you publicly minimized your role on Lin Wood's plantation, during the weeks after the election emails and other communications show you were reporting directly to Lin Wood. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

19. Our understanding is that at a point in December 2020, members of the coalition no longer had to present evidence that would succeed in court because they could instead use the evidence to appeal directly to state legislatures and then Congress, eventually placing pressure on Mike Pence to stop or delay certification on January 6. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this account?**

20. Our understanding is that the coalition members were also briefing Congressional representatives and publicizing their theories in speeches, on social media and on TV. Our understanding is that the aim was to help create a public outcry that would put pressure on Republican lawmakers to stop or delay certification of the Biden electoral votes. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**

21. Our understanding is that the belief perpetuated by Staci Burk in Arizona that fake ballots had been flown in from Asia was extremely widespread in Arizona. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

22. Our understanding is that in December of 2020 James Penrose had told Burk

that he had spent \$75,000 investigating her claims and found that they were false. Our understanding is that that one of many goals of the Arizona audit was to examine the integrity of the paper ballots and figure out whether claims like Burk's were true and that you had auditors scan ballots with UV lights to check if there were bamboo fibers mixed into the paper, which could suggest that they were imported from Asia, among other theories. It also is our understanding that Penrose informed you that Burk's claims were incorrect. It also is our understanding that you proceeded with the investigation of her claims even after Penrose's findings because you said the claims were so widespread that they needed to be publicly disproven. **Did you publicly disprove them? Do you have any other comment or clarification?**

23. Our understanding is that much of the evidence the coalition had collected in December 2020 made its way into reports or talking points or memos that were coming out of the White House via Peter Navarro or from Rudy Giuliani. **Is this accurate?**

24. Our understanding is that the evidence assembled by teams led by Flynn, Byrne, Powell, Wood, Waldron, Giuliani and others was used in the days leading up to January 6, 2021, to try to convince lawmakers that the results of the election were questionable or fraudulent. **Is this accurate?**

25. Our understanding is after the inauguration, you, Michael Flynn, Phil Waldron and Patrick Byrne decided to continue to pursue the investigation of the theory that voting machines were hacked and that "forensic audits" were necessary and worked to build an "election integrity" movement among grassroots groups focused on overhauling electoral systems, which you believed were corrupt. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

26. Our understanding is that after it became public that Karen Fann had [selected](#) Allied Security Operations Group and Phil Waldron to run the audit in early February, she faced criticism that caused her to switch your firm, Cyber Ninjas. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

27. Our understanding is that you believe that the Arizona We the People Alliance

were fundamental in making the audit there happen. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this statement?**

28. Our understanding is that the coalition you had led after the election played key roles in many parts of the Arizona audit, with you running it and at least \$7 million coming from organizations overseen by you, Byrne, Powell, Wood and others who worked closely with you. **Do you have any comment or clarification of this account?**

29. Our understanding is that Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai served as a consultant for the audit. **Is this accurate?**

30. Our understanding is that running the Arizona audit involved managing hundreds of workers and volunteers. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this?**

31. Our understanding is that you did not have experience in election work or in managing a project of this size. **Is this accurate?**

32. Our understanding is that ASOG originally said that the audit would take a maximum of 10 days, but the Cyber Ninjas audit ended up taking more than four months. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

33. Our understanding is that elections officials who were observing the audit said the process was marred by basic procedural errors. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

34. Our understanding is that three nationally recognized election experts issued a report saying the audit's hand count could not be replicated. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

35. Our understanding is that the equipment list used in the audit in Arizona was originally introduced publicly in a lawsuit filed by Lin Wood and then later appeared in other state auditing efforts including in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Do you know how or by whom it was shared?**

36. Our understanding is that in July, Trump said that 74,000 mail-in ballots in Arizona were counted with no clear record of them ever being sent. This was based on your earlier statement to the legislature. However, our understanding is that your statement was based on an incomplete data set that didn't include all of the mail-ballots sent out and received by Maricopa County, according to the county. **Do you have any comment or clarification? Did you or anyone that you're aware of try to contact Trump to correct the misleading statements or respond to Maricopa County's explanation?**

37. Our understanding is that you presented your final report to the Arizona Senate on Sept. 24, 2021, that said that in recounting ballots by hand you found that Biden had won by 360 more votes than the certified results. **Is this accurate?**

38. Our understanding is that during the hearing you and others, including Dr. Shiva, spent much of the time talking about anomalies that suggested the election was rigged. Maricopa County later came out with a rebuttal showing that of the findings made by Cyber Ninjas, 7 were false, 23 inaccurate and 9 misleading. It said the Cyber Ninjas report "made faulty and inaccurate conclusions about more than 53,000 ballots in 22 different categories." **What is your response to the Maricopa County report about your findings? Do you have any other comments or clarification?**

39. Our understanding is that many of the specifics that members of the coalition were presenting — including interpretations of data from Antrim County, Michigan;

the information from the Venezuelan security officer about the corruption of the Dominion Voting Systems; and the suggestion of impropriety in the Arizona audit — have been debunked and discredited in extensive reports from Republican-led experts and teams. These include the Michigan Republican legislators in the case of Antrim County, the Trump campaign staff in the case of the Venezuelan report, and the Maricopa County Elections Department (led by a Republican recorder) in the case of the Arizona audit. **Do you have any comment or clarification?**

40. Our understanding is that the consensus among government agencies and former administration officials, such as former Attorney General William Barr, is that no evidence of widespread election fraud has emerged. **Do you have any comment or clarification on this? Do you continue to believe the election was stolen and if so why? Have you ever wavered on this belief? What is your response to the commonly expressed criticism that spreading the idea that the election was stolen is undermining faith in American democracy?**

I'm available during normal working hours at doug.clark@propublica.org or 678.243.0784.

Thank you,

Doug Bock Clark

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Interview request/
Date: Wednesday, October 06, 2021 3:12:02 PM

Mr. Logan:

Thank you for your response. I appreciate you taking the time to look over the claims and address them.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen

Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Office: [602.444.8694](tel:602.444.8694)
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 6, 2021, at 11:54 AM, Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

Robert,

I do believe that Randy Pullen talked with you last week and explained that the sheets in his machine count were pulled before our work was complete. As a result an analysis of those is mostly meaningless. As we publicly relayed at the time the work was being done, we were working on Quality Control when we moved into the green building. That was making sure that every single batch was properly allocated to the right pallet, and the right batch, that there were no double-entries, and that batch numbers were entered properly. With the massive amount of data, this was a particularly challenging and time-consuming task. We not only had to do with the occasional typo from our team; but in some cases the batch number on the manifest, and/or the batch number on the box, and/or the batch number on the batch sheet did not match. When they didn't match we had to be sure we consistently handled it in the same way so that as much as possible so that everything could hopefully match up with the County's data, even when the County's data didn't agree with itself. With a decent percentage of the boxes having batch sheets on the side of the box, rather than

separating the batches; and some boxes without any batch separators at all, it would literally be impossible for us to match up our data at the batch level to everything since the batches were not clearly marked. We had to assume the batches were in a certain order that matched the label; then again, not every batch was on the label.

Ray's response in general seems more objective than the last report you sent over; but its still has quite a few assumptions and misunderstandings that make quite a bit of it inaccurate. There is also a clear bias for saying things in a negative way whenever possible.

Your first point is a great example. There is a 263 discrepancy among the two ballot totals between the Presidential race and the Senate race. We identified it, highlighted it and footnoted it to explain it. This amounts to 1/100th of a percent of the total ballots counted; and yet its some huge embarrassment? I think the fact we recorded it as-is instead of just trying to cover it up shows our integrity. There is no perfect handling of 2.1 million ballots, especially with over 1,500 people involved and many of them volunteers. A certain number of clerical errors is expected. The fact the count is different between the Senate and Presidential races is not surprising when you consider we applied the "2 out of 3 counts need to agree, and the 3rd needs to be within 1 per 50 ballots" per race instead of per tally sheet. This meant that often when things had to be retallied because it was out of those thresholds it was a single race that was counted.

Prior criticism that came in, I believe it was from Bennie Smith; stated that hand counting was extremely inaccurate and was routinely off by 2% of the total ballot counts. They utilized it to try and discredit us while we were conducting the work. Our accuracy to the official results actually proves that our hand counting method is extremely accurate and blows those numbers away. I have no doubt that's part of the reason why these "experts" are having a hard time believing they were legitimate. However, its also worth noting that none of these reports were put together by anyone who ever hand counted anything close to 2.1 million ballots, nor conducted an audit anywhere close to the scope of what we did. As a result are they truly the right experts to critique a discrepancy of 1/100th of a percentage point?

I don't disagree with Lutz's comments that the Tally Sheets should be made publicly available; but that is a decision for the Senate to make not us. In totally there was almost 2 petabytes of data collected over the course of this audit. We're still working with the Senate on what of this data they would like to have available and how to get that data to them. The tally sheets is probably the most manageable section of that, representing only 200 GB of data; and will probably be the first section to be sent into their care.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer

O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:48 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Interview request/
Importance: High

Doug Logan/ Rod Thomson:

Last week, I sought your comment on an analysis of the ballot hand count authored by “The Audit Guys.” I am reaching out today regarding a new report on the Cyber Ninjas’ audit findings, this time authored by California election auditor Ray Lutz.

I am happy to make Lutz’s report available to you. But I wanted to draw your attention to his core observations. The first: That the Cyber Ninjas reported different totals for races on the same ballot, which Lutz says raises significant questions about your methodologies. Here is the language from his report:

<image001.jpg>

As always, I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this issue and other issues Lutz raises before we publish a story about his findings. Is there an explanation for the different totals of ballots counted in the two races? Should that call into question other information raised in your Sept. 24 report to the Senate? Is Lutz wrong to focus on this?

