

**Election Integrity Scorecard 2021**  
**Election Hygiene status in Virginia**  
**State of Virginia**  
**Five Counties**  
**Prince William, Fairfax, Loudoun, Arlington, and Chesterfield**  
**A quantitative and qualitative assessment**  
**Chesterfield County under review**

Factors	State of Virginia	Prince William County	Fairfax	Loudoun	Arlington																																																		
Overall Election Integrity Score (higher number is better)	-11 (Failing)	-20 (Failing)	-15 (Failing)	-15 (Failing)	-13 (Failing)																																																		
Election Commissioner	Chris Piper	Michele White	Scott O. Kropf	Kristen Kalina	Matthew J. Weinstein (D), Chairman																																																		
Tel Number	804-864-8903	703-792-6472	703-222-0706	703-777-0380	703-228-3456																																																		
Email	<a href="mailto:chris.piper@elections.virginia.gov">chris.piper@elections.virginia.gov</a>	<a href="mailto:MWhite@pwgov.org">MWhite@pwgov.org</a>	<a href="mailto:scott.kropf@fairfaxcounty.gov">scott.kropf@fairfaxcounty.gov</a>	<a href="mailto:ekalina@loudoun.gov">ekalina@loudoun.gov</a>	<a href="mailto:mweinstein@arlington.gov">mweinstein@arlington.gov</a>																																																		
Nov 3, 2020 Voting State Certified	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Absentee</th> <th>In Person</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Provisional</th> <th>Total Cumulative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2,687,304</td> <td>1,774,862</td> <td>60%</td> <td>25,155</td> <td>4,487,321</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative	2,687,304	1,774,862	60%	25,155	4,487,321	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Absentee</th> <th>In Person</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Provisional</th> <th>Total Cumulative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>169,929</td> <td>57,468</td> <td>74%</td> <td>1,355</td> <td>228,752</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative	169,929	57,468	74%	1,355	228,752	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Absentee</th> <th>In Person</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Provisional</th> <th>Total Cumulative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>415,227</td> <td>186,204</td> <td>69%</td> <td>4,124</td> <td>605,555</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative	415,227	186,204	69%	4,124	605,555	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Absentee</th> <th>In Person</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Provisional</th> <th>Total Cumulative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>156,164</td> <td>68,698</td> <td>69%</td> <td>809</td> <td>225,671</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative	156,164	68,698	69%	809	225,671	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Absentee</th> <th>In Person</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Provisional</th> <th>Total Cumulative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>107,822</td> <td>130,699</td> <td>83%</td> <td>427</td> <td>238,948</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative	107,822	130,699	83%	427	238,948
Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative																																																			
2,687,304	1,774,862	60%	25,155	4,487,321																																																			
Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative																																																			
169,929	57,468	74%	1,355	228,752																																																			
Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative																																																			
415,227	186,204	69%	4,124	605,555																																																			
Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative																																																			
156,164	68,698	69%	809	225,671																																																			
Absentee	In Person	Percentage	Provisional	Total Cumulative																																																			
107,822	130,699	83%	427	238,948																																																			
1	<p>Viewer Polls have properly been vetted against any daily elections. Prince William County was sampled in 2020 and showed a 12% unlawful voters on the voting rolls.</p>	<p>Although a County responsibility, no action by State is evident.</p>	<p>Election Commissioner queried multiple times with either no acknowledgment or an apparent understanding of the issue.</p>	<p>Election Commissioner queried multiple times and was very helpful and cooperative, but no action evident to date.</p>	<p>Viewer Registrar and County Clerk employees transfer their FOMAs requests. There was no direct correspondence with Election Board members. After several emails back and forth with Judicial Services personnel we progressed from "no public records exist" to learning that asking for "disqualified jurors" got a response. Loudoun upgraded their juror system in 2020 for which they attribute the jump of disqualified jurors between 2019 (18,211) and 2020 (24,307). To get the subcategories of those numbers they charged \$100. Fairfax County charged \$4 for a similar response, other counties provided more detailed responses at no charge. In Virginia administration systems to manage jurors vary by county, as do systems used by electronic courts and law enforcement. For improving accuracy of voter rolls, they provided an "Information Item" created and presented on the January 7, 2021 to the Loudoun County Electoral Board on current list maintenance activities and an "Action Item" presented and adopted at the March 25, 2021 of the Loudoun County Electoral Board to conduct an annual "Juror Notice Campaign" if</p>	<p>Voting Registrar and county clerk employees handled our FOIA requests. There was no direct correspondence with Election Board members. We received documentation of Va state guidelines and procedures for managing voter rolls, implying smooth operations excluding a 2019 glitch impacting OMR recently records of people identifying as non-citizens. It was remedied by reprogramming and adding new procedures.</p>																																																	
