1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
2	ATLANTA DIVISION
3	
4	DONNA CURLING, ET AL., :
5	PLAINTIFFS, : DOCKET NUMBER
6	vs. : DOCKET NUMBER : 1:17-CV-2989-AT
7	BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, ET AL., :
8	DEFENDANTS. :
9	
10	TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE AMY TOTENBERG
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13	JUNE 15, 2020
14	5:08 P.M.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY OF PROCEEDINGS AND COMPUTER-AIDED
22	TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY:
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: SHANNON R. WELCH, RMR, CRR
24	2394 UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 75 TED TURNER DRIVE, SOUTHWEST
25	ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303 (404) 215-1383

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS DONNA CURLING, DONNA PRICE, JEFFREY SCHOENBERG:
4	
5	DAVID D. CROSS MARY G. KAISER
6	MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
7	HALSEY G. KNAPP, JR. ADAM M. SPARKS
8	KREVOLIN & HORST, LLC
9	
10	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS COALITION FOR GOOD GOVERNANCE, LAURA DIGGES, WILLIAM DIGGES, III, AND RICARDO DAVIS:
11	WILLIAM DIGGES, III, AND RICARDO DAVIS.
12	ROBERT ALEXANDER McGUIRE, III ROBERT McGUIRE LAW FIRM
13	NODEKI MCGOIKE DAW FIRM
14	FOR THE STATE OF GEORGIA DEFENDANTS:
15	VINCENE DODEDE DUCCO ID
16	VINCENT ROBERT RUSSO, JR. CAREY A. MILLER
17	JOSH BELINFANTE ROBBINS ROSS ALLOY BELINFANTE LITTLEFIELD, LLC
18	BRYAN P. TYSON
19	BRYAN JACOUTOT LOREE ANNE PARADISE
20	TAYLOR ENGLISH DUMA
21	
22	FOR THE FULTON COUNTY DEFENDANTS:
23	CHERYL RINGER DAVID LOWMAN
24	OFFICE OF THE FULTON COUNTY ATTORNEY
25	

## 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia; June 15, 2020.) COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: We have got quite a few on 3 4 here. Would you like me to call the case and have everybody 5 make an appearance for the record? THE COURT: Call the case. And if you know everyone 6 7 who is on the -- who is on -- do we, Mr. Martin? -- you could 8 just read their names. 9 COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: Okay. All right. We're here for the teleconference in the case of 17-CV-2989, Curling 10 11 vs. Raffensperger. Counsel of record are David Cross, Mary Kaiser, 12 13 Halsey Knapp, Adam Sparks, Robert McGuire, Bruce {sic} Tyson, 14 Mr. Jacoutot, Ms. Paradise, Vincent Russo, Josh Belinfante, 15 Carey Miller, Cheryl Ringer, and -- I'm sorry -- Mr. -- for the 16 Fulton County defendants? 17 MR. LOWMAN: David Lowman. 18 COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: Lowman. I couldn't read my 19 own writing. I apologize. 20 That should be everyone, Judge. 21 THE COURT: Is there anyone who didn't hear their 22 names and are present in a representational capacity? 23 Okay. All right. I have just gotten off of a long criminal sentencing. So I basically looked very briefly at 24

your letter. And I can't tell you that I completely understand

25

what is going on. So I'm just going to have to start from scratch. And I'm not sure I'm not coming in the middle of it anyway.

So let's just start with square one. What happened with where we were last at the end of last week? What happened with the question of being able to make the documents available so that the plaintiff said they could have a team look at things and be ready within a few weeks and that we were -- that was it seemed to be at that point the easiest way of resolving the conflict.

MR. TYSON: Yes, Your Honor. This is Bryan Tyson. I can kind of start for the State defendants.

We spoke with our clients about that approach with the documents, and they agree and consent to that process. Our concern that we wanted to raise was that apparently the time line for getting all the documents from the Georgia archives is apparently a two- to three-month process to retrieve all of the documents.

