

MICHIGAN 2020 VOTING ANALYSIS REPORT

11-27-20



Table of Contents

Executive Overview	3
1 - Analysis of Michigan County Vote Counts	5
2 - Wayne & Oakland Counties: Finding Excessive Votes	8
3 - Exploring Michigan Mail-in Ballots Data	14
4 - Absentee Ballots Compared in Select MI Counties	16
5 - Irrational MI Absentee Ballot Findings	18
6 - Analysis of a Survey of Absentee Ballot Recipients	21
Summary	24

Executive Overview

This scientific analysis of the reported Michigan (MI) 2020 Presidential voting results is a non-partisan effort by unpaid citizens and volunteer experts (several un-named). Our only objective is to play a small roll in helping assure that all legal MI votes are counted, *and* that only legal MI votes are counted.

Whether Donald Trump or Joseph Biden wins is not of concern in this analysis — the scientists involved with this report just want the election results to truly reflect the wishes of Michigan voting citizens.

Since there are multiple reports of voting chicanery circulating the Internet, a collection of statisticians and other scientists volunteered to examine the reported MI results from a scientific statistical perspective.

We feel that the best way to do this is to start by putting ourselves in the shoes of bad actors — and then considering how they might go about changing the wishes of MI citizens, into a different result. Some of the actions they might take are:

- 1 - Keep ineligible people (e.g. deceased, moved, etc.) on the voting roles.
(This would disguise actual voter participation rates, allow fabricated votes to be submitted in their names, etc.)
- 2 - Get legislation passed that does not require in-person voter identification.
(This would make it easier for non-citizens, felons, etc. to vote.)
- 3 - Encourage a much higher percentage of voting by mail.
(This would make it much easier to manipulate, as in-person checking is a more secure way to keep track of actual registered citizens, etc.)
- 4 - Discard envelopes and other identifying materials from mail-in votes.
(This makes it very hard to check for duplications, etc.)
- 5 - Count mail-in votes without careful signature or registration verification.
(This makes mail-in an easier choice for manipulators.)
- 6 - Allow votes to count that are received after Election Day.
(This can direct where mail-in votes are needed to go.)
- 7 - Stop vote counting for several hours before the final tabulations.
(This allows for an assessment of how many votes are “needed” etc.)
- 8 - Do not allow for independent oversight of voting tabulation.
(This would make it easier to lose or miscalculate actual votes.)
- 9 - Connect voting machines or precincts to the Internet.
(This makes it quite easy for third parties to access and change votes.)
- 10-Distribute vote manipulations over multiple precincts and/or counties.
(This makes the adjustments more difficult to find.)
- 12-Make most of the manipulations in unexpected districts.
(In other words, don’t do as much manipulation where it’s expected.)
- 12-Use multiple methodologies to change vote results.
(It requires a much longer investigation to find all the adjustments.)

There are undoubtedly more strategies those who are trying to control our politics would employ — but this is a representative sample. It should also be clear that many of these are difficult and time-consuming to find.

Frequently there is documented proof of some of these voting actions (e.g. leaving non-eligible voters on the rolls). However, these are usually dismissed with cursory responses such as: *we're doing the best that we can*, or *these deviations are not statistically significant*, or *our rolls are as accurate as other states*, or *there are some benefits for doing this (e.g. #3 & #6 above)*, etc.

However, studies like [this](#) and reports like [this](#) do not instill confidence that election results actually reflect the wishes of actual citizens.

So what can we do as scientists? Clearly we can't verify the legitimacy of every Michigan vote submitted. On the other hand, we can (from a scientific perspective along with with sufficient data) provide a statistically strong assessment that reported votes in certain locations are statistically unusual. Such a determination should be treated as an indication that some type of accidental or purposeful manipulation almost certainly occurred.

Such a science-based statistical analysis can not identify exactly what happened — or prove that fraud was involved. Honest mistakes, unintentional computer glitches, etc. can and do happen.

We approached this project assigning different experts to look at the Michigan data from different perspectives. By-and-large the experts worked mostly independently of each other. As a result, there may be some overlaps in the analyses in the following four “chapters.”

All of the experts agreed that there were major statistical aberrations in some of the Michigan results that are extremely unlikely to occur naturally.

Using more conventional statistical analyses, we identified nine counties with abnormal results (see Chapter 1). Due to time, data and manpower limitations, for this Report we focused on the statistical analysis for the worst two counties. **Our strong recommendation is that both of those Michigan counties have an audited recount.**

If the results of a carefully *audited* recount are that there is **no** significant change in voting results for those two counties (very unlikely), then the authors of this report recommend that we write off those county deviations as an extreme statistical fluke, and that the Michigan voting results be certified.

On the other hand, if the results of a carefully *audited* recount are that there **are** significant changes in voting results for either of these two counties, then the authors of this Report recommend that (as a minimum) that the next seven statistically suspicious counties also have an audited recount, prior to any certifying of the Michigan voting results.

See **Summary** on the final page, for more conclusions.