2	<p>Demonstration that County Voting Roll and State Oversight are healthy compliant, returns and database is free of errors of registration to confirm lawfulness of voters, and Voting Roll and procedures are compliant with 19C-512. Two additional violations of Federal law are being willfully conducted by the State of Virginia. The National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993 and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 require that voters must present valid identification at the time of registration. The levy of purging throughout legislation in 2020 signed by the Governor of Virginia overrode federal maintenance requirements of the Department of Motor Vehicles. The new legislation requires that the voter registration form only have a box to check an eligibility with no evidence required. Therefore, the State is willfully not following Federal Law and allowing an unlawful enforcement to exist in the most sacred of citizens responsibilities in the United States.</p>	<p>State is willfully non-complying with Federal Law and willfully allowing unlawful citizens to vote in Federal Elections.</p>	<p>County is willfully non-complying with Federal Law and willfully allowing unlawful citizens to vote in Federal Elections.</p>	<p>County is willfully non-complying with Federal Law and willfully allowing unlawful citizens to vote in Federal Elections.</p>	<p>County is willfully non-complying with Federal Law and willfully allowing unlawful citizens to vote in Federal Elections.</p>																																																		
3	<p>Election Commissioner and Election Board demonstrate transparency on election matters including contractual support for Auditing including Election Machine Contracts, Election Management Services, and ability to operate, function, and be responsive without undue consultation with Election Management Service</p>	<p>Rejected lawful and reasonable FOIA requests multiple times. Responses showed significant lack of knowledge of State, Federal Law, and significant awkwardness on demonstrated ability. Writing on overly broad legal citations demonstrated an inability to precisely respond to reasonable requests. Election Board met to discuss Election Commissioners future with Board and Election Commissioners resigned</p>	<p>Fairfax County's Election Office is very knowledgeable of FOIA procedures. They have been very cooperative to date on all FOIA requests.</p>	<p>Was immediately responsive on these matters, showed transparency, and demonstrated ability to dialogue and converse without undue coordination with Election Management Service Providers or Consultants.</p>	<p>Was immediately responsive on these matters, provided order forms and invoices.</p>																																																		
4	<p>Remediation and response status of Department of Elections to the 2018 Joint Legislative Audit Review Commission (JLARC) report listed deficiencies and recommendations on F, I, and J. Some address legislative branch action, but many do have specific actions for the executive branch in Virginia. No demonstrated action at State level</p>	<p>JLARC report listed deficiencies and recommendations on F, I, and J. Some address legislative branch action, but many do have specific actions for the executive branch in Virginia. Several actions cite voter roll issues that are a key responsibility at the County level. No demonstrated action at the County level</p>	<p>JLARC report listed deficiencies and recommendations on F, I, and J. Some address legislative branch action, but many do have specific actions for the executive branch in Virginia. Several actions cite voter roll issues that are a key responsibility at the County level. No demonstrated action at the County level</p>	<p>JLARC report listed deficiencies and recommendations on F, I, and J. Some address legislative branch action, but many do have specific actions for the executive branch in Virginia. Several actions cite voter roll issues that are a key responsibility at the County level. No demonstrated action at the County level</p>	<p>JLARC report listed deficiencies and recommendations on F, I, and J. Some address legislative branch action, but many do have specific actions for the executive branch in Virginia. Several actions cite voter roll issues that are a key responsibility at the County level. No demonstrated action at the County level</p>																																																		
