



Election Integrity Project[®] *California*
EVERY LAWFULLY CAST VOTE ACCURATELY COUNTED

The Golden State Agenda

California's Legislative Blueprint for the Destruction of Election Integrity

“It is enough that the people know there was an election.” J. Stalin

Step-by-step for most of the last three decades, California's legislature has slowly implemented a well-thought-out progression of laws that work synergistically to erode any semblance of election integrity in the state. The erosion and ultimate destruction of the California Republic is the end game of the **Golden State Agenda**.

The swift progress of the Agenda was made possible by what appears to be the intentional failure of the federal government to enforce the elements of federal election laws designed to protect the electoral process (NVRA and HAVA). In addition, Congress has remained selectively deaf, dumb and blind to the obvious defects in these laws and to the critical necessity of updating them to account for changing times and political environments.

California's executive and judicial branches also began a slow decline into electoral anarchy by refusing to enforce many of the state laws that stood between the right of their citizens to choose those who would govern them and the desire of the “governing class” to cement their complete and permanent control of electoral results.

Starting in 1998, the California legislature began in earnest to implement the Agenda that would ultimately result in a transformation of the way California's government functions. Each year California operates less as a Constitutional Republic and more as a Socialist Oligarchy.

The Constitutions of all 50 states mandate that voting is a privilege given **ONLY** to **legal citizens**. California's election code **guarantees every registered citizen ONE, privately cast, uninfluenced vote** that is accurately tabulated.

Nevertheless, the implementation of the Agenda paved the way for integrity in the election process to be weakened or eliminated. As a result, these guarantees are too easily circumvented, and more potentially unlawful votes can too easily be cast in competition with lawfully cast ballots.

The results are:

- Work overload of elections officials, diminishing ability to maintain integrity.
- Distancing by time and geography of voters from their ballots and from election results.
- Diminishment or complete removal of secret ballot.
- Diminishment of meaningful citizen oversight.

- Loss of governmental voice by California’s most vulnerable citizens.
- Potential dilution of citizen vote by non-citizen and other illegitimate votes.
- Loss of choice and personal responsibility.
- Potential and irrevocable harm to legal immigrants on legitimate path to citizenship.
- Diminishment and attempted removal of ALL “restrictions” to voting (age, legal status, citizenship status, jurisdiction, criminal status, etc.).

FEDERAL LAWS

1994

National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) - Section 7 and Section 8 open the door to making it possible to manipulate the outcome of elections in every state in the Union.

- **NVRA and CNVRA** (CA’s version of NVRA) **requires no verification of citizenship.**
- **NVRA (Section 7)** requires all individuals interacting with state or federal government agencies to be offered a voter registration form without implementing safeguards to ensure only ONE of those registrations could be submitted or that the registrants are eligible.
 - Further access to voter rolls was given to all non-citizens through Obamacare (Covered California) and the extension of social services such as welfare, social security, health care and food stamps to non-citizens, including the undocumented.
 - Increased easy access of non-citizens to voter rolls through the DMV.
 - California’s issuance of driver licenses to undocumented immigrants starting in 2015 increases their access to voter rolls.
- **NVRA (Section 8)** requires voter roll maintenance.
 - A 1993 special dispensation to CA by Clinton DOJ gives CA years of extended time to comply with this mandate.
 - 2019 – Election Integrity Project® *California* (EIPCa) wins settlement that re-establishes mandate for California to comply with list maintenance requirements.

2002

Help America Vote Act (HAVA) requires top down, statewide voter database and provisional ballot.

- CA claimed to come into “compliance” with the statewide database mandate in 2016, the last state to do so 14 years after HAVA passed. **Concerns remain:**
 - The manner in which the contract was awarded (no-bid, non-competitive award).
 - The poor reputation of the company awarded the contract (CGI of Healthcare.gov fame).
 - The lack of public transparency with regard to the database certification.
 - EIPCa revelations of serious and potentially disqualifying defects in the database (continuing as of date of this document).

- CA expands use of provisional ballot (ballots indicating a problem) beyond all reasonable boundaries.
 - **Laws regarding provisional ballots are unenforced.**
 - **Secretary of State “Advisories”** suggest subversion of the law (turn no one away, give everyone a provisional ballot), a practice that:
 1. Overwhelms the system with excess numbers of provisional ballots.
 2. Increases the chances that unlawful ballots may be counted.
 3. Leads voters whose ballots cannot be counted to believe they have voted.
 - Voters are disenfranchised by ignorantly casting ballots not tailored to their own precinct, because elections officials either do not know or ignore the consequences.
 - Out-of-county voters are allowed to vote without being informed that their ballot will likely not be counted.
 - Counties are inundated with ballots that are time-and labor-intensive, and subject to errors in duplicating. (remaking) and counting. (**CA cast 70% of the nation’s provisional ballots in 2018.**)

CALIFORNIA LAWS

SB (Senate Bill) AB (Assembly Bill)

SCA (Senate Constitutional Amendment) ACA (Assembly Constitutional Amendment)

1998

1. CA eliminates the Absentee Ballot; converts to no-excuse, permanent vote-by-mail.

- TWO Presidential Commissions (2001 and 2005) determined that vote-by-mail ballots do not satisfy FIVE requirements for fair and honest elections, and DO facilitate election manipulation and fraud.
- 20 years of unabated effort to get ALL voters to vote by mail. Now by law, 100% of voters on the active list receive a mail-in ballot. Lack of effective voter education and at times intentional misleading language and policies lead large percentages of CA voters to believe voting by mail is their only option.

2011

1. CA passes SB 397, online voter registration.

- Though implementation is not supposed to trigger until CA was in compliance with the HAVA mandate for a statewide voter database (which did not happen until 2016), online registration begins in September of 2012, one month before the registration deadline for the November election.
- **Election Integrity Project, Inc. (EIP)**, not yet formed as a non-profit, researches the voter rolls after SB 397 is passed and **submits a Findings Report** to the Secretary of State.