In another section of the report, Lutz seizes on the lack of data offered by the Cyber Ninjas in regard to tally sheets, which he describes as key to any audit:

<image002.jpg>

Lutz goes on to say:

<image003.jpg>

Can you please address his assessment? Can you explain why these sheets do or do not matter in your opinion?

Because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need your response within the next 24 hours. I appreciate your attention to this. I can be reached at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Anglen, Robert
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:24 AM
To: dlogan@cyberninjas.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Interview request/ analysis calls hand count 'fiction'
Importance: High

Mr. Logan:

Following up on my phone call last night, I wanted to provide you copies of a report by election data analysts Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen. They have conducted an analysis based on data in the Senate's audit report that they say calls into question the hand count of Maricopa County ballots conducted by Cyber Ninjas.

The report says it found a nearly 16K discrepancy in one pallet between the hand count and the machine count of ballots. They use the word "fiction" to describe your work.

I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this report. I can be reached today at 602-316-8395. I do need to hear back from you today.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Anglen, Robert](#)
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: RE: Interview request/
Date: Wednesday, October 06, 2021 2:54:00 PM

Robert,

I do believe that Randy Pullen talked with you last week and explained that the sheets in his machine count were pulled before our work was complete. As a result an analysis of those is mostly meaningless. As we publicly relayed at the time the work was being done, we were working on Quality Control when we moved into the green building. That was making sure that every single batch was properly allocated to the right pallet, and the right batch, that there were no double-entries, and that batch numbers were entered properly. With the massive amount of data, this was a particularly challenging and time-consuming task. We not only had to do with the occasional typo from our team; but in some cases the batch number on the manifest, and/or the batch number on the box, and/or the batch number on the batch sheet did not match. When they didn't match we had to be sure we consistently handled it in the same way so that as much as possible so that everything could hopefully match up with the County's data, even when the County's data didn't agree with itself. With a decent percentage of the boxes having batch sheets on the side of the box, rather than separating the batches; and some boxes without any batch separators at all, it would literally be impossible for us to match up our data at the batch level to everything since the batches were not clearly marked. We had to assume the batches were in a certain order that matched the label; then again, not every batch was on the label.

Ray's response in general seems more objective than the last report you sent over; but its still has quite a few assumptions and misunderstandings that make quite a bit of it inaccurate. There is also a clear bias for saying things in a negative way whenever possible.

Your first point is a great example. There is a 263 discrepancy among the two ballot totals between the Presidential race and the Senate race. We identified it, highlighted it and footnoted it to explain it. This amounts to $1/100^{\text{th}}$ of a percent of the total ballots counted; and yet its some huge embarrassment? I think the fact we recorded it as-is instead of just trying to cover it up shows our integrity. There is no perfect handling of 2.1 million ballots, especially with over 1,500 people involved and many of them volunteers. A certain number of clerical errors is expected. The fact the count is different between the Senate and Presidential races is not surprising when you consider we applied the "2 out of 3 counts need to agree, and the 3rd needs to be within 1 per 50 ballots" per race instead of per tally sheet. This meant that often when things had to be retallied because it was out of those thresholds it was a single race that was counted.

Prior criticism that came in, I believe it was from Bennie Smith; stated that hand counting was extremely inaccurate and was routinely off by 2% of the total ballot counts. They utilized it to try and discredit us while we were conducting the work. Our accuracy to the official results actually proves that our hand counting method is extremely accurate and blows those numbers away. I have no doubt that's part of the reason why these "experts" are having a hard time believing they were legitimate. However, its also worth noting that none of these reports were put together by anyone who ever hand counted anything close to 2.1 million ballots, nor conducted an audit anywhere close to the scope of what we did. As a result are they truly the right experts to critique a discrepancy of $1/100^{\text{th}}$ of a percentage point?

I don't disagree with Lutz's comments that the Tally Sheets should be made publicly available; but that is a decision for the Senate to make not us. In totally there was almost 2 petabytes of data collected over

the course of this audit. We're still working with the Senate on what of this data they would like to have available and how to get that data to them. The tally sheets is probably the most manageable section of that, representing only 200 GB of data; and will probably be the first section to be sent into their care.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
O: 941-364-6527 x1337

From: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 7:48 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: rpullen13@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Interview request/
Importance: High

Doug Logan/ Rod Thomson:

Last week, I sought your comment on an analysis of the ballot hand count authored by "The Audit Guys." I am reaching out today regarding a new report on the Cyber Ninjas' audit findings, this time authored by California election auditor Ray Lutz.

I am happy to make Lutz's report available to you. But I wanted to draw your attention to his core observations. The first: That the Cyber Ninjas reported different totals for races on the same ballot, which Lutz says raises significant questions about your methodologies. Here is the language from his report:

It is interesting to note the somewhat embarrassing reality that the audit did not have the same number of ballots between the two contests being reviewed, the Presidential contest and the Senate contest, losing about 263 ballots in the Senate contest. This does not inspire a great deal of confidence in the hand count, because those ballots were counted at the same time and should have been exactly the same number. It does however speak to the beneficial transparency of the reported result that exposes an internally recorded discrepancy.

Presidential Contest					
	Trump	Biden	Jorgenson	Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	995,404	1,040,873	31,501	20,791	2,088,569
County Canvass	995,665	1,040,774	31,705	21,419	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(261)	99	(204)	(628)	(994)
Senate Contest					
	McSally	Kelly		Write In / Over / Under	Total
Audit	983,662	1,064,336		40,398	2,088,396
County Canvass		1,064,396		40964	2,089,563
Audit - Canvass	(541)	(60)		(566)	(1,167)
Machine Paper Ballot Count (Pullen Report)					2,089,442
Machine Ballot Count - Canvass					(121)

As always, I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this issue and other issues Lutz raises before we publish a story about his findings. Is there an explanation for the different totals of ballots counted in the two races? Should that call into question other information raised in your Sept. 24 report to the Senate? Is Lutz wrong to focus on this?

In another section of the report, Lutz seizes on the lack of data offered by the Cyber Ninjas in regard to tally sheets, which he describes as key to any audit:

What We Expected and Did Not Find

This audit was touted as a "forensic" audit, apparently meaning it is in-depth and considers all evidence including physically collected evidence. Merriam-Webster defines "Forensic" as relating to or dealing with the application of scientific knowledge to legal problems.

We expected that the audit would compare, batch to batch, for all 10,341 batches, the vote totals for each of the contest options being audited. The Dominion Voting System designates each ballot processed with a tabulator number, batch number and offset in the batch. Vote counts per candidate for each batch can be easily subtotaled directly from the cast-vote record (CVR) file, and then compared to a hand tally. The audit did not provide any result of such a comparison to the public.

For example, we have a spreadsheet of all the totals of all batches which was derived from the CVR file, and their corresponding pallet and box. The following snippet shows two boxes, each containing 7 batches of about 200 ballots each. It provides the vote counts for each candidate and each batch. These totals should be comparable to the totals from the hand tally. But neither the hand tally sheets nor master spreadsheet were provided and therefore we cannot perform the comparison.

batchid	Blue Sheet	scanner	EV batch	Pallet	Box #	President				Trump votes	Biden votes	Jorg. votes	Senate				McSally votes	Kelly votes	
						ballots	votes	writes	ov				uv	votes	writes	ov			uv
03001_00001	102020 p3	H1	265	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	195	0	2	2	79	114	2	197	0	0	2	82	115
03001_00002	102020 p3	H1	237	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	200	0	0	0	64	135	1	198	0	0	2	61	137
03001_00003	102020 p3	H1	305	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	197	0	1	2	83	110	4	200	0	0	0	80	120
03001_00004	102020 p3	H1	244	27	EVH1/10-20/265	200	198	0	2	0	82	115	1	197	0	0	3	80	117
03001_00005	102020 p3	H1	243	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	199	1	0	0	87	110	1	198	0	0	1	85	113
03001_00006	102020 p3	H1	333	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	198	0	1	0	78	120	0	197	0	0	2	79	118
03001_00007	102020 p3	H1	292	27	EVH1/10-20/265	199	196	0	2	1	84	112	0	197	0	0	2	83	114
03001_00008	102020 p3	H1	219	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	11	189	0	200	0	0	0	11	189
03001_00009	102020 p3	H1	309	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	0	0	1	84	112	3	197	2	0	3	81	114
03001_00010	102020 p3	H1	236	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	196	1	1	2	62	127	6	199	1	0	0	66	132
03001_00011	102020 p3	H1	279	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	199	2	0	1	49	147	1	196	0	0	4	49	147
03001_00012	102020 p3	H1	245	27	EVH1/10-20/219	200	200	0	0	0	59	139	2	198	0	0	2	58	140
03001_00013	102020 p3	H1	288	27	EVH1/10-20/219	198	195	1	1	2	69	121	4	196	1	0	2	65	130
03001_00014	102020 p3	H1	210	27	EVH1/10-20/219	199	199	0	0	0	49	150	0	198	0	0	1	48	150

Lutz goes on to say:

The tally sheets and the reconciliation spreadsheet should be published immediately.

The report of the hand count provides very little detail. But assuming the aggregate sum of the hand count is as stated, we learn of no evidence that the voting machines nor the election management system was hacked. The report does not establish any indication of electronic intrusion or electronic hacking to modify the tabulation, but even if such an intrusion were documented, it is doubtful that such an intrusion would alter the paper ballots. This is an expected benefit of a substantive hand count of paper ballots. Even if concerns remain from an election quality and procedural compliance standpoint, including the complex topic of eligibility, these issues can't change the outcome of the tabulation itself as documented by the paper ballot record.

Can you please address his assessment? Can you explain why these sheets do or do not matter in your opinion?

Because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need your response within the next 24 hours. I appreciate your attention to this. I can be reached at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Anglen, Robert
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:24 AM
To: dlogan@cyberninjas.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Interview request/ analysis calls hand count 'fiction'
Importance: High

Mr. Logan:

Following up on my phone call last night, I wanted to provide you copies of a report by election data analysts Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen. They have conducted an analysis based on data in the Senate's audit report that they say calls into question the hand count of Maricopa County ballots conducted by Cyber Ninjas.

