

EXHIBIT 14

Affidavit of Lisa Gage (Dec. 10, 2020)

AFFIDAVIT OF LISA GAGE

Lisa Gage, being sworn, declares under penalty of perjury:

1. I am personally familiar with the facts stated in this Affidavit and, if sworn as a witness, am competent to testify to them as well.
2. I am a registered voter in the State of Michigan.
3. I was a Republican Poll Challenger on November 3, and November 4, 2020.
4. On November 3, 2020 I was observing at TCF Center in Detroit Michigan.
5. I began observing the processing and counting of absentee ballots at 7:00 am on November 3, 2020. There were approximately 140 tables with five poll workers at each table.
6. I observed several irregularities with the 20-30 tables I was able to spend time observing in detail.
7. I was not assigned to a specific precinct. The first precinct table I observed only had 10 ballots. I then moved on to another table with no GOP Challenger present.
8. Generally, the process I observed, was that the person that was at the e-poll computer would first scan the bar code on the envelope with a hand-held scanner. The voter's name, date of birth, and registration status would appear on a computer monitor on the table. If the voter's name did not appear on the computer monitor, poll workers were supposed to type in the voter's name, and if the name did not appear, check for the voter's name on an Absentee Voter List ("AV List"). The AV List would include voters who registered and voted on Monday and Tuesday, election day.

9. After checking that information, the envelope was to be passed to another person who separated the envelope from the secrecy envelope that contained the ballot.
10. The next person would take the ballot out of the secrecy envelope and pass the ballot to the next worker who would roll it to flatten it, tear off the perforated stub with the ballot number, and then put the ballot into a box identified as the "tabulation box" with other processed ballots that was then taken to a tabulator when the box had up to 50 ballots. I would estimate that I saw thousands of ballots placed in the tabulation box during the time I worked at the TCF.
11. There was no signature comparison being conducted on absentee ballots. There were stacks of ballots in "post office" bins in their envelopes, on tables identified by precinct number.
12. Between 9:00 and 9:30 am, I asked a supervisor about signature comparison for the ballots currently on the table. She was a slightly overweight, African-American woman with shoulder length hair. She wore one of the white shirts with an election insignia on the shirt. As with all other election workers, she did not have a name tag. This supervisor told me "that was done somewhere else".
13. A poll worker said "we have 10 ballots, just like yesterday (meaning Monday)". When I heard this, I approached a supervisor because I thought it was unusual that there would be just 10 on one day and then just 10 the next day. The supervisor told me that they had ballots on Tuesday that they had "partially processed on Monday." This supervisor wore a white shirt with election insignia and no name tag, but was a

different supervisor identified in paragraph 11. With these repeat ballots, the poll workers followed the 5 step process outlined above.

14. Later that morning approximately between 11:45am and 12:30pm, a third supervisor announced that they “needed to catch up”. This supervisor was tall, approximately 5’9” average build, late 40’, early 50-ish, short hair, African-American woman. She also wore the white shirt with election insignia with no name tag. At this point the ballots were just divided up between each of the poll worker at the table who opened envelopes, pulled the stub and put the ballots in the tabulator box. The entire 5 step process was entirely abandoned. There was no scanning of the outside of the envelope to check for registration status, there was no signature, or ballot number verification.
15. There was no post mark verification ; there was no ballot review for stray marks; there was no verification of the voter existing in the data base; there was no signature comparison or authentication.
16. I estimate that thousands ballots were processed this way.
17. None of the outer envelopes that I observed, included any additional written statements or stamps in addition to the signature, and if there had been I would have noticed them. I estimate these outer envelopes that I was able to see to be at least several hundred to a thousand.
18. These non-verified ballots were then placed in a box and then a separate worker took the box to the tabulator, without any review.
19. As a challenger I was prohibited from observing the postmarks. I was told many times by a supervisor that I had to “stand away”.

20. As a challenger I was prohibited from observing the ballot duplication process by poll workers moving in front of me to block me from watching the duplication process. Poll works are supposed to have three people involved in the duplication process: a Democrat, a Republican, and an independent observing the process. One of the three would mark the duplicate ballot, while another person called out the selections.
21. Once the duplicate was made, the poll workers deposited the original into an envelope, marked 'Originals'. As poll challengers were not able to see what happened to the envelope. I asked a Supervisor as to the disposition of the originals, and was told the originals envelope will stay in the supplies box. Having observed other challengers being escorted out of the site, and the noticeable disgust at my asking questions, I felt that too much inquiry could result into dismissal from the site.
22. Over the course of the day, I changed my tactic and would ask a variety of supervisors a question instead of multiple questions to any one or two supervisors. I left the TCF Center on November 3, 2020 mid-afternoon as it appeared no more ballots were coming in. Contributing to my decision to leave was that GOP challengers were denied the ability to sit in unoccupied chairs by either poll workers or supervisors. We were not allowed to pull chairs away from the table; we were not permitted to leave to get food and were told by republican resources that if we left we would not be able to return. Other GOP challengers and myself observed Democrat challengers sit at the tables with the poll workers. We were not even permitted to place a water bottle on an unused corner of the tables. We were left to juggle water bottles pens, note papers and other documents, making note taking difficult.

