



**MEMBERS:**

SEN. LANA THEIS, MAJORITY VICE CHAIR  
SEN. JOHN BIZON  
SEN. JEFF IRWIN, MINORITY VICE CHAIR

**THE SENATE**  
**COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT**  
**SENATOR EDWARD MCBROOM**  
**CHAIR**

7200 BINSFELD OFFICE BUILDING  
P.O. BOX 30036  
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909-7536  
PHONE: 37840  
FAX: 33932

May 28, 2021

Dear Mr. Colbeck,

Thank you for taking the time to respond to my earlier letter. I apologize that this response has not been timelier. You are fully aware of my personal situation and I can assure you, in addition to that, I have spent countless hours over the last several months working on these issues, including combing through your own materials, some of which I paid for, both submitted earlier and more recently. I remain committed to doing all I can to uncover and declare what is true.

I will not apologize for methods or pace of the committee to you or anyone. You are not the only person who has communicated with me on a regular basis regarding the election nor were you the only one I chose not to take into my counsels. It was, and remains, my judgement, as a public servant, requested by my colleagues and many citizens to provide an extensive investigation into these matters, that playing close with parties to the matter was unseemly and unwise, as well as potentially biasing. Beyond that, I simply have not had the time to return every call, especially when it was apparent or possible that the expectation of two-way communication was to also advantage the other party's interests and efforts and may have even become a talking point to be later used to provide gravitas to that party's own efforts. I treated you the same way I treated others. If that seems cool and unfriendly to you, whom I have long considered a friend, I can only say that I hoped you would understand and trust me.

I did not leak the letter, nor did I ask for it to be. However, as your receipt of the so-called challenge to testify was public, your calls to be heard in committee were public, and your subsequent reactions have been so public, I very much am confused by your seeming offense to the letter being public.

You impugn me and my motives without attempting to verify them and have now gone so far as to releasing our own text conversations. You completely ignored my personal concerns for you instead dredging up old and completely irrelevant claims that are as pejorative as they are self-serving. You accuse me of disparaging you in the media, which I have very purposefully tried to avoid. Even when you privately tried to trick me into an admittance of some private disparagement of you to a mutual friend, I was able to show you that was not at all the spirit of what I said- to which you did not respond at all. You accuse me of taking on the role of a judge and prosecutor when I simply offered a warning any attorney worth his salt would about sitting under oath in front of an inquiry while also being sued in a court of law over those same matters. I have ZERO interest in judging you on this or other matters, however; my warning stands: questions about the lawsuit against you are relevant to the Committee's work and I will not shield you from such questions.

Regardless, the original purpose of the first letter has been lost and despite my earnest desire to debate each point with you, all that really matters now is obtaining your answer. Namely, do you now hold new information of probative value to the work of the Committee?

You have already appeared in front of the Committee. You provided more than one hour of testimony. You have also prepared, and made available for money, which I paid, your arguments regarding the election in more than 80 pages/slides entitled "Case for Michigan Decertification," and also in numerous speeches, blogs, posts, and appearances. You now claim to have additional, compelling information to share with the Committee that we have not yet heard but nothing in any of those sources I just referenced has contained information new to the committee. It is entirely reasonable to ask to be briefed either concisely or extensively before taking the valuable time of the Committee members to hear what may have already been heard from you or another source.

If I were not willing to accept and risk the messiness of the process or practice courage why did I allow you and others to come, unscripted and with no limitations? Why did I provide a full day for all first-hand witnesses to testify and all others to provide unlimited, written testimony? You have the incredible gall to suggest I am not willing to put my own words and convictions into practice.

Yet, I still desire to know, if you truly do have new and compelling information. Why? Because you say that you do, and I desperately want to believe that the friend I first made in 2011 is still the honest and intelligent man I know him to be. So, I will ask again for you to share with me what this new, previously unheard evidence is. I am only interested in uncovering truth in all these matters and I am committed to publicly airing truth, wherever it takes us. But it is far from inappropriate for me, as the Chair, to preview materials before submitting them to the Committee. All I ask is that you provide evidence that your additional testimony is not a rehash of what you or others have already made available.

As before, please forward communication and materials in response to this to [pburns@senate.michigan.gov](mailto:pburns@senate.michigan.gov) and do so by 6/3/2021.

Whether you continue to choose to pursue such an appearance or not, I am committed to not carrying out any of our conversation in public. You are my brother and it is good that brothers dwell in peace together. Also, no disagreement between brothers ought to bring the name of Christ into disrepute.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ed McBroom". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Ed McBroom, Chair  
Senate Oversight Committee

P.S.- Regardless of whether you have *new* information to present to the Committee I would appreciate a better understanding of pages 26-28 of your report. Particularly, what is the source of the "incremental" votes in these tables and the "spike."