

Risk Limiting Audit Committee

Pitkin County

Respectfully submitted: Janice Vos Caudill and Greg McPherson

March 24, 2017

Q1. What methods should we look at having for the counties that are not CVR counties? Are there other methods beyond the ballot polling, ballot batch, hand count, or transition method? No Comment.

Q2. What contest(s) should be audited if a county does not have a countywide contest? For simplicity and consistency among counties, a standard rule to audit:

- a. The race/measure of the district with the largest number of voters, which in turn one may assume could be the largest number of ballots counted; OR
- b. The race/measure with the closest margin, that meets other minimum qualifying criteria; i.e., size of manifest, % of electorate in county; OR
- c. Whichever of the above scenarios, a or b, creates the smallest number of ballots to sample, while assuring validity in RLA.
- d. SOS or Canvass Board randomly selects the race/measure for RLA.

Q 1. In exercising the scenarios in “a” and “b” above, what are the minimum parameters that should be utilized to assure the outcome is valid, when taking into consideration the number in manifest [race or measure], margin, and risk limit? In comparing scenarios, please consider time, resources and cost when determining best practices for RLA.

Q3. If a statewide contest is included in a RLA, and only 40 of 64 counties have been randomly selected to conduct the statewide contest RLA, what should counties not selected do? Do we create a hybrid RLA for those counties?

- a. If some counties are not drawn, the RLA is still statistically valid, therefore the RLA has been fulfilled/concluded.

Q 1. Could the software randomly select samples from all counties?

- i. Once a county has fulfilled its ballot quota for the audited race/measure, and if the tool randomly selects another ballot from that county, can it be put back into the pool and another ballot drawn until all counties have fulfilled their quota requirement AND the total sample size required by the RLA fulfilled? Does this only address a PR concern?
- ii. Can the software draw proportionally based on the number of ballots cast by each county vs. the number in the entire state. How does this affect the statistical analysis/validity?

Q 2. Is there concern that disparity may arise, whereas a smaller county may be required to conduct RLA on a disproportionately larger number of ballots in comparison to other counties? If this happens, is there a reason? (Disparity is interpreted as utilizing resources, time and cost to conduct a RLA in comparison to other counties with more readily available resources and money.)

- b. If some counties are not drawn in a statewide RLA, practical or perceived concerns may create possible issues:
- i. If a county had a systemic error in their counting process, and was not selected for the RLA, would it not be caught?
 - ii. Even with a Statewide RLA that proves accurate outcome, and even if not all counties are selected, isn't the goal of proving equipment accuracy provided through LAT, partisan judge representation, in-house accounting and balancing procedures, Canvass, CORA, mandated recounts for races with $\leq 0.5\%$ margins, etc., and still met?
 - iii. Even though the statewide RLA is statistically defensible, at a county level, would public relations concerns arise, if no ballots were drawn for that county? Could the RLA then be optional at county level, and determined by the Clerk? Clerks could revert to conducting a countywide race/measure RLA, or if not a countywide race utilize processes defined in Question 2 above, again as an optional additional procedure.

Respectfully submitted.