The report says it found a nearly 16K discrepancy in one pallet between the hand count and the machine count of ballots. They use the word "fiction" to describe your work.

I want to make sure you have every chance to review and comment on this report. I can be reached today at 602-316-8395. I do need to hear back from you today.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Re: Logan interview
Date: Friday, October 22, 2021 6:03:23 PM

Hi, Mr. Logan, I just wanted to follow up and see if you'd be willing to do at least one interview with someone who won't throw you softballs, pat you on the back and ignore the many documented problems with your audit findings. If your findings are truly credible and legitimate, then surely you'd have no need to limit your interviews to individuals and media organizations that you know won't ever ask you a tough question. If you can't answer questions, perhaps that tells us everything we need to know about how seriously we should take your findings.

Real audits can withstand scrutiny. Was this a real audit?

On Thu, Oct 21, 2021 at 12:05 PM Jeremy Duda <jduda@azmirror.com> wrote:

Mr. Logan,

I saw that you sat down for an interview with Lyle Rapacki, and I was wondering if you'd be willing to speak with me.

Obviously, I've been very critical of your work, and I'm sure you're no fan of my reporting. But if you're willing to stand by your work, answering questions from critics rather than people who are already on your side could go a long way toward showing the public that your audit was legitimate. If your work is as good as you claim it to be, then surely it can stand up to scrutiny. If you're not willing to answer questions from critics and your work can't stand up to scrutiny, I think most people will wonder why they should take this audit seriously.

--

Jeremy Duda

Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

--

Jeremy Duda

Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Andrew Stavro](#)
Subject: RE: logistics
Date: Wednesday, June 09, 2021 9:13:00 PM

I should know more about how many and how soon in the next week or so.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Andrew Stavro <andy@iamroaddog.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 11:15 AM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: logistics

Rental for a trailer is going to be about \$1000 a month (\$250 a week) plus .15 cents a mile, if we can find one. We have our 36' available but I'm not sure everything is going to fit into it. If it does then great, we are covered. To buy a new trailer with a lift gate it's \$60K out the door. I don't think it's going to come to that, just want you to have all the information.

Semi trackers are running about \$1600 a week before fuel and driver right now. I have called two vendors already (Velocity and Rider) and both companies have "blackouts" on tractors right now, meaning we can't get them. Again, semi tractors can cost approx. \$120-\$150 to purchase, then you have DOT and IFTA which is a pain.

So my next step is to reach out to logistic companies like Stage Call and Rocket Cargo to see what their rates are for transport and storage.

I'm sure I know the answer to this, but do you have any time frame on how long we would be storing this equipment before it goes to the next venue? And what the next state might be?

I'll keep looking around for options.

Andy Stavro / [480.586.6121](tel:480.586.6121) / [Road Dog Show Pros, LLC](#)

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Heather Honey](#)
Subject: RE: Pending Issues
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2021 7:15:00 PM

Thanks Heather! I'm writing a quick reply as we're about to walk out the door on our way to something.

- I am working on a summary of duplicate issues so you will have good information to provide on Thursday. Maybe we can schedule some time to discuss it on Wednesday evening?

I have to brief Senator Fann and others Wednesday morning on what we're covering on Thursday. Can we please move this up?

- If you have a chance, can you please upload some other images with the serial number to your ShareFile or send via email? I can't properly download from Signal.

I need you to tell me a batch and box and I can upload the images. You said you were looking for the duplicates, but what I uploaded had to do with adjudication.

- Did you get the batch number from Jovan? Even the box ID would be helpful if he can't determine the batch.

Batch number for what issue? I have no idea which thing you're talking about.

- Are you (or is someone) doing a count of the ballot images to compare to the CVR count? They should be the same but...you never know.

I do not know of anyone currently doing this. Right now I'm only seeing 1.1M images. I need to double-check they're not in two places.

- If you are able to locate Suzanne's number, that would be great.

I have not been able to find this.

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Heather Honey <hhoney@haystackinvestigations.com>

Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 3:47 PM

To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>

Subject: Pending Issues

Hi Doug,

Attached is the procedure for the Machine Count. Bryan and Randy both signed off on it. I believe that Randy was working with Carol to recruit some volunteers to start the process tomorrow. After the jogger is delivered, I am hoping that Randy will do some accuracy testing before making a final decision about using the machine count. I am concerned that adding an inaccurate count to the mix will create unnecessary issues. Sharyn and Michele have volunteered to be the verifiers/recorders for the machine counting if Randy goes forward with it. Both will be there on Monday. The tech will be there in the afternoon to train people to use the jogger and the machine counter. I gave Randy the necessary files on a USB drive. I have to do training for a client on Tuesday and Wednesday but will be able to come back as early as Thursday.

- I am working on a summary of duplicate issues so you will have good information to provide on Thursday. Maybe we can schedule some time to discuss it on Wednesday evening?
- If you have a chance, can you please upload some other images with the serial number to your ShareFile or send via email? I can't properly download from Signal.
- Did you get the batch number from Jovan? Even the box ID would be helpful if he can't determine the batch.
- Are you (or is someone) doing a count of the ballot images to compare to the CVR count? They should be the same but...you never know.
- If you are able to locate Suzanne's number, that would be great.

Thanks,
Heather

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Heather Honey](#)
Subject: RE: Pending Issues
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2021 10:21:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

I had a few SD cards. Does this look familiar? Is this something you're looking for?

> SDXC (F:) > 20210616 > AZ Audit 2021 >

Name	Date modified	Type	Size
Aggregation	6/16/2021 9:33 PM	File folder	
Corral	6/16/2021 11:15 PM	File folder	
File Server	6/16/2021 11:16 PM	File folder	
Manifest	6/16/2021 6:14 PM	File folder	
Phase 1	6/9/2021 8:58 PM	File folder	
Phase 2	6/15/2021 11:12 PM	File folder	
OverallAggregationAnalysis.xlsx	6/15/2021 9:09 PM	Microsoft Excel W...	12 KB

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Heather Honey <hhoney@haystackinvestigations.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 3:47 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Pending Issues

Hi Doug,
Attached is the procedure for the Machine Count. Bryan and Randy both signed off on it. I believe that Randy was working with Carol to recruit some volunteers to start the process tomorrow. After the jogger is delivered, I am hoping that Randy will do some accuracy testing before making a final decision about using the machine count. I am concerned that adding an inaccurate count to the mix will create unnecessary issues. Sharyn and Michele have volunteered to be the verifiers/recorders for the machine counting if Randy goes forward with it. Both will be there on Monday. The tech will be there in the afternoon to train people to use the jogger and the machine counter. I gave Randy the necessary files on a USB drive. I have to do training for a client on Tuesday and Wednesday but will be able to come back as early as Thursday.

- I am working on a summary of duplicate issues so you will have good information to provide on Thursday. Maybe we can schedule some time to discuss it on Wednesday evening?
- If you have a chance, can you please upload some other images with the serial number to your ShareFile or send via email? I can't properly download from Signal.
- Did you get the batch number from Jovan? Even the box ID would be helpful if he can't determine the batch.

- Are you (or is someone) doing a count of the ballot images to compare to the CVR count? They should be the same but...you never know.
- If you are able to locate Suzanne's number, that would be great.

Thanks,
Heather

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171
www.Haystack.Group

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Pending Issues
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2021 11:41:39 PM

It looks like it might be a back up of the Access database that Mike is working on. I know he backed up to a USB but might be an earlier back up?

The tote I am looking for has a couple hundred unused SD cards and a drive with images that were left on desktops of the PE computers. It also has hanging folders with some documents.

On Jul 11, 2021, at 10:21 PM, Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

I had a few SD cards. Does this look familiar? Is this something you're looking for?

<image001.png>

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: Heather Honey <hhoney@haystackinvestigations.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 3:47 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Subject: Pending Issues

Hi Doug,
Attached is the procedure for the Machine Count. Bryan and Randy both signed off on it. I believe that Randy was working with Carol to recruit some volunteers to start the process tomorrow. After the jogger is delivered, I am hoping that Randy will do some accuracy testing before making a final decision about using the machine count. I am concerned that adding an inaccurate count to the mix will create unnecessary issues. Sharyn and Michele have volunteered to be the verifiers/recorders for the machine counting if Randy goes forward with it. Both will be there on Monday. The tech will be there in the afternoon to train people to use the jogger and the machine counter. I gave Randy the necessary files on a USB drive. I have to do training for a client on Tuesday and Wednesday but will be able to come back as early as Thursday.

- I am working on a summary of duplicate issues so you will have good information to provide

on Thursday. Maybe we can schedule some time to discuss it on Wednesday evening?

- If you have a chance, can you please upload some other images with the serial number to your ShareFile or send via email? I can't properly download from Signal.
- Did you get the batch number from Jovan? Even the box ID would be helpful if he can't determine the batch.
- Are you (or is someone) doing a count of the ballot images to compare to the CVR count? They should be the same but...you never know.
- If you are able to locate Suzanne's number, that would be great.

Thanks,
Heather

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Randy Pullen](#)
To: [Anglen, Robert](#)
Cc: KFANN@azleg.gov
Subject: Re: Report on hand count
Date: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:29:48 AM

Hi Robert,

Thank you for sending the report last night. The purpose of the machine count was to confirm the total ballot count, which it did. This does not mean it counted every ballot perfectly. As part of the testing and training for the machine count, our machine count team did numerous hand counts of test batches in order to confirm accuracy of the machine count. Based on industry standards the machine count was considered accurate. There was an assumption made by Mr. White and Moore (I assume that is who it came from) that was incorrect. The Cyber Ninja hand count was not completed before we did the machine count. They were in the process of checking their counts and when there was a variation from the CoC or from the counts as listed on the the batch count sheets in each box they were doing recounts. This is why there were boxes on our tabulation sheets that did not have hand counts included. So the conclusion that the hand count was off 16,292 from the machine count is incorrect.

