

When Audits and Recounts Distract from Election Integrity: The 2020 U.S. Presidential Election in Georgia

E-Vote-ID

Tarragona, Spain

1–4 October 2024

Philip B. Stark

University of California, Berkeley

Trump, in Taped Call, Pressured Georgia Official to ‘Find’ Votes to Overturn Election

The president vaguely warned of a “criminal offense” as he pressured Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger in the call, according to an audio recording.

Share full article



6.6K



President Trump has spent almost nine weeks making false conspiracy claims about his election loss. Anna Moneymaker for The New York Times



By Michael D. Shear and Stephanie Saul

Published Jan. 3, 2021 Updated May 26, 2021

WASHINGTON — [President Trump](#) pressured Georgia’s Republican secretary of state to “find” him enough votes to overturn the presidential election and vaguely threatened him with “a criminal offense” during an [hourlong telephone call](#) on Saturday, according to an audio recording of the conversation.

Mr. Trump, who has spent almost nine weeks making false conspiracy claims about his loss to President-elect Joseph R. Biden Jr., told [Brad Raffensperger](#), the state’s top elections official, that he should recalculate the vote count so Mr. Trump, not Mr. Biden, would end up winning the state’s 16 electoral votes.

“I just want to find 11,780 votes, which is one more than we have,” Mr. Trump said during the conversation, according to a recording first [obtained by The Washington Post](#), which published it online Sunday. The New York Times also acquired a recording of Mr. Trump’s call.

The president, who will be in charge of the Justice Department for the 17 days left in his administration, hinted that Mr. Raffensperger and Ryan Germany, the chief lawyer for secretary of state’s office, could be prosecuted criminally if they did not do his bidding.



Mark Lastinger
Effingham Herald

Published: Jun 16, 2021, 3:55 AM



SPRINGFIELD — Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger believes Republicans and Democrats have finally achieved bipartisanship.

Unfortunately, it is the spread of misinformation about a series of close elections that has united sizeable swaths of both parties, he said.

Raffensperger, who has faced death threats against himself, his family and his office in recent days, discussed the situation during a visit to the Effingham County Elections & Registration Office on Monday.



"At the end of the day, in 2020, we had the most secure and accurate election in Georgia's history," Raffensperger said. "All five million ballots were counted three times — the first time in the original count, then we did a 100 percent risk-limiting audit with a hand recount which proved the accuracy of the count and also proved that the machines were accurately counting it, and that no votes were flipped."



Historic First Statewide Audit of Paper Ballots Upholds Result of Presidential Race

[Home](#) > [News & Announcements](#) > Historic First Statewide Audit of Paper Ballots Upholds Result of Presidential Race

November 19th, 2020

(Atlanta) -- Today, Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger announced the results of the Risk Limiting Audit of Georgia's presidential contest, which upheld and reaffirmed the original outcome produced by the machine tally of votes cast. Due to the tight margin of the race and the principles of risk-limiting audits, this audit was a full manual tally of all votes cast. The audit confirmed that the original machine count accurately portrayed the winner of the election. The results of the audit can be viewed [HERE](#), [HERE](#), and [HERE](#).

"Georgia's historic first statewide audit reaffirmed that the state's new secure paper ballot voting system accurately counted and reported results," said Secretary Raffensperger. "This is a credit to the hard work of our county and local elections officials who moved quickly to undertake and complete such a momentous task in a short period of time."

"Georgia's first statewide audit successfully confirmed the winner of the chosen contest and should give voters increased confidence in the results," said Ben Adida, Executive Director of VotingWorks. "We were proud to work with Georgia on this historic audit. The difference between the reported results and the full manual tally is well within the expected error rate of hand-counting ballots, and the audit was a success."

The Risk Limiting Audit reaffirmed the outcome of the presidential race in Georgia as originally reported, with Joe Biden leading President Donald Trump in the state.