- **After no response** from the Sect. of State, EIP sends a press release to sound the alarm that the online voter registration system lacks integrity.
- **Elements of the EIP Press Release:**

SANTA CLARITA, CA. April 14, 2014 - Election Integrity Project (EIP) reports on its analysis of **2012-2013 on-line voter registrations in nine counties.**

EIP's analyses of voter lists in nine counties show that the on-line registration system lacks sufficient safeguards to prevent duplications of existing voters.

- ✓ Authorized by Governor Brown and launched September 19, 2012.
- ✓ More than 500,000 Californians registered on line during that period.
- ✓ EIP found that 6,080 persons duplicated their voter registrations.
 - * **113 of them appear to have voted twice on November 6, 2012.**
- ✓ **Over 4,500 of these duplicates occurred in Los Angeles County.**
- ✓ Duplications were not identified and cleared up before the 2012 election.
- ✓ Duplications still on the counties' books as of summer-fall 2013.

2012

1. CA "Top Two Primary" (Prop 14) goes into effect.

- **Moves CA into functioning as a Democracy rather than as a Republic.**
 - Article 4, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution states that "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a **republican** form of Government."
 - The rights of voters of minority opinion or affiliation, which are protected in a republic, **are no longer protected** in CA.
 - Under the Top Two Primary system, voters affiliated with political parties other than the major two will **never** have a candidate reflective of their values on the General Election ballot.
 - **This situation is very likely to result in voter suppression.**
- Voters approved the proposition largely because of deceptive, large-money media campaign and the misleading ballot title.

2013

1. CA passes AB 817, enabling non-citizens to be poll workers.

- There are "qualifications" stipulated in the law, but **no way to verify that poll workers meet those qualifications.**
- The law facilitates foreign intervention by making it possible for non-citizens to be part of the polling location management.
- EIP Observers report that many do not speak or understand English, which is a mandatory requirement for poll working.

- In some polls, EIP observers documented that not a single poll worker could assist an English-speaking voter.
- **Non-citizens now have hands-on involvement in CA's election process**, even though they have not:
 - Relinquished allegiance to their native country.
 - Relinquished allegiance to their foreign leaders.
 - Sworn allegiance to the United States.

2014

1. California begins issuing driver licenses to non-citizens – direct path to voter registration.

- CA elections officials, up to and including the SOS, are barred from accessing DMV and DHS information regarding non-citizens and illegal aliens; no way to ascertain citizenship status of registrant other than self-identification.

2. Counties cleared to do all vote-by-mail elections for special elections (AB 1873 - San Diego County; AB 2028 - San Mateo).

- Begins the move toward all vote-by-mail for the entire state. Subjects all ballots to “processing” behind closed doors where anything can happen to subvert the security of each ballot and the accuracy of the count.

3. CA passes SB 29, allowing vote-by-mail ballots postmarked by Election Day to arrive up to 3 days late and be counted; allows for acceptance of late ballots even without a postmark.

- Begins to implement the philosophy of “grace periods” that enable election manipulation after totals become public; begins to undermine the mandate for responsible self-governance.

4. CA passes SB 113 lowering the pre-registration age to 16.

- Introduces chaos into voter rolls; results in people under 18 receiving election and voting materials because there is no effective “firewall” in the rolls separating registered and pre-registered individuals.

5. CA passes SB 1063—Mandates state and local juvenile detention centers to identify residents eligible to vote and to assist them in filling out registration affidavits.

- Floods the voter rolls with troubled and criminal youth who are highly susceptible to influence and manipulation by those in direct power over every aspect of their lives; voting is a privilege for *free* people; those remanded to any aspect of the penal system are NOT free by virtue of their own decisions and actions.

2015

1. **CA passes AB 363, authorizing county elections officials to account for ballots at the central counting place rather than at the polls.**

- Moves attempted resolution of discrepancies between issued and cast ballots at the polling place away from the point of error to the central counting place where officials will not have the experience or information to determine correct accounting; removes essential transparency by allowing one more process of ballot handling to be done ‘behind closed doors’.

2. **CA passes AB 477—Establishes the curing process for unsigned ballots—requires curing within 8 days after Election Day.**

- Lowers the bar for expectation of individual voter responsibility; ensures fewer voters will be disenfranchised, but begins the slow creep toward the ridiculous that peaks in 2020 with a “temporary” 17-day grace period and is then codified as a permanent 7-day grace period in 2021.

3. **CA passes AB 547, extending the all-vote-by-mail pilot program in San Diego County through January 1, 2021.**

- See notes on 2014 AB 1873 above.

4. **CA passes AB 554, extending ability of non-citizen 16- and 17-year-olds to act as elections officials (poll workers).**

- See notes on 2013 AB 817 above.

5. **CA passes AB 952, mandating that council members appointed to fill vacancies remain in office until the next regular election for which a timely election can be accomplished.**

- By eliminating special elections to fill vacancies, this bill removes the power of the people to be governed by individuals of their choice, and solidifies power of the official(s) making the appointments.

6. **CA passes AB 1020 regarding reasons for cancelling registrations; eliminates as a reason for cancellation the official notification that the voter is registered in another county.**

- Allows voters to be officially registered to vote in more than one county in the same state.

7. **CA passes AB 1100, increasing the filing fee for a proposed ballot initiative or referendum from \$100 to \$1,000.**

- Provides potential discouragement to file frivolous or nonsense initiatives or referenda, but also begins the process of making self-governance through direct democracy more difficult (see laws passed in future years imposing further and more severe roadblocks).

8. CA passes AB 1461 (New Motor Voter Program): voter registration and re-registration becomes automatic for “each person who submits an application for a driver’s license or identification card...or who notifies the department of a change of address.”