— Editor, physicist John Droz, jr. 11-26-20

1 - Analysis of Michigan County Vote Counts

S. Stanley Young, PhD, FASA, FAAAS, 11-25-20

Summary:


People today generally vote as they have done in the past. If a voting pattern changes, is it a slight shift, or are large changes occurring in a small number of locations? Our idea is to look at relative vote changes in counties within Michigan. How does Biden *vs* Trump2020 compare to Clinton *vs* Trump2016? There could be slight shifts that accumulate across the state, or there could be major changes in a relatively few counties. We use contrasts to examine voting results. We find vote changes are modest for the bulk of MI counties: less than 3,000± votes. However, there are nine counties with much larger changes in votes, up to 54,000±.

Item 1 —

Consider Biden *vs* Trump2020 compared to Clinton *vs* Trump2016.

$$\text{Contrast} = (\text{Biden} - \text{Trump2020}) - (\text{Clinton} - \text{Trump2016})$$

Here is the distribution of Contrast:




Examine the left side of the above chart. There we see an approximate bell-shaped distribution, which is normally what would be expected. The Contrast (change in votes for Biden *vs* Trump relative to Clinton *vs* Trump) for almost all counties is within the range of plus or minus 3000± votes.

The outliers (numbers unusual relative to the rest of the data) are on the right of the chart, where Biden bested Trump *much* more than Clinton bested Trump.

Item 2 —

Here we rank contrasts from largest to smallest for all Michigan counties.



In the above histogram, each dot is one MI county. In 74 of 83 MI counties, the differential is small (near zero) implying that for the vast majority of counties, voters considered Biden *vs* Trump2020 much like they considered Clinton *vs* Trump2016. On the left side of the histogram are the nine (9) outliers — i.e. counties with numbers that substantially deviate from the main distribution.


RowID	County	Biden 2020	Trump 2020	Clinton 2016	Trump 2016	Contrast	Rank
63	OAKLAND	434,148	325,971	343,070	289,203	54,310	1
82	WAYNE	597,170	264,553	519,444	228,993	42,166	2
41	KENT	187,915	165,741	138,683	148,180	31,671	3
81	WASHTENAW	157,136	56,241	128,483	50,631	23,043	4
33	INGHAM	94,212	47,639	79,110	43,868	11,331	5
39	KALAMAZOO	83,686	56,823	67,148	51,034	10,749	6
50	MACOMB	223,952	263,863	176,317	224,665	8,437	7
70	OTTAWA	64,705	100,913	44,973	88,467	7,286	8
28	GD. TRAVERSE	28,683	30,502	20,965	27,413	4,629	9

These nine counties together substantially increase the vote count for Biden. For instance, in the first two of these counties (Wayne and Oakland), the differential (contrast) swing for Biden amounts to 96,000± votes.

The remainder of the nine outlier counties (ranks 3 to 9 on the spreadsheet above) represent an additional $95,000 \pm$ excess votes for Biden, compared to Clinton *vs* Trump. (For example, Trump bested Clinton in Kent county by $10,000 \pm$ votes but lost to Biden by $22,000 \pm$ votes, for a net swing of $32,000 \pm$ votes.) The total unexpected votes for Biden in the nine Michigan outliers is $190,000 \pm$ votes.

Item 3 —

Here is another anomaly that indicates suspicious results. The first set of plots compare Trump's election day votes to his mail-in votes, for each county. As would be expected, the distributions are quite similar. The second set of plots compare Biden's election day votes to his mail-in votes, again for each county. As is easily seen, the distributions are *very* different. This is a serious statistical aberration.



CONCLUSIONS: The distribution of Item 1, *and* the magnitude of the differentials in Item 2, *and* the statistically deviant patterns in Item 3, are all statistically improbable relative to the body of the data.

2 - Wayne and Oakland Counties: Finding Excessive Votes in the 2020, Well Outside Their Voting History

(condensed version: full version available)

Dr. Eric Quinnell, Dr. Stanley Young

11/26/2020

Contents

Executive Summary	8
Wayne County/Oakland Buck the Trend	8
Wayne County	8
Oakland County	12

Executive Summary


Analysis – A statistical team of unpaid citizen volunteer scientists, mathematicians, and engineers collaborated in a statistical vote analysis in the Pennsylvania 2020 Presidential Election, after having worked originally as individuals on various vote analysis across the country. Following the PA report (available on request), the collaboration team netted steep learning curves in analysis and methods, and produced a mathematically based predictive model to reverse engineer vote differential signatures. This now much more robust model is re-applied to Michigan.

Using simple linear regression of unproblematic voting districts, we predict hypothetically problematic voting districts. Using distributional characteristics within problematic counties, we point to problematic districts and precincts.

Findings – Two Michigan counties stand out as problematic, Wayne and Oakland Counties, 40,000 and 46,000 estimated excessive votes, respectively. Problematic districts and precincts within these counties exhibit unusual Democrat/Republican (D/R) ratios relative to their history and excessive vote in favor of Biden often in excess of new Democrat registrations.