The audit process also led to counties catching making mistakes they made in their original count by not uploading all memory cards. Those counties uploaded the memory cards and re-certified their results, leading to increased accuracy in the results the state will certify.

The differential of the audit results from the original machine counted results is well within the expected margin of human error that occurs when hand-counting ballots. A 2012 [study](#) by Rice University and Clemson University found that "hand counting of votes in postelection audit or recount procedures can result in error rates of up to 2 percent." In Georgia's recount, the highest error rate in any county recount was .73%. Most counties found no change in their finally tally. The majority of the remaining counties had changes of fewer than ten ballots.

Because the margin is still less than 0.5%, the President can request a recount after certification of the results. That recount will be conducted by rescanning all paper ballots.



Historic First Statewide Audit of Paper Ballots Upholds Result of Presidential Race

[Home](#) > [News & Announcements](#) > Historic First Statewide Audit of Paper Ballots Upholds Result of Presidential Race

November 19th, 2020

(Atlanta) -- Today, Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger announced the results of the Risk Limiting Audit of Georgia's presidential contest, which upheld and reaffirmed the original outcome produced by the machine tally of votes cast. Due to the tight margin of the race and the principles of risk-limiting audits, this audit was a full manual tally of all votes cast. The audit confirmed that the original machine count accurately portrayed the winner of the election. The results of the audit can be viewed [HERE](#), [HERE](#), and [HERE](#).

"Georgia's historic first statewide audit reaffirmed that the state's new secure paper ballot voting system accurately counted and reported results," said Secretary Raffensperger. "This is a credit to the hard work of our county and local elections officials who moved quickly to undertake and complete such a momentous task in a short period of time."

"Georgia's first statewide audit successfully confirmed the winner of the chosen contest and should give voters increased confidence in the results," said Ben Adida, Executive Director of VotingWorks. "We were proud to work with Georgia on this historic audit. The difference between the reported results and the full manual tally is well within the expected error rate of hand-counting ballots, and the audit was a success."

The Risk Limiting Audit reaffirmed the outcome of the presidential race in Georgia as originally reported, with Joe Biden leading President Donald Trump in the state.

The audit process also led to counties catching making mistakes they made in their original count by not uploading all memory cards. Those counties uploaded the memory cards and re-certified their results, leading to increased accuracy in the results the state will certify.

The differential of the audit results from the original machine counted results is well within the expected margin of human error that occurs when hand-counting ballots. A 2012 study by Rice University and Clemson University found that "hand counting of votes in postelection audit or recount procedures can result in error rates of up to 2 percent." In Georgia's recount, the highest error rate in any county recount was .73%. Most counties found no change in their finally tally. The majority of the remaining counties had changes of fewer than ten ballots.

Because the margin is still less than 0.5%, the President can request a recount after certification of the results. That recount will be conducted by rescanning all paper ballots.

sos.ga.gov/admin/uploads/11.19_20_Risk_Limiting_Audit_Report_Memo_1.pdf

Sorry, you have been blocked

You are unable to access sos.ga.gov



Why have I been blocked?

This website is using a security service to protect itself from online attacks. The action you just performed triggered the security solution. There are several actions that could trigger this block including submitting a certain word or phrase, a SQL command or malformed data.

What can I do to resolve this?

You can email the site owner to let them know you were blocked. Please include what you were doing when this page came up and the Cloudflare Ray ID found at the bottom of this page.

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.
- All 3 are substantially wrong compared to the margin.

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.
- All 3 are substantially wrong compared to the margin.
- *In principle* no way to show no votes were “flipped.”

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.
- All 3 are substantially wrong compared to the margin.
- *In principle* no way to show no votes were “flipped.”
- SOS chose the least accurate hand-count method.

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.
- All 3 are substantially wrong compared to the margin.
- *In principle* no way to show no votes were “flipped.”
- SOS chose the least accurate hand-count method.
- SOS arbitrarily attributed all discrepancies to errors in hand count.

