



February 14, 2023

JoLynn Behny
Pulaski County Clerk
112 E Main St, Room 230
Winamac, IN 46996

Dear Clerk Behny,

On February 9, 2023, the VSTOP team successfully completed a post-election audit in Pulaski County, Indiana, for the 2022 General Election. The VSTOP Team members who participated in person included Dr. Chad Kinsella, Co-Director; Liz Beatrice, Program Manager; Rachael Alaniz, Project Specialist; and Marc Chatot, Certification Specialist. This activity was carried out by the VSTOP Team in collaboration with the Pulaski County Audit Team. The Pulaski County Team members included JoLynn Behny, Pulaski County Clerk; Richard Fox, Pulaski County Voter Registration Clerk; Laura Cosgray, White County Clerk; Kara Fishburn, Jasper County Clerk; Shanda Cortez, White County Election Clerk; Ashley Pierce, Starke County Deputy Election Clerk; Angie Witherington, Jasper Deputy Election Clerk; and Angie Witherington, Jasper Deputy Election Clerk. Vendor representative Steve Shamo was also present and assisted throughout the audit.

The VSTOP Team would like to thank Clerk Behny, the Pulaski County Audit Team, and the Pulaski County Election Board for hosting this post-election audit. Several preparatory meetings were conducted with the county in the weeks leading up to the post-election audit and Clerk Behny provided valuable information and data that was used to conduct the audit.

The post-election audit began with an introductory presentation to the county participants on the morning of the audit. This presentation included the generation of a 20-digit seed number, in collaboration with all county participants. The seed number produced is as follows: 95208547734670515750.

The VSTOP team would also like to take this opportunity to provide a brief description of the post-election audit conducted and the contests that were audited. Pulaski County uses the MicroVote EMS 4.4.8 direct record electronic voting system. The post-election audit included the total number of Absentee Mail-In ballots cast on paper and all Absentee Walk-In and Election Day ballots cast on voter-verifiable paper audit trails (VVPATs) during the Pulaski County 2022 General Election.

In consultation with Pulaski County, the following three races were audited with an initial risk limit set at 9% (as the attached report shows, the actual risk limits attained were lower):

- Auditor of State
- United States Representative District 2 (2-Year Term)
- United States Senator

There was a total of 1,150 Absentee Mail-In, Absentee Walk-In, and Election Day ballots included in the total sample. 228 Absentee and Election Day ballots were sampled to reach the risk limit and verify the outcomes. Of this total, the audit team was required to sample 98 ballots for Auditor of State, 65 ballots for United States Representative District 2 (2-Year Term), and 65 ballots for United States Senator to meet the risk limit. Specifics regarding each race's outcomes are displayed by images provided by Dr. Philip Stark's Audit Tool used to conduct the post-election audit and can be found in Appendix A.

VSTOP acknowledges the Indiana Secretary of State and his office staff for their full support. At the end of all post-election audits for the 2022 General Election, a full report of the audit results will be prepared and submitted to the Indiana Secretary of State and each participating county.

Dr. Jay Bagga, VSTOP Co-Director

Dr. Chad Kinsella, VSTOP Co-Director

Pulaski County Post-Election Audit Procedure

Election: 2022 General Election

Date(s) of Audit: February 9, 2023

Number of Registered Voters: 9,119

Total Number of Ballots Cast: 3,851

Total Paper Absentee Ballots Cast: 217

Total Walk-in Absentee Ballots Cast: 933

Stark's Risk-Limit: Initially set at 9%
(See below for the actual risk limit achieved)

Seed Number: 95208547734670515750

Post-Election Audit Method(s):

- Ballot Polling Post-Election Audit (Paper Absentee Ballots)
- Ballot Comparison Post-Election Audit (Walk-in Absentee & Election Day Ballots)

Post-Election Audit Tools used:

The post-election audit tools have been designed by Dr. Philip Stark.

The ballot polling tool is available at:
<https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~stark/Vote/ballotPollTools.htm>

The ballot comparison tool is available at:
<https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~stark/Vote/auditTools.htm>

Audited Races Details

Races Audited – Ballot Polling Method:

Pulaski County Ballot Polling Audit (ABS Mail-In)						
Race/Question	Outcome		Smallest Margin	Diluted Margin	Initial Sample Size	Total Ballots Sampled
Auditor of State	(R) Tera K Klutz*	125	47	21.66%	100 ¹	85
	(D) Zenai Brooks	78				
	(L) John Andrew Schick	3				
	Undervotes	11				
	Total Ballots Cast	217				
United States Representative District 2 (2-year term)	(R) Rudolph (Rudy) Yakym III*	132	62	28.57%	58 ²	51
	(D) Paul D Steury	70				
	(L) William E Henry	8				
	Undervotes	7				
	Total Ballots Cast	217				
United States Senator	(R) Todd Young*	136	63	29.03%	58 ³	52
	(D) Thomas M McDermott, Jr.	73				
	(L) James M Sceniak	2				
	Undervotes	6				
	Total Ballots Cast	217				

Asterisk (*) denotes the winner of each contest

¹ The initial sample included 100 ballots. Once duplicates were removed, the sample size was 84, which yielded a 9% risk limit. An additional 1 ballot was sampled and a risk limit of 8% was achieved.