5	<p>Absentee Ballots have reasonable control measures for issuance, receipt, and processing to ensure no voter is disenfranchised. Prior to 2020, Absentee Ballots had reasonable control measures for issuance, receipt, and processing to ensure no voter is disenfranchised and election results could be audited. Legislation passed by the legislature and enacted by Governor in summer of 2020 created new voter category of "Absentee" and Central Counting Facilities that lumped together new and legacy voter categories to whom the significant majority of ballots are handled in the Central Counting Facilities (CCF) with little public transparency. Furthermore, within this new category there is a combination of voters by precinct, which indicates any precinct ability to analyze voter turnout by precinct, such changes fundamentally disincentivized to audit auditing of election results by precinct and which greatly impeded the risk limiting ability, in summary terms, by creating a larger pool of voters with no ability to disaggregate them by precinct, and how results it, thereby to disenfranchise voter and ensure to keep the ballot box with tens of thousands of illegal votes, and near impossible to detect either.</p>	<p>Legislation and enacted regulation appear to have no reasonable control measures to ascertain authenticity (for example, separate optical scanning to ensure authenticity before feeding into an election machine). Central Counting Facilities have little to no transparency. The current state of affairs on absentee ballot issuance and handling offer receipt go against the current stated best practices and letter and spirit of the Carter Center, considered the gold standard on free and fair elections.</p>	<p>Legislation and enacted regulation appear to have no reasonable control measures to ascertain authenticity (for example, separate optical scanning to ensure authenticity before feeding into an election machine). Central Counting Facilities have little to no transparency. The current state of affairs on absentee ballot issuance and handling offer receipt go against the current stated best practices and letter and spirit of the Carter Center, considered the gold standard on free and fair elections.</p>	<p>Legislation and enacted regulation appear to have no reasonable control measures to ascertain authenticity (for example, separate optical scanning to ensure authenticity before feeding into an election machine). Central Counting Facilities have little to no transparency. The current state of affairs on absentee ballot issuance and handling offer receipt go against the current stated best practices and letter and spirit of the Carter Center, considered the gold standard on free and fair elections. Loudoun appears to be involved in CCF Grant Program from Big Tech</p>	<p>Used 5267k or grant funds from CCF to scale up from 7 person operation to over 100 employees spread across 8 different sites running 18 hours, 6 days a week. 5157k was spent on temporary staffing. Registrar reported on CCF feedback form that with current resources it's a struggle to accomplish highly demanding tasks. There are no resources left over for a basic outreach program, or to introduce technologies for increasing communications for voters. For 2023 Arlington is planning to use Facebook online training Facebook has offered to provide a Social Media Best Practices webinar about the elections administration in Virginia. This webinar will reach about the latest best, products and resources to keep accounts safe and connect with constituents and voters. Facebook has offered to design the website in the way that would best fit the audience.</p>																																																		
6	<p>Optical scanning of incoming ballots to determine authenticity</p>	<p>A separate and distinct optical scan of incoming ballots before they are entered into an election machine is a reasonable control measure to ensure the validity of an incoming ballot. This will review whether an incoming ballot is lawful by several measures: was it ever mailed out to a recipient, is it an original ballot, whether it is a copy of another ballot, paper weight and weave against county and state standards, and other reasonable metrics. Technology to conduct this step is available at reasonable cost and can be done rapidly and on scale at the new Central Counting Facilities established by state law and in full public transparency. This is primarily a county responsibility, but state guidance is necessary to fully implement the spirit and intent of the 2020 laws enacted by the Virginia Governor. This reasonable control measure is in the spirit, intent, and letter of Carter Center guidance on conduct of elections that allow substantive voting other than in-person.</p>	<p>A separate and distinct optical scan of incoming ballots before they are entered into an election machine is a reasonable control measure to ensure the validity of an incoming ballot. This will review whether an incoming ballot is lawful by several measures: was it ever mailed out to a recipient, is it an original ballot, whether it is a copy of another ballot, paper weight and weave against county and state standards, and other reasonable metrics. Technology to conduct this step is available at reasonable cost and can be done rapidly and on scale at the new Central Counting Facilities established by state law and in full public transparency. This is primarily a county responsibility to fully implement the spirit and intent of the 2020 laws enacted by the Virginia Governor. A reasonable control measure is in the spirit, intent, and letter of Carter Center guidance on conduct of elections that allow substantive voting other than in-person.</p>	<p>Loudoun County applied for a grant from CCF on Sept 29, 2020. Thirty days before the Nov 3, 2020 election. On the grant application they stated feedback form that with current resources it's a struggle to accomplish highly demanding tasks. There are no resources left over for a basic outreach program, or to introduce technologies for increasing communications for voters. For 2023 Arlington is planning to use Facebook online training Facebook has offered to provide a Social Media Best Practices webinar about the elections administration in Virginia. This webinar will reach about the latest best, products and resources to keep accounts safe and connect with constituents and voters. Facebook has offered to design the website in the way that would best fit the audience.