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.
- All 3 are substantially wrong compared to the margin.
- *In principle* no way to show no votes were “flipped.”
- SOS chose the least accurate hand-count method.
- SOS arbitrarily attributed all discrepancies to errors in hand count.
- SOS ignored differences between the machine counts.

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.
- All 3 are substantially wrong compared to the margin.
- *In principle* no way to show no votes were “flipped.”
- SOS chose the least accurate hand-count method.
- SOS arbitrarily attributed all discrepancies to errors in hand count.
- SOS ignored differences between the machine counts.
- Georgia lacks physical inventories of voted ballots, memory cards, and other election materials.

Two machine counts, one hand count.

- The 3 tallies disagree substantially.
- All 3 are substantially wrong compared to the margin.
- *In principle* no way to show no votes were “flipped.”
- SOS chose the least accurate hand-count method.
- SOS arbitrarily attributed all discrepancies to errors in hand count.
- SOS ignored differences between the machine counts.
- Georgia lacks physical inventories of voted ballots, memory cards, and other election materials.
- No audit/recount in Georgia can prove outcomes are right: universal-use BMDs, lax chain of custody, lack of ballot accounting and pollbook reconciliation, etc.

Data sources

- Georgia Secretary of State website
 - Audit documentation
https://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/2020_general_election_risk-limiting_audit
 - Audit spreadsheet
<https://sos.ga.gov/admin/uploads/audit-report-November-3-2020-General-Election-2020-11-19.csv>
 - <https://sos.ga.gov/admin/uploads/audit-report-November-3-2020-General-Election-2020-11-19.csv>
 - <https://sos.ga.gov/admin/uploads/Fulton%20RLA%20Batches.zip>
- Election results (Clarity)
- Open records requests

Focus on Fulton County (Atlanta) and precinct RW01 in particular: Curling v Raffensperger

Counting error study cited by Raffensperger had 108 subjects and 120 ballots, each containing 27 contests with 2 candidates.

3 kinds of “ballots”: printout from two kinds of DRE & optical scan ballot, no BMDs.

Highest error rates were for thermal printout from DREs.

Method with the *highest* error rate was sort-and-stack, the method Georgia used.

Did not study hand tabulation in a real election or audit.

In Georgia, some discrepancies between the two machine counts of Biden’s absentee votes is almost 3 percent.

The machine counts

☒ **Annette Davis Jackson**
Republican

☒ **Keith E. Gammage**
(Incumbent) Democrat

☒ **YES**
☐ **NO**

pair	Image A	Image B
1	05162_00234_000096	05162_00235_000057
2	05162_00234_000093	05162_00235_000054
3	05162_00234_000074	05162_00235_000036
4	05162_00234_000072	05162_00235_000034
5	05162_00234_000068	05162_00235_000030
6	05162_00234_000069	05162_00235_000031
7	05162_00234_000054	05162_00235_000014
8	05162_00234_000031	05162_00235_000090
9	05162_00234_000026	05162_00235_000085
10	05162_00234_000017	05162_00235_000076
11	05162_00234_000013	05162_00235_000072
12	05162_00234_000014	05162_00235_000073
13	05162_00234_000003	05162_00235_000062
14	05162_00234_000001	05162_00235_000060

Images erroneously included in first machine count in precinct RW01 at least twice.

Multiple	Image A	Image B	Image C
1	00801_00044_000168	00801_00043_000168	
2	00801_00044_000083	00801_00043_000083	
3	00801_00044_000042	00801_00043_000042	
4	05160_00074_000023	05160_00067_000008	
5	00794_00017_000024	00791_00026_000091	00791_00019_000010
6	00794_00017_000029	00791_00026_000086	00791_00019_000015
7	00794_00018_000001	00791_00026_000009	00791_00019_000092
8	00794_00018_000011	00791_00026_000019	00791_00019_000082
9	00794_00019_000002	00791_00026_000079	00791_00019_000022
10	00794_00019_000005	00791_00026_000076	00791_00019_000025
11	00794_00019_000006	00791_00026_000075	00791_00019_000026

Images erroneously included in precinct RW01 machine recount 2-3 times.

