

7/18/2023

# 2023-07-18 LC-BOC Mtg Bill Wiesner Public Comment

[www.FingerprintsOfFraud.com](http://www.FingerprintsOfFraud.com) – Volume 1 – SELECTIONS from the EXECUTIVE SUMMARY pages 9-19

## SELECTIONS from Jeffrey O'Donnell's EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

### Page 10:

... unnatural voting patterns in the county's Cast Vote Record that coincided with my originally discovered internal database manipulation.

... , it is my expert opinion that the United States of America was the victim of a coordinated multi-state conspiracy to defraud the 2020 General Election.

### Page 11:

#### ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY – RANDOMNESS ASSUMPTION

... As mail-in ballots are randomly requested, randomly sent out, randomly filled out, randomly returned or delivered by the voter, and not presorted by the county upon receipt, they become naturally shuffled and mixed.


### Page 13:

#### ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY - RANDOMIZED RESULT PREMISE

... The chart below shows the variations of a coin flip experiment, where a coin is flipped 4,000 times and the cumulative percentage of times it landed on "heads" is calculated and displayed horizontally. The variation in the percentage – the highest and lowest it achieves – decreases as the flips increase.

... towards the eventual 0.5 (50%). The same mathematics apply to plotting a candidate's percentage of votes in a sufficiently randomized set of ballots.

### Page 14:




### ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY - RANDOMIZED ELECTION TRIALS

... To determine what maximum and minimum values could be expected at any particular number of ballots, I ran a simulation of 1 00,000 random elections of 500,000 ballots each and recorded the highest and lowest values observed at all of the ballot counts. Then, to allow for unexpected fluctuations, the resulting ranges were widened by 10% in each direction. This process creates a visual cone which, when plotted, is not dissimilar to the cone of probability used by meteorologists when tracking hurricanes.


#### Page 15:

As an example, below is the percentage plot of Trump's mail-in vote in a county that shows no obvious signs of manipulation.



The mail-in votes from this county show Trump receiving roughly 24% support. Because the ballots are randomized, our plotted average tracks horizontally across the graph. The heavy Biden support simply shifts the entire horizontal line down the scale, exactly as if a weighted coin was used to plot the graph.

Below is the percentage plot of President Trump's mail-in votes in Mesa County, CO during the 2020 General Election.



In these plots, President Trump's percentage of the vote is in blue, while the expected maximum and minimum percentages expected at any point to achieve his official result are shown by the red cone. The black line indicates the 50% point, at which both candidates would be tied.

### Page 16:

... In Mesa County, the percentage plot line in blue is severely below the red cone throughout nearly all of the counting, only "catching up" at the end.


... In Mesa County, the percentage plot line in blue is severely below the red cone throughout nearly all of the counting, only "catching up" at the end. The pattern defies all mathematics for how the plotted line of cumulative votes should behave, knowing the mail-in vote sample was randomized. The pattern is alarmingly outside of the minimums and maximums established by having run the 100,000 different randomized elections described above. This is indicator #1 of fraud in the county. I call the pattern observed above the "Mesa Pattern", as this is where I first encountered it.

(Mesa County Report #3, referenced above, details that about a quarter of the initial ballots were either secretly reprocessed inside the computer software into a second database or left behind in the initial database, which was then hidden from view from the clerks. This matches up well with what is seen here – there were just too many Biden votes at the beginning to possibly justify the results at the end, causing the percentage plot of Trump's votes to fall well below the expected minimum values.)


### **ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY – ISOLATING THE "FRONT-END LOAD"**

... In Mesa County Report #3 I showed hard evidence of manipulation of the first 25,138 votes. This portion of the 81,599 total mail-in votes recorded represents approximately 31.

### Candidate Percentages in Mail-In Votes Mesa County, Colorado - 2020 General Election



**Page 18:**




Testing other counties showing the Mesa Pattern revealed that a great many of them had a rising value, which I call the "back half rise", that fell within 1.1 and 1.3 (Rounded). This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> indicator of fraud, and a very serious one.

The following is an example of this calculation, using the Mesa County Cast Vote Record.

Total Mail-in Votes for President Trump and Joseph Biden	79,798
Midpoint (79,798 / 2)	39,899
President Trump's percentage at midpoint 39,899 votes	53%
President Trump's percentage at end (79,798)	62%
Back Half Rise (63% / 53%)	1.17

To emphasize the seriousness of this discovery, of the 159 counties from the nine states included in this volume, 128 (80.5%) show a back half rise of between 1.1 and 1.3 (rounded). 69 of the counties fall within 1.1 and 1.2, not rounded.

**Page 19:**



[I ran out of time to finish this handout, but this and much more can be seen in the Executive Summary at

**[www.FingerprintsOfFraud.com](http://www.FingerprintsOfFraud.com)**

Submitted by Bill Wiesner