</p>	<p>Multiple of budget goes into voting systems/equipment to Arlington, Inverness Facebook and its surrogate CCF to operate. For example, used over 100 employees spread across 8 different sites running 18 hours, 6 days a week. 5157k was spent on temporary staffing. Registrar reported on CCF feedback form that with current resources it's a struggle to accomplish highly demanding tasks. There are no resources left over for a basic outreach program, or to introduce technologies for increasing communications for voters. For 2023 Arlington is planning to use Facebook online training Facebook has offered to provide a Social Media Best Practices webinar about the elections administration in Virginia. This webinar will reach about the latest best, products and resources to keep accounts safe and connect with constituents and voters. Facebook has offered to design the website in the way that would best fit the audience.</p>																																																		
7	<p>Application of the Virginia Court Decision on the Row/Heck case represented by the Public Interest Legal Foundation. The public need to see the quantitative effect of this court ruling on the election of November 2020. This relates to the tallying of ballots received after 72 hours.</p>	<p>This is a major court decision and the quantitative effect on the November 2020 election needs to be applied. It is the County's legal obligation, duty, and requirement to adjust the vote totals based on this court decision. No demonstrable action has occurred despite specific requests for action. This is primarily a County action and responsibility, however the State Department of Elections needs to provide decisive oversight and ensure compliance with the Court Decision.</p>	<p>This is a major court decision and the quantitative effect on the November 2020 election needs to be applied. It is the County's legal obligation, duty, and requirement to adjust the vote totals based on this court decision. No demonstrable action has occurred despite specific requests for action.</p>	<p>This is a major court decision and the quantitative effect on the November 2020 election needs to be applied. It is the County's legal obligation, duty, and requirement to adjust the vote totals based on this court decision. No demonstrable action has occurred despite specific requests for action.</p>	<p>This is a major court decision and the quantitative effect on the November 2020 election needs to be applied. It is the County's legal obligation, duty, and requirement to adjust the vote totals based on this court decision. No demonstrable action has occurred despite specific requests for action.</p>																																																		
8	<p>Access to and review of Ballots from November 3rd, 2020 election</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Arlington County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. Although primarily a county issue, leadership and involvement of the State Department of Elections is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia election system.</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Arlington County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. This will include an optical scanning of the ballots to determine authenticity. This is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia and County election system.</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Arlington County, Arizona and Antrim County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. This will include an inspection of the audit log and all features of the election machine. It will also include a sample verification of at least 1,000 of the ballots from Item 8. To ensure the election machine correctly tabulates the actual votes on each ballot, observers should hand tally concurrently to monitor and verify. Although primarily a county issue, leadership and involvement of the State Department of Elections is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia election system.</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Maricopa County, Arizona and Antrim County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. This will include an inspection of the audit log and all features of the election machine. It will also include a sample verification of at least 1,000 of the ballots from Item 8. To ensure the election machine correctly tabulates the actual votes on each ballot, observers should hand tally concurrently to monitor and verify. Although primarily a county issue, leadership and involvement of the State Department of Elections is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia election system.</p>																																																		