Wayne County/Oakland Counties Buck the Trend


A bi-variate trend-line across all Michigan counties (see next page) identify Wayne County and Oakland County as behaving well outside the trends of the rest of the state in 2020. Wayne and Oakland counties also stood out from the analysis done in another section of this report (see Page 6). Thus, these two counties were selected for deeper analysis.



RowID	County	Biden 2020	Trump 2020	Other 2020	Total 2020
63	OAKLAND	434,148	325,971	10,090	780,299
82	WAYNE	597,170	264,553	10,660	883,043

Wayne County

A bi-variate linear fit of the Trump and Biden votes in 2020 Wayne County show major precincts completely off the charts as compared to the majority of the other precincts in the same county. The points exceedingly off the fit are mostly those in the Absentee Vote Counting Board (AVCB) districts. Several others outside of Detroit also buck the trend of the rest of the area.



The AVCB mail-in districts within Detroit have no ability to correlate with the precincts inside the city, so a historical voting pattern per precinct is not possible. There is also no indication that the AVCB distributions include the same precincts from year to year, so therefore there is no way to link AVCB in obvious ways. Instead, we first looked at the remainder of Wayne County. Outside the city we have much more history and can observe both mail-in votes as well as election day votes correlated to a precinct with history.

Outside Detroit, Wayne County shows a significant disruption or new vote distribution well outside the 2016 norm. Specifically, both candidates achieved the total 2016 vote count and added to their sums, consistent with new turnout. What's curious is that above the 2016 totals, a new vote ratio appears in contrast to the history of the area – showing new votes going 70% Democrat vs 30% Republican – a 15-point mismatch to the same area just in the last Presidential Election.

Gained Votes over 2016 Avg per Precinct	
<i>Trump</i>	79.85
<i>Biden</i>	185.41
<i>Diff</i>	105.56
<i>2020 Dem/Rep Gain Ratio</i>	2.32
<i>%</i>	70D / 30R
<i>2016 Dem/Rep Historical Ratio</i>	1.29
<i>%</i>	55D / 45R

Voting totals of precincts may presume to follow a semi-normal distribution with enough data points. By fitting a normal distribution to actual data and taking the difference between the fitted and actual, potentially anomalous precincts can be identified. Using a per-precinct history, we can take an election result like this:

<i>2020 Actual</i>	<i>Register</i>	<i>Voted</i>	<i>Biden</i>	<i>Trump</i>	<i>D/R</i>
	900050	620483	356234	251664	1.42
<i>Turnout</i>	68.9%		57.4%	40.6%	

And identify anomalous precincts. We forced the anomalous precincts back to their voting history ratios and adjust to keep pace with the 2020 turnout. This results in this prediction:

<i>Total Predicted 2020</i>	<i>Register</i>	<i>Voted</i>	<i>Biden</i>	<i>Trump</i>	<i>D/R</i>	<i>Excess Votes</i>
	900050	580056	315807	251664	1.25	40771
<i>turnout</i>	64.4%		54.4%	43.4%		

Which helps us identify several townships outside Detroit in Wayne County that significantly stick out. A partial list of main townships that show excessive votes vs a standard normal with reasonable variance:

<i>Townships</i>	<i>Excessive Votes</i>
<i>Canton</i>	5735
<i>Livonia</i>	5428
<i>Redford</i>	4159
<i>Gr Pointe</i>	3052
<i>Taylor</i>	2891
<i>Westland</i>	2559
<i>Plymouth</i>	2400
<i>Dearborn</i>	2240
<i>Northville</i>	2111

As an example of the excess vote gains above the norm, consider the Township of Livonia, broken into precincts. Nearly every single precinct first achieves the entire 2016 vote total for each party, but then a new population of votes skews excessively in favor of the Biden camp – resulting in a “new vote population” that is voting 76 D / 24 R — *in a 2016 Republican township!*

Additionally, the votes gained by Biden well outpace even the new registrations in the township – gaining 151% of the new registered voters and 97% of the new votes above 2016. This result/example is incredibly mathematically anomalous.