- Registration is automatic through DMV interaction unless voter proactively requests not to be registered; DMV is not responsible to determine eligibility, even though they have that information.
- Odd requirement in added EC 2265: “a person whose party preference is designated as “Unknown” [no party preference] shall not be counted for purposes of determining the total number of voters registered on the specified day preceding an election.”
- Given the ease of voter impersonation and ballot harvesting in CA, this multiplies exponentially the opportunity for undetectable fraudulent voting.
- Non-citizens WILL become registered with or without their knowledge – this inevitability is admitted in the text of the law itself.
- Any non-citizen who becomes registered and/or votes shall be “presumed to have acted with official authorization and shall not be guilty of fraudulently voting” – opens an enormous window for foreign influence and non-citizen manipulation with no accountability.

NOTE: Immigrants legally here and on path to citizenship may become registered without their knowledge or permission; upon applying for citizenship, they will be found guilty of a felony, denied citizenship and deported.

- DMV requires proof of citizenship and residency before issuing a license. Even though an individual unable to prove eligibility is not authorized to be uploaded for registration, the impossibility of proper training, supervision and oversight of so many DVM clerks opens the door to countless noncitizens becoming registered to vote; the law specifically states that the DMV is NOT required or expected to determine eligibility for voter registration and voting.
 - 2018--DMV admits to clerical errors affecting over 105,000 registrants within months after implementation. Errors include incorrect recording of party affiliation and desired voting method and 1,600 registered despite requested opt-out, creating duplicates and unlawful registrations; DMV admits that some non-citizens are erroneously registered.
 - The DMV process becomes a great source of registration error due to voters who are not computer savvy, as the software is complicated and the default is “permanent vote-by-mail” and “decline to state” party affiliation. Because of state party rules, this situation disenfranchises unsuspecting Republicans from participating in that party’s presidential primary in 2016 and 2020.
- AB 1461 allows pre-registration of 16- and 17-year-olds with the promise they won’t be activated until their 18th birthday.
 - Reports to EIPCa are that minors are showing up on the **active** voter rolls.

- Labor-intensive for ROVs since it is highly unlikely that residency information of 16-17-year-olds will remain consistent for the next two years.
- High schools hold registration drives on campus, conducted by untrained individuals. Allows vulnerable teens to be shepherded into teacher-suggested party affiliation and selection of permanent vote-by-mail status, making their votes more susceptible to manipulation and error. Also hurts many students who are non-citizens but who become registered due to ignorance or peer group pressure, and thus they forfeit any qualification for future citizenship.

9. EIP research and documentation triggers hearing by CA Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

- Full day testimony of citizens from all over the state.
- Documentation signed under penalty of perjury by EIP volunteers.
- Evidence that the civil rights of all CA citizens are being violated.
- Testimony focuses on chaos and unlawful behavior of LA County ROV and poll workers.
- The Regional Director states that citizen testimony and documentation are extremely troubling, and that similar hearings should be held in other states.
 - Regional Director removed during process of writing report with recommendations.
 - His replacement never visits CA and is later was removed from the position.
 - The required report is delayed, heavily redacted and generalized so that damaging specific testimony is not included, and the entire report is buried entirely for quite some time. (Redacted report finally resurfaces in July, 2017 and is dismissed by the national Commission.)

10. CA passes AB 1504, authorizing Monterey and Sacramento counties to conduct all-mailed ballot elections under the same program as Yolo, San Diego and San Mateo – extends all through January 1, 2018.

- See notes on 2014 AB 1873 above—evidence of the ultimate goal of all-state vote by mail.

11. CA passes SB 439, allowing county elections officials to offer conditional voter registration (same day registration) and provisional voting at satellite offices other than on Election Day.

12. CA passes SB 505, removing mandatory standardization of the Voter Bill of Rights, instead authorizing the Secretary of State to revise the wording “as necessary to ensure understanding.”

- Conjures up the specter of the “Ten Commandments” painted on the barn in *Animal Farm* by George Orwell and how they changed over time until they were exactly the opposite of how they began.

2016

1. CA passes AB 278 and AB 2220; both extend to permission of legislative body of a city to adopt an ordinance that requires district rather than at-large representation without seeking voter approval to cities of any size.

- Encourages “balkanization”, division; causes citizens to focus on their differences rather than their commonalities; begins to crumble the “one nation...indivisible.”

2. CA passes AB 1921 allowing unlimited number of mail ballots to be turned in by anyone, regardless of relationship to voter (“unrestricted ballot harvesting”); also allows mail ballots to be submitted anywhere in the state.

- Eliminates chain of custody and legalizes wholesale ballot harvesting prohibited in most other states, and considered a felony in many.
- **Prohibits disqualifying a ballot** solely because the person returning it does not provide name, relationship to the voter or signature (i.e., does not follow the law).
- Facilitates voter intimidation, harassment, vote selling, manipulation of vulnerable populations and more. Documentation in 2018 and 2020 bears out the validity of these concerns.
- Requires already heavily burdened ROVs to find out-of-county ballots and forward them to the proper county within 8 days.
- Extends the time ROVs have to count last minute mail ballots, thus severely shortening the time to process an ever-growing number of provisional ballots.

NOTE: In the June 7, 2016 primary election several troubling patterns emerge statewide that result in a huge spike in Provisional Ballot use:

- Voters’ party affiliation changed without their permission or knowledge.
- Voters who requested party change before registration deadline found their request was not processed.
- Disturbing spike in vote-by-mail voters not receiving their ballots.
- Disturbing spike in voters changed to vote-by-mail without their request or knowledge, and not receiving ballot in mail—result: potential illegal ballot harvesting and disenfranchisement.

FURTHER NOTE: The last two situations mentioned have been growing in number in each election since our research began in 2012; a new spike was reached in November, 2018.

3. CA passes AB 2021, giving international election observers “uniform and nondiscriminatory access to all stages of the election process that are open to the public.”

