



MEMORANDUM

Date: September 3, 2014

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "C.H. Huckelberry", is written over the typed name and title.

Re: **2014 Primary Election Report**

The primary election of August 26, 2014 has been canvassed by the Board of Supervisors and reported timely to the Arizona Secretary of State as the official results from Pima County.

We experienced the typical number of provisional and conditional provisional ballots being cast at the polls, as well as the usual large number of voted early ballots dropped off at the polls for tabulation. As the Board knows, all provisional and conditional provisional ballots, as well as early ballots dropped off at the polls, must be returned to the voter registration function of the County Recorder for signature verification prior to return to the Elections Department for tabulation. All votes were tabulated by 1:00 PM on Saturday, August 30, 2014.

As the Board also knows, 25 of the 248 precincts, or approximately 10 percent, operated without scanners at the polling places. Ballots were voted and deposited in a sealed ballot box and then under party observation were transported to central tabulation at the Elections Building at 6550 S. Country Club Road. Elections workers at the 25 precincts reported no unusual activities or concerns. In addition, when the political parties randomly selected the 10 precincts to hand count audit, two of the 10 selected precincts were for precincts without scanners. The hand count audit of the ballots cast at those two precincts, as well as the votes for the four contested races audited, were an exact match to the computer generated results.

Voters at these precincts were also queried after voting regarding scanners. Two questions were asked. The first question was "How satisfied are you with casting your ballot in the sealed metal ballot box?" The second question was "How likely are you to recommend that the sealed metal ballot box be used in future elections?" To Question 1, 218 responses were received; to Question 2, 219 responses were received. The results of these responses are shown below.

Question 1: How satisfied are you with casting your ballot in the sealed metal ballot box?

Very Satisfied	88
Satisfied	55
Neutral	36
Unsatisfied	10
Very Unsatisfied	29

- Nearly two-thirds of the voters (65.55 percent) were either very satisfied or satisfied with casting their ballot in a metal ballot box.
- Approximately 17 percent were very unsatisfied or unsatisfied with a metal ballot box.
- Approximately 16 percent were neutral on the question.

Question 2: How likely are you to recommend that sealed metal ballot boxes be used in future elections?

Definitely recommend	90
Probably recommend	63
Not sure	44
Probably will not recommend	8
Definitely will not recommend	14

- Nearly 70 percent of the voters (69.86 percent) would either definitely recommend or recommend having steel ballot boxes in the future.
- Approximately 10 percent would definitely not or probably not recommend the use of sealed metal ballot boxes in the future.
- Approximately 20 percent were neutral (not sure) on the question.

The results are a general indication that voters were not inconvenienced, nor were they generally concerned about election integrity by placing their ballots in a sealed metal ballot box rather than through the traditional precinct scanner.

Also, the Elections Director is required by Administrative Procedure 3-17 to report any discrepancy in the audit of precincts; and his report is attached to this memorandum. These are fairly common mistakes made by poll workers. While 19 polling places were required to report a discrepancy, the remaining 229 polling locations were not. This means

The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Re: **2014 Primary Election Report**
September 3, 2014
Page 3

approximately 93 percent of all precincts had no discrepancies in the voting process. The discrepancies that were discovered, as the Board can observe from the report, were human errors. It was the County's tabulation that discovered these discrepancies, and these discrepancies do not affect the outcome of any race and are almost all one ballot per precinct reporting.

The acquisition of a new central tabulating system will allow, even in the Request for Proposals, the addition of precinct scanners if so desired in the future. Some election advocates argued at the September 2, 2014 meeting that the Board should purchase precinct scanners as a method for election transparency and integrity. Interestingly, it was not too many years ago other election advocates argued that precinct scanners were the weakest link in election security; precinct scanners could be easily hacked, modem reporting altered and programmable memory cards altered in the scanners. All of these concerns were then identified by election integrity advocates as points of vulnerability.

Election integrity is best demonstrated through hand count audits, which are randomly conducted on both early ballots and precinct-cast ballots. The results of all hand count audits verified the computer tabulations by race and precinct; hence, demonstrating a high level of election integrity.

CHH/mjk

Attachment

c: Ellen Wheeler, Assistant County Administrator
Brad Nelson, Elections Director



ELECTIONS DEPARTMENT

PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENT
6550 SOUTH COUNTRY CLUB RD. TUCSON, AZ 85756
(520) 724-6830 FAX (520) 724-6870

September 1, 2014

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Brad".

To: C. H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

From: Brad R. Nelson
Elections Director

Re: Notice pursuant to Administrative Procedure 3-17 Discrepancy in the Audit of Precincts for the August 26, 2014 Primary Election

This memorandum is written pursuant to Administrative Procedure 3-17 to provide Notice of Discrepancy in the Audit of Precinct Results. This notice will be sent to the Secretary of State, political party representatives and the County Attorney.

There were 248 election precincts designated for this election. Three precincts had fewer entries in the poll list than the number of ballots counted. This was due to poll workers failing to enter the correct number of names in the poll list. Sixteen precincts had more entries in the poll list than the number of ballots counted. This was due to a poll worker not accounting for spoiled ballots correctly.

A report identifying which precinct had the problems noted above is attached for your review.

The errors that occurred at the polling places were human errors. The County's tabulation system is sound. Indeed, the discrepancies were found because of the sophisticated reports generated by the tabulation system.

Most importantly, these discrepancies do not affect the final outcome of any race.

Audit of Precinct Results for the August 26, 2014 Primary Election

Precinct #	Comments
024	The poll list reflects two more entries than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballots being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
047	The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to a spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
061	The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to voter choosing not to vote.
064	The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to poll worker failing to enter all names in the poll list
074	The poll list reflects one less entry than the number of total ballots cast due to poll workers failing to enter all voters' names.
087/230	The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to voter spoiling a ballot then choosing not to vote.
104	The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
107	The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
111	The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast. A voter spoiled their first ballot, then ripped up their second ballot and left the polls.

- 125 The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
- 131 The poll list reflects one less entry than the number of total ballots cast due to poll workers failing to enter all voters' names.
- 155 The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
- 157 The poll list reflects one less entry than the number of total ballots cast due to poll workers failing to enter all voters' names.
- 189 The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to voter leaving prior to receiving a ballot.
- 198 The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to voter leaving prior to receiving a ballot.
- 201 The poll list reflects two more entries than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
- 205 The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
- 217 The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.
- 234 The poll list reflects one more entry than the number of total ballots cast due to spoiled ballot being reflected incorrectly in the poll list.