²The initial sample included 58 ballots. Once duplicates were removed, the sample size was 51, which met the risk limit and did not require further ballots to be sampled.

³The initial sample included 58 ballots. Once duplicates were removed, the sample size was 52, which met the risk limit and did not require further ballots to be sampled.

Note: The Stark Audit Tool's algorithm provided a randomized list of ballots to review in the total sequence of ballots. Due to the randomization, the audit tool may require that the audit team review the same ballot twice. The risk of auditing the same ballot twice is eliminated by utilizing the "remove duplicates" feature within the auditing tool. This ensures that the 6-cut method can be conducted accurately and ensures each ballot audited represents a unique data point.

Races Audited – Ballot Comparison Method:

Pulaski County Ballot Comparison Audit (ABS Walk-In & Election Day)						
Race/Question	Outcome		Smallest Margin	Diluted Margin	Initial Sample Size	Total Ballots Sampled
Auditor of State	(R) Tera K Klutz*	616	402	43.09%	13	13
	(D) Zenai Brooks	214				
	(L) John Andrew Schick	23				
	Undervotes	80				
	Total Ballots Cast	933				
United States Representative District 2 (2-year term)	(R) Rudolph (Rudy) Yakym III*	597	375	40.19%	14	14
	(D) Paul D Steury	222				
	(L) William E Henry	29				
	Undervotes	85				
	Total Ballots Cast	933				
United States Senator	(R) Todd Young*	655	422	45.23%	13	13
	(D) Thomas M McDermott, Jr.	233				
	(L) James M Sceniak	19				
	Write-In	2				
	Undervotes	26				
	Total Ballots Cast	933				

Asterisk (*) denotes the winner of each contest

Auditor of State (Absentee Mail-In)

Sample Size:

With the selected risk limit of 9%, the initial sample size for this contest was 100 ballots. Once duplicates were removed, the sample size was 84.

Initial sample size

Contest information

Ballots cast in all contests: Smallest margin (votes): 47. Diluted margin: 21.66%.

Contest 1. Contest name:

Winners:

Reported votes:

Candidate 1 Name:	Tera K Klutz	Votes:	125
Candidate 2 Name:	Zenai Brooks	Votes:	78
Candidate 3 Name:	John Andrew Schick	Votes:	3
Candidate 4 Name:	Undervotes	Votes:	11

Audit parameters

Risk limit: Expected sample size: 100.

Final Outcome:

The risk limit was not met with the initial sample size of 84 ballots. An additional 1 ballot was sampled. With the final sample size of 85 ballots, the final outcome resulted in an 8% risk limit, which indicates 92% confidence that the audit confirmed the results of this contest.

Audit progress

Audited votes for Auditor of State: 85

	Tera K Klutz	49	
Zenai Brooks	29		0.08
John Andrew Schick	2		0
Undervotes	5		0

Auditor of State (Absentee Walk-In & Election Day)

Sample Size:

With the selected risk limit of 9%, the sample size for this contest was 13 ballots.

Initial sample size

Contest information

Ballot cards cast in all contests: 933 Smallest margin (votes): 402 Diluted margin: 43.09%

Contest 1. Contest name: Auditor of State
Contest type: plurality super-majority

Winners: 1

Reported votes:

Candidate Name	Votes
Candidate 1 Name: Tera K Klutz	616
Candidate 2 Name: Zenai Brooks	214
Candidate 3 Name: John Andrew Schick	23

Add candidate to contest 1 Remove last candidate from contest 1

Add contest Remove last contest

Audit parameters

Risk limit: 9%

Expected rates of differences (as decimal numbers)

Overstatements	1-vote	2-vote
Understatements	0.001	0.0001

Starting size

Round up 1-vote differences Round up 2-vote differences Calculate size 13

Final Outcome:

With a sample size of 13 ballots, the final outcome resulted in a 0% risk limit, which indicates 100% confidence that the audit confirmed the results of this contest. Further sampled ballots were not required for this audit.

Stopping sample size and escalation

Ballots audited so far: 13

1-vote overstatements:	0	Rate: 0
2-vote overstatements:	0	Rate: 0
1-vote understatements:	0	Rate: 0
2-vote understatements:	0	Rate: 0

Estimated stopping size

Calculate **Audit complete**

If no more differences are observed: 12.
If differences continue at the same rates: 12.
Estimated additional ballots if difference rates stay the same: 0.

United States Representative District 2 (Absentee Mail-In)

Sample Size:

With the selected risk limit of 9%, the sample size for this contest was 58 ballots. Once duplicates were removed, the sample size was 51.

Initial sample size

Contest information

Ballots cast in all contests: 217 Smallest margin (votes): 62. Diluted margin: 28.57%.