- EC §§ 2300 (9a, b)(10) and 15100 – 15105 give citizens the right to observe (close enough to see and hear) and document every aspect of the election process.
- Consistent and numerous EIPCa Observer Incident Reports, signed under penalty of perjury, document that observer rights are limited, interfered with or outright denied by

some county officials. EIPCa’s lawsuit against Ventura County for egregious violations of observer rights is expected to be heard in court before summer of 2023.

- Concern exists that international elections observers may be granted more access than California’s own citizens.

4. CA passes AB 2389, allowing governing body of a special district to require, by resolution, that its members be elected by district rather than at-large representation without seeking voter approval.

- Extension of agenda begun with AB 2220.

5. CA passes AB 2686, authorizing San Diego County to conduct all mail ballot special elections to fill congressional or legislative vacancies and for recall of local officers.

- See notes on 2014 AB 1873 above—evidence of the ultimate goal of all-state vote by mail.

6. CA passes SB 450, establishing the “Voter’s Choice Act”; also extends authorization for all mail ballot special elections to all cities with population under 100,000; allows L.A. County to conduct special elections as all vote by mail.

- In light of California’s lack of voter roll maintenance, essentially facilitates election chaos and authorizes counties to greatly complicate and make inconvenient the right to vote in person. In counties that elect to accept the VCA:
 - Eliminates neighborhood precinct voting.
 - Sends mail ballot to every registered voter on the “active list”.
 - The 5 pilot counties that implemented in 2018 indicated that they had done so too soon and were therefore less prepared than they should have been; many ballots mishandled, and election results questionable.
 - Because voters in the 5 pilot counties were not properly educated as to their options for voting (right to vote in person), Vote Centers were sparsely used for in-person voting, but became overwhelmed on Election Day as excessive numbers of voters dropped off their ballots; ballot security was jeopardized as ballot containers became full to overflowing.
 - Depends on internet connectivity; no voting can take place if there is a breakdown (significant issues within multiple counties have been documented, most notably Los Angeles).
 - Relies on “clean” database and the efficiency of USPS to avoid disenfranchisement – neither of which can be guaranteed.
 - Distances voters from opportunity to vote in person in their neighborhood – each Vote Center services 10,000 registered voters, many of whom would have to travel a long distance.

- Impacts voters with disabilities and transportation issues, forcing them to use the much less secure mail-in ballot—removes voter choice.
- Huge waste of taxpayer money to print and mail thousands of ballots that will not get used and to staff Vote Centers for 11 days, the first 9 of which have panned out to show virtually no voting activity.

2017

1. CA issues Assembly Joint Resolution 1 urging U.S. Congress to propose a Constitutional Amendment to abolish the electoral college.

- Shows a complete ignorance of the substantive and essential difference between a Republic and a Democracy, and a lack of understanding of basic history of the founding of this country and the development of its founding documents.

2. CA issues Senate Joint Resolution 3 urging state legislatures and governors in all states to ratify the National Popular Vote movement that would require each state to ignore the preference of its citizens and award all Electoral College votes to the candidate garnering the largest number of popular votes.

- Shows disdain for the voting rights of the individuals in participating states, basically potentially silencing and disenfranchising the majority within each state.
- Shows a complete ignorance of the substantive and essential difference between a Republic and a Democracy, and a lack of understanding of basic history of the founding of this country and the development of its founding documents.

2018

1. CA passes AB 216, establishing state-paid postage for vote-by-mail ballots.

- Because of the preponderance of community drop boxes and ability for voters to authorize someone else to submit their ballot, the state's incurring this expense was completely unnecessary.
- The law also provides subtle incentive for voters to use USPS (2nd least safe way to submit a VBM ballot).

2. CA passes AB 306, allowing harvested ballots to be counted without documentation of chain of custody.

3. CA passes AB 1407, extending the Motor Voter Law mandates of automatic voter registration of all individuals who do not specifically request to opt out to the pre-registration of 16- and 17-year-olds.

4. CA passes AB 3075 requiring the establishment within the office of the SOS an Office of Elections Cybersecurity. Requires that office to monitor and counteract "false or misleading information regarding the electoral process" and mitigate information so designated, including educating voters, "especially new and unregistered voters."

- Does not require safeguards against state officials' overstepping boundaries for political reasons.

- Does not designate who will determine what is “false or misleading.”
- Carries with it all of the dangers of any official Ministry of Truth.

5. CA passes SB 759, implemented in November election under urgency clause, requiring counties to contact all voters whose mail ballots are considered for rejection so they can “cure” their vote

- While this law could potentially keep voters from being disenfranchised due to faulty signature rejection, there are significant “unintended” consequences (verification by voter is done by downloading a form online or responding with a form sent in the mail – voter may never see original envelope and may “verify” a fraudulent signature).
- Many counties send a copy of the signature in the voter’s file with the cure notice, which facilitates easy forgery.
- County officials, already pressed by certification deadline, and overwhelmed with mounting numbers of mail, conditional and provisional ballots—all time and labor-intensive, will not have the time or personnel to accomplish nor process voter outreach. This will inevitably lead to looser standards of signature match (already extremely liberal) and thus the counting of untold numbers of fraudulent ballots.
- Though the law limits this practice to a period of 8 days after receipt (potentially 16 days after Election Day), SOS Padilla issued an advisory in November 2018 that the practice can and should continue up to the date of certification.

6. CA passes SB 1171, solidifying Conditional Voter Registration (“same day”) and authorizing Provisional Ballot envelopes to be used as an affidavit of registration if needed.

- Opens the door for ineligible votes to be cast and counted.

2019

1. CA passes AB 679, allowing a person to “take up an abode at the same place at which the person does business.”

- It has long been mandatory to register at one’s domicile, not at a P.O. box or place of business. While it is understandable that someone may choose to reside in a “back room” of a business establishment for economic or security reasons, this law has NO provisions for checking on address legitimacy on a case-by-case basis. As a result, it opens wide the door to registration fraud. Illegitimate or fraudulent registrations may now be anchored to a business address in large numbers without challenge. As written, this law is a huge blow to the ability of elections officials to maintain the legitimacy of their voter rolls.

