

Draft Election Results Comparison of "Election Administrator Results" with "Exit Poll Affidavit Results"

Election:	Texas Primary Election
Race Presented in Below Table:	Presidential Primaries
Election Date:	March 04, 2008
State:	Texas
County:	Travis County
Precinct:	236; Rosedale Elementary School

03-09-08 DRAFT RESULTS-
 Election Administrator Results are from initial electronic machine tape output from Travis County Substation read by a volunteer on Election Eve.

PURPOSE OF THIS PRESENTATION
 1. Present Actual Results, without interpretation/analysis, so that observers may be able to draw their own conclusions.
 2. Provide Limited Analysis that is merely the opinion of one person that was involved in the polling, and that may be found useful by others as a guide for how the results may be interpreted.
 3. Provide future Exit Poll Affidaviters with information useful for configuring their polling to have successful results.

Comment on Analysis Presented Here
 Due to a desire to present the results soon after the Election, but still provide some background and analysis, and in consideration of limited volunteer time, the analysis presented here represents only initial considerations that have not yet been fully refined, and/or summarized.

Party	Candidate	Election Administrator Results			Exit Poll Affidavit Results			% of Election Administrator Votes Captured by Exit Poll Affidavit (= # of Exit Poll Votes Cast / Election Administrator Total Votes Cast)	Ratio of # of "Election Administrator" Votes Cast to "Exit Poll Affidavit" Votes Cast
		Votes	% of Party	% of Both Parties	Votes	% of Party	% of Both Parties		
Democrat	Joe Biden	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	Hillary Clinton	236	32.7%	28.8%	117	29.9%	26.8%	49.6%	2.0
	Chris Dodd	0	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	John Edwards	5	0.7%	0.6%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	--
	Barack Obama	478	66.3%	58.3%	273	69.8%	62.6%	57.1%	1.8
	Bill Richardson	2	0.3%	0.2%	1	0.3%	0.2%	50.0%	2.0
	Other		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	No Vote		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	TOTAL		721	100.0%	87.9%	391	100.0%	89.7%	54.2%
Republican	Hugh Cort	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	Rudy Giuliani	2	2.0%	0.2%	1	2.2%	0.2%	50.0%	2.0
	Mike Huckabee	21	21.2%	2.6%	8	17.8%	1.8%	38.1%	2.6
	Duncan Hunter	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	Alan Keyes	1	1.0%	0.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	--
	John McCain	50	50.5%	6.1%	20	44.4%	4.6%	40.0%	2.5
	Ron Paul	22	22.2%	2.7%	15	33.3%	3.4%	68.2%	1.5
	Mitt Romney	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	Fred Thompson	3	3.0%	0.4%	1	2.2%	0.2%	33.3%	3.0
	Hoa Tran	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	Uncommitted		0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	--	--
	TOTAL		99	100.0%	12.1%	45	100.0%	10.3%	45.5%
TOTAL Both Parties		820			436			53.2%	1.9

Note! See "General Notes" and "Analysis Considerations" on the following page for basic polling method and results gathering information, and limited analysis.

General Notes

1. Types of Voting Ballots Included- Only Election Day votes are shown, for both "Election Administrator results" and "Exit Poll Affidaviting" results. Provisional Ballots are not intended to be included in the above, based on only limited, if any, Provisional Ballots being cast in the polling place, and on limited soliciting of this information from participants. Results here do not include Early Voting, and do not include Absentee Voting. "Election Administrator" results for Travis County that are shown here are those read from the "tickertape" output of the Electronic Voting Machines that were available at the "Substations" on Election Night evening, and are not supposed to include Provisional Votes.

2. Precinct and Polling Information- This precinct had ____ Registered Voters who had the opportunity to vote on 03-04-08. The Precinct Coordinator reported that approximately ____% of those voters who walked out of the Polling Place were solicited for participation in the Exit Poll Affidavit. From 7 am to 11:30 am, there were generally ____ volunteers (poll conductors). From 11:30 am to 3:30 pm, there were ____ volunteers. From 3:30 pm to 7:30 pm (1/2 hour after the polls officially closed, but extending longer to ask participation of those still waiting in line to vote), there were generally ____ volunteers.

Analysis Considerations

3. How much more likely are supporters of one particular candidate to participate in the Exit Poll Affidavit than supporters of another candidate?- This question can be considered with the results in the column "% of Election Administrator Votes Captured by Exit Poll Affidavit". For the Republicans in this precinct, the values for the top 3 candidates range from 40.0% to 68.2%. For the top 2 candidates of the Democrats, the values range from 49.6% to 57.1%.

4. How close are the Exit Poll Affidavit results to the Election Administrator results?- Consideration can be made for this question by comparing the "% of Party" values for each candidate in the Election Administrator results, with the corresponding values in the Exit Poll Affidavit results. Relative consistency can be seen for the Democrats, with Hillary Clinton results at 32.7% Election Administrator versus 29.9% Exit Poll Affidavit, and Barack Obama at 66.3% Election Administrator versus 69.8% Exit Poll Affidavit. For the Republicans, there is still relative consistency (when considering the relatively small total population size of 45 Exit Poll Affidavits collected), though less than is seen with the Democrats, with Mike Huckabee at 21.2% Election Administrator versus 17.8% Exit Poll Affidavit, and John McCain at 50.5% Election Administrator versus 44.4% Exit Poll Affidavit, and Ron Paul at 22.2% Election Administrator versus 33.3% Exit Poll Affidavit.