What this report does confirm is there were significant differences between the County's CVR and the CoC counts and the batch counts as listed on each box. Our Machine Count Report pointed out the many anomalies we found in the boxes and batches.

With best regards,

Randy Pullen

On Wed, Sep 29, 2021 at 8:44 PM Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com> wrote:

As promised, here is a copy of the report by Benny White, Randy Pullen and Tim Halvorsen. They conclude that the Cyber Ninjas' hand count is "fiction" based on the numbers Randy Pullen provided in his report. The 27-page report breaks down those numbers by batch and box.

I can be reached at 602-316-8395 tonight or Tuesday morning to discuss their findings and your reaction to it.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen

Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Anglen, Robert](#)
To: [Karen Fann](#); [Douglas Logan](#); rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com; kbazos@gmail.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#); eddiefarnsworth2006@cox.net; votewarren@gmail.com; [Greg Jernigan](#)
Subject: RE: Response to analysis of hand count/ accusations of malfeasance
Date: Friday, November 19, 2021 9:03:53 PM

Hi, all:

I anticipate the story about The Audit Guys' report will publish Monday. I am reaching again to give you an opportunity to respond to the findings and the accusations.

Please call me at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Consumer investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395
Office: 602.444.8694
robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com
Twitter @robertanglen
Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 4:19 PM
To: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com; kbazos@gmail.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>; eddiefarnsworth2006@cox.net; votewarren@gmail.com; Greg Jernigan <GJernigan@azleg.gov>
Subject: RE: Response to analysis of hand count/ accusations of malfeasance

To All, I'm not sure if any of you wish to respond to Mr. Anglen's request for comment. I will leave that decision up to you individually since you were the ones directly involved with the audit process. What I will say from my end relates to the "accusation" of Senator Farnsworth, Senator Petersen and myself being involved with a "conspiracy". That is absolutely incorrect and, quite honestly, crosses the line of slander.

Karen Fann
President of the Senate
Tel: 602.926.5874

From: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 12:15 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>;
rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Response to analysis of hand count/ accusations of malfeasance

Hello:

I want to make sure you have ample time to respond to a new analysis of the hand count numbers by Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen.

Their analysis is based on the nearly 80,000 pages of vote/ tally data released by the Senate on Nov. 1. They conclude that the data shows the numbers were made up and are not supported.

A link to their report can be found here: <https://docs.real-audits.org/s/iJFMEiz3jHBE9Bt>

Their report makes several claims about the nature of the audit, which they concluded was meaningless. They say the numbers reported to the Senate on Sept. 24 cannot be replicated or verified.

Among their claims:

- Sen. Karen Fann and the Cyber Ninjas “tried” to hand count 2.1 million ballots and proved a couple of things.
- They were not able to accurately hand count either the number of ballots cast in the Maricopa County 2020 General Election or the votes on those ballots, and
- They spent about \$9 million over 7 months, so far, and have proven absolutely nothing.
- The Ninjas were convinced that the auditors could not trust anything the county said and the Dominion election management system could not count the ballots or the votes correctly or had been manipulated so that the official results were not valid.
- This presumption was fatal to the validity of the “forensic audit”. It caused them to never actually audit the election results but rather to attempt to create a new result that the public would accept. Unfortunately, the procedures they followed and the records they kept and relied on to announce results were so erroneous that nothing they reported could be relied on by the public.

Their report follows two other reports in October that Mr. Logan and Mr. Pullen said were built on faulty assumptions and incomplete data.

This raises several issues that I hope you will address:

- Since the latest report is built on the definitive data about the hand count, do you agree with the assessment?
- Explain why/ why not you believe their analysis is wrong.
- Is there data that remains outstanding that you believe would neuter the findings? If so, what?
- Identify anything misleading in the report.
- How do you each respond to individual accusations leveled against you in the summary? That includes one alleging Sens. Fann, Eddie Farnsworth and Warren Peteresn “ abused their offices by becoming involved in a conspiracy initially intended to allow Donald Trump to remain in power through a series of largely aspirational extra-constitutional processes.”

As always, I want to make sure you have the information before I begin writing any story. However, because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need to hear back from you within 24 hours.

If you wish to reach me directly, feel free to call at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen
Investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic
PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: [Karen Fann](#)
To: [Anglen, Robert](#); [Douglas Logan](#); rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com; kbazos@gmail.com
Cc: [Tulumello, Kathy](#); eddiefarnsworth2006@cox.net; votewarren@gmail.com; [Greg Jernigan](#)
Subject: RE: Response to analysis of hand count/ accusations of malfeasance
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 6:18:48 PM

To All, I'm not sure if any of you wish to respond to Mr. Anglen's request for comment. I will leave that decision up to you individually since you were the ones directly involved with the audit process. What I will say from my end relates to the "accusation" of Senator Farnsworth, Senator Petersen and myself being involved with a "conspiracy". That is absolutely incorrect and, quite honestly, crosses the line of slander.

Karen Fann

President of the Senate

Tel: 602.926.5874

From: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 12:15 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Karen Fann <KFann@azleg.gov>; rpullen13@gmail.com; rod@thomsonpr.com
Cc: Tulumello, Kathy <kathy.tulumello@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Response to analysis of hand count/ accusations of malfeasance

Hello:

I want to make sure you have ample time to respond to a new analysis of the hand count numbers by Larry Moore, Benny White and Tim Halvorsen.

Their analysis is based on the nearly 80,000 pages of vote/ tally data released by the Senate on Nov. 1. They conclude that the data shows the numbers were made up and are not supported.

A link to their report can be found here: <https://docs.real-audits.org/s/iJFMEiz3jHBE9Bt>

Their report makes several claims about the nature of the audit, which they concluded was meaningless. They say the numbers reported to the Senate on Sept. 24 cannot be replicated or verified.

Among their claims:

- Sen. Karen Fann and the Cyber Ninjas "tried" to hand count 2.1 million ballots and proved a couple of things.

- They were not able to accurately hand count either the number of ballots cast in the Maricopa County 2020 General Election or the votes on those ballots, and
- They spent about \$9 million over 7 months, so far, and have proven absolutely nothing.
- The Ninjas were convinced that the auditors could not trust anything the county said and the Dominion election management system could not count the ballots or the votes correctly or had been manipulated so that the official results were not valid.
- This presumption was fatal to the validity of the “forensic audit”. It caused them to never actually audit the election results but rather to attempt to create a new result that the public would accept. Unfortunately, the procedures they followed and the records they kept and relied on to announce results were so erroneous that nothing they reported could be relied on by the public.

Their report follows two other reports in October that Mr. Logan and Mr. Pullen said were built on faulty assumptions and incomplete data.

This raises several issues that I hope you will address:

- Since the latest report is built on the definitive data about the hand count, do you agree with the assessment?
- Explain why/ why not you believe their analysis is wrong.
- Is there data that remains outstanding that you believe would neuter the findings? If so, what?
- Identify anything misleading in the report.
- How do you each respond to individual accusations leveled against you in the summary? That includes one alleging Sens. Fann, Eddie Farnsworth and Warren Peteresn “ abused their offices by becoming involved in a conspiracy initially intended to allow Donald Trump to remain in power through a series of largely aspirational extra-constitutional processes.”

As always, I want to make sure you have the information before I begin writing any story. However, because I am a reporter working on deadline, I need to hear back from you within

24 hours.

If you wish to reach me directly, feel free to call at 602-316-8395.

Sincerely,

Robert Anglen

Investigations

azcentral | The Arizona Republic

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

Mobile: 602.316.8395

Office: 602.444.8694

robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com

Twitter @robertanglen

Facebook: Robert Anglen

azcentral.com

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Fifield, Jen](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Cc: [Anglen, Robert](#)
Subject: RE: Response to Maricopa County, questions
Date: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 5:34:56 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jen,

Our report was issued with every single Appendix referenced in the report provided to the Senate. That is the proof for all the findings beyond the data that is in the report. They have had this data available to them from the point we turned in our final report. Maricopa County's response references validating some of the findings, which would only be possible if they also had this data. I'm assuming the Senate provided it to them.

The Tally Sheets were not an original work product written in our SOW, but we're making this data available to the Senate. As an interim step in our process, the master spreadsheet for this and the linked images of all the Tally Sheets is not in a format that the general public is going to understand. We're working through these issues with the Senate and should have something soon. We may simply explain the format, or there may be changes to the format to make it more clear. I don't have a precise timeline but it shouldn't be long.

As far as the "hand counts not being finalized". I think what you're referring to is the numbers in the independent report put out by Randy Pullen for the machine count. That was not a Cyber Ninjas report and I never saw it before it was published. Before they started the machine count they pulled some preliminary numbers from our data, but our quality control wasn't done. One of the primary things accomplished during that phase of quality control was making sure the tallies were associated with the right pallet / box / batch. In Pullen's report there was a single page with Pallet 15 on it

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 1:47 PM
To: Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>; Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: Anglen, Robert <robert.anglen@arizonarepublic.com>
Subject: Response to Maricopa County, questions

Hi Doug and Rod,

We just received a copy of Cyber Ninjas' response to the county's response of the Cyber Ninjas' audit results (attached).

We are wondering if you could please update us on when Cyber Ninjas will be providing to the Senate all of your work product – including all of your spreadsheets containing the hand count and ballot inspection results – that would provide proof of your findings in the audit report. It would seem that providing all of your work product would help back up your findings and claims.

Also, there has been an assertion that the hand count results in the final report Cyber Ninjas provided to the Senate were not finalized. Can you please let us know if that is the case, and if so, when the results from the hand count will be final and publicly available?