2. CA passes AB 693, allowing elections officials with real time access to the statewide voter registration database (VoteCal) to give a non-provisional ballot to a same day registrant.

- Any Conditional Voter Registrants (CVR) who are not found already listed on the VoteCal database are now allowed to vote non-provisionally.
 - EIPCa data analysis shows that VoteCal is fatally flawed and unreliable.
- This law is a blatant admission that a full eligibility check of a new registrant is immaterial to state officials (or at least the legislature).
 - A CVR may not be registered anywhere else but the registration must also be investigated: does the SS# or CDL# number align with the registrant's name? Does the residence address given align with the registrant's name? Is the address a legitimate residence address? Has the registrant's citizenship status been verified?
 - By failing to definitively answer the above questions before accepting a vote from an individual, the state tacitly admits it does not ask and answer those questions for any registrant.
- By allowing non-provisional votes to be cast by Conditional Voter Registrants, the state opens the door to a flood of illegitimate and fraudulent votes due to poll worker confusion or lack of training, as well as the state failures listed above.

3. CA passes AB 730, prohibiting distribution “with actual malice” of materially deceptive audio or visual media about a candidate “with the intent to injure the candidate’s reputation or to deceive” voters.

- While well-intentioned, the law fails to define “actual malice” or how it will be determined.
- The law equally fails to define how “intent” can or will be proven.
- This law, without the above specific limitations, opens the door to despotic and one-sided action by the state against a person or candidate it wishes to destroy.

4. CA passes AB 963, instituting complex programs on college and university campuses with the goal of increasing registration and voting by all students.

- While the surface purpose of encouraging voter participation of the 18 to 25-year-old age group is good, this mandatory program is highly expensive and has the very real potential of removing the students’ right to CHOOSE if and how to engage in civic affairs. It also has great potential for:
 - Partisan indoctrination and intimidation.
 - Facilitating registration and voting by ineligible individuals.
 - Jeopardizing of student funding status (cancellation of scholarships and other funding when official state of residence is changed).
 - Derailing legal immigrants’ path to citizenship.

5. CA passes AB 1036, instituting a complex pilot program on certain high-school campuses similar to the one implemented on college and university campuses by AB 963.

- While the surface purpose of educating teens with respect to civic engagement is good, this mandatory program has the same negatives as its university counterpart listed above.

6. CA passes SB 27, requiring providing the state with “every income tax return filed” with the IRS “in the five most recent taxable years” in order to be placed on the ballot as a candidate for president of the United States. Those returns would be made public.

- This law violates the privacy of a U. S. citizen simply for having the audacity to seek the presidency.
- This law will lead to much misinformation and misinterpretation, since most people are not educated in how to read and understand complicated tax documents.
- This law is discriminatory in the extreme.
- This law authorizes the state to intrude into the rights of political parties to nominate their chosen candidate for the presidency, and could disenfranchise all Californians from their vote in a presidential election.

7. CA passes SB 72, mandating Conditional Voter Registration (“same day registration”) in all polling locations.

- Puts undertrained, under-supervised and at times overwhelmed poll workers in a position to do great harm by making errors and allowing non-provisional ballots to be cast by ineligible voters.

8. CA passes SB 212, allowing school board elections to use rank-choice voting, if approved by the voters of that district.

- Sets up potential for the top vote getters to be declared the losers, which may create confusion, mistrust and ultimate apathy in the voting population.
- This lets the camel’s nose under the tent, and rank-choice voting may spread to other elected offices, magnifying the effect stated above.

9. CA passes SB 523, extending the “curing” process to two days before certification.

- While the surface intention of preventing disenfranchisement of eligible voters is good, this extension will intertwine the processing of vote-by-mail and provisional ballots, and potentially facilitate the counting of fraudulent ballots while the voter’s response is pending.
- The concern still exists that the time and labor needed to send a ballot through the curing process may act as an incentive to approve more questionable signatures rather than research them with the voter. Result: enables more mail ballot fraud.
- Pressure on elections officials to finalize election results acts as a disincentive to lengthen the process through waiting for a “cure”; officials will feel pressured to accept signatures without challenge to meet deadlines.

10. CA passes SB 641, extending authorization to conduct special elections to fill vacancies for Congressional Representatives, State Senators and State Assembly Members as all mail elections.

- More incremental creep toward the ultimate goal of removing the right to vote in-person altogether, forcing voters into a highly suspect and less secure form of voting.

11. CA passes SB 681, authorizing a proponent of a municipal or district referendum to withdraw the referendum up to 88 days before the election even if the referendum has qualified for the ballot.

- This law runs the risk of removing the choice of all signers of the referendum's petition.
- This law opens up the potential of undue influence or pressure on a proponent to scuttle a legitimate act of self-governance for all proponents and signers.

2020

1. CA passes AB 646, extending registration and voting eligibility to parolees.

- Parole is a period of trial for individuals believed to have the highest potential for rehabilitation and are therefore given an opportunity to serve the remaining portion of their sentence out of the penal institution to prove themselves. However, they are still severely restricted in choice and movement.
- Individuals on parole are highly susceptible to influence and manipulation by parole officers in direct power over every aspect of their lives; voting is a privilege for **free** people; those remanded to any aspect of the penal system are NOT free by virtue of their own decisions and actions.

2. CA passes AB 860, urgency legislation propelled by COVID concerns, mandating that all active registered voters be sent a vote-by-mail ballot. Valid for November 2020 only.

- This law fails to address the chaos and un-accounted-for ballots would be generated by the deplorable condition of the VoteCal database.
- Ballots postmarked by Election Day may arrive up to 17 days after Election Day and be counted. Eligibility of ballots with missing or illegible postmark will be determined by the date provided by the voter!

