## Post-Election Audit Summary

## May 7, 2019 Primary Election

Member of Council, Strongsville Ward 01
On June 5, 2019 we conducted a Risk-Limiting Post-Election Audit for the May 2019 Primary Election. There were 35,872 total ballots cast in the election. A hand count was conducted of 2,723 ballots cast in the audited contest. The accuracy rate for the post-election audit is $100 \%$.

Audited contest and batch details are provided below:

| RACE | TOTAL <br> BALLOTS <br> CAST | UNIQUE <br> BATCHES <br> AUDITED | TOTAL <br> BALLOTS <br> AUDITED | NUMBER OF <br> PRECINCTS <br> IN CONTEST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Member of Council, Strongsville Ward 01 |  |  |  |  |

Member of Council, Strongsville Ward 01

| PRECINCT NAME | NUMBER OF TIMES SELECTED | SELECTED <br> BATCH TYPE | OFFICIAL BALLOTS CAST | AUDIT HAND COUNT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DIFFERENCE } \\ & \text { DISCREPANCY } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-A | 1 | Absentee | 137 | 137 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-A | 1 | Election Day | 372 | 372 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-A | 1 | In-House Absentee | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-A | 1 | Post Absentee | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-A | 1 | Post Election Day | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-A | 1 | Provisional | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-B | 1 | Absentee | 14 | 14 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-B | 1 | Election Day | 48 | 48 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-B | 1 | In-House Absentee | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-B | 1 | Post Absentee | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-B | 1 | Post Election Day | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-B | 1 | Provisional | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-C | 1 | Absentee | 110 | 110 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-C | 1 | Election Day | 329 | 329 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-C | 1 | In-House Absentee | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-C | 1 | Post Absentee | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-C | 1 | Post Election Day | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-C | 1 | Provisional | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-D | 1 | Absentee | 180 | 180 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-D | 1 | Election Day | 374 | 374 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-D | 1 | In-House Absentee | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-D | 1 | Post Absentee | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Audit Summary - May 2019

| STRONGSVILLE -01-D | 1 | Post Election Day | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-D | 1 | Provisional | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-E | 1 | Absentee | 110 | 110 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-E | 1 | Election Day | 181 | 181 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-E | 1 | In-House Absentee | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-E | 1 | Post Absentee | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-E | 1 | Post Election Day | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-E | 1 | Provisional | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-F | 1 | Absentee | 183 | 183 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-F | 1 | Election Day | 326 | 326 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-F | 1 | In-House Absentee | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-F | 1 | Post Absentee | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-F | 1 | Post Election Day | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-F | 1 | Provisional | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-G | 1 | Absentee | 142 | 142 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-G | 1 | Election Day | 188 | 188 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-G | 1 | In-House Absentee | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-G | 1 | Post Absentee | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-G | 1 | Post Election Day | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STRONGSVILLE -01-G | 1 | Provisional | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  | - | $\mathbf{2 , 7 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

Our Risk-Limiting Audits are based upon the Kaplan-Markov method as explained by Philip B. Stark and Mark Lindeman. Auditing best practices recommend we split up the total ballots cast by precinct into multiple batch types. We utilize six batch types each consisting of one single ballot type category: Absentee, In-House Absentee, Election Day, Provisional, Post Absentee, and Post Election Day.

A master spreadsheet is created for each contest with statistical formulas to determine the number of batches that must be audited in order to reach a $90 \%$ confidence level. This confidence level means the audit has at least a $90 \%$ probability of leading to a full recount if the apparent outcome is incorrect.

We use a "Probability Proportional to Error Bound with Replacement" selection method. We assign numbers ranging from 000000 through 999,999 for each batch within each contest. Unique ranges of numbers are allocated to specific batches based upon their error bound - i.e. the greater the possibility of a miscount within a batch, the more numbers assigned, and the more likely it is to be selected. For example, if a single batch has a high probability of a miscount, multiple numbers are assigned to that single batch, making the random selection of that batch more likely during the audit. Each of those individual numbers might be randomly selected and included in the overall batch audit requirement, but the single batch to which those numbers are assigned needs to be audited only once. To obtain the precinct batch number we roll differently colored dice numbered $0-9$, each one of the colored dice representing one digit of the batch number.


These results will be certified at the next scheduled Board Meeting.