2016						2020 Gain							
						New	New	New	Gain	Dem % of New	Dem % of		
Precinct	Trump	Clinton	Total	Dem/Rep	% Dem	New Trump	Biden	Total	Registered	Dem/Rep	Registered	New Votes	
Livonia Pct 1A	650	783	1558	1.20	50%	119	263	310	272	2.21	97%	85%	
Livonia Pct 1B	310	348	706	1.12	49%	51	106	137	94	2.08	113%	77%	
Livonia Pct 2A	630	634	1337	1.01	47%	58	214	230	158	3.69	135%	93%	
Livonia Pct 3A	467	492	1035	1.05	48%	64	125	132	105	1.95	119%	95%	
Livonia Pct 3B	854	722	1680	0.85	43%	87	183	214	132	2.10	139%	86%	
Livonia Pct 4A	1034	834	1961	0.81	43%	44	233	217	137	5.30	170%	107%	
Livonia Pct 7A	823	638	1514	0.78	42%	31	164	168	102	5.29	161%	98%	
Livonia Pct 8A	752	398	1212	0.53	33%	20	134	123	71	6.70	189%	109%	
Livonia Pct 8B	598	426	1082	0.71	39%	18	135	114	30	7.50	450%	118%	
Livonia Pct 9A	947	635	1651	0.67	38%	12	264	238	146	22.00	181%	111%	
Livonia Pct 10A	615	478	1168	0.78	41%	47	153	152	105	3.26	146%	101%	
Livonia Pct 11A	797	715	1625	0.90	44%	53	218	193	95	4.11	229%	113%	
Livonia Pct 12A	544	671	1293	1.23	52%	78	159	183	146	2.04	109%	87%	
Livonia Pct 13A	637	709	1426	1.11	50%	44	180	177	131	4.09	137%	102%	
Livonia Pct 14A	755	721	1582	0.95	46%	53	163	143	60	3.08	272%	114%	
Livonia Pct 15A	732	563	1361	0.77	41%	74	140	181	114	1.89	123%	77%	
Livonia Pct 16A	713	506	1294	0.71	39%	84	133	176	106	1.58	125%	76%	
Livonia Pct 16B	479	408	961	0.85	42%	46	85	83	44	1.85	193%	102%	
Livonia Pct 17B	646	493	1219	0.76	40%	114	226	287	297	1.98	76%	79%	
Livonia Pct 17A	732	488	1284	0.67	38%	-61	136	42	-111	-2.23	-123%	324%	
Livonia Pct 18A	884	597	1552	0.68	38%	57	161	171	88	2.82	183%	94%	
Livonia Pct 19A	674	494	1244	0.73	40%	57	148	158	103	2.60	144%	94%	
Livonia Pct 19B	768	598	1472	0.78	41%	69	183	181	68	2.65	269%	101%	
Livonia Pct 20A	861	602	1555	0.70	39%	32	208	183	90	6.50	231%	114%	
Livonia Pct 21A	715	566	1369	0.79	41%	39	219	207	100	5.62	219%	106%	
Livonia Pct 22A	712	576	1396	0.81	41%	33	223	192	119	6.76	187%	116%	
Livonia Pct 22B	592	486	1142	0.82	43%	32	128	125	86	4.00	149%	102%	
Livonia Pct 23B	508	325	876	0.64	37%	119	390	498	524	3.28	74%	78%	
Livonia Pct 23A	579	550	1199	0.95	46%	-31	-89	-164	-315	2.87	28%	54%	
Livonia Pct 24B	492	591	1149	1.20	51%	102	235	313	182	2.30	129%	75%	
Livonia Pct 24A	535	610	1215	1.14	50%	69	126	155	161	1.83	78%	81%	
Livonia Pct 25A	358	358	784	1.00	46%	24	122	105	107	5.08	114%	116%	
Livonia Pct 31A	654	561	1286	0.86	44%	69	197	224	152	2.86	130%	88%	
Livonia Pct 31B	600	520	1199	0.87	43%	45	193	190	172	4.29	112%	102%	
Livonia Pct 32A	739	537	1345	0.73	40%	73	148	178	115	2.03	129%	83%	
Livonia Pct 33A	850	680	1616	0.80	42%	86	225	257	136	2.62	165%	88%	
Livonia Pct 34A	683	746	1532	1.09	49%	83	257	280	158	3.10	163%	92%	
Livonia Pct 34B	651	591	1345	0.91	44%	48	215	197	126	4.48	171%	109%	
Livonia Pct 34C	539	487	1107	0.90	44%	25	187	154	119	7.48	157%	121%	
Livonia Pct 35A	517	468	1085	0.91	43%	67	130	121	65	1.94	200%	107%	
Livonia Pct 35B	350	343	753	0.98	46%	28	144	135	62	5.14	232%	107%	
Livonia Pct 35C	330	315	703	0.95	45%	45	121	121	70	2.69	173%	100%	
Livonia Pct 36A	407	462	944	1.14	49%	62	145	163	151	2.34	96%	89%	
Livonia Pct 36B	534	469	1079	0.88	43%	104	165	219	142	1.59	116%	75%	
						New	New	New	Gain	Dem % of New	Dem % of		
Precinct	Trump	Clinton	Total	Dem/Rep	% Dem	New Trump	Biden	Total	Registered	Dem/Rep	Registered	New Votes	
TOTAL	28247	24194	55896	0.86	43%	2373	7595	7863	5015	3.20	151%	97%	
			2016						2020 Gain				
			Dem/Rep	46D / 54R					Dem/Rep	76D / 24 R			

Oakland County

Oakland shares the Wayne County mathematical deviance of being well outside the norm. In Oakland all votes added by both candidates above the 2016 take show a new vote ratio of 72% Democrat to 28% Republican – an 18-point mismatch to the same area just since the last Presidential Election.

