Voting System Post-Election Audit Report

	Count	y: Leon Date of Election: Nvember 5, 2024
	Type	of Audit (check applicable box): Manual Automated Independent
	Precin	ect Number(s): All precincts
	Race (if Manual Audit): N/A
	1.	Overall accuracy of the audit: Both systems are in agreement within the required threshold
ballots counted be presidential and	etween the vice-preside	votes cast provides detailed information regarding the results of the voting system post-election audit. With regards the comparison in the number of e two systems, there is zero difference (0.0% percent). With regards to the number of votes counted, there is zero difference in the top-ticket ential contest (0.0%). The highest amount of difference was found in the Meredith Sasso judicial retention race, with a raw difference of five votes refers of magnitude below the 1/2 of 1% threshold which would require additional investigation Comment added by Leon SOE staff on 11/25/24
	2.	Description of any problems or discrepancies encountered: N/A
	3.	Likely cause of such problems or discrepancies: N/A
	4.	Recommended corrective action with respect to avoiding or mitigating such circumstances in future elections: N/A
	■ We accurat	applicable box and sign below: the hereby certify that the report of the voting system audit performed for the election is e and that attached are precinct summary reports for each precinct audited. the hereby certify that a voting system audit was not done because a manual recount was ted under s. 102.166, Florida Statutes.
	Signatur Printed MA Printed Printed	RK S EARLEY July 24

DS-DE 107 (eff. 01/2014)

Rule 1S-5.026, F.A.C.

	Wi	Ballots th Contes	st		Votes			
Choice	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Overvoted With Vote for this Choice	Undervoted Without Vote for this Choice
President (Vote for 1)						mmanisa hanna menyana Akena		
Kamala D. Harris	158,906	158,90 6	0	94520	94520	0	54	1,116
Donald J. Trump	158,906	158,90 6	0	60397	60397	0	13	1,116
Write-in	158,906	158,90 6	0	927	927	0	2	1,116
Jill Stein	158,906	158,90 6	0	742	742	0	38	1,116
Chase Oliver	158,906	158,90 6	0	560	560	0	16	1,116
Claudia De la Cruz	158,906	158,90 6	0	250	250	0	15	1,116
Peter Sonski	158,906	158,90 6	0	215	215	0	15	1,116
Randall Terry	158,906	158,90 6	0	116	116	0	22	1,116
US Senator (Vote for 1)		do des alamentario de				10-625-1000-1000-1000-1000-100-100-100-100-10		
Debbie Mucarsel-Powell	158,906	158,90 6	0	88881	88882	+1	10	3,608
Rick Scott	158,906	158,90 6	0	63554	63554	0	7	3,608
Tuan TQ Nguyen	158,906	158,90 6	0	1002	1002	0	3	3,608
Feena Bonoan	158,906	158,90 6	0	852	852	0	3	3,608
Ben Everidge	158,906	158,90 6	0	792	792	0	4	3,608
Write-in	158,906	158,90 6	0	204	204	0	1	3,608
Rep in Congress, Dist 2 (\	Vote for 1)	ey or at a new						
Yen Bailey	158,906	158,90 6	0	88719	88721	+2	4	6,501
Neal Dunn	158,906	158,90 6	0	63678	63680	+2	4	6,501
State Senator, Dist 3 (Vote	e for 1)				***************************************	CCPACHUCULA MATERIA MATERIA (MATERIA)		CONTROL OF THE STATE OF THE STA
Daryl Parks	158,906	158,90 6	0	86224	86224	0	4	6,563

	Wi	Ballots th Contes	st		Votes			
Choice	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Overvoted With Vote for this Choice	Undervoted Without Vote for this Choice
Corey Simon	158,906	158,90 6	0	66114	66115	+1	4	6,563
State Rep, Dist 7 (Vot	e for 1)					Terrett år start om fram til så sakt junet skannen som		
Jason Shoaf	4,324	4,324	0	2780	2780	0	0	279
Kenny Beasley	4,324	4,324	0	1265	1265	0	0	279
State Rep, Dist 8 (Vote	e for 1)	**************************************			*******		Bar Willer Copyrigin manner	
Gallop P. Franklin	57,388	57,388	0	40258	40258	0	1	3,361
Grace Glass	57,388	57,388	0	13768	13768	0	1	3,361
State Rep, Dist 9 (Vote	e for 1)				PROFESSIONAL PROFE		MXX-ethoris Soul unique to account and account to account	
Allison Tant	97,194	97,194	0	54400	54401	+1	5	4,427
Spencer Brass	97,194	97,194	0	38361	38361	0	5	4,427
Superintendent of Sch	ools (Vote for 1)							
Rocky Hanna	158,906	158,90 6	0	107969	107970	+1	23	8,825
Joe Burgess	158,906	158,90 6	0	42086	42088	+2	23	8,825
Sup Crt - Renatha Fran	ncis (Vote for 1)		***			No. 10 Ave. 10		
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	77712	77716	+4	35	21,597
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	59558	59558	0	35	21,597
Sup Crt - Meredith Sas	so (Vote for 1)							
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	73544	73549	+5	9	23,260
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	62088	62088	0	9	23,260
Dist Crt - Stephanie Ra	y (Vote for 1)			Philade de Colombia de Antonio de Servicio de Colombia				an Prince month production and billion behaviorable
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	80898	80899	+1	17	26,232
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	51757	51758	+1	17	26,232
Dist Crt - Bradford L. Th	nomas (Vote for 1)							
⁄es	158,906	158,90 6	0	75712	75715	+3	12	28,017