And as a result, instead of, you know, with us being like pulling out a box and handing it to plaintiffs to begin reviewing right away, we are -- we wanted to raise to the Court the tension where we're trying to balance the cost against the need here, that we're looking at another \$70- to \$100,000 worth of storage expenses before we even get to the part of the process where the plaintiffs are able to make their review.

we still view that as pretty steep in the current situation where we are. But I wanted to give you that. But we do consent to having the plaintiffs go through a document-based approach and doing this. We don't have a problem with that at all.

THE COURT: And so what is -- what currently is in archives, and what is currently available --

MR. TYSON: So we are --

THE COURT: -- without having to go through the archives?

MR. TYSON: Correct. This is Bryan Tyson again. So the Secretary's office is still trying to figure out how many of the 2018 elections that they have. The plaintiff had requested originally the 2018 general primary and the 2018 runoff.

I think they have a high degree of confidence that the 2018 general election is there. And they are relatively confident the 2018 election is in the office. So that review could begin quickly. But it is possible that one of the 2018 elections or both have already been sent to archives. So that is what they were looking at for us today. And I have not heard back at this point.

The 2016 and 2017 are definitely at the archives right now.

THE COURT: So you -- they think that most of the 2018 and the general election is available?

MR. TYSON: Yes, Your Honor. And the concern there would be that it could be -- we're fine for that process to begin. There is no issue there. But we couldn't begin disposing of any machines until the entirety of the process is complete. Because we have to have all of the records in place to get that done. So that is -- that is the issue for us from a cost perspective.

THE COURT: And what is the problem with the archives -- what is the archives challenge that it takes two to three months?

MR. TYSON: I don't fully understand what the process is there. But the Secretary's office has advised us that to get all these records, since they are so voluminous and since they cover so many elections — apparently that's the time line they have worked on for getting documents in the past.

I'm sure it is possible it could be faster. But that is the time line the Secretary's office has had in trying to obtain voluminous paper records like this from archives in past issues they have had.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So did that lead you -- is that how you-all started revisiting the issue of the cards?

MR. TYSON: No, Your Honor. When we proposed our

email this morning to the plaintiff advising them of that, we wanted to try to be very specific to lay out what we understood the proposal we are presenting to be. And so we presented the list that we had in our email there of what the proposal was.

Mr. Cross' recollection was that part of the proposal was we must also provide a random and reliable sample of memory cards that Dr. Halderman could examine to match machine IDs.

And I think one of our points of dispute is that was not -- we thought though that had come up at the conference that we had on Friday we did not understand that to be the kind of fully fleshed-out concept that we were ready to bring to the clients and try to analyze there. And I think that is one of our major points of disagreement in the emails.

THE COURT: Are there any other points of disagreement that are -- that I should know about --

MR. TYSON: I believe --

THE COURT: -- from your perspective?

MR. TYSON: Yes. Certainly. I'm sorry. Yes.

The only other one that I'm aware of relates to -there seems to be kind of a floated proposal from the Curling
plaintiffs about maybe just looking at 2018 only and not
looking at 2016 and 2017. We are not sure whether that
approach would be okay with the Coalition plaintiffs.

But as we understand it, I think those are the points of contention that we are aware of at this point.

THE COURT: Before we get to the card issue, let me just try to sort out the -- there appeared to be some difference between what the Coalition wanted and what the Curling plaintiffs wanted.

Could the -- is that reconciled at this point or not?

I'll ask the Coalition. Mr. Brown?

MR. McGUIRE: Your Honor, Rob McGuire. Mr. Brown is actually not on the phone.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. All right.

MR. McGUIRE: So our -- as we have told the Court before, our approach is to look at the machines that we know have shown anomalies because we think that from our perspective those are more likely to be machines that have malware.

And we on February 10 gave them a list of the machines we wanted. 139 of them already had serial numbers identified. So those machines are identifiable, 139 of them.

The remainder that we identified, we only had machine IDs. So this current discussion from our perspective pertains only to attaching serial numbers to the 472 that we identified by machine ID.