Gained Votes over 2016 Avg per Precinct

<i>Trump</i>	70.79
<i>Biden</i>	179.83
<i>Diff</i>	109.04
<i>2020 Dem/Rep Gain Ratio</i>	2.54
<i>%</i>	72D / 28R
<i>2016 D/R Historical Ratio</i>	1.19
<i>%</i>	54D / 46R

As mentioned, voting totals of precincts may presume to follow a normal distribution. By fitting a normal distribution to actual data and taking the difference between the fitted and actual, potentially anomalous precincts can be identified. Using a per-precinct history, we can take an election result like this

2020 Actual	Register	Voted	Biden	Trump	D/R
	1035172	771991	434148	325971	1.33
<i>Turnout</i>	75%		56%	42%	

and identify anomalous precincts. Should we peel those anomalies back to the voting history ratios and keep pace with the 2020 turnout, we get this prediction:

Total Predicted 2020	Register	Voted	Biden	Trump	D/R	Excess Votes
	1035172	750646	388023	325971	1.19	46125
<i>turnout</i>	73%		52%	43%		

This helps us identify several townships in Oakland County that significantly stick out. This is a partial list of main townships that show unexpected deviations:

Townships	Excessive Votes
<i>Troy</i>	4781
<i>Royal Oak</i>	4152
<i>Novi</i>	3911
<i>Farmington Hills</i>	3598
<i>Rochester Hills</i>	3597
<i>Bloomfield</i>	2696

As an example of the excess vote gains above the norm, consider the Township of Troy, broken into precincts. Nearly every single precinct first achieves the entire 2016 vote total for each party, but then a new population of votes skews excessively in favor of the Biden camp – resulting in a “new vote population” that is voting 80 D / 20 R — in a 2016 almost even split Dem/Rep township.

Additionally, the votes gained by Biden well outpace even the new registrations in the township – gaining 109% of the new registered voters and 98% of the new votes above 2016.

This situation is yet another example that is incredibly mathematically anomalous.

2016						2020 Gain							
Precinct	Trump	Clinton	Total	Dem/Rep	% Dem	New Trump	New Biden	New Total	New Registered	Gain Dem/Rep	Dem % of New Registered	Dem % of New Votes	
Troy, Precinct 1	462	434	944	0.94	46%	40	226	230	199	5.65	114%	98%	
Troy, Precinct 2	805	792	1680	0.98	47%	53	231	217	189	4.36	122%	106%	
Troy, Precinct 3	791	572	1446	0.72	40%	137	270	343	337	1.97	80%	79%	
Troy, Precinct 4	974	998	2064	1.02	48%	48	350	341	273	7.29	128%	103%	
Troy, Precinct 5	683	453	1193	0.66	38%	18	120	104	72	6.67	167%	115%	
Troy, Precinct 6	204	177	402	0.87	44%	19	55	61	40	2.89	138%	90%	
Troy, Precinct 7	571	625	1251	1.09	50%	49	197	201	184	4.02	107%	98%	
Troy, Precinct 8	536	731	1337	1.36	55%	29	153	125	68	5.28	225%	122%	
Troy, Precinct 9	843	746	1683	0.88	44%	134	188	254	216	1.40	87%	74%	
Troy, Precinct 10	760	673	1518	0.89	44%	21	306	263	273	14.57	112%	116%	
Troy, Precinct 11	754	680	1496	0.90	45%	-12	183	123	87	-15.25	210%	149%	
Troy, Precinct 12	523	534	1103	1.02	48%	56	128	155	137	2.29	93%	83%	
Troy, Precinct 13	939	1037	2112	1.10	49%	37	312	251	217	8.43	144%	124%	
Troy, Precinct 14	763	679	1508	0.89	45%	50	244	249	270	4.88	90%	98%	
Troy, Precinct 15	695	687	1443	0.99	48%	2	288	254	200	144.00	144%	113%	
Troy, Precinct 16	549	599	1223	1.09	49%	60	197	205	224	3.28	88%	96%	
Troy, Precinct 17	746	830	1644	1.11	50%	-35	219	133	139	-6.26	158%	165%	
Troy, Precinct 18	618	529	1208	0.86	44%	-14	177	127	111	-12.64	159%	139%	
Troy, Precinct 19	595	531	1189	0.89	45%	-32	224	157	73	-7.00	307%	143%	
Troy, Precinct 20	812	766	1647	0.94	47%	24	267	246	198	11.13	135%	109%	
Troy, Precinct 21	486	536	1096	1.10	49%	67	194	214	213	2.90	91%	91%	
Troy, Precinct 22	838	1008	1941	1.20	52%	82	320	329	325	3.90	98%	97%	
Troy, Precinct 23	866	954	1908	1.10	50%	124	344	403	380	2.77	91%	85%	
Troy, Precinct 24	801	669	1554	0.84	43%	181	178	311	295	0.98	60%	57%	
Troy, Precinct 25	724	802	1604	1.11	50%	153	216	329	363	1.41	60%	66%	
Troy, Precinct 26	616	699	1421	1.13	49%	120	332	369	330	2.77	101%	90%	
Troy, Precinct 27	404	671	1131	1.66	59%	128	150	246	280	1.17	54%	61%	
Troy, Precinct 28	380	679	1109	1.79	61%	60	155	173	149	2.58	104%	90%	
Troy, Precinct 29	840	885	1848	1.05	48%	35	236	179	168	6.74	140%	132%	
Troy, Precinct 30	202	199	425	0.99	47%	-12	81	56	27	-6.75	300%	145%	
Troy, Precinct 31	319	238	590	0.75	40%	24	136	141	95	5.67	143%	96%	
Precinct	Trump	Clinton	Total	Dem/Rep	% Dem	New Trump	New Biden	New Total	New Registered	Gain Dem/Rep	Dem % of New Registered	Dem % of New Votes	
TOTAL	20099	20413	42718	1.02	48%	1646	6677	6789	6132	4.06	109%	98%	
2016 Troy				51D / 49R		2020 Troy Gain				80D / 20R			

