

## **Risk Limiting Audit Committee**

### **Pitkin County**

**Respectfully submitted: Janice Vos Caudill, County Clerk and Greg McPherson, Application Specialist**

**March 10, 2017**

In response to requests from the March 3, 2017 RLA Committee meeting:

1. How many counties have a 2-page ballot in odd years? We are unaware of any 2-page ballot elections in odd years in the western region over the past ten years.
2. What are ideas or feedback on how to conduct a RLA for Hart system? No response.
3. When comparing a paper ballot to CVR, if there is an error, specifically if the ballot is out of order, what do you do?
  - a. Compare the paper ballot to the scanned image in Dominion Voting System, Election Management System (DVS EMS).
  - b. If not a match, review the order of ballots in the batch to the order of scanned images in DVS EMS batch.
  - c. If scanner supports imprinting bates number on each ballot, use bates numbers to address ballot order and compare with scanned image order.
  - d. If error still exists, clarify specifics.
- I. In Pitkin County, when scanning each batch of ballots, judges complete a Ballot Counting Batch Log to identify each batch of ballots, scanned and identified by the Dominion Voting System, and the number of ballots in each batch; i.e., Batch Number 1, Batch Size 25; Batch Number 2, Batch Size 19, etc. See Attachment A. In the future, like Arapahoe, it will benefit Pitkin to create an "ICC Scanning Station Log," therefore documenting each batch and ballot count in each batch, to use as the Ballot Manifest for each scanning station - the inventory of all scanned ballots.
- II. Lessons learned as proactive measures to assure scanned ballots remain in order:
  - i. Develop ballot handling procedures to guarantee ballot order; i.e., 22" ballots create additional scanning challenges such as folding and jumbling/shuffling issues during scanning, which require additional attention.
  - ii. Create logs to verify and track batches after scanning, as described above.
  - iii. Assure judges training emphasizes the importance of maintaining ballot order, and review logs and importance of accurate documentation.
4. What are the resources used in the past or previous audits; what was the workload?
  - a. During the 2016 primary, two Post Election Audit Board members conducted the audit, and the Clerk and one staff assisted where needed, all spending approximately five hours conducting the PEA.
  - b. During the 2016 Presidential, two PEA Board members, the Clerk and three staff spent over ten hours conducting the PEA. In hindsight, the 2016 Presidential should have been scheduled for two full days.

5. What are your thoughts on imprinting ballots?
  - a. Until a scanned batch is accepted by the casting judges, there is opportunity to reject and rescan a batch. Judges may reject a batch if they suspect the final scanned ballot batch order is jumbled, shuffled, etc., or may not match the imaged order.
  - b. If a batch is rejected, an already imprinted ballot would be rescanned and most likely another number would be imprinted on the rescanned ballot, most likely not the same number, therefore causing sequencing issues. At this time we are not aware of a scanner imprinting device that will address a rejected batch and recalibrate numbering when rescanning in order to align with CVR (See Rule 21.4.14(c)(4)). Further research on imprinting devices will need to be conducted.
  - c. An additional auditing/accounting step could include documenting the scanner imprinting bates numbers on ballots on the "ICC Scanning Station Log"; with this, the ICC Scanning Station Log could include the Batch Number, Number of Ballots in the batch, and imprinted bates number sequence/series on the ballots in each batch. See Attachment B

Additional concerns provided by Greg McPherson in reference to ICC and scanning machine performance:

- a. When scanning, it is possible that the scanner scans ballots faster than the DVS ICC processes the scanning.
- b. By the time the ICC detects an error in scanning and signals the scanner to stop scanning, an additional several ballots could be scanned with imprinted bates numbers. *The ballots scanned after the error have not been processed, but have been serialized, bates stamped.*
- c. At this point there are questions:
  - a. Reject the batch and rescan, which may overwrite the previous serial/bates number with a new/different number, or not?
  - b. Rescan while turning the imprinter off to maintain the unique, original serial/bates number stamped on previous scanned imprinted ballots?
  - c. Does the scanning imprinting mechanism have the capability to re-sequence if a batch is rejected? And, will it match the populated fields in the voting system? And how can we guarantee/review/verify at that moment that a re-sequencing is correct?

We hope these details assist with processes, yet address questions that may need further assessment. Respectfully submitted.