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

From: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Re: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Tuesday, October 05, 2021 6:23:58 PM

Hi Doug,

I forwarded your points to my editors and they decided that they would not fit with the article as a representation of the arguments of each side. Although we want to present a complete picture and your points further address the ongoing refutations of the Maricopa officials, WORLD is not the debate decider between the audit team and the county. We did amend a sentence about the 23,000 ballots to more accurately reflect the data your team pulled. Thank you for taking the time to answer these points so thoroughly.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta

On Fri, Oct 1, 2021 at 4:40 PM Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

Carolina,

If you're interested in getting a bit more facts into your article, I've got a response to a few things stated to make things a bit more clear. Hopefully it helps you understand the situation a bit better.

“Officials with the county, though, said the claim of deleted data was false and that they had simply archived excess data in storage files that were not subpoenaed.”

When they say “archived” that means they’re admitting they deleted files, but they also have a backup copy that is not on the computer. The implication is that it was a normal process at the end of an election. Before we claimed any deletion of files, we also reviewed prior year elections. There was no “archiving” of past elections for any prior year. All the files were still in tact and on the file system. As a result this was not a normal process that we were just ignorant of their procedures; as they try to portray. They did something different with the 2020 election and deleted artifacts.

Furthermore, as shown during the hearing the files deleted included ballot images, result files, logs, and SQL Database Files among other things. These were specifically mentioned in the subpoena, as can be seen in the attached copy of the original subpoena. If you review #4, #17 and #18 you will see what I’m talking about. If they “archived” these files then these files should have also been supplied since the subpoena explicitly covered them. What they’re saying via Twitter is absolutely not accurate.

“Regarding the 23,000 ballots, the Board of Supervisors disputed the number on the basis that the auditors used a private population database rather than official county numbers. The county [tweeted](#) rebuttals that attributed the mail-in votes to legal address differences for military voters, college students, and “snowbirds”—people temporarily residing in a different state for the winter.”

To generate the list of 23,344 individuals who voted via mail-in address, but had moved prior to October 5th, we took the official list of who voted, called the VM55 file; and we cross-referenced it with a commercial database called Melissa. As input to Melissa we included both the original name and address from the voter file and got input back from Melissa as to whether the individual still lived at that location, and when this had changed. For people who showed as moved, we then ran a general query on the address from the VM55 file to see if anyone new showed up at the given address after the move date. If any name that came back with that query had the same last name as the registered voter, we dropped the name from our results; assuming the individual was a relative and therefore could theoretically hand a mail-in ballot to their relative it came for. By law mail-in ballots are not allowed to be forwarded via mail, as a result these ballots could NOT have been forwarded to another location.

Melissa gets its move data from the US Postal Service’s National Change of Address (NCOA) service. This data only gets populated when you go to your postal service and fill out a change of address form and request that your mail be forwarded to a new location (Remember, that ballots can NOT be forwarded).

With the above explanation I think you can see why the 23,344 can’t be explained by college students or snow birds and would not cover most military votes. In all situations except rare circumstances college students would have someone still at the address with the same last name. Likewise, snow birds would still have their name on the location. Most likely this would

also be true with military; but there is one circumstance where this might not be true. If the military was overseas they might qualify for UOCAVA and could have voted via “mail-in” utilizing the UOCAVA process. That could have allowed them to vote without receiving the physical ballot sent to their house. This is not something we’d thought about prior, but I ran a query on the 23,344 people flagged by that finding, and this could potentially explain 1,344 of the 23,344.

“The audit team said it removed from its tally voters who appeared to be college students but that it could not account for the remaining thousands”

What I believe I explained is the last name bit I covered above. This would account for college students as well as a lot of other scenarios where someone would be able to get their ballot because family owned the house.

Thank-you for taking the time to review this. I’m hopeful that this might make it into your article.

If there is anyway you can update that awful picture as well it would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,

Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Friday, October 1, 2021 12:58 PM

To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Re: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Here is the WORLD article about the audit: <https://wng.org/roundups/the-arizona-audit-fallout-1633038107>

Thank you again for speaking with me.

Sincerely,

Carolina Lumetta

Digital Reporter | [WORLD](#)

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 10:09 PM Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com> wrote:

Sounds great. Here's the Zoom link:

Carolina Lumetta is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: WORLD Interview

Time: Sep 29, 2021 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/94749096083?pwd=TCs1Qk02RnArQ3lMeDRvQ1lLYUNKUT09>

Meeting ID: 947 4909 6083

Passcode: Yz6Biy

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 7:50 PM Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

Caroline,

I can make tomorrow at 11am work.

Thanks,

Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,

Carolina Lumetta

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
Cc: [rod@thomsonpr.com](#)
Subject: RE: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 4:48:34 PM

Caroline,

I can make tomorrow at 11am work.

Thanks,

Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Carolina Lumetta](mailto:Carolina.Lumetta); rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: RE: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Friday, September 23, 2022 11:00:37 AM
Attachments: [SUBPOENA - January 12 2021 NEW Senate Sub to Maricopa County.pdf](#)

Carolina,

If you're interested in getting a bit more facts into your article, I've got a response to a few things stated to make things a bit more clear. Hopefully it helps you understand the situation a bit better.

“Officials with the county, though, [said](#) the claim of deleted data was false and that they had simply archived excess data in storage files that were not subpoenaed.”

When they say “archived” that means they're admitting they deleted files, but they also have a backup copy that is not on the computer. The implication is that it was a normal process at the end of an election. Before we claimed any deletion of files, we also reviewed prior year elections. There was no “archiving” of past elections for any prior year. All the files were still in tact and on the file system. As a result this was not a normal process that we were just ignorant of their procedures; as they try to portray. They did something different with the 2020 election and deleted artifacts.

Furthermore, as shown during the hearing the files deleted included ballot images, result files, logs, and SQL Database Files among other things. These were specifically mentioned in the subpoena, as can be seen in the attached copy of the original subpoena. If you review #4, #17 and #18 you will see what I'm talking about. If they “archived” these files then these files should have also been supplied since the subpoena explicitly covered them. What they're saying via Twitter is absolutely not accurate.

“Regarding the 23,000 ballots, the Board of Supervisors disputed the number on the basis that the auditors used a private population database rather than official county numbers. The county [tweeted](#) rebuttals that attributed the mail-in votes to legal address differences for military voters, college students, and “snowbirds”—people temporarily residing in a different state for the winter.”

To generate the list of 23,344 individuals who voted via mail-in address, but had moved prior to October 5th, we took the official list of who voted, called the VM55 file; and we cross-referenced it with a commercial database called Melissa. As input to Melissa we included both the original name and address from the voter file and got input back from Melissa as to whether the individual still lived at that location, and when this had changed. For people who showed as moved, we then ran a general query on the address from the VM55 file to

see if anyone new showed up at the given address after the move date. If any name that came back with that query had the same last name as the registered voter, we dropped the name from our results; assuming the individual was a relative and therefore could theoretically hand a mail-in ballot to their relative it came for. By law mail-in ballots are not allowed to be forwarded via mail, as a result these ballots could NOT have been forwarded to another location.

Melissa gets its move data from the US Postal Service's National Change of Address (NCOA) service. This data only gets populated when you go to your postal service and fill out a change of address form and request that your mail be forwarded to a new location (Remember, that ballots can NOT be forwarded).

With the above explanation I think you can see why the 23,344 can't be explained by college students or snow birds and would not cover most military votes. In all situations except rare circumstances college students would have someone still at the address with the same last name. Likewise, snow birds would still have their name on the location. Most likely this would also be true with military; but there is one circumstance where this might not be true. If the military was overseas they might qualify for UOCAVA and could have voted via "mail-in" utilizing the UOCAVA rules. That could of allowed them to vote without receiving the physical ballot sent to their house. This is not something we'd thought about prior, but I ran a query on the 23,344 people flagged by that finding, and this could potentially explain 1,344 of the 23,344.

"The audit team said it removed from its tally voters who appeared to be college students but that it could not account for the remaining thousands"

What I believe I explained is the last name bit I covered above. This would account for college students as well as a lot of other scenarios where someone would be able to get their ballot because family owned the house.

Thank-you for taking the time to review this. I'm hopeful that this might make it into your article.

If there is anyway you can update that awful picture as well it would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Friday, October 1, 2021 12:58 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Re: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Here is the WORLD article about the audit: <https://wng.org/roundups/the-arizona-audit-fallout-1633038107>

Thank you again for speaking with me.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta
Digital Reporter | [WORLD](#)

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 10:09 PM Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com> wrote:

Sounds great. Here's the Zoom link:

Carolina Lumetta is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: WORLD Interview

Time: Sep 29, 2021 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/94749096083?pwd=TCs1Qk02RnArQ3lMeDRvQ1lLYUNKUT09>

Meeting ID: 947 4909 6083

Passcode: Yz6Biy

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 7:50 PM Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

Caroline,

I can make tomorrow at 11am work.

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12 PM

To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>

Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com

Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: RE: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Friday, October 01, 2021 4:40:00 PM
Attachments: [SUBPOENA - January 12 2021 NEW Senate Sub to Maricopa County.pdf](#)

Carolina,

If you're interested in getting a bit more facts into your article, I've got a response to a few things stated to make things a bit more clear. Hopefully it helps you understand the situation a bit better.

“Officials with the county, though, [said](#) the claim of deleted data was false and that they had simply archived excess data in storage files that were not subpoenaed.”

When they say “archived” that means they’re admitting they deleted files, but they also have a backup copy that is not on the computer. The implication is that it was a normal process at the end of an election. Before we claimed any deletion of files, we also reviewed prior year elections. There was no “archiving” of past elections for any prior year. All the files were still in tact and on the file system. As a result this was not a normal process that we were just ignorant of their procedures; as they try to portray. They did something different with the 2020 election and deleted artifacts.