3 - Exploring Michigan 2020 Mail-In Ballots Data

Robert Wilgus 11/27/20

The 2020 election data for Michigan mail-in ballots was provided as a large file obtained *via* an FOIA. The data was perused for anomalies that stood out. A more comprehensive analysis is appropriate and that is what has been arranged (see **Conclusions**).

The data file contains 19 fields for each mail-in application. The fields can be text, numbers, or dates. My understanding of the process is that certain voters (not sure how they were determined) were sent a form to request a mail-in ballot.

The data available captures the process from when the application was sent. The total of requested absentee ballots is 3,507,129. The table below contains measures that merit further investigation:

Measure	Count
Duplicate Voter ID	8341
Duplicate Ballot ID	32
Missing Ballot ID	35897
Missing Ballot Number	36035
Missing Application Sent Date	495065
Missing Application Return Date	0
Missing Ballot Sent Date	36052
Missing Ballot Returned Date	217271
Missing Ballot Address	35988
Missing Resident Address	41
Rejected Ballots	47226
Spoiled Ballots	87793
Year of Birth Earliest	1850
Year of Birth Latest	2002
Year of Birth before 1921	1414

Ballots did not get sent to about 36,000 of the requests received. It's not clear what the reason(s) were for this (e.g. faulty address, etc.). The ballot can be marked as Rejected or Spoiled. Spoiled ballots (incomplete?) and Rejected ballots (duplicates?) add up to about 135,000 ballots that got tossed. That seems like a lot.

The data also includes the voter's year of birth. One is 170 years old, likely an error but their application was not rejected. In total more than 1400 of these absentee voters are over 100 years old. These could well be nursing home patients.

There are 217,271 applications without a recorded date (i.e. never received back). More interesting is the 288,783 that have the application sent and ballot received on the same day. Maybe these are one stop voting and get recorded with the mail in ballots? The table below contains other date related findings:

Measure	Value
Earliest Ballot Sent	06-Feb-2020
Ballots Sent before 1-Sep-2020	13372
Ballots Sent after 3-Nov-2020	12
Ballots Returned after 3-Nov-2020	936
Ballots Returned before Sent	64
Same Date App Sent/Returned	224525
Same Date Ballot Sent/Returned	288783
Same Date for All	78312

The ballots rejected doesn't provide any additional information for what the reason was. It does appear that the majority of ballots received after Nov-3 did fall into this category.

Measure	Value
Total Ballots Rejected	47,226
Rejected Missing Return Date	43,874
Rejected and Spoiled	398
Rejected Return after 3-Nov-2020	909

The last but not least is the spoiled ballots. There is a lot of them. In the first table there are 8,341 duplicate Voter ID. I would expect these were the 'spoiled' ones that got new ballots. There is another column in the table named SPOILED_IND that means spoiled by the individual. It has values 'N' or is not entered.

There is also very small number that are both rejected and spoiled

Measure	Value
Total Spoiled Ballots	87,793
Spoiled Missing Return Date	15,724

CONCLUSIONS: There are numerous measures in the mail-in ballot data that warrant further investigation. This is surprising because there are very few field values with obvious errors. The records with multiple empty fields are of concern. Additional information is also needed for the high number of applications and ballots with the same and returned dates

Because of the importance of this file we recently shared it with a firm that specializes in data analytics of very large databases, to see what they can tease out if it. We are looking forward to some interesting analyses.

4 - Michigan Absentee Ballots: Several Key Counties Compared

Dr. William M. Briggs, 11/26/20


Data from counties in Michigan where absentee votes by candidate were available were gathered. The counties were (alphabetically): (1) Eaton, (2) Grand Traverse, (3) Ingham, (4) Leelanau, (5) Macomb, (6) Monroe, (7) Oakland, and (8) Wayne.

In Eaton and Oakland votes could be either **straight** party (e.g. choose all Democrats for all contests) or **variable** ballots (e.g. choose candidates individually). These were treated separately.