5. Differences between Different Candidates for Consideration of Election Administrator Results and Exit Poll Affidavit Results- Although some candidate's differences (in %s from the Election Administrator versus those from Exit Poll Affidaviting) are higher than others, consideration should be made that, with the relatively small total population sample of the precinct here considered by itself, it seems reasonable to consider that the differences may be reasonably due to typical situations as may be present in these types of sampling method. Such nonhomogeneity over time can be attributed to a whole range of people's normal life occurrences. For instance, there could be the possibility that a family of one particular candidate all left the polling place simultaneously, and that they were all traveling in the same vehicle, and one of them had to be at work soon, and therefore, when asked to participate, none of them were willing to take the time to do so. Such could skew the Exit Poll Affidavit results against that candidate, and in favor of the others. And, with a small sampling population, the impact of these variations caused by even a few voters can have a not insignificant effect on the calculated percentages.

6. Consideration of Limited Discrepancies in Small Population Sampling- With the limited population considered (for instance, for the Republicans in this precinct, there was only 45 Exit Poll Affidavit respondents) and the degree of participation (53.2% for both parties), the present analyzer of these results is considering that, by themselves, the results here do not show any anomalies that are significant enough to consider that the differences between the Election Administrator results and the Exit Poll Affidavit results are attributable to anything other than typical statistical variations that occur when the population sampled consists of independent and free thinking individuals that display a whole host of differences in their daily actions. To determine whether the above-mentioned seemingly minor differences are possibly attributable to some other explanation, consideration could be made to compare the results here with those of other precincts, counties, and states.

7. "Apples to Apples" Comparison of Voting Numbers, versus Voting Percentages- Recognition must be made that one of the intents of an "Exit Poll Affidaviting" of everyone who votes is to be able to do an "apples to apples" comparison of actual voting totals for each candidate, and not merely %s, by comparing the Election Administrator total for each candidate with the Exit Poll Affidaviting total for each candidate. Using only %s is not sufficient to prove fraudulent behavior, although, if the polling is comprehensive enough, indications can definitely be obtained. However, with Exit Poll Affidaviting conducted with a sufficiently high respondent rate, an "apples to apples" comparison can show discrepancies that actually show potential fraud in a conclusive enough manner that mere %s can not. Recognition is made that the total respondent rate was not high enough in this precinct to have such an "apples to apples" comparison. In these regards, it is the opinion of the writer of this limited analysis here that continued striving to achieve higher respondent rates is needed so that such an "apples to apples" comparison can be made.

8. Democratic Participation Rate in Exit Poll Affidaviting Significantly Higher than Corresponding Republican Participation Rate- 89.7% of the participants in the Exit Poll Affidaviting were voters in the Democratic Primary, and 10.3% were voters in the Republican Party. In the opinion of the present compiler and analyzer of this information, this difference may be due to a perceived noninterest in the Republican Primary by a significant portion of the voting population, as indicated by a seeming communication by the mainstream media in the weeks prior to the election that there was only a single Republican candidate who had any chance of winning the nomination. Such communications are reasonably understood to potentially have a negative effect on participation rates that would reasonably be expected to be higher if people were to have believed that there was not already a perceived winner. The present analyzer has had access to Exit Poll results from at least one other state, and, in that Exit Poll, which had its primary on February 05, 2008, there was an approximately equal number of Democratic participants compared to Republican participants in the Exit Poll.

9. Participation Rate Composed of Two "Factors", 1=How Many Voters were Asked to Participate; 2= Of the Voters Asked, How Many Were Willing to Participate- The Participation Rate can be considered to be composed of these two factors, such that Overall Participation Rate= Voters Asked Percentage * Voters Willing to Participate Percentage. If either one of these factors is 100%, then the resulting percentage of the other factor can be determined if the Overall Participation Rate is known. In a different Travis County Precinct than the one whose results are shown here, that was similarly affidavited (Travis Precinct 309), the Precinct Coordinator communicated that a very high % of people who walked out the door were actually solicited for participation. In that manner, the answer of "Of the Voters Asked, How Many Were Willing to Participate" was able to be reasonably ascertained. See the results and analysis for the Travis Precinct 309.

10. Overall Lessons- One lesson that is that, even when full coverage is occurring (which results in being able to ask for participation by nearly everyone who walks out of the Polling Place), in the climate that existed on that day, 50% to 60% of people would participate, as shown by the results from Travis Precinct 309 (which is not shown on this present sheet). With similar overall participation rate, and a recognition that the polls in the different precincts were generally conducted similarly, it is reasonable to expect that similar conclusions could be drawn for the precinct here if confirmation were obtained that a high percentage of people walking out the door were asked to participate. Obviously, with lesser coverage, the overall participation rate would likely have been less. For this reason, presentation is made here that full coverage (i.e. having a high number of poll taking volunteers) is important to get successful results. **Further, with more voter education, and a different political situation, higher percentages can be achieved. In this manner, true "apples to apples" comparisons may indeed be able to be achieved in such future elections.**

Also, in this manner, consideration can be made that, when those who may be able to control/manipulate the outcome of the electronic machines have a reason to so act, then, **with the polling/affidaviting method used here (seen successful with a high consistency between Election Administrator results and Exit Poll Affidavit results), and with a higher participation rate as the political climate and education state of voters increases, the method is seen to have a high likelihood of being able to detect any nefarious behavior that may so occur in future elections that may have their results manipulated.**

Contacts- Exit Poll Affidaviting was organized in Travis County and Williamson County, Texas by Vote Rescue, www.voterescue.org. Analysis here provided by polling volunteer participant Mitchell Stein, mss10@earthlink.net.