		Ballots			Votes			
	Wi	ith Contes	st					
Choice	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Overvoted With Vote for this Choice	Undervoted Without Vote for this Choice
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	55162	55162	0	12	28,017
Dist Crt - M. Kemmerly	Thomas (Vote for	1)						
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	77441	77442	+1	6	27,626
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	53832	53832	0	6	27,626
County Judge, Group 4	(Vote for 1)							
LaShawn D. Riggans	158,906	158,90 6	0	66229	66229	0	13	27,773
Robert Churchill	158,906	158,90 6	0	64890	64891	+1	13	27,773
County Comm, At Lg, G	rp 1 (Vote for 1)							alan karan mengang bijalan sebanah sebagai ananggalannya ya
Carolyn D. Cummings	158,906	158,90 6	0	89862	89863	+1	9	30,309
David T. Hawkins	158,906	158,90 6	0	38724	38725	+1	9	30,309
County Comm, Dist 4 (V	ote for 1)							
Brian Welch	40,580	40,580	0	21861	21861	0	5	4,596
Isaac Montilla	40,580	40,580	0	14118	14118	0	5	4,596
City Comm, Seat 2 (Vote	for 1)							, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Curtis Richardson	97,755	97,755	0	42020	42020	0	6	14,872
Dot Inman-Johnson	97,755	97,755	0	40856	40857	+1	6	14,872
Piney-Z CDD Supervisor	, Seat 2 (Vote for	r 1)						
Linda Guyas	1,156	1,156	0	583	583	0	0	144
Greg Moran	1,156	1,156	0	429	429	0	0	144
1 - Amend - Partisan Sch	nool Boards (Vote	e for 1)					Met in was a construction of the following and a graph of the construction of the cons	
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	85600	85602	+2	22	13,001
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	60281	60281	0	22	13,001
2 - Amendment - Right to	Fish and Hunt (Vote for 1)		-18				**************************************
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	85355	85356	+1	10	8,572

				Votes				
	Wi	Ballots th Contes	st					
Choice	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Overvoted With Vote for this Choice	Undervoted Without Vote for this Choice
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	64968	64968	0	10	8,572
3 - Amend - Marijuana (Vo	te for 1)							
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	101249	101250	+1	13	2,608
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	55034	55035	+1	13	2,608
4 - Amend - Abortion (Vote	for 1)				********			
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	102266	102268	+2	28	3,439
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	53170	53171	+1	28	3,439
5 - Amend - Homestead Ex	kemptions (Vo	te for 1)						
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	81823	81826	+3	14	15,625
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	61441	61441	0	14	15,625
6 - Amend - Campaign Fina	ancing (Vote fo	or 1)						
No	158,906	158,90 6	0	85518	85518	0	21	16,199
Yes	158,906	158,90 6	0	57164	57168	+4	21	16,199
1 - City Charter - Commiss	ioner Salaries	(Vote for	1)					
Yes	97,755	97,755	0	47293	47293	0	15	13,326
No	97,755	97,755	0	37120	37121	+1	15	13,326
2 - City Charter - Ethics Bo	ard (Vote for 1)						
Yes	97,755	97,755	0	60116	60116	0	7	14,939
No	97,755	97,755	0	22693	22693	0	7	14,939
3 - City Charter - Two-Cand	didate Election	s (Vote for	r 1)					
Yes	97,755	97,755	0	57759	57759	0	4	15,003
No	97,755	97,755	0	24989	24989	0	4	15,003
4 - City Charter - Periodic F	Review of Cha	rter (Vote f	for 1)				*	
Yes	97,755	97,755	0	66628	66628	0	3	15,207
No	97,755	97,755	0	15917	15917	0	3	15,207

	Wi	Ballots th Contes	st		Votes			
Choice	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Comparison System	This System	Difference	Overvoted With Vote for this Choice	Undervoted Without Vote for this Choice
5 - City Charter -	Inspector General (Vote	for 1)						***************************************
Yes	97,755	97,755	0	52596	52596	0	2	16,840
No	97,755	97,755	0	28317	28317	0	2	16.840

Additionally for Item 1 above, I believable the term "Overall Accuracy of the Audit" is a poor choice of words.

The AIA provides a secondary measure against which the certified results can be compared. I believe the best measure of the Overall Agreement between the certified results and the audit results can be calculated by first finding the absolute value of all the differences in the vote counts for all candidates across all races. This number becomes your numerator to find the variance between the two certified tabulation systems.

