

From: Krista Grassi <kristagrassi@me.com>
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2024 4:00 PM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: 8/13/24 Agenda Item #27

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

Report Suspicious

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Supervisors - It's very disappointing that the BOS still isn't taking election integrity seriously. I'm not sure if this is because it's such a daunting task or because you truly think we are running clean elections in this county.

While I do agree that the Elections department makes themselves readily available and has some very thorough processes, I think many of us are concerned about the items that aren't being addressed.

Comments on the findings & recommendations:

F2 & F3 – Because we have let the counting of the votes take place completely within a computer software system and have never done a full recount in this county (that I could find), we really don't know if there is any election interference or if the technology is performing poorly. What we do know is that there is proprietary software that does not allow anyone to watch the counting of the votes. No one in the elections department can tell us what the software does – code by code – line by line. If no one is actually doing a full audit, how do we know how bad the counting really is? The ballots are also imaged & adjudicated off those images, but as DEFCON has shown, it's a very easy program to build to change the ballot image that is saved. Who is to say that the source code provided by the state doesn't have a sneaky set of instructions built in? Just take a look at the recent CrowdStrike debacle. Compromising Microsoft systems around the world – when it's supposed to be protecting them.

F5 – Whenever I ask an IT expert if data could be held securely & deemed “unhackable” if saved on some sort of device that has the *ability* to connect to the internet or if only connected to on a private network, the answer is always a very strong “No”. Why would things be any different for election data? Election Departments make a big deal about the logic & accuracy testing, but remember that the “system” knows you are running it and if programmed to cheat, will also be programmed to run the “2nd set” of books so that you can never tell votes are being moved around. If I were programming the software, that's how I would do it,

R4 – This is an interesting comment. The BOS has no issue with just one person being in the room with the tabulator. What if the tabulator was a very large pile of cash that was never hand counted? Would we feel the same way? Given that the Reg of Voters launched electronic voting systems across the country, was the VP of Cybersecurity/CIO for Runbeck (a current elections vendor for EDC), and produced patents with Runbeck after he was already working for EDC, I'm surprised there wouldn't be stronger measures in place. EDC also employed the former President of Runbeck along with a former

employee of Dominion. All with access to the tabulator? I'm not saying any of these people did anything nefarious, but it blows my mind that so much freedom is given to the employees of a department that can literally run this county by controlling the results. There is no oversight to tell me otherwise.

I have barely scratched the surface of my issues with the current election system. Unless you can prove to me that no fraud can occur, then fraud can most definitely occur. I have asked the Reg of Voters to prove to me that my ballot was recorded as cast...and he confirmed he is unable to. With the mass rollout of Mail-in ballots, we now have no chain of custody and I can confirm with my own eyes, how dirty the voter rolls are. With the change to the "vote center" models, we now have all the ballots counted in a centralized location which means even less oversight.

Please take this topic seriously.

Thank you,

Krista Grassi