So we still want to look at the machines that we want to look at. And the whole idea of a random sample doesn't really work for us because we know the machines we want. The ones we don't have serial numbers already for we just need to attach serial numbers to them. And that is why we wanted to go

through the memory card exercise to see if we could use those to make that attribution of the serial number to a machine.

THE COURT: What is the process that you are looking to go through to make that attribution with the memory cards?

MR. McGUIRE: It is the same one that I believe

Mr. Cross -- his expert, Dr. Halderman, was going to do, which
is basically just look at the memory cards to see if his script
can actually really produce a correspondence between machine ID
and serial number. Because if it will, then there's no need
for us to wade through hundreds of thousands of pieces of paper
because we can do it just by running the script on the memory
cards and it is easy.

We can identify the serial numbers, and then we can release all the machines that we don't want for our specific selection and they don't want for their random sample. And then all of this concern about cost from the State's point of view could be mitigated.

So the memory cards from our perspective is an important thing to try because we think it is just going to shortcut a lot of this.

THE COURT: I'm going to just tell you that my distinct view -- impression when we last talked was you-all understood that there were all sorts of potential -- there was -- there might be conflict over the memory cards.

I did get the fact that the Coalition had a

completely different approach to trying to identify what machines you wanted to look at. But I didn't hear you saying, well, we really need the cards at that point. And I didn't -- and, in fact, everyone seemed sort of prepared to roll up your sleeves and look at the documents, even if it seems like a floppy method because there was no -- no way to know whether or not Dr. Halderman's approach was correct and you were going to end up having to negotiate once again a slippery situation about regarding the cards and security and everything else, you know, we have had problems with every single time.

So, you know, I thought y'all frankly -- it is not that you had given it up altogether. But that was definitely not the focus of what the plaintiffs were talking about to me. And I didn't hear it from the Coalition that this is what you think was the only way of getting it done in a reliable, cost-efficient way.

You know, if that had been your drumbeat, maybe we would have spent more time on that instead. But instead we are really looking at it in terms of these records.

Now, you didn't know it was going to take two to three months either, on the other hand. And I get that. That is a whole other -- in order to get a complete set of records.

But are you -- is the Coalition still looking to examine machines based on the 2017 or 2016 elections?

MR. McGUIRE: Well, our -- so the list we gave them

in February of this year has machines from all of the elections -- machines where there were anomalies in all of the elections that are sort of within the time frame we're talking about. So from 2016 through 2018, we have got machines from each of the elections that showed weird behavior. And we identified them either by serial number in the case of 139 of them, which those could be preserved right now based on that alone, or 472 additional ones for which we only have the machine ID.

Now, Your Honor is absolutely right we didn't make a big deal about it on the last call because we -- I think the Curling plaintiffs' needs for a representative sample kind of makes our -- our problem is solved when their problem is solved.

And we are ready to help them do what they need to do in order to go through the papers the way it has to be done. From our perspective, looking at the cards would be a lot faster and cheaper for everybody. So it is preferable. But we're not saying it is the only way it can be done.

We are certainly -- we are certainly prepared to help sift through if the Curling plaintiffs do that the hard way if that is what we have to do.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Cross?

MR. CROSS: Yes, Your Honor. I guess I should begin with an apology because I was not as clear as I intended to be

given your remarks.

What I thought we were discussing and what we were going to get on today from the State was a response to -- because what I thought I said -- and obviously I was not as clear about this as I needed to be -- was that these two efforts would move in parallel in the sort of initial stage to figure out what we could do.

As I indicated before, I mean, we are prepared to do the paper recap route. But we've had further conversations with Dr. Halderman. And he really believes based on what he has seen in his past experience that this can be done with the memory cards.

And so what I had tried to articulate on Friday was that we could begin with just a very simple sample. Right?

The memory cards are about the size of a credit card. And my understanding -- and Mr. Tyson can tell me if I have this wrong. But my understanding is they collected the memory cards at the same time they collected the DREs and other equipment.

So there are memory cards -- at least most of them, maybe all of them are sitting in a single facility where all of this equipment is. So they could put -- I mean, pick a number. Dr. Halderman tells me he can put 1000 of them in a bankers box. You could take something that feels like a good sample.