You can get the denominator using one of several measures: the total votes cast in the election, the total times each contest was adjudicated for voter intent, or the total number of ovals assessed (every oval on every ballot) that could potentially have a voter mark representing voter intent.

I prefer the latter because in the determination of a vote, every oval on every ballot is assessed for voter intent by both systems. Thus, my preference to determine the denominator is by calculating the total number of ovals across the entire cast ballot inventory. This can be determined for each race by multiplying the times the race appeared on a cast ballot by the number of candidates in that race. Then you add all those up for the entire election.

Our numbers for this election are:

Total vote variance between systems (adding absolute values) = 45

Total number of ovals on ballots cast = 8,884,020

Oval Assessment Variance: 45/8,884,020 = 0.000507%

Oval Assessment Agreement: 99.999493%

Using the other measures results in the following:

Vote Variance: 45/3,273,207 = 0.001375%

Vote Agreement: 99.998625%

Race Adjudication Variance: 45/3,647,480 = .0001234%

Race Adjudication Agreement: 99.998766%

The contest with the greatest percentage variance was the Sasso Retention contest.

The variance measures for that contest were as follows.

Vote: 0.003686%

Race Adjudication: 0.003147%

Oval Assessment: 0.001573%

Amended by

MARK S. EARLEY

LEON COUNTY SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS

	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I
				Times race	Adjudication	Candidates incl WI	Oval	Assessment	AbsValue
1	Contest	Votes Counted	Vote Variance	adjudicated		option	assessments	Variance	Variance
	President	157,727	0.000000%	158,906	0.000000%	8	1,271,248	0.000000%	
3	US Senator	155,285	0.000644%	158,906	0.000629%	6	953,436	0.000105%	1
4	Representative in Congress, District 2	152,397	0.002625%	158,906	0.002517%	2		0.001259%	4
5	State Senator, District 3	152,338	0.000656%	158,906	0.000629%	2	317,812	0.000315%	1
6	State Representative, District 7	4,045		4,324	0.000000%	2		0.000000%	0
7	State Representative, District 8	54,026	0.000000%	57,388	0.000000%	2	114,776	0.000000%	0
8	State Representative, District 9	92,761	0.001078%	97,194	0.001029%	2		0.000514%	
9	Superintendent of Schools	150,055	0.001999%	158,906	0.001888%	2	317,812	0.000944%	3
10	Supreme Court Justice - Renatha Francis	137,270	0.002914%	158,906	0.002517%	2	317,812	0.001259%	4
11	Supreme Court Justice - Meredith Sasso	135,632	0.003686%	158,906	0.003147%	2	317,812	0.001573%	
	District Court of Appeals - Stephanie Ray	132,655	0.001508%	158,906	0.001259%	2	317,812	0.000629%	2
13	District Court of Appeals - Bradford L. Thomas	130,874	0.002292%	158,906	0.001888%	2	317,812	0.000944%	3
	District Court of Appeals - M. Kemmerly Thomas	131,273	0.000762%	158,906	0.000629%	2	<u> </u>	0.000315%	
	County Judge, Group 4	131,119	0.000763%	158,906	0.000629%	2	317,812	0.000315%	1
16	County Commissioner At Large, Group 1	128,586	0.001555%	158,906	0.001259%	2	317,812	0.000629%	2
	County Commissioner, District 4	35,979	0.000000%	40,580	0.000000%	2	81,160	0.000000%	0
	City Commissioner, Seat 2	82,876	0.001207%	97,755	0.001023%	2	195,510	0.000511%	1
19	Piney-Z CDD Supervisor, Seat 2	1,012	0.000000%	1,156	0.000000%	2	2,312	0.000000%	0
20	Amendment 1	145,881	0.001371%	158,906	0.001259%	2		0.000629%	2
21	Amendment 2	150,323	0.000665%	158,906	0.000629%	2	317,812	0.000315%	1
22	Amendment 3	156,283	0.001280%	158,906	0.001259%	2	317,812	0.000629%	2
23	Amendment 4	155,436	0.001930%	158,906	0.001888%	2	317,812	0.000944%	3
24	Amendment 5	143,264	0.002094%	158,906	0.001888%	2	317,812	0.000944%	3
25	Amendment 6	142,682	0.002803%	158,906	0.002517%	2	317,812	0.001259%	4
26	City Charter Amendment 1	84,413	0.001185%	97,755	0.001023%	2	195,510	0.000511%	1
27	City Charter Amendment 2	82,809	0.000000%	97,755	0.000000%	2	195,510	0.000000%	0
28	City Charter Amendment 3	82,748	0.000000%	97,755	0.000000%	2	195,510	0.000000%	0
29	City Charter Amendment 4	82,545	0.000000%	97,755	0.000000%	2	195,510	0.000000%	0
	City Charter Amendment 5	80,913	0.000000%	97,755	0.000000%	2	195,510	0.000000%	0
31	OVERALL VARIANCE MEASURES	3,273,207	0.001375%	3,647,480	0.001234%	68	8,884,020	0.000507%	45
32	OVERALL AGREEMENT MEASURES		99.998625%		99.998766%			99.999493%	