This outrageous and indefensible extended "grace period" enables election manipulation after totals become public; continues undermining the mandate for responsible self-governance.

- **Result:** Conservatively, approximately one-half million ballots were sent to the last-known address of "voters" who have been unreachable for at least 12 years, and most for decades longer. All of these ballots are ripe for abuse.
- **Result:** Voters who do not normally get a ballot by mail were confused, angry or upset, just as they were in the recent special election held, at the last minute, by mail. Some of these voters were disenfranchised by not knowing how to vote in person.

- **Result:** In-person voting was still to be facilitated, but was much less convenient (see SB 423 below).

3. CA passes SB 207 as an urgency bill, allowing voters to change party affiliation and other registration information at the moment of voting without having to fully re-register.

- This was primarily a “band-aid” designed to mitigate the voter roll chaos caused by AB 1461 (New Motor Voter.) Instead of suspending, rethinking and repairing the bill, the legislature and governor provided this “instant fix” in an attempt to calm voter frustration while allowing the underlying problem to continue.
- Certain VBM voters will be disenfranchised because of their inability to make an in-person, last-minute “repair” to their registration.
- This bill circumvents the prerogative of each political party to minimize external interference in their presidential candidate nomination process. The perceived protections intended by declaring a “closed primary” are completely irrelevant under this law.
- This bill was passed and signed long after poll worker training materials were prepared and printed, so poll workers for the 2020 presidential primary were ill-prepared to process this huge change in procedure.
- The bill did not designate any procedure for implementation, leaving each county to create on the fly its best understanding of how to incorporate the dictates of this new law. The result was complete inconsistency in voter experience throughout the state.

4. CA passes ACA 6, (approved as Proposition 17 in November 2020) restoring the franchise to felons during their period of parole.

- Felons rely on the good graces of their parole officer for their continued freedom, and are therefore subject to potential undue influence.
- Approximately 50% of parolees re-offend within the period of their parole. This law enfranchises individuals who have not yet proven their ability and willingness to commit to the social contract.

NOTE: California’s prison reforms and realignments over the last decade have reclassified many felonies such that sentences for all but the most heinous of felonies (murder, rape, child sexual abuse, human trafficking, etc.) are served in jail rather than in prison. All jailed offenders of any sort retain their franchise during their confinement and they are not subject to a parole requirement. This in itself is highly problematic, subjecting this vulnerable population to potential undue peer-group or supervisor pressure, influence and intimidation, from registration through mail ballot marking and posting.

NOTE: Proponents won this argument with voters largely by playing the race card, and by quoting certain studies that do not disaggregate behavior of different levels of offenders.

5. CA passes ACA 4, proposing enfranchising 17-year-olds for a primary election if they will be 18 by the date of the corresponding general election. ACA 4 became Proposition 18 on the November 2020 ballot, and was soundly rejected by California voters.

- This proposed constitutional change is a blatant attempt to enfranchise yet another population highly vulnerable to undue institutional influence. It failed this time, but there is already another effort in that direction proposed by the legislature.

6. CA passes SB 423, urgency legislation allowing consolidating of polling locations at county discretion, with polls open 4 days.

- Along with AB 860, fundamentally changed the voting process at the last minute for a vast number of voters. Communicating these changes to the entirety of the CA population was impossible. Very unwise in such a contentious presidential election year.
- Gave permission to consolidate precincts at the ratio of 10 precincts to 1 polling location. Normal election ratio is 1:1. Getting to the polls required often inconvenient travel. Locations were crowded, discouraging voters from voting in the safest manner.

7. On September 28, 2020, CA Secretary of State announces an emergency rulemaking action regarding signature verification ballot processing and counting.

- Some elements of these regulations appear to be overstepping executive authority by putting into place practices that either supersede previously legislated CA law or establish new elements of the election code, which is the sole purview of the legislative body.

8. As a final blow, CA counties followed the executive over-reach of the governor and imposed, in the name of COVID protection, restrictions on observer rights such that meaningful citizen oversight was effectively nullified. These policy restrictions illegally and unconstitutionally over-rode observer rights as codified in CA election codes §§ 2300 (9a, b)(10) and 15100 – 15105 without legislative action.

2021

1. CA passes AB 37 and SB 29, making universal mailing of vote by mail ballots to “active” voters permanent for all elections.

- Until (if ever) CA is able to rectify the chaotic condition of its voter rolls, ballots will be mailed to hundreds of thousands of individuals who are relocated or deceased.
- Taxpayers will fund the printing and mailing of hundreds of thousands of ballots that go unused.
- The potential for lost, stolen or otherwise abused and manipulated ballots is unchecked and ongoing.
- Election results will be subjective and approximate; they will also be heavily delayed at a time when voters are suspicious and other states are derisive regarding CA’s inability to produce timely results.

2. CA passes AB 796, strengthening the required automatic registration for all who interact with the DMV.

- The Constitution guarantees liberty to all Americans. That includes the liberty to choose. CA’s virtually mandatory DMV registration infringes upon that liberty.
- See arguments under 2015 AB 1461.

3. CA passes SB 503, requiring the assumption that the signature on a VBM ballot envelope is the voter's legitimate signature, specifying that an exact match is not required, and establishing several roadblocks to rejection of a signature; this bill also blocks observers from seeing addresses on the VBM ballot envelopes.

- Severe weakening of the sole verification method existing to ensure only legitimate ballots are opened and counted, especially after creating an atmosphere among CA voters that results in 80% or more voting by mail, severely jeopardizes the legitimacy of election results.

4. CA passes SB 714 authorizes the Democratic Party to allow non-citizens to be elected or appointed to their Central Committees.

- No country in the world allows the participation of non-citizens in any element of their governmental process. This extension of non-citizen "rights" is Step 2 (see 2013 AB 817 for Step 1) of the goal to destroy citizenship identity and solidify the potential of foreign intrusion in CA political life.