Furthermore, as shown during the hearing the files deleted included ballot images, result files, logs, and SQL Database Files among other things. These were specifically mentioned in the subpoena, as can be seen in the attached copy of the original subpoena. If you review #4, #17 and #18 you will see what I’m talking about. If they “archived” these files then these files should have also been supplied since the subpoena explicitly covered them. What they’re saying via Twitter is absolutely not accurate.

“Regarding the 23,000 ballots, the Board of Supervisors disputed the number on the basis that the auditors used a private population database rather than official county numbers. The county [tweeted](#) rebuttals that attributed the mail-in votes to legal address differences for military voters, college students, and “snowbirds”—people temporarily residing in a different state for the winter.”

To generate the list of 23,344 individuals who voted via mail-in address, but had moved prior to October 5th, we took the official list of who voted, called the VM55 file; and we cross-referenced it with a commercial database called Melissa. As input to Melissa we included both the original name and address from the voter file and got input back from Melissa as to whether the individual still lived at that location, and when this had changed. For people who showed

as moved, we then ran a general query on the address from the VM55 file to see if anyone new showed up at the given address after the move date. If any name that came back with that query had the same last name as the registered voter, we dropped the name from our results; assuming the individual was a relative and therefore could theoretically hand a mail-in ballot to their relative it came for. By law mail-in ballots are not allowed to be forwarded via mail, as a result these ballots could NOT have been forwarded to another location.

Melissa gets its move data from the US Postal Service's National Change of Address (NCOA) service. This data only gets populated when you go to your postal service and fill out a change of address form and request that your mail be forwarded to a new location (Remember, that ballots can NOT be forwarded).

With the above explanation I think you can see why the 23,344 can't be explained by college students or snow birds and would not cover most military votes. In all situations except rare circumstances college students would have someone still at the address with the same last name. Likewise, snow birds would still have their name on the location. Most likely this would also be true with military; but there is one circumstance where this might not be true. If the military was overseas they might qualify for UOCAVA and could have voted via "mail-in" utilizing the UOCAVA process. That could of allowed them to vote without receiving the physical ballot sent to their house. This is not something we'd thought about prior, but I ran a query on the 23,344 people flagged by that finding, and this could potentially explain 1,344 of the 23,344.

"The audit team said it removed from its tally voters who appeared to be college students but that it could not account for the remaining thousands"

What I believe I explained is the last name bit I covered above. This would account for college students as well as a lot of other scenarios where someone would be able to get their ballot because family owned the house.

Thank-you for taking the time to review this. I'm hopeful that this might make it into your article.

If there is anyway you can update that awful picture as well it would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Friday, October 1, 2021 12:58 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Re: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Here is the WORLD article about the audit: <https://wng.org/roundups/the-arizona-audit-fallout-1633038107>

Thank you again for speaking with me.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta
Digital Reporter | [WORLD](#)

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 10:09 PM Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com> wrote:

Sounds great. Here's the Zoom link:

Carolina Lumetta is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: WORLD Interview

Time: Sep 29, 2021 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/94749096083?pwd=TCs1Qk02RnArQ3lMeDRvQ1lLYUNKUT09>

Meeting ID: 947 4909 6083

Passcode: Yz6Biy

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 7:50 PM Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

Caroline,

I can make tomorrow at 11am work.

Thanks,
Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12 PM

To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>

Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com

Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta

From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: RE: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 7:50:00 PM

Caroline,

I can make tomorrow at 11am work.

Thanks,

Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta

From: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 10:09:53 PM

Sounds great. Here's the Zoom link:

Carolina Lumetta is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: WORLD Interview

Time: Sep 29, 2021 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/94749096083?pwd=TCs1Qk02RnArQ3lMeDRvQ1lLYUNKUT09>

Meeting ID: 947 4909 6083

Passcode: Yz6Biy

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 7:50 PM Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

Caroline,

I can make tomorrow at 11am work.

Thanks,

Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give

extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,

Carolina Lumetta

From: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Re: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Friday, October 01, 2021 12:58:03 PM

Hello Mr. Logan,

Here is the WORLD article about the audit: <https://wng.org/roundups/the-arizona-audit-fallout-1633038107>

Thank you again for speaking with me.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta
Digital Reporter | [WORLD](#)

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 10:09 PM Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com> wrote:
Sounds great. Here's the Zoom link:

Carolina Lumetta is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: WORLD Interview
Time: Sep 29, 2021 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
<https://zoom.us/j/94749096083?pwd=TCs1Qk02RnArQ3lMeDRvQ1lLYUNKUT09>

Meeting ID: 947 4909 6083
Passcode: Yz6Biy

On Tue, Sep 28, 2021 at 7:50 PM Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com> wrote:

Caroline,

I can make tomorrow at 11am work.

Thanks,

Doug Logan

From: Carolina Lumetta <clumetta@gwpub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12 PM

To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,

Carolina Lumetta

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: RE: story about Cleta Mitchell
Date: Friday, September 03, 2021 3:02:50 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Just one follow-up... My main question is actually whether Cyber Ninjas paid all three subcontractors (Wake, StratTech, and CyFIR) directly, and how much. Is this additional money from the escrow account right here, on top of what Cyber Ninjas paid them?

Just that answer alone would help considerably.

Thanks,
Jen

From: Fifield, Jen
Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 8:27 PM
To: dlogan@cyberninjas.com; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: story about Cleta Mitchell

Hi Doug and Rod,

I'm writing a story about Cleta Mitchell's involvement in managing an escrow account to pay contractors for the audit. Here's what we see in the documents and what Randy Pullen told me tonight, please let me know if you would like to comment or correct anything here, questions in parenthesis. **Please get back to me by noon Florida time tomorrow.**

- Cleta Mitchell set up an escrow account to collect funds to pay for the audit
- She involved a group called American Voting Rights Foundation (Do you know who this is?)
- Randy Pullen told me that Mitchell sought outside funds to bring into this account. He indicated that Cyber Ninjas did not take the \$5.7M it was given from outside groups and put it in this account. He said this is separate money from other funders.
- The group paid or is paying about \$1 million, divided by \$500,000 to CyFir, \$250,000 to StratTech and \$250,000 to Wake.
- Randy Pullen said that Mitchell brought in the money to this account separate from the Senate/Cyber Ninjas
- Pullen said he wasn't sure what Cyber Ninjas spent the \$5.7M on. He said he knew that more than \$2M went to technology. (Could you provide more details about what your money went to?)
- A settlement agreement was reached in late July between Cyber Ninjas, Wake TSI and the managers under Wake. The agreement said that Wake hadn't paid its managers yet, and that money would come from the escrow account – at least \$270,000 to at least 41 people (Is there a third round of people to be included in this? If so, how many and for how much?)
- Pullen told me that Cyber Ninjas paid Wake already what was under the original contract. (Is this correct?)
- (Why is it that Wake didn't pay its managers? Did they pay any people who contracted with

them? Did the work expand what was initially expected/take more people than expected and that's why they didn't have enough to pay them?)

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)

480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

From: dlogan@cyberninjas.com
To: [Fifield, Jen](#)
Subject: RE: Text message review, part 2 of 2
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 12:13:12 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Jen,

Thank-you for taking the time to research and write something with journalistic integrity about me.

From: Fifield, Jen <Jen.Fifield@azcentral.com>
Sent: Monday, August 30, 2021 11:15 AM
To: Douglas Logan <dlogan@cyberninjas.com>; Rod Thomson <rod@thomsonpr.com>
Subject: Text message review, part 2 of 2

Hi Doug and Rod,

One more email about the text messages I'll be using in the story. Attached are two texts between Dave Hancock and Aaron Vick, who was at Lin Wood's property. The Nov. 14 texts show that Jim Penrose brought Doug to Lin Wood's property for a meeting with Giuliani and others regarding election fraud.

I also have about 10 or so text message screenshots back and forth from Doug Logan to Dave Hancock, showing that Doug was staying at Lin Wood at his property from mid-November until end of November. They are related to transferring the home security and cybersecurity network at Wood's home. I can send these as well, just let me know.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on these.

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Re: Unanswered audit questions
Date: Thursday, October 07, 2021 3:48:38 PM

Also, Maricopa County issued these responses to the findings in the audit reports. Across the board, they say the claims that Doug Logan, Ben Cotton and Shiva Ayyadurai made are false. What is Cyber Ninjas and the audit team's response to these statements from Maricopa County?

<https://recorder.maricopa.gov/justthefacts/pdf/Maricopa%20County%20Analysis%20of%20Senate%20Review%20%E2%80%93%20Cyber%20Ninja%20Report.pdf>

<https://recorder.maricopa.gov/justthefacts/pdf/Maricopa%20County%20Analysis%20of%20Senate%20Review%20%E2%80%93%20EchoMail%20Report.pdf>

On Thu, Oct 7, 2021 at 9:08 AM Jeremy Duda <jduda@azmirror.com> wrote:

I've got a few questions about the audit findings and the testimony that we heard from Doug Logan and Ben Cotton on Sept. 24 in the Arizona Senate.

-Mr. Cotton told President Fann and Chairman Petersen that the county's tabulation machines hadn't received any upgrades or patches to their software since they were acquired in 2019. But this is common in election departments because of the intensive process the EAC requires for installing such upgrades. And the machines can't be connected to the internet, so they can't upgrade automatically. J Alex Halderman explained his issue in his March report on the election in Antrim County. Why was Mr. Cotton unaware of this? And if he was aware, why did he omit this significant information in his testimony at the Senate?

-The county says that the allegedly deleted files were deleted because they'd been backed up elsewhere, which they say is a standard practice. Did Mr. Cotton make any efforts to determine whether the allegedly deleted files had been backed up elsewhere in the elections department's system? Is he familiar at all with the policies governing the retention of those files, and whether that is, in fact, a common practice?

-What was Jim Penrose's involvement in the audit? The draft report that began circulating the day before Mr. Logan and Cotton's testimony included suggestions that Mr. Penrose added to the Google document, showing that, at the very least, he was involved in reviewing the report. Why was he involved in this process? Did he have any role in the actual audit prior to the drafting of that report?