11 ballots contributed 29 CVRs.

Write-ins for Anyone, XXX, Willie Nelson, Alexander Hamilton

Lower 95% confidence bound of 891 doubly-scanned ballots in the first machine count in Fulton County

\geq 214 doubly-scanned BMD ballots in machine recount for precinct RW01: 2 scan batches of advance in-person BMD printout start w/ 214 CVRs in same order, scanned w/i 5 minutes of each other.

Number of ballots differs by 851 in the 2 machine counts

Machine count 1, machine count 2, and audit disagree substantially:

Count	Election Day			Advance			Absentee by Mail			Provisional		
	Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Trump	Biden	Jorgensen
Original	193	88	11	1455	1003	23	619	833	15	9	4	1
Recount	162	73	9	1487	1015	25	619	809	15	5	3	1
Audit	243	88	11									

Fulton County, GA, precinct RW01, 2020 U.S. Presidential election

Audit / manual tally

Did not check whether:

- every validly cast ballot included in tally exactly once
- number of participating voters differs from number of cast ballots
- every memory card was accounted for and uploaded
- scans were duplicated, deleted, replaced, or altered
- QR-encoded BMD votes match human-readable selections
- the voting system correctly interpreted any ballot or BMD printout
- manual audit tallies aggregated correctly

Not an RLA for many reasons.

Audit teams used “sort and stack”: sort ballots (including BMD printout) by the presidential vote, then count each stack.

Batch tallies manually entered on paper Audit Board Batch Sheets (ABBSs).

Transcribed the ABBSs into VotingWorks software to create a database of tallies; hand-count totals were calculated from that database.

Every ballot *should* be reflected in exactly one ABBS.

Data from every ABBS should have been (but was not) entered exactly once into the database.

Transcription not observable by the public but images of ABBSs were posted.

ABBS image files for Fulton County contain 1,927 ABBSs.

Hand-count database has 1,916 rows of data: ≥ 11 ABBSs missing.

Re-transcribe data; outer join against posted database to find missing sheets.

Audit Board Batch Sheet

Absentee Scanner 3
Batch 48
Table
118

County Fulton

Batch Name Sc#3 (48)

Batch Type: ☐ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	4
Joseph R. Biden	93
Jo Jorgensen	2
Overvotes	
Blank/Undervote	

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	
Duplicated	
Undetermined	

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Was the container resealed by the audit board? ☐ Yes



- ☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)
 - ☐ Entered tallies into Arlo
- ____ Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

Absentee Scanner 2 #128
Batch 52

County Fulton

Batch Name Sc#2 (52)

Batch Type: ☒ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	6
Joseph R. Biden	92
Jo Jorgensen	0
Overvotes	0
Blank/Undervote	0

10+10+10+10+10+10+10
+10+2

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	0
Duplicated	0
Undetermined	0

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Was the container resealed by the audit board? ☐ Yes



Check In/Out Station

- ☐ Recorded batch return on Ballot Container Inventory Sheet
 - ☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)
 - ☐ Entered tallies into Arlo
- ____ Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County Fulton
 Batch Name SCANNER 3 (12) (13) + (14)
 Batch Type: ☐ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☒ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	12
Joseph R. Biden	83
Jo Jorgensen	1
Overvotes	
Blank/Undervote	

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	
Duplicated	
Undetermined	

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Was the container resealed by the audit board? ☐ Yes



 I have recorded this batch return on Ballot Container Inventory Sheet

☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)

☐ Entered tallies into Arlo

_____, Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County Fulton Co.
 Batch Name 239 SCANNER 3

Batch Type: ☐ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	13
Joseph R. Biden	87
Jo Jorgensen	
Overvotes	
Blank/Undervote	

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	
Duplicated	
Undetermined	

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.