1000 may be right. Maybe he could do something smaller.

We'll pay to ship those to Michigan. He can then

look at them. I'm trying to pull up his email. He thinks he can probably go with a team and look at these cards in a matter of minutes for each of them. And he just needs to look and see if he can extract the audit logs. And the audit logs should then have the serial numbers of the corresponding DREs.

If he is right about that, it really is as simple as them gathering a random sample of these cards, putting them in a box, shipping them to Michigan, letting them look at them.

And this can all get done in a matter of days. And then we would know -- you know, neither the State nor us has to spend a lot of time and money dealing with paper.

That is what I had tried to articulate on Friday but evidently did a poor job of that.

THE COURT: Well, given all of that and the State would like to be done with this, let me ask you this: Why is it necessary even for him to go through 1000? Either he knows -- first of all, if they give them 20 cards, would he know one way or the other whether his -- this works or not? I mean, isn't that the first step, rather than sending 1000 cards?

MR. CROSS: So there's two things -- yeah. I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. CROSS: And this is David Cross again.

There are two things that we need to figure out. One

is confirm that the audit logs do have the serial numbers.

Again, he has a high confidence of that just because he has

seen it.

The other piece -- the reason why we were suggesting a larger number is we don't know how many times these cards have been reused in the machines and we don't know to what degree the information on the machines -- on the cards themselves has been preserved.

Our understanding and our position has always been that these cards should not get reused from election to election. They are very inexpensive. It is not like a DRE where you don't -- you are not going to buy a new DRE for every election. It is easy to do for a memory card.

And our position is they shouldn't have been wiped or altered in any way. So assuming that is the case, then yeah, you can look at 20 of them, confirm the serial numbers are there, and then have a high amount of confidence that if you get the rest of the cards you can find the other serial numbers.

But it is also possible that he could look at 20 and think that the larger universe of the cards has the information but then we get into them and it turns out some of them have not been preserved in some way.

So I wouldn't -- that is why we are suggesting a random sample so that we address both of those points. It

could be that the State is in a position to answer that question. And so they may know what exactly has been preserved on the cards and how they have been used. We don't. So that was the idea.

THE COURT: Mr. Russo, do you know?

MR. TYSON: Your Honor, this is Bryan Tyson. Our -- I will give you my current understanding. Actually, it is as Mr. Cross has described. That if the cards are used in regular order, that no information is erased from the cards. A folder is just renamed for the particular election.

I think in terms -- I think, Your Honor, you hit on one of the concerns that we had raised earlier in this process though is if we're going to be having Dr. Halderman look at the original memory cards -- this isn't like the GEMS databases where we can easily copy them on to a CD. If he is looking at the original card, you know, what is his script doing? Is it altering the card? How are we handling chain of custody on that?

There's kind of a lot of issues there. There is also a lot more information on the cards than just the audit log. There are ballot image reports. There are a variety of other election-related details about the operations of the DRE itself. And you haven't yet ordered a forensic examination, but it would give a lot of information to Dr. Halderman on that front too.

So I think, again, we're kind of -- when we get into the electronic world, we're going down the slope, which is why we had understood as well that we were talking about the paper-based record search on Friday so we could avoid a lot of these, you know, sticky questions that we have had to deal with previously.

## (Unintelligible cross-talk)

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. CROSS: I was just going to say some of those -- this is David Cross.

Dr. Halderman. What he has explained on the -- so these are the questions I had from Mr. Tyson. What is being extracted? It would be the audit log entries that show the serial numbers of the DREs that the cards were inserted into. We understand it also shows the elections and precincts where they were used. So that would enable us to match everything up by machine ID.

To the answer will the cards be altered, no. He said he would use write blocker -- a write blocker device, which is common forensic practice so it won't alter the card. In fact, it won't allow any information to be written to the card at all. He would only be copying information.

On the question of whether we need original memory cards, we are happy to take copies as long as everyone is comfortable that these are -- the copies themselves are made in

such a way as not to alter any information on the cards. That is going to add time and expense. Since they are going to destroy the cards anyway, we thought maybe they could just ship them out. Dr. Halderman will extract his information and send them back. That was our thinking anyways.