-Why were the results of the analysis of the ballots, which was included in the draft report, omitted from the final reports that were presented to President Fann and Chairman Petersen?

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

From: luvbug1611
To: [Stephen Richer - RISCX](mailto:Stephen.Richer@riscx); luvbug1611@cox.net
Subject: RE: VPN files.
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 2:10:01 PM

Thank Stephen for your assistance in this matter.

What username and password should I use to access ONE particular day in time for the file, specifically, Election Day, November 3rd, 2020?

Thank you sir for your help.

Respectfully,

Linda Brickman
Former Maricopa County Republican Chairman,
Luvbug1611@cox.net
602-330-9422

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Stephen Richer - RISCX <sricher@risc.maricopa.gov>
Date: 7/22/21 10:09 AM (GMT-07:00)
To: luvbug1611 <luvbug1611@cox.net>
Cc: mickie.azrp@gmail.com, chair@maricopacountygop.org,
LegalCounsel@maricopacountygop.org, Joseph La Rue <laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov>, Rey
Valenzuela - RISCX <rvalenzuela@risc.maricopa.gov>, Scott Jarrett - RISCX
<sjarrett@risc.maricopa.gov>, Kristi Passarelli - RISCX <kpassarelli@risc.maricopa.gov>
Subject: VPN files.

Dear Linda,

Thank you for your recent emails.

The Maricopa County Elections Department has consistently provided the required files to the Maricopa County Republican Party through VPN as required.

You signed the voter data agreement on December 18, 2020 (see attached) and confirmed receipt by email of VPN access on December 18, 2020 at 6:07 PM.

The following individuals had access to the VPN at the following periods of time:

- February 13, 2019 – December 18, 2020
 - Chornenky
- December 18, 2020 – January 13, 2021
 - Brickman
- January 13, 2021 – Present
 - Niland

Accordingly, and as required, the Elections Department provided the November 2020 General Election VM34 “Precinct List” data files to chairwoman Chornenky, who had access to the VPN folder at that time.

We are, however, willing and lawfully permitted to resend this file to the Party by placing it in the VPN folder for the Party’s current access. We will initiate that process now.

The Party is welcome to use and share this file in accordance with the law and the Voter Data Agreement. That is at the discretion of the current party leadership.

Thank you.

Stephen

Maricopa County Recorder

From: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: rod@thomsonpr.com
Subject: Scheduling WORLD Interview
Date: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:12:27 PM

Hello Mr. Logan,

Thank you for your interest in speaking to me about the election audit. I understand it's been a crazy few months for you, and I appreciate your willingness to tell us your story. My deadline for the article is no later than Thursday morning, which unfortunately doesn't give extensive scheduling time. My schedule is very flexible, though, so I can accommodate whatever time works for you. How does tomorrow around 11am EST/8amMST work? As soon as we narrow down a time, I'll send a Zoom link along.

Thank you again, and I look forward to connecting.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta

From: [Internal Audit Services](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Scott Sigman](#)
Subject: Sexual harassment allegation
Date: Saturday, July 03, 2021 7:48:18 PM

Hey Doug

After thinking about this,

I hope it's the same guy and you only have one individual but two girl's told me and I told your atty. Brian.

Skinny girl (kid) that always wore a hat and girl that worked Red Pod table 2 both girls went to forensics when the guy hit on them.

Suspect w/m with a beard no further description.

John

Sent from my iPhone

From: [todd](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Sheets
Date: Saturday, July 03, 2021 4:23:57 PM

Sheets

Sent from ProtonMail for iOS

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: story about Clela Mitchell
Date: Thursday, September 02, 2021 11:27:24 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Hi Doug and Rod,

I'm writing a story about Clela Mitchell's involvement in managing an escrow account to pay contractors for the audit. Here's what we see in the documents and what Randy Pullen told me tonight, please let me know if you would like to comment or correct anything here, questions in parenthesis. **Please get back to me by noon Florida time tomorrow.**

- Clela Mitchell set up an escrow account to collect funds to pay for the audit
- She involved a group called American Voting Rights Foundation (Do you know who this is?)
- Randy Pullen told me that Mitchell sought outside funds to bring into this account. He indicated that Cyber Ninjas did not take the \$5.7M it was given from outside groups and put it in this account. He said this is separate money from other funders.
- The group paid or is paying about \$1 million, divided by \$500,000 to CyFir, \$250,000 to StratTech and \$250,000 to Wake.
- Randy Pullen said that Mitchell brought in the money to this account separate from the Senate/Cyber Ninjas
- Pullen said he wasn't sure what Cyber Ninjas spent the \$5.7M on. He said he knew that more than \$2M went to technology. (Could you provide more details about what your money went to?)
- A settlement agreement was reached in late July between Cyber Ninjas, Wake TSI and the managers under Wake. The agreement said that Wake hadn't paid its managers yet, and that money would come from the escrow account – at least \$270,000 to at least 41 people (Is there a third round of people to be included in this? If so, how many and for how much?)
- Pullen told me that Cyber Ninjas paid Wake already what was under the original contract. (Is this correct?)
- (Why is it that Wake didn't pay its managers? Did they pay any people who contracted with them? Did the work expand what was initially expected/take more people than expected and that's why they didn't have enough to pay them?)

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)

Jen.fifield@azcentral.com

Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)

azcentral.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Story about Doug, fact checking and final request for comment
Date: Friday, August 27, 2021 7:43:18 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug and Rod,

I'm finishing up my story, a story about Doug – who he is, what his personal background and cybersecurity background is, why he says he got involved in the audit (taken from past statements), thoughts from his longtime friends and others who met him during the audit about what his motivations might be, about his character. A hard story to tell when the subject himself is unwilling to talk, but I did my best to write a fair piece and accurately represent what Doug has said before about his thoughts on the election, the audit and his motivations.

The overall unanswered question I have is how Doug got involved. Who was the initial person he was in contact with, within the Byrne/Flynn/Wood/Powell team? Was it someone from his cybersecurity background? Any light you can shed on this would be great. Beyond that, I hoped you could fact check the following, and respond to certain facts I've learned about Doug's ties to the Byrne/Flynn/Wood/Powell team.

Please get back to me by **Tuesday latest**. And of course my request for a full interview, and photos of Doug in his life before this, still stands until this publishes.

Facts to check:

41 years old (nexis)
No prior political involvement (Rod)
Devout Christian (Rod + many friends)
Longtime registered republican (voting records)
11 children (or maybe 12, someone said Doug's wife is pregnant, pls let me know)
Homeschools children (neighbors and longtime friends)
Founded Cyber Ninjas in 2013 (linkedin)
Hired by Cigital in 2011 to build team that would run penetration testing/cybersecurity work, grew from 3-20 people
Graduated from Guilford College in business and accounting (checked with school)
First participated in US Cyber Challenge in 2010 as a student and was high scorer (longtime friend)
Volunteered for the challenge until spring 2020 when he resigned. Went from teaching assistant to teacher to also being chief technology officer (longtime friend)
SANS 2015 "difference maker" award
Handled cybersecurity projects for the FCC, United Services and Administration Corporation, and many major banks (online bio)
Cyber Ninjas had about 5-6 employees as of 2017 (longtime friend)
Antrim County analyst (court records)
Before lived in current house, lived in Colonial Oaks (nexis)

Parts of the story I would like response to, if possible:

OVERALL CLAIM IN THE STORY: Logan worked under both Lin Wood and Sidney Powell on election cases, research and evidence from mid-November to January. He was one of the cybersecurity experts and analysts working under Wood, Powell, Patrick Byrne and Mike Flynn in a plot to overturn the election results since November. The plan was to get access to voting machines (through court cases, local clerks or state lawmakers) and the analysts/cyber experts (Doug among them) would conduct audits. When the audits showed discrepancies, the plan was to have state lawmakers or local electors flip their electoral college votes. This is still the plan as communicated by Byrne and Flynn, two of the main funders of the AZ audit.

LEARNED IN MY REPORTING, NOT REPORTED BEFORE:

Doug went to Lin Wood's property on Nov. 15 – Jim Penrose brought him there – for a meeting that included Giuliani about election fraud. (text from Dave Hancock)

Doug stayed at Wood's property for a certain time period in November, until late November, and during this time helped Wood with home security and internet networks. (texts between Doug and Dave Hancock)

Doug has a doug@fightback.law email (which Dave Hancock says shows proves he worked directly for Wood)

In December, when AZ resident Staci Burk thought she might get access to her ballots, she was shown a series of text messages between at least two people on Sidney Powell's legal team (Carissa Keshel and someone named Sharon) and Doug Logan. The texts show that if Burk was to get the ballots, Doug and Jim Penrose would be the ones to help her evaluate the voting machines. Doug said in the text he would help with subpoenas.

Greg Freemeyer of Sullivan Strickler said Doug was the one to call him to ask him to go out to Antrim County (he says Doug was organizing the team)

Team that Doug put together for the AZ audit were all part of the "Bad News Bears," analysts that had done work prior for Byrne/Flynn/Wood/Powell and with ASOG

Happy to tell you more about my story on the phone as well so that you can respond fully.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Cc: [Anderson, Zachary](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Story about you for Arizona Republic/Sarasota Herald-Tribune
Date: Monday, August 23, 2021 5:52:40 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug,

I'm sorry to hear that you have COVID-19. I hope you feel better soon. I wanted to let you know directly about a story that Zac and I have been working on. We want to tell people the true story about you. Who you are as a person, what your background is, what makes you the person you are, where your convictions are, and how you got involved in the election audits. Even if you are willing to share some photos of you – to show a side of you people don't know. We have been calling around and talking to people who know you, including many who know you through the US Cyber Challenge. We would love to talk to your family or close friends as well if you are willing to connect us.

I can tell you more on the phone when you're feeling better, if you're interested and willing.