The data sources are: [Eaton](#) (XML), [Grand Traverse](#) (PDF), [Ingham](#) (PDF), [Leelanau](#) (PDF), [Macomb](#) (HTML), [Monroe](#) (PDF), [Oakland](#) (XML), and [Wayne](#) (PDF).

The percent of the total vote for each candidate (not the over all total, but the candidate total) that was absentee was calculated across each precinct or district within each county. The data within a county was sorted by the absentee percentages for Biden, low to high, for display ease.

Next, we plot the percent absentee votes for both Biden (D:blue) and Trump (R:red). See below for examples of two large counties. (For the same types of graphs of more Michigan counties see [here](#).) The precinct numbers are here arbitrary, and reflect the sorting of the data.




Almost never does the percent of absentee ballots cast for Trump exceed the percent cast for Biden. There are only rare exceptions, such as in very small precincts where we'd expect totals to be more variable.

If absentee voting behavior was the same for those voting for Trump and Biden, the chance that absentee ballots for Biden would almost always be larger would, given the large number of precincts here, be vanishingly small.

Thus, either the absentee voting behavior of those voting for Biden was remarkably consistently different, or there is another explanation, such as manipulation of totals.

More proof of this is had by examining the ratios of absentee ballot totals in each precinct. See below for examples of the same two large counties. (For the similar graphs of more Michigan counties see [here](#).) Again, the precinct numbers are arbitrary and reflect the same sorting as before.



Only 36 precincts out of the 2,146 examined had 0% absentee ballots. These are obviously not shown in the figures (because of divide-by-zero possibilities). As mentioned, the ratio of Biden to Trump absentee votes is astonishingly consistent. The mean ratio inside each county is printed in the figure, along with the number of precincts.

If voting behavior was similar for both candidates, we'd expect this ratio to be 1, with some variability across precincts, with numbers both above and below 1. Instead, the ratios are almost always greater than 1, and with a tight mean about 1.5 to 1.6 or so. This indicates the official tallies of absentee ballots for Biden were about 50-60% higher almost everywhere, with very little variation, except in smaller counties where the ratio was slightly higher.

Such behavior could be genuine, or programmatic changes of the votes could be the explanation of these unusual results. The data here is more consistent with the later hypothesis.

5 - Irrational MI Absentee Ballots Findings


Thomas Davis, 11/27/20

All American citizens, regardless of party affiliation, should be concerned about the integrity of our election system. If the people no longer determine who their representatives are, the United States is no longer a Republic. Accordingly, post-election scrutiny of suspicious results is not only appropriate, but required.


It is unsurprising that absentee voting in 2020 occurred at a much higher rate than in previous years. (In Kent County Michigan, for example, there were 68,967 absentee voters in 2016, and 211,209 in 2020 – a threefold increase.) The COVID-19 virus undoubtedly had a direct impact on the strong move to absentee voting across the nation. In Michigan, there were two additional major contributing factors: **1)** voters approved a no-reason absentee voting law in 2018, and **2)** Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson sent absentee voting applications to all 7.7 million registered Michigan voters this past summer.

When statistics in Michigan showed especially high numbers of absentee votes for Biden, it didn't raise many red flags. After all, the Democratic party had encouraged people to vote absentee while the Republican party had encouraged voting in-person since ballots *could* be lost in the mail. However, a closer look at absentee voting (from the select Michigan counties that publish detailed voting statistics) appears to tell a different story.


Let's start by showing what normal (non-manipulated) absentee voting results should be. The plot below is the actual percentage of absentee ballots received by each 2020 presidential candidate in a swing state county, by precinct (Red = R and Blue = D). Note the irregularities that normally occur: some are higher for R, some are higher for D, and the difference between the two varies widely — from plus to minus. *This is what a normal result looks like!*




Now back to what happened in Michigan. Specifically, save for outliers, the *percentage* of Democratic absentee voters exceeds the *percentage* of Republican absentee voters in **every precinct**. Even more remarkable – and unbelievable – these two *independent variables* appear to track one another. This statistical anomaly can be seen very readily in Monroe County:



In Oakland County (with 4x more voters than Monroe County) this same pattern can be seen, albeit somewhat less clearly (as there are more data points — i.e. precincts):



Comparing the same county (Oakland) 2020 data with 2016 brings the statistical anomaly into even sharper focus. The 2016 plot is below, and it looks approximately like the initial plot shown (page 18), of what a normal situation would look like:



By examining the absentee voting in the other Michigan counties for which these data are available, similar statistical anomalies are observed.

Conclusion: This is *very* strong evidence that the absentee voting counts in Michigan have been manipulated by a computer algorithm.

On the surface it would seem that the tabulating equipment in each precinct has been programmed to shift a percentage of absentee votes from Trump to Biden. A simple hand-count of absentee ballots from a sampling of precincts should be sufficient to determine whether this assertion is valid; a forensic analysis of the tabulating equipment would be required for definitive proof.

6 - An Analysis of Surveys Regarding Absentee Ballots in Several States (including Michigan)

Dr. William M. Briggs, 11/23/20

1: Summary

Survey data was collected from individuals in several states, sampling those who the states listed as not returning absentee ballots. Data was provided by [Matt Braynard](#).