2022

1. CA passes AB 1416, extending requirements of ballot label for statewide measures and, at the option of the county, to include a listing of the people and organizations officially opposing or supporting the measure.

- This law unnecessarily lengthens the ballot, even at times pushing it to 2 cards.
- It also may confuse voters with more to read, and slow the in-person voting *process*.
- The law also makes the initiative process, already paperwork- and time- intensive, even more so, thus de-incentivizing volunteer and citizen activist groups from participating in the activities of self-governance.
- The exact same information is clearly delineated in the Voter Guide received by every voter.
- There is no need to spend the money to pay for the human hours to lengthen the ballot label, to fund the extra paper and ink to print (and mail) millions of ballots, and to make voting more confusing and stressful for the voter.

2. CA passes AB 2582, requiring that a recall election for a local officer include only whether the officer should be recalled and removed from office or not. The vacancy created as a result of a successful recall will be vacant until filled "according to law", not elected concurrently with the recall election.

Requires that recall ballots for state officers provide one blank line for the write-in vote. Petitions for recall of school board members must include an estimate of the cost of conducting a special election.

- This law discourages self-governance at the level closest to the people by making the recall process for local office a two-step process.
- Leaves the people without representation for a lengthy period of time if the recall is successful by separating the recall election from the subsequent election to fill the position;

- Makes local recalls twice as expensive for the taxpayer by requiring double the number of elections.

3. CA passes AB 2584, increasing the number of required signatures on a recall petition, assigned based on the office in question. Establishes those numbers.

- By increasing the number of signatures to qualify a recall, this law increases the difficulty of the people to self-govern, and could act as a discouragement for people to initiate any recall efforts.
- Makes statement and answer in the notice for recall subject to civil or criminal action or penalty in the case of any false, slanderous or libelous material.
- Repeats a lot of the mandates of AB 2582.

4. CA passes AB 2841, requiring certain notifications of results of regarding hearings of mental competence with regard to voting.

- Establishes as major qualification for voter registration in the case of individuals under conservatorship their ability to communicate, with or without reasonable accommodations, a desire to participate in the voting process.
- Specifies other liberal allowances for individuals in potentially questionable circumstances.

5. Sunsets section 2201 of Elections Code regarding canceling registrations due to death or relocation on January 1, 2024 and reinstates similar ones with extensive and redundant voter notification requirements.

- This law will significantly delay maintenance of voter rolls in the lead up to the 2024 Presidential Primary and General Elections and is likely to result in incalculable number of illegitimate votes cast in those elections.
- It will also potentially open the door to large numbers of new and potentially questionable registrations.

6. CA passes SB 1061, regarding any election to fill school district or community college district vacancy, requires request (petition) for election to include cost estimate on a per-pupil basis; changes required timing for said elections.

- A clear effort to discourage citizens from pursuing recall efforts.

**Clearly the Golden State Agenda is gaining momentum,
not only in California but across the country.**

It is firmly aimed at maximizing both the manipulation of vulnerable populations (youth, criminals, non-citizens) and the chaos, lack of election security and inaccuracy of potential electoral results engendered by the widespread (quickly becoming universal) vote-by-mail process.

**Essential to the Agenda's success is the crippling of citizen oversight and
the direct democracy opportunities of recall and citizen initiatives.**

**Governmental intrusions in the face of COVID-19 put the Agenda's progress into warp
drive, and full advantage is still being taken to pass further destructive laws.**

2023

1. **CA passes AB 292, clarifying and expanding methods for NPP voters to request partisan ballots as allowed by certain parties for Presidential Primary elections.**

- Allows requests for partisan ballots to be made by filling out the form mailed to the voter, and by email, fax, telephone and text request.
- Creates an inequality of standards in that voters making their request via the official form must verify their identity with a signature under penalty of perjury, whereas voters choosing any of the other methods of making the request are specifically excused from having to do so. For all four alternative methods, “the voter’s signature shall not be required.”
- Opens new threats to election integrity by opening further doors to voter impersonation.
- Also emphasizes informing NPP voters on procedures for requesting a remote access ballot (RAVBM). Given that each RAVBM requires duplication before tabulation, each ballot cast in this manner increases the potential for error and manipulation. This provision may act to generate a larger number of less secure ballots.

2. **CA passes AB 398, removing the requirement for the voter to provide a statement under penalty of perjury before receiving a replacement ballot.**

- Allows voters to receive a replacement ballot upon receipt of a written request, and removes the requirement to provide a signature under penalty of perjury attesting to their identity and to the fact that they have not already voted.
- Voters must only provide name, address and date of birth, opening another door to voter impersonation.

3. **CA passes AB 545, removing the necessity for an assisted voter to take an oath requesting assistance. Expands services to voters with disabilities.**

- Removes one more protection against voter intimidation by removing the oath requirement.
- Expands assistance methods to those in need, which is a good element of this bill.

4. **CA passes AB 626, allowing voters to use their vote by mail ballot free of its security envelope as a poll ballot if they are at their designated home precinct or a vote center. The right is contingent on the county’s ability to determine that the voter has not already voted and to electronically cancel the barcode on the return envelope provided for those voters.**

- EIPCa applauds this provision to voters who prefer to bypass as much technological interference in their vote casting experience as possible.
- The bill fails to provide any mandates or structure for educating voters with regard to this new right, nor for training poll workers to accommodate the changes. As of now, it appears that most counties have not made any effort to do so. This has the potential to create chaos at the polls

5. CA passes AB 969, prohibiting a hand count of votes in any regular election involving more than 1,000 voters and any special election involving more than 5,000 voters. No hand count may be conducted unless the plan is certified by the SOS.

Adopted as an urgency statute to stop Shasta County from implementing the hand count plan duly approved by their county BOS after extensive research and debate, and to stop any other county from following suit.