Oh, and the last point he made -- sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's all right.

MR. CROSS: To the question of -- we're not suggesting any forensic examination. And as I proposed to Mr. Tyson earlier today, if there are parameters they want to set about what Dr. Halderman can do with the cards, what he can extract, what he can analyze, we are totally open to that.

I mean, this will save literally months and thousands of hours and hundreds of thousands of dollars in expense if it works the way we think it will. So we are all in in trying to make the memory card piece work. And we think we can get to an answer in a matter of days if we can get some sample of the cards on that. I think we can address this -- the issues he is raising pretty simply if we can talk through it.

THE COURT: How is he basically -- you know, this is sort of the elephant in the room. Obviously, they don't want him to go look at all sorts of other things. How is he -- other than -- obviously, he is representing he won't. But, obviously, that is their concern.

So how would you propose to address that?

MR. CROSS: Two ideas come to mind, Your Honor. One is Your Honor could enter an order that makes clear he is only allowed to extract the audit log. I want to confirm with him that that is really all he needs. But the point would be the order can specify he is only allowed to extract what he needs for this particular purpose and not anything else. He's a professional expert. There is no reason to think that he would ignore that.

The other thing is it may be possible -- I have to ask him this. I have not asked him this as to whether it may be possible for him to send (unintelligible) that we can pass on to the State a copy of the script that he plans to run. And then they can see exactly what it is going to do.

Because my understanding from him is all he will do is literally plug the card into a computer, run the script, the script will extract the information he needs, and that is the only thing that will come off the cards. So I think we can probably provide the script, and they can verify that for themselves.

MR. TYSON: Your Honor, this is Bryan Tyson. Again, I appreciate Mr. Cross' and Dr. Halderman's work on that. I guess my concern is we have kind of been down this road in January of we thought we had a good solution to do this. And maybe this one will work. I don't know.

But my concern is: Okay. We engage in this process.

We go through it. We do all these steps, and then we're back at square one again.

We know the paperwork. We know where the paper is.

I guess I am just concerned that we are going to have to check
a bunch of boxes for a process that the plaintiffs think will
work but we're not sure yet, which is where we were, you know,
five months ago.

THE COURT: Well, you know where the cards are. I'm just trying to be -- how many -- how many -- you want -- he wants them to send how many -- how many cards so that he has some -- just let's say initially just so we don't -- we're not just sort of spending time and money. I mean, just trying to get through this no later than the end of July but really preferably this June, what is he saying he needs? How many cards again, just so that he knows if he were to run a first -- a first -- a first kind of set so that he knows this is actually going to work?

MR. CROSS: Right. Your Honor, this is David Cross. To that question of just to figure out whether it works, he hasn't given us a number. Again, he said you could put 1000 in a bankers box. If they don't want to send 1000, I mean, I would say probably at least 100 would give us enough of a number, if it is truly a random sample, for us to make sure that the audit logs are there and he can extract the information.

If they want to drop 500 in a box and ship them, we'll pay for it. It sounds like he could get through that by the end of the week if they were to ship those quickly or certainly by early next week. And so we would know definitely whether he can do this.

To Mr. Tyson's point, the only expense is literally shipping this to him. They know where the cards are, and they can grab them. Given what is on the flip side of the paper, the expense and time of that, it just seems to me we should run this to ground.

MR. TYSON: David, if he wants 100, that is not even one per county. Is the random sample like you are describing going to be at least one per county, or is it going to be some other grouping? I mean --

THE COURT: 100 doesn't sound like enough for anyone --

MR. TYSON: Right.

THE COURT: -- for us just not to end up being in trouble.

MR. TYSON: I'm also not certain exactly -- we have got to figure out how these are stored. I don't know if they are stored by county with the DREs or if they are stored in some other method. I honestly don't know the answer to that right now either.