9	<p>Review of Voting Machines (audit logs and features of machines on an electoral appointment)</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Arlington County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. This will include an inspection of the audit log and all features of the election machine. It will also include a sample verification of at least 1,000 of the ballots from Item 8. To ensure the election machine correctly tabulates the actual votes on each ballot, observers should hand tally concurrently to monitor and verify. Although primarily a county issue, leadership and involvement of the State Department of Elections is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia election system.</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Arlington County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. This will include an inspection of the audit log and all features of the election machine. It will also include a sample verification of at least 1,000 of the ballots from Item 8. To ensure the election machine correctly tabulates the actual votes on each ballot, observers should hand tally concurrently to monitor and verify. Although primarily a county issue, leadership and involvement of the State Department of Elections is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia election system.</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Maricopa County, Arizona and Antrim County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. This will include an inspection of the audit log and all features of the election machine. It will also include a sample verification of at least 1,000 of the ballots from Item 8. To ensure the election machine correctly tabulates the actual votes on each ballot, observers should hand tally concurrently to monitor and verify. Although primarily a county issue, leadership and involvement of the State Department of Elections is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia election system.</p>	<p>Because of findings and concerns over election machine results in Maricopa County, Arizona and Antrim County, Michigan, the findings against the Secretary of State for Michigan for decisions on the handling of Absentee ballots, the Virginia state implementation of the new category of Absentee voting, and the new enactment of county (and state) central counting facilities, it is in the public interest to allow a public review of election machines in the custody of County Clerks from the November 3rd, 2020 election. This will include an inspection of the audit log and all features of the election machine. It will also include a sample verification of at least 1,000 of the ballots from Item 8. To ensure the election machine correctly tabulates the actual votes on each ballot, observers should hand tally concurrently to monitor and verify. Although primarily a county issue, leadership and involvement of the State Department of Elections is necessary to restore and establish trust and confidence in the Virginia election system.</p>																																																		

November 4, 2020 Pause in voting	A public review of the forensics of vote tallying and reporting is needed to establish truth on tabulation of votes on the morning of November 4th, 2020 to include the apparent pause in vote tallying. Pauses followed by statistically questionable tranches of votes for a specific candidate after the counting re-starts is a flag of election fraud from the Carter Center, considered the gold standard for election integrity.	A public review of the forensics of vote tallying and reporting is needed to establish truth on tabulation of votes on the morning of November 4th, 2020 to include the apparent pause in vote tallying. Pauses followed by statistically questionable tranches of votes for a specific candidate after the counting re-starts is a flag of election fraud from the Carter Center, considered the gold standard for election integrity.	A public review of the forensics of vote tallying and reporting is needed to establish truth on tabulation of votes on the morning of November 4th, 2020 to include the apparent pause in vote tallying. Pauses followed by statistically questionable tranches of votes for a specific candidate after the counting re-starts is a flag of election fraud from the Carter Center, considered the gold standard for election integrity.	A public review of the forensics of vote tallying and reporting is needed to establish truth on tabulation of votes on the morning of November 4th, 2020 to include the apparent pause in vote tallying. Pauses followed by statistically questionable tranches of votes for a specific candidate after the counting re-starts is a flag of election fraud from the Carter Center, considered the gold standard for election integrity.	A public review of the forensics of vote tallying and reporting is needed to establish truth on tabulation of votes on the morning of November 4th, 2020 to include the apparent pause in vote tallying. Pauses followed by statistically questionable tranches of votes for a specific candidate after the counting re-starts is a flag of election fraud from the Carter Center, considered the gold standard for election integrity.
<b>Overall Election Integrity Score</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>-15</b>	<b>-15</b>	<b>-13</b>

Copyright April 2021 and July 2022 by the National Election Integrity Association (NEIA) A non-partisan Virginia Association  
 NEIA LLC is a Virginia non-profit Association, Federal 501(c)(3) status has been filed  
 NEIA has no legal, financial, or any other obligations or responsibilities for, with, or to any other entity, listed or not  
 No further use or distribution without written approval from NEIA.  
 Any similar concepts or works appearing will be subject to legal scrutiny, review, and court action for damages and compensation.

Individual Criteria Score	Red	-2	Passing score = 0 or better
	Yellow	-1	
	Light Green	1	
	Green	2	

Overall Election Integrity Score	Red	-10 or lower	Pervasive weakness and broad untrustworthiness of election integrity parameters. Significant voter disenfranchisement. An election system in crisis
	Yellow	0 to -9	Substantive weakness in election environment, grave concern over election integrity and voter disenfranchisement
	Light Green	1 - 10	Beginnings of election integrity, but still issues to work on to improve voter inclusion
	Green	10 or higher	Substantive Election Integrity