- Mandates the arrangement of a contract with a replacement election system company prior to the dissolution of a contract with another.
- Denies counties the autonomy to select the method of conducting elections best for their constituents and most conducive to valid results based on their own research.
- Flies in the face of best practices in virtually all other countries in the western world who have proven that voting machines and tabulators are a threat to fair, honest and transparent elections (as well as valid results) and a facilitator of election fraud.
- Codifies the use of election systems that more and more undeniably are being “outed” for their vulnerabilities to outside interference.
- Denies and ignores incontrovertible proof provided by cities, counties and numerous countries that hand counts can be done efficiently and effectively, providing reliable results quickly and without controversy.
- Begs the question as to whether the State’s desire to force universal use of a limited number of controversial elections systems may have its genesis in a nefarious underlying agenda.

6. CA passes AB 1539, establishing as a misdemeanor the act of voting in the same election in two different states.

- While this determination fills a void in California law, it sends a poor message. Rather than making clear and intentional vote fraud a serious crime, the law classifies it as a misdemeanor, a slap on the wrist that is unlikely to act as any kind of deterrent. Refusal to establish double voting as a serious crime shows a level of condoning that is unacceptable.

7. CA passes SB 485, strengthening the definition of and penalty for election interference.

- While appropriate to ensure there is no interference with or intimidation of elections workers doing their jobs, there is enough vagueness in the wording of this law to give elections officials leeway to interfere with or completely deny or even punish observers exercising their constitutional right to oversee elections.

APENDIX I

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact:

Ellen Swensen, EIP Chief Analyst
ellenswensen@eip-ca.com 925-286-1116

Linda Paine, President
linda@eip-ca.com 661-313-5251

CALIFORNIA'S ON-LINE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM LACKS SUFFICIENT SAFEGUARDS AND ENABLES VOTING FRAUD

Over 6,000 duplicate registrations generated on line in just nine counties, with over 100 appearing to vote twice on November 6, 2012.

SANTA CLARITA, CA. April 14, 2014- Election Integrity Project (EIP), a citizen-funded nonpartisan election oversight group, today reported on its analysis of 2012-2013 on-line voter registrations in nine counties. California's on-line registration system was authorized by Governor Brown and launched September 19, 2012, one month before the registration cut-off date for the 2012 Presidential Election. News reports at that time suggested that on-line voter registration was implemented to boost college-age registrations and help pass the Proposition 30 tax increase that was on the ballot. More than 500,000 Californians registered on line during that period.

EIP's analyses of voter lists in nine counties show that the on-line registration system lacks sufficient safeguards to prevent duplications of existing voters. The organization found that 6,080 persons duplicated their voter registrations using the on-line system. Over 4,500 of these duplicates occurred in Los Angeles County. Unfortunately, the duplications were not identified and cleared up by officials before the 2012 election and they were still on the counties' books as of summer-fall 2013. While voters may not have purposely duplicated their registrations, the system should have prevented the duplication of already-registered persons.

In addition to the 6,080 duplicates generated via the on-line system, **113 of these suspected duplicated registrants appear to have voted twice on November 6, 2012.** Almost half of these suspected double voters were college age (18-24), who were targeted for on line registration and Proposition 30 support in that election.

EIP President Linda Paine stated, "With serious list maintenance deficiencies in California counties and no single, statewide voter registration database in place, it was shocking that the Governor chose to authorize an online voter registration system that would potentially disenfranchise legitimate voters by ultimately enabling double voting."

EIP has submitted the duplicate registrations and suspected double voters to county election officials for investigation. California's chief election officer, Secretary of State Debra Bowen, has also been notified. There has been no response to EIP's expressed concerns about the on-line voter registration system from any election official, including Bowen and Los Angeles Co. Registrar Dean Logan. Additionally, EIP knows of only one EIP-reported case of unlawful voting that has been referred to law enforcement by election officials.

APENDIX II

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact:

Ellen Swensen, EIP Chief Analyst
ellenswensen@eip-ca.com 925-286-1116

Linda Paine, President
linda@eip-ca.com 661-313-5251

ELECTION INTEGRITY PROJECT® SUBMITS 60,000 VOTER LIST IRREGULARITIES TO LA COUNTY REGISTRAR

LA County has twice the rate of suspected illegitimate registrations of other counties.

SANTA CLARITA, CA. January 30, 2014- Election Integrity Project (EIP), an independent, non-partisan citizen organization, today sent its third set of registration irregularities to Los Angeles County Registrar Dean Logan for investigation. The third submittal brings the total reported irregularities to 60,352. Previous reports were sent on September 13, 2013 and December 12, 2013.

The suspected irregularities include 37,675 registrants that appear to be registered more than once in the county, 14,958 suspected deceased registrants, and 5,330 registrants that appear to be registered in both LA and San Diego counties. EIP has also submitted 2,389 registrants that appear to have double voted in an election or voted after date of death.

The Registrar's office has only responded to the initial September 13 report, stating that it had conducted a review to authenticate the integrity of the information EIP provided and was referring it to their voter records staff to update their registration information accordingly. The Registrar's office has not denied the validity of any of the reported irregularities, yet EIP's December 12 request for a meeting to discuss the findings has gone unanswered.

About the reports of unlawful voting, the Registrar's office said it will "refer any irregularities identified and/or confirmed to the appropriate law enforcement authorities." EIP's request for a copy of each law enforcement referral has also gone unanswered.

"LA County is large, so one would expect larger numbers of irregularities than other counties. What's troubling is that LA County has more than double the irregularities on a *per-registrant* basis than other large counties such as San Diego and Riverside," said EIP President Linda Paine. "A reasonable question is why?"

Election Integrity Project seeks to answer this question, its goal being to improve voter confidence in

California's elections. One step in attaining this goal is to request feedback from county entities about their compliance with Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act. Section 8 requires state and local officials to maintain voter lists in an accurate and timely manner and to inactivate or cancel records when legally indicated, such as when a registrant moves out of county or dies. In the case of LA County, the question remains unanswered.