MR. CROSS: Yeah. I mean, this is David Cross. I

can follow up with Dr. Halderman and our statistician -- the

two of them are working together -- to figure this out. I

think if we could get -- again, the first step isn't to figure

out a sample for preservation. The first step is just to

figure out whether this process works. So that is why I wasn't

coming in with a bigger number. I mean, it sounds like -
THE COURT: Yeah. But you still want to have -- you

want to know enough --

MR. CROSS: Got it.

THE COURT: -- so that you know that there are -there are some cards that reflect it and some cards that don't.

I mean, it may be whatever they were supposed to do in one
county they did and in another county they didn't. That is the
thing in terms of overwriting the data. It could be anything.

MR. CROSS: Yeah. I mean, if we really want to short circuit it, Your Honor, the easiest way is to just take all the memory cards they have, ship them to Dr. Halderman. We will pay for that, and he can just go through the whole thing right now.

THE COURT: Yeah. That is true. But on the other hand, what if it is basically a process -- you find out that 80 percent of it doesn't work and so we are back -- and they haven't ordered their -- anything up in terms of paper and then you are saying you want to have paper? I mean, yeah. We could get -- I can understand the 1000. I could understand 500

depending -- as a sample. But you have to at some point -- I guess the thing is in judging the relative worth of this exercise I have been conscious of the fact that on one hand the State doesn't want to basically say it is not going to appeal and that there is a -- and I can't deny you information that you have been trying to get that is based on the merits of your claims.

2.2

But it has -- you know, arguably it might -- as the Court has found, it certainly could impact anything else going forward that might be -- have been asserted. But, nevertheless, there comes a point where the value of we want to do this and we want to do that doesn't really work.

So I don't know why he thinks that the script will work. I respect his knowledge. But he thinks other things -you know, he thought the GEMS would work too. So that is -I'm just really -- I think the State should go ahead and find out how they are collected. It doesn't take -- I guess what -from Mr. McGuire's perspective on his client, they -- it may take care of their concerns that there are particular machines they want. But I don't know where the cards are kept, if those are in archives as well, if they are for anything but the 2018 election.

MR. TYSON: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

Mr. Tyson, do you know?

1 MR. TYSON: Yes, Your Honor. This is Bryan Tyson. 2 The archives would not maintain the cards since the cards used are put into the DRE. They would just maintain the paper 3 4 records and the CDs that are sent by the counties. 5 THE COURT: All right. So where are the cards for 6 the 2017 and '16 elections, or are they -- have they been 7 maintained? 8 MR. TYSON: So they are the same cards that are used 9 for the DREs. So the same set of cards are used --10 THE COURT: The same set of cards. 11 MR. TYSON: -- and it renames something, but it 12 doesn't delete it. 13 THE COURT: All right. Well, none of us 14 want to go through this another number of times. I mean, it 15 is -- I don't know the way the cards are kept. And, obviously, 16 Mr. Tyson doesn't know precisely in terms of the counties they 17 come from, the jurisdictions they come from. 18 But -- and, you know, it would seem like you --19 without saying that this is the sample, it just would seem like 20 you would want to have a large enough number that everyone would feel confident that the same protocols are used and they 21 come from a diverse enough set of counties. I don't know if 22 23 they are kept that way, that Fulton County's are kept and

Chatham County's are kept separately.

Are they?

24

25

MR. TYSON: Your Honor, this is Bryan Tyson. That was one thing I was just writing down here. I don't know the answer to that either. I don't know if the cards were aggregated together after they were collected or if they were maintained county by county. So that is something we will run to ground as well.

But, again, if they are all together, then that is not going to be much use for a sample I don't think because we couldn't figure out which county was which without looking at each individual card electronically. But we can find that out.

THE COURT: Well, let's say that is so, that they were just -- they were only kept collectively without separating the counties, which doesn't make much sense. But anything is possible.

I guess Dr. Halderman would say, well, I would like to have every county and that is why I should just have them all at that point because there is no other way of proceeding. So I don't think we have to reach that until we know how they are kept.