Contest 1. Contest name: United States Representative District 2 (2-Year Term)

Winners: 1 ▾

Reported votes:

Candidate 1 Name:	Rudolph (Rudy) Yakym III	Votes:	132
Candidate 2 Name:	Paul D Steury	Votes:	70
Candidate 3 Name:	William E Henry	Votes:	8
Candidate 4 Name:	Undervote	Votes:	7

Add candidate to contest 1 Remove last candidate from contest 1

Add contest Remove last contest

Audit parameters

Risk limit: 9% Expected sample size: 58.

Final Outcome:

With the sample size of 51 ballots, the final outcome resulted in a 4% risk limit, which indicates 96% confidence that the audit confirmed the results of this contest. Further sampled ballots were not required for this audit.

Audited votes for United States Representative District 2 (2-Year Term): 51		
	Rudolph (Rudy) Yakym III	34
Paul D Steury	16	0.04
William E Henry	0	0
Undervote	1	0

United States Representative District 2 (Absentee Walk-In & Election Day)

Sample Size:

With the selected risk limit of 9%, the sample size for this contest was 14 ballots.

Initial sample size

Contest information

Ballot cards cast in all contests: 933 Smallest margin (votes): 375 Diluted margin: 40.19%

Contest 1. Contest name: United States Representative District 2 (2-Year Term)

Contest type: plurality super-majority

Winners: 1

Reported votes:

Candidate 1 Name:	Rudolph (Rudy) Yakym III	Votes:	597
Candidate 2 Name:	Paul D Steury	Votes:	222
Candidate 3 Name:	William E Henry	Votes:	29

Add candidate to contest 1 Remove last candidate from contest 1

Add contest Remove last contest

Audit parameters

Risk limit: 9%

Expected rates of differences (as decimal numbers):

Overstatements. 1-vote: 0.001 2-vote: 0.0001

Understatements. 1-vote: 0.001 2-vote: 0.0001

Starting size

Round up 1-vote differences. Round up 2-vote differences. Calculate size: 14

Final Outcome:

With the sample size of 14 ballots, the final outcome resulted in a 0% risk limit, which indicates 100% confidence that the audit confirmed the results of this contest. Further sampled ballots were not required for this audit.

Stopping sample size and escalation

Ballots audited so far: 14

1-vote overstatements: 0 Rate: 0
2-vote overstatements: 0 Rate: 0
1-vote understatements: 0 Rate: 0
2-vote understatements: 0 Rate: 0

Estimated stopping size

Calculate **Audit complete**
If no more differences are observed: 13.
If differences continue at the same rates: 13.
Estimated additional ballots if difference rates stay the same: 0.

United States Senator (Absentee Mail-In)

Sample Size:

With the selected risk limit of 9%, the initial sample size for this contest was 58. Once duplicates were removed, the sample size was 52.

Initial sample size

Contest information

Ballots cast in all contests: 217 Smallest margin (votes): 63. Diluted margin: 29.03%.

Contest 1. Contest name: United States Senator

Winners: 1

Reported votes:

Candidate 1 Name:	Todd Young	Votes:	136
Candidate 2 Name:	Thomas M McDermot, Jr	Votes:	73
Candidate 3 Name:	James M Sceniak	Votes:	2
Candidate 4 Name:	Undervotes	Votes:	6

Add candidate to contest 1 Remove last candidate from contest 1

Add contest Remove last contest

Audit parameters

Risk limit: 9% Expected sample size: 58.

Final Outcome:

With a sample size of 52 ballots, the final outcome resulted in a 2% risk limit, which indicates 98% confidence that the audit confirmed the results of this contest. Further sampled ballots were not required for this audit.

Audited votes for United States Senator: 52	
	Todd Young 35
Thomas M McDermot, Jr 15	0.02
James M Sceniak 0	0
Undervotes 2	0

United States Senator (Absentee Walk-In & Election Day)

Sample Size:

With the selected risk limit of 9%, the sample size for this contest was 13 ballots.

Initial sample size

Contest information

Ballot cards cast in all contests: 933 Smallest margin (votes): 422 Diluted margin: 45.23%

Contest 1. Contest name: United States Senator

Contest type: plurality super-majority

Winners: 1

Reported votes:

Candidate 1 Name:	Todd Young	Votes:	655
Candidate 2 Name:	Thomas M McDermott Jr.	Votes:	233
Candidate 3 Name:	James M Sceniak	Votes:	19

Audit parameters

Risk limit: 9%

Expected rates of differences (as decimal numbers):

Overstatements. 1-vote:	0.001	2-vote:	0.0001
Understatements. 1-vote:	0.001	2-vote:	0.0001

Starting size

Round up 1-vote differences. Round up 2-vote differences. 13.

Final Outcome:

With the sample size of 13 ballots, the final outcome resulted in a 0% risk limit, which indicates 100% confidence that the audit confirmed the results of this contest. Further sampled ballots were not required for this audit.

Stopping sample size and escalation

Ballots audited so far: 13

1-vote overstatements:	0	Rate:	0
2-vote overstatements:	0	Rate:	0
1-vote understatements:	0	Rate:	0
2-vote understatements:	0	Rate:	0

Estimated stopping size

If no more differences are observed: 12.

If differences continue at the same rates: 12.

Estimated additional ballots if difference rates stay the same: 0.