 I have recorded this batch return on Ballot Container Inventory Sheet

☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)

☐ Entered tallies into Arlo

_____, Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County Fulton

Batch Name Scanner 1 (80) 81-82-83-84

Batch Type: ☐ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	118
Joseph R. Biden	329
Jo Jorgensen	3
Overvote	1
Blank/Undervote	2

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	2
Duplicated	0
Undetermined	0

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Was the container resealed by the audit board? ☐ Yes

____ Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County Fulton County

Batch Name Scanner 3 (260)

Batch Type: ☒ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	30
Joseph R. Biden	66
Jo Jorgensen	
Overvotes	
Blank/Undervote	

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	
Duplicated	
Undetermined	

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Check In/Out Station

- ☐ Recorded batch return on Ballot Container Inventory Sheet
- ☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)
- ☐ Entered tallies into Arlo

____ Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County Fulton

Batch Name AP01A - 1

Batch Type: ☐ Absentee ☐ Advance ☒ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	84
Joseph R. Biden	62
Jo Jorgensen	6
Overvotes	8
Blank/Undervote	1

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	2
Duplicated	5
Undetermined	0

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Check In/Out Station

- ☐ Recorded batch return on Ballot Container Inventory Sheet
 - ☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)
 - ☐ Entered tallies into Arlo
- ____ Initials of check in/out station member

70

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County Fulton

Batch Name SC #3

Batch Type: ☒ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	85
Joseph R. Biden	224
Jo Jorgensen	5
Overvotes	0
Blank/Undervote	2

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	1
Duplicated	0
Undetermined	0

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Check In/Out Station

- ☐ Recorded batch return on Ballot Container Inventory Sheet
 - ☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)
 - ☐ Entered tallies into Arlo
- ____ Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County FULTON 239
 Batch Name SCANDERO
 Batch Type: ☒ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	4
Joseph R. Biden	42
Jo Jorgensen	
Overvote	
Blank/Undervote	

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	
Duplicated	
Undetermined	

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Was the container resealed by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Check in/out station

- ☐ Recorded batch return on Ballot Container Inventory Sheet
- ☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)
- ☐ Entered tallies into Arlo

____ Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

#123
 County FULTON
 Batch Name CHAOSTAIN
 Batch Type: ☐ Absentee ☒ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	613
Joseph R. Biden	605
Jo Jorgensen	24
Overvote	0
Blank/Undervote	4

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	7
Duplicated	0
Undetermined	0

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Was the container resealed by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Check in/out station

- ☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)
- ☐ Entered tallies into Arlo

____ Initials of check in/out station member

Audit Board Batch Sheet

County Fulton

Batch Name Chastain

Batch Type: ☒ Absentee ☐ Advance ☐ Election Day ☐ Provisional ☐ Other

Was the container sealed when received by the audit board? ☐ Yes

Candidates	Enter Stack Totals
Donald J. Trump	
Joseph R. Biden	
Jo Jorgensen	
Overvotes	
Blank/Undervote	

Trump
5
100
105
100
205
50
255
256
100
356
100
456
40
496
7
503
100
603
10
613

Biden
7
100
107
100
207
20
227
4
231
100
331
100
431
40
471
4
475
100
575
20
595

Number of Ballots sent to the Vote Review Panel (if any)

Write-In	
Duplicated	
Undetermined	

When work is completed, return all ballots (except Vote Review Panel ballots) to the ballot container and seal container.