I mean, it seems to me it would be the fastest and you would take care of your money issues about the -- but on the other side of it, if Dr. Halderman is really making this commitment, I don't know, frankly, if he is not looking at all -- you know, the entire collection initially at least, Mr. Cross, I don't know why -- even when we talk about the 1000

why he is talking about it will take til next week. Time is of the essence here for the purposes of the legislative session and their budget.

MR. CROSS: Your Honor, this is David Cross. We agree. The only reason I was -- if he got 1000 cards, it sounds like he could turn that in a couple of days, maybe even faster, depending on how many people he has to help him.

I'm just thinking about how long it is going to take the State to pull these and get them to us. I mean, if they ship them tomorrow and he got them in Michigan on Wednesday, I believe he can get it done this week. I just don't know -- I don't know when he will have them.

THE COURT: Well, the point is to see whether it works and works consistently enough. And if not, then you are basically in this paper process, which does seem like it is —is going to have all sorts of problems.

MR. CROSS: Your Honor, one other thought if I may. This is David Cross again.

I mean, to your point, it could be we get into this with the memory cards and it turns out -- let's say half the counties for whatever reason -- their cards don't have the information. My understanding is it is automatically coded on the cards from the machines. So anytime they are used, that information should be there. So it wouldn't be they are only there if somehow the card got altered or overwritten.

But in any event, even if we found out, you know, through this sample to suggest that half the counties don't have it, that would still cut the work in half on the paper. So that is why my original thinking --

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, at some point, you have to decide if you really want to have the cards and half the counties have them it may be that is what it is. I mean, I'm just -- you know -- because, you know, it may not be. It depends on really -- you know, it may be -- you know, if the only counties that didn't override were in south Georgia, that wouldn't be fair.

But if it is just, you know -- it really depends. It is not that it is just that you get everything and we keep everything for three months waiting for the archives. So I just want to be clear about that.

Besides everything else, I mean, the Coalition is looking for particular machines. That may end up being the most efficient way. I don't know. Of course, if they can't find any of their machines, that is a whole other -- that is something else.

All right. Why don't -- Mr. Tyson, why don't you try to find out tomorrow morning how these are kept. I'm certainly happy to enter into any order and -- any order that will ensure the confidentiality and restriction of the use of the cards or that you -- that they will get copies of the cards rather than

the original cards, which is understandable, if you are able to do that. Otherwise, I mean, I don't know what is involved in running the cards. And we'll get to that as an alternative.

But I mean, tell me about the budget process in terms of how the Secretary of State -- what are the requirements that -- you know, there were 11 days.

Is today the first day of the session?

MR. TYSON: Yes, Your Honor. I'll give as much context as I can. And Mr. Belinfante and Mr. Russo may have some better context than I do.

I know the session started back today with 11 days left. I know that all agencies were required to propose 14 percent cuts originally. And I believe the Governor has now directed that down to an 11 percent cut across the board.

I do not know the status of the appropriations process. But I am certain that the House and the Senate have been working on that. Mr. Belinfante and Mr. Russo may have more insight. That is as much as I know at this point.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELINFANTE: This is Josh Belinfante. There is really nothing to add. But no budget was on the floor of the Senate today. So it is still being worked out.

THE COURT: I mean, I think we can have confidence that at least -- either that you don't have to enter -- I would love to say it would be -- the whole thing -- this whole thing

is going to be over by July -- June 30th or at minimum

July 30th. But if it takes -- if you can't get the documents

for another two or three months, then -- you know, then it

looks more like six months that you have to have this stuff for

another six months -- keep it around for six months. It seems

crazy. And that is why, you know, hopefully on all sides we

can figure this out.

But I will be tomorrow available if you try to -hopefully, you can come up with a consent order for him to look
at in a very narrow -- just for one processes. And I don't
know what alternatives there are other than that at this
juncture in order to get this over with very rapidly.

But if this is where we're at, then Mr. Halderman has to be prepared actually to move heaven and earth in order to get -- go this way.

MR. CROSS: Your Honor, this is David Cross. I'm --

MR. TYSON: I'm sorry. Go ahead, David.