We are hoping to run the story next week if we can, so please let me know what you think sometime by the end of this week.

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](https://twitter.com/JenAFifield)
azcentral.com

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Subpoena Requests
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 9:21:13 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

- Records of all mailed ballots returned as undeliverable and the unopened packets associated with each undeliverable ballot.
- Records of all mailed ballots marked "Return to Sender" and returned after delivery by USPS
- All electronic records of address information transmitted for the printing of mail ballots.
- Copies of all files transmitted for the purpose of duplicating damaged ballots or alternate format ballots. Provide copies of all invoices associated with the printing and delivering of the duplicated ballots. Copies of all chain of custody documents utilized to transfer the printed duplicate ballots from Runbeck to Maricopa County
- Records of all ballot paper distributed to the vote centers including sheets distributed, ballots used, ballots spoiled and sheets returned.
- All invoices, acquisition documents and packing slips associated with the receipt of ballot paper used in all vote centers in the 2020 General Election.
- Total count of all ballots sent to UOCAVA eligible voters and how they were sent (mail or electronically), total count of all FWAB ballots received, total count of all ballots returned by UOCAVA eligible voters and the method of return (mail, electronic)
- All original envelopes

NOTE: I don't know how to put this in technical terms but it would be great if we could have records of every session- every time the voter registration system was accessed. Ideally this would include the IP address and machine for each connection and what records were changed and/or accessed during the session.
Change history, transaction log or audit logs?

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171
www.Haystack.Group



From: [Douglas Logan](#)
To: [Donald Hiatt](#)
Subject: SUBPOENA
Date: Saturday, July 17, 2021 6:56:00 PM
Attachments: [20210717 - Subpoena - NEW.docx](#)

Hey Don,

I hope you're getting better fast, and I'm REALLY glad you're okay after the accident!

If you're able to flag which of the items from this subpoena we could potentially FOIA, it would help us prioritize things!

Thanks for your help and get better fast!

Thanks,
Doug Logan
Chief Executive Officer
Cyber Ninjas
(o) (941)-3-NINJAS
(c) (941)-404-0360

From: [craig.cunningham](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Tally Results
Date: Monday, October 04, 2021 4:47:44 PM
Attachments: [Tally Results.pdf](#)

Dear Mr. Logan,

Thanks so much for your work on the Maricopa County Audit. My question is in regards to your tally results on your audit section 4 as shown below. I am hearing that these are not the final results from people that believe that the election in Maricopa County was still stolen.

They claim that there are about 50,000 possible fraudulent ballots that need to be looked at that are included in your final tally below. This makes no sense to me. Can you clarify that your final numbers below do not include any potential fraudulent ballots?

Thanks so much! And thanks again for your do diligence in this most important audit!

Thanks,
Craig

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Text message review, part 2 of 2
Date: Monday, August 30, 2021 2:15:02 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug and Rod,

One more email about the text messages I'll be using in the story. Attached are two texts between Dave Hancock and Aaron Vick, who was at Lin Wood's property. The Nov. 14 texts show that Jim Penrose brought Doug to Lin Wood's property for a meeting with Giuliani and others regarding election fraud.

I also have about 10 or so text message screenshots back and forth from Doug Logan to Dave Hancock, showing that Doug was staying at Lin Wood at his property from mid-November until end of November. They are related to transferring the home security and cybersecurity network at Wood's home. I can send these as well, just let me know.

Please let me know if you would like to comment on these.

Thanks,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [Fifield, Jen](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#); [Rod Thomson](#)
Subject: Text messages for review, response by Wednesday
Date: Monday, August 30, 2021 2:09:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Doug and Rod,

Here is a text message and screenshot of two text messages Doug was a part of that I will be using in my story. This shows Doug communicating with Carissa Keshel and Sharon, two members of Sidney Powell's team, on a text chain labeled "FightBack," the name of Lin Wood's organization. This shows that when Staci Burk thought she was going to get access to Pinal County voting machines in mid-December, Doug was going to be the one to work on that, and he said he in this text would help with subpoenas. Please let me know if you would like to comment specifically on these text messages.

Thank you,
Jen

Jen Fifield
Phoenix & Maricopa County Reporter
The Arizona Republic

azcentral.

PART OF THE USA TODAY NETWORK

602-444-8763 (desk)
480-476-0108 (cell)
Jen.fifield@azcentral.com
Twitter: [@JenAFifield](#)
azcentral.com

From: [David A. Graham](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: The Atlantic: Audit update?
Date: Monday, September 13, 2021 1:49:55 PM

Hi Doug,

I hope you're doing well. I'm trying to understand the current status of the Maricopa audit. Where do things stand now? When will a report go to the Senate?

Thanks,

David

--

David Graham
Staff Writer, The Atlantic
(c) 330-805-0908
[@GrahamDavidA](#)

From: [Jeremy Duda](#)
To: [Rod Thomson](#); [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Unanswered audit questions
Date: Thursday, October 07, 2021 12:08:55 PM

I've got a few questions about the audit findings and the testimony that we heard from Doug Logan and Ben Cotton on Sept. 24 in the Arizona Senate.

-Mr. Cotton told President Fann and Chairman Petersen that the county's tabulation machines hadn't received any upgrades or patches to their software since they were acquired in 2019. But this is common in election departments because of the intensive process the EAC requires for installing such upgrades. And the machines can't be connected to the internet, so they can't upgrade automatically. J Alex Halderman explained his issue in his March report on the election in Antrim County. Why was Mr. Cotton unaware of this? And if he was aware, why did he omit this significant information in his testimony at the Senate?

-The county says that the allegedly deleted files were deleted because they'd been backed up elsewhere, which they say is a standard practice. Did Mr. Cotton make any efforts to determine whether the allegedly deleted files had been backed up elsewhere in the elections department's system? Is he familiar at all with the policies governing the retention of those files, and whether that is, in fact, a common practice?

-What was Jim Penrose's involvement in the audit? The draft report that began circulating the day before Mr. Logan and Cotton's testimony included suggestions that Mr. Penrose added to the Google document, showing that, at the very least, he was involved in reviewing the report. Why was he involved in this process? Did he have any role in the actual audit prior to the drafting of that report?

-Why were the results of the analysis of the ballots, which was included in the draft report, omitted from the final reports that were presented to President Fann and Chairman Petersen?

--

Jeremy Duda
Arizona Mirror
Associate editor
Cell: (602) 315-3108

Unrelated Log 9-23-22

CATEGORY	Number Reviewed
1. Travel Related	
2. Insurance Related	
3. T-shirt Offers	
4. Amex	
5. Microsoft Related	
6. Amazon	
7. Banking	
8. Junk Mail	
9. Money loan Offers	
10. Educational Opportunities	
11. Job Opportunities	
12. Subscriptions	
13. Request by individuals to be hired	
14. Computer Equipment/Software Related	
15. Church Related	
16. LinkedIn Related	
17. Finance Related	
18. Purchase Receipts	
TOTALS:	

*****Each of the 114 unrelated emails fell into one of the categories listed above*****

1. Travel Related: either an ad to travel somewhere or an airline confirmation not related to the audit.
2. Insurance Related: Home owners Insurance, car, etc.
3. Trying to sell company t-shirts
4. American Express Payments
5. Microsoft either subscription info, offers for product, or pay the bill emails
6. Amazon offers to buy
7. Personal Banking emails
8. Junk Mail-just junk like everyone gets
9. Offers by various “pre-approved” organizations to loan money
10. Offers from various organizations to provide training and/or asking for help training
11. Listing for jobs being offered
12. Personal subscriptions
13. Individuals seeking employment
14. Emails related to various equipment offers and updates on product
15. Church Related means that, personal church
16. Linkin alerts for various things
17. Emails dealing with personal financial issues
18. Receipts for personal items.

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Updated Finding - More Votes than Voters who Voted
Date: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 1:45:12 PM
Attachments: [Updated More Votes than Voters who Voted .docx](#)

Updated with Cards Cast numbers. I can change it if you want me to.

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Very Rough Draft
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 3:04:45 AM
Attachments: [Draft Senate Testimony Issues .docx](#)

Here you go.

Heather Honey

Phone: 717.288.7171

www.Haystack.Group

From: [Heather Honey](#)
To: [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: Wake Payments Due
Date: Friday, July 02, 2021 1:59:35 PM
Attachments: [QBSE WAKE Technology Services Invoice 210502.pdf](#)
[QBSE WAKE Technology Services Invoice 210503.pdf](#)

Hi Doug,

I am happy to report that I got a flight out of AZ this morning. Currently have a delay on the connecting flight here in ATL. Marc and Scott asked me to send my outstanding invoices to you last week but I just have not had the time until now. Hopefully Chris and Gene will agree to the offer. I will forward the expense email to you separately. Please let me know if you have any questions about the expenses or the invoices.

Thanks,
Heather

[Heather Honey](#)

Phone: 717.288.7171
www.Haystack.Group

From: [Carolina Lumetta](#)
To: rod@thomsonpr.com; [Douglas Logan](#)
Subject: WORLD Interview
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 5:54:39 PM

Hello Mr. Logan and Mr. Thomson,

As the Maricopa Co. audit winds down, I wanted to reiterate my request for an interview with Mr. Logan. I realize this is a contentious topic and you have most likely been inundated with interview requests. I've also read a fair amount of reporting that paints the audit and Mr. Logan in a negative or positive light based on the outlet. WORLD is not in the business of political punditry; we look for the biblically-objective truth, and I believe it is more accessible when we can hear from you directly. Our coverage is balanced and unbiased, and I would appreciate whatever time you have to discuss the audit, the challenges you have faced, and possibly the results as well. [Here](#) is my recent coverage for WORLD.

Thank you for your consideration. I can best be reached via this email or my cell: 269-491-5918.

Sincerely,
Carolina Lumetta
Digital Reporter | [WORLD](#)