Was the container sealed by the audit board? ☒ Yes

Initials of check/in/out station member

☐ Delivered Vote Review Panel ballots (if any)

☐ Entered tallies into Arlo

Initials of check/in/out station member

	Scanner	Batch	Mode	Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Write-In	Undervote/blank	Overvote	Image source
1	3	48	absentee	4	93	2	0	0	0	4 at 162
2	2	52	absentee	6	92	0	0	0	0	1 at 1
3	3	12-14	?	12	83	1	0	0	0	4 at 128
4	3	239	?	13	87	0	0	0	0	3 at 177
5	1	80-84	?	118	329	3	2	2	1	3 at 519
6	3	260	absentee	30	66	0	0	0	0	4 at 355
7		AP01A-1	election day	84	62	6	2	1	0	1 at 170
8	3	179-181	absentee	85	224	5	1	2	0	4 at 293
9	2	239	absentee	4	42	0	0	0	0	2 at 153
10	Chastain	12	advance	613	605	24	7	4	0	3 at 351
11	Chastain	114	advance	613	605	24	?	4	0	3 at 270
tot				1582	2288	65	≥ 12	13	0	

11 omitted ABBSs for Fulton County.

Unsigned discrepancy ≥ 3960 votes.

Statewide margin 11,779 votes.

Per audit, machine-count error rate at least 0.87%; margin was 0.12%.

More might be missing: some might be duplicates.

The 2020 audit found thousands of previously untabulated ballots.

Per Raffensperger's office, "the audit process also led to counties catching making mistakes they made in their original count by not uploading all memory cards."

No inventory of memory cards, so others might not have been included.



STATE OF GEORGIA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
ATLANTA 30334-0090

Brian P. Kemp
GOVERNOR

November 17, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Ms. Rebecca N. Sullivan, Acting Chair
200 Piedmont Avenue SE
Suite 1804, West Tower
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Ms. Sara Tindall Ghazal
4880 Lower Roswell Rd
Suite 165-328
Marietta, Georgia 30068

Mr. Matthew Mashburn
P.O. Box 451
Cartersville, Georgia 30120

Ms. Anh Le
P.O. Box 4008
Decatur, Georgia 3003

Dear Members of the State Election Board,

I write to refer the following matter to the Board for its review and consideration. As you know, I called on Georgians with information about inconsistencies or complaints regarding the 2020 election to notify the proper state authorities. To date, the complaint outlined below is the only instance where a complainant has referred an issue to my office and provided all requested information for me and my staff to fully evaluate its veracity.

On September 3, 2021, Mr. Joseph Rossi, a retired executive from Houston County, Georgia, contacted my office. Mr. Rossi presented an analysis of the 2020 Risk-Limiting Audit Report ("RLA Report") data, noting 36 inconsistencies reported by Fulton County.¹ The analysis was created by him and attorney Jack James who volunteered their own time, without compensation, to review thousands of ballot images, audit tally sheets, and other data to double-check the work of the county. Their dedication to this immense task is commendable.

The 36 inconsistencies noted by Mr. Rossi are factual in nature, pose no underlying theories outside of the reported data, and could not be explained by my office after a thorough review detailed below. The purpose of this letter is to convey these inconsistencies to the Board and request them to be explained or corrected.



STATE OF GEORGIA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
ATLANTA 30334-0900

**REVIEW OF INCONSISTENCIES IN THE
DATA SUPPORTING THE RISK LIMITING AUDIT REPORT**

November 17, 2021

OVERVIEW

The following inconsistencies were initially discovered by Joe Rossi through comparisons of the Fulton County vote counts included in the document titled "Detailed Audit Report with Results from all Batch Sheets (Excel)" ("Detailed Audit Report") and the ballot images obtained by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution Open Records Request ("Ballot Images"). Mr. Rossi's analysis ("Rossi Count") and the review conducted by the Office of the Governor ("Internal Count") were performed by manually counting the Ballot Images for Fulton County. The Ballot Images only include absentee ballots.