23. On November 4, 2020, I returned to TCF at 6:30am.
24. I returned to the same general area I had been on the day before. I started observing four tables but eventually observed many different tables.
25. I observed incomplete and inconsistent E-poll documentation, table to table.
26. The E-poll system allowed ballot acceptance even when date of birth and/or voter registration dates were suspect. For example, I observed a voter date of birth 20 years AFTER the date of voter registration. The poll worker simply processed the ballot without inquiry. I tried to challenge this ballot and was told that the ballot would go into the "problem bin". The "problem bin" was at the table. At various times the "problem bin" would be taken the "bull pen" or in some cases, directly to the tabulation area.
27. On one occasion I witnessed two of the ballots that I challenged, being fed through the tabulator without adjudication. The poll worker that processed this ballot saw me watching this process and stared back at me with indignation.
28. I specifically observed 26 ballots that were not verified with either e-poll or the AV list. This list of 26 is attached. I attempted to challenge these 26 ballots, although the poll workers would not acknowledge my challenges. The 26 ballots on this list were observed by me in the span of a few hours. There were other ballots that I could have challenged for the same reasons, but these 26 were the ones that I was able to write down as the pace of processing increased. The 26 were observed in a couple of hours at a single table on Wednesday November 4. There were over 140 tables in the counting room.

29. Each of the ballots on the list of 26 I challenged were tabulated without adjudication. It can be observed that these ballots were sequential, highly suggestive of fraud, due to the fact that each clerk must assign a ballot number as the applications for absent voter ballots arrive in the clerk's office. The chance of the same ballots being applied for and then returned for tabulation as the same time is remote.
30. When the military ballots came in, I observed, all were in the E-poll system. However there were inconsistencies between dates of birth and voter registration on the vast majority of the ballots I observed. For example, I observed an active duty ballot, with a voter date of birth of 1938, with a voter registration date of 2020.
31. I made a point to examine every military ballot for date of birth and date of voter registration. A vast majority contained dates of birth between 1938 and 1960 for active duty ballots. They had e-poll addresses of Detroit, MI, rather than a deployment location. Also there were only a handful of "voting locations" identified in the e-poll for approximately 100 ballots. I noticed that these same "voting locations" would come up again and again as these military ballots were being processed. I would estimate this to be approximately 100 ballots at the multiple tables I was observing. There were approximately 143 tables.
32. Of all the military ballots I observed, none were in AV envelopes. There were less than 5 in larger manila envelopes, the rest were in standard white business envelopes.
33. I observed the opening of military ballots that arrived in standard white business envelopes. I did not see any voter signature certificates come out of these envelopes as required by law.

34. I observed the duplication process of the each of the military ballots onto the machine readable ballot forms. The original, 8/5x11 papers were put back in their mailing envelopes and placed in the originals envelope.
35. During a time when there was no activity, I observed that the system clock time on the screen saver on the E-poll system monitors varied by up to 5 hours, thereby rendering inability to verify date and time stamp for data verification later. This would make it easy for ballots to be excluded if a review was time specific.
36. I also experienced attempts at intimidation. When I began challenging ballots I was approached by individuals identifying as from the NAACP or a "civil rights group" accusing me of acting in "bad faith"; telling me that I was violating "civil rights" by challenging ballots.
37. I was able to resist the intimidation but I did observe other Republican poll challengers become visibly upset by this activity. I was asked to replaced several poll challengers who had become rattled. I observed a Republican poll challenger arrested for taking off his mask when he experienced breathing problems. The poll workers would cheer and clap whenever a Republican poll challenged was escorted out.
38. I was also approached by an "activists" who inserted himself into a particular challenge discussion, offering his opinion that my challenge was in bad faith. He later identified himself as a University of Michigan Law School student, stating he and others decided to come to TCF to be involved.
39. Once the actual attorneys were present, these activists moved on.

40. Other forms of intimidation were body blocking, deprivation of chairs to sit in. Then when Republican poll challengers left to get food or drink, they were denied re-entry.

41. Dated: December 10, 2020



Lisa Gage

Subscribed and sworn to before me on:

/s/ Sam Wood

Notary public, State of Michigan, County of: Louisa

My commission expires: 5/16/21