The survey asked respondents whether they **(a)** had ever requested an absentee ballot, and, if so, **(b)** whether they had in fact returned this ballot. From this sample I produce predictions of the total numbers of: **Error #1**, those who were recorded as receiving absentee ballots without requesting them; and **Error #2**, those who returned absentee ballots but whose votes went missing (i.e. marked as unreturned).

The sizes of both errors were large in each state. The states were: Arizona, Georgia,, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

2: Analysis Description

Each analysis was carried out separately for each state. The analysis used **(a)** the number of absentee ballots recorded as *unreturned*, **(b)** the total number of people responding to the survey, **(c)** the total of those saying they did *not* request a ballot, **(d)** the total of those saying they *did* request a ballot, and of these **(e)** the number saying they returned their ballots.

From these data a simple parameter-free predictive model was used to calculate the probability of all possible outcomes. Pictures of these probabilities were derived, and the 95% prediction interval of the relevant numbers was calculated. The pictures for Michigan appear in the Appendix at the end. (Other states are available on request.) They are summarized here with their 95% prediction intervals.

Error #1: being recorded as sent an absentee ballot without requesting one.

Error #2: sending back an absentee ballot and having it recorded as not returned.

State	Unreturned ballots	Error #1	Error #2
Georgia	138,029	16,950–22,787	31,581–38,894
Michigan	139,190	29,402–36,270	27,731–34,464
Pennsylvania	481,022	93,091–107,795	77,037–90,748
Wisconsin	96,771	10,640–13,216	10,067–12,581
Arizona	518,560	208,333–229,937	78,714–94,975

Ballots that were not requested, and ballots returned and marked as not returned were classified as troublesome. The estimated average number of troublesome ballots for each state was then calculated using the table above and are presented here:

State	Unreturned ballots	Estimated average troublesome ballots	Percent
Georgia	138,029	53,528	39%
Michigan	139,190	62,064	45%
Pennsylvania	481,022	181,604	38%
Wisconsin	96,771	21,517	22%
Arizona	518,560	303,305	58%

3: Conclusion

There are clearly a large number of troublesome ballots in each swing state investigated. Ballots marked as not returned that were never requested are clearly an error of some kind. The error is not small as a percent of the total recorded unreturned ballots.

Ballots sent back and unrecorded is a separate error. These represent votes that have gone missing, a serious mistake. The number of these missing ballots is also large in each state.


Survey respondents were not asked that if they received an unrequested ballot whether they sent these ballots back. This is clearly a possibility, and represents a third possible source of error, including the potential of voting twice (once by absentee and once at the polls). No estimates or likelihood can be calculated for this additional potential error due to absence of data.

(See next page for an Appendix to this chapter...)


4: Appendix

The probability pictures for Michigan for each outcome as mentioned above.

Probability of numbers of un-requested absentee ballots listed as not returned for Michigan:



Probability of numbers of absentee ballots returned but listed as not returned for Michigan:



Summary

Several nationally recognized statistical experts were asked to examine some 2020 Michigan voting records, and to identify anything that they deemed to be statistically significant anomalies — i.e large deviations from the norm.

In the process they basically worked separately from other team members, consulted with other experts, analyzed the data they were given from different perspectives, obtained some additional data on their own, etc. — all in a very limited time allotment.

Their one — and only — objective was to try to assure that every legal Michigan vote is counted, *and* only legal Michigan votes are counted.

The takeaway is that (based on the data files they were examining) these experts came to one or more of the following conclusions:

- 1) There are some major statistical aberrations in the MI voting records, that are extremely unlikely to occur in a normal (i.e. un-manipulated) setting.
- 2) The anomalies almost exclusively happened with the Biden votes. Time and again, using a variety of techniques, the Trump votes looked statistically normal.
- 3) Nine (out of 83) Michigan counties stood out from all the rest. These counties (see p 6) showed distinctive signs of voting abnormalities — again, all for Biden.
- 4) The total number of suspicious votes in these counties is 190,000± — which greatly exceeds the reported margin of Biden votes over Trump. (We don't know how many of these are artificial Biden votes, *or* votes switched from Trump to Biden.)
- 5) These statistical analyses do not prove fraud, but rather provide scientific evidence that the reported results are highly unlikely to be an accurate reflection of how Michigan citizens voted.

As stated in the Executive Summary, our strong recommendation is that (as a minimum):
the two worst of the nine abnormal MI counties have an immediate audited recount.

If the results of a carefully *audited* recount are that there is **no** significant change in voting results for those two counties (very unlikely), then the authors of this report recommend that we write off those county deviations as an extreme statistical fluke, and that the Michigan voting results be certified.

On the other hand, if the results of a carefully *audited* recount are that there **are** significant changes in voting results for either of these two counties, then the authors of this Report recommend that (as a minimum) that the next seven (7) statistically suspicious counties also have an audited recount, prior to any certifying of the Michigan voting results.