Ballot Images obtained by the Atlanta Journal-Constitution Open Records Request are available at the link below:

<https://theatlantajournalconstitution.sharefile.com/share/view/s3c2d5cd a4b5a42a88b6a76990379d181/fo8028bo-c150-45f5-911d-f9959144930e>

The Detailed Audit Report (audit-report-November-3-2020-General-Election-2020-11-19) is available at the link below:

https://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/2020_general_election_risk-limiting_audit

INCONSISTENCY 2: DUPLICATED BATCH ENTRY

The batch entry on Row 18840, identified as "AbsenteeScanner1Batch18," reports an identical vote count as the batch entry on Row 20288, identified as "Scanner 1/18." **One of these entries appears to be duplicated.**

Detailed Audit Report:

Row 18840: AbsenteeScanner1Batch18

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	I W/I	V W/I	B/U	O
26	72	1	0	0	0	0

Row 20288: Scanner 1/18

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	I W/I	V W/I	B/U	O
26	72	1	0	0	0	0

Rossi Count: Absentee Scanner 1 (Tabulator 05150), Batch 18

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Other
26	72	0	0

Internal Count: Absentee Scanner 1 (Tabulator 05150), Batch 18

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Other
26	72	1	0

INCONSISTENCY 3: DUPLICATED BATCH ENTRY

The batch entry on Row 18911, identified as "AbsenteeScanner1Batch 25," nearly matches the same vote count reported by the batch entry on Row 20296, identified as "Scanner 1 /25." The lone exception being that Row 20296 reports an additional valid write-in vote. **One of these entries appears to be duplicated.**

Detailed Audit Report:

Row 18911: AbsenteeScanner1Batch 25

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	I W/I	V W/I	B/U	O
21	77	0	0	0	1	0

Row 20296: Scanner 1 /25

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	I W/I	V W/I	B/U	O
21	77	0	0	1	1	0

Rossi Count: Absentee Scanner 1 (Tabulator 05150), Batch 25

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Other
21	77	0	2

Internal Count: Absentee Scanner 1 (Tabulator 05150), Batch 25

Trump	Biden	Jorgensen	Other
21	77	0	2

- Every voter should have opportunity to hand-mark ballot
- Reduce use of ballot-marking devices to a minimum
- Implement better chain of custody procedures/checks, especially of voted ballots.
- Implement better protocols for using and checking physical security seals on ballots and voting equipment—and check whether protocols were followed.
- Require scrutiny of custody logs and surveillance video, etc.
- Perform internal consistency checks in canvass:
 - Verify # ballots sent to each polling location (& blank paper stock for BMDs & ballot-on-demand printers) equals the # returned voted, spoiled, or unvoted. Physical check based on manual inventories, not on reports from the voting system.
 - Check pollbooks & other participation records against the number of voted ballots of each style
 - Check whether the number of electronic vote records (images and CVRs) matches physical inventory

An RLA can leverage the paper trail from a well-run election to ensure that whatever might have gone wrong did not change the outcome.

An RLA can leverage the paper trail from a well-run election to ensure that whatever might have gone wrong did not change the outcome.

A careful hand recount of a trustworthy paper trail can find correct winners.

An RLA can leverage the paper trail from a well-run election to ensure that whatever might have gone wrong did not change the outcome.

A careful hand recount of a trustworthy paper trail can find correct winners.

But audits and recounts can't magically restore trustworthiness to a poorly run election.

An RLA can leverage the paper trail from a well-run election to ensure that whatever might have gone wrong did not change the outcome.

A careful hand recount of a trustworthy paper trail can find correct winners.

But audits and recounts can't magically restore trustworthiness to a poorly run election.

Applying RLA procedures to an untrustworthy vote record is *security theater*: garbage in, garbage out.

An RLA can leverage the paper trail from a well-run election to ensure that whatever might have gone wrong did not change the outcome.

A careful hand recount of a trustworthy paper trail can find correct winners.

But audits and recounts can't magically restore trustworthiness to a poorly run election.

Applying RLA procedures to an untrustworthy vote record is *security theater*: garbage in, garbage out.

Even if the paper trail is trustworthy, auditing one contest says nothing about any other contest.

What makes a paper trail trustworthy?

- Trustworthy eligibility determinations
- Trustworthy recording technology (HMPB, not BMD)
- Physical accounting, appropriate use of seals, verifiable chain of custody, etc.
- Organization: physical inventory, ballot manifest