MR. CROSS: I'm sorry. Thanks. One other idea that I could run by Dr. Halderman is whether we could actually have people just do the extraction of the memory cards locally in Atlanta. But, again, it is a simple process from what I understand.

It could be that if we get his script and get folks set up on whatever laptop he was going to use -- you can also do it by just plugging it into the DRE itself.

(Unintelligible). So I will explore that as well, and I can let Mr. Tyson know. But it may be we can make this even faster by not having to ship the cards anywhere.

THE COURT: Well, it occurred to me. I mean, if the State wasn't in such a state of stress, I would say they could run it themselves -- the script. But I don't see that happening without everyone getting into another state -- another mess. So let's -- but certainly it could be done locally, potentially at least.

MR. TYSON: Well, Your Honor, this is Bryan Tyson again. As far as deliverables go, we will look at finding out where the -- how the memory cards are stored and kind of what order they are stored. I hope I can ask somebody who has personal knowledge of that because obviously the election staff is kind of running around right now with the certification process.

But we'll get that as quickly as we can. And then we can look at a set of parameters that we think might be reasonable on that. And then if I could have from Mr. Cross a proposed sample process. And once -- once we explain how the cards are stored and then whatever protocol and the script, I guess that will be the other pieces we would need to try to keep putting these pieces together.

THE COURT: I mean, there remains the problem that if the Coalition wants particular machines a sample process might

1 not get to those particular machines. So somebody has to --2 that is -- just bear that in mind. I mean, it is a little bit like potentially -- do you know what counties -- does --3 4 Mr. McGuire, do you know what counties they are from? 5 MR. McGUIRE: Yes. All the machines we have 6 identified by machine ID, which are the ones we don't -- we 7 need to certainly find the actual device. The ones we have 8 identified by machine ID, we know the election, we know the 9 precinct, and we know the county. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. McGUIRE: And we know the machine ID. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, anyway, that 13 would have to be a supplement to whatever the sample is. But I 14 don't think that they can do a sample without knowing what 15 you -- basically how they are kept and all of that. 16 MR. TYSON: Yes. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. McGUIRE: This is Robert McGuire. Just from my 19 understanding to make sure I'm clear on what is happening, 20 we're only talking about a sample for purposes of determining 21 if the memory card to serial number process works? That is 22 what I think; right? 23 MR. TYSON: That is my understanding -- this is Bryan Tyson -- of what the goal would be to determine if it works, 24 25 understanding that, you know, it may work in the sample and may not work for all, you know, the universe of units we're looking at. But yes.

THE COURT: It is to identify a set of cards to be examined for the machines, if I understand, because you only have partial information. You can't find the machines based on the information you have available.

MR. TYSON: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. McGUIRE: This is Rob McGuire. That is slightly different than I understood. I thought we were just trying to confirm that we can find the serial number from the machine ID and we were doing a random search to make sure that that process works at large.

THE COURT: I don't see a -- I don't see a difference with what we said. But maybe -- maybe I didn't say it properly.

MR. McGUIRE: I probably misheard. I didn't understand it. Thank you.

THE COURT: You are trying to find out -- you want -you basically want to know does the script work and is the data
collected consistently enough so that you could actually -this process that he has proposed would work so that he could
have a -- from that he could identify -- once you had a -- you
have a large enough sample of cards that provide information as
to both the machine number and what you would call the VIN

number that you are able to -- you are able to use it as -- as the data foundation for figuring out a smaller sample.

Is that what you said, or am I misunderstanding it?

MR. McGUIRE: This is Rob McGuire. I may be

misunderstanding. But I thought it is exactly what Your Honor said. Use the sample to determine if the script will produce the serial numbers for the data at large.

Again, the followup step after that would be to use the script on the data at large to get the machines we have identified specifically and to get the Curling sample from the entire universe. That was what I thought would be the followup step from this process.

MR. TYSON: Your Honor, this is Bryan Tyson. I adwith what Mr. McGuire is saying. I think that if

Dr. Halderman's process works, it would provide us a reconciliation of machine ID to serial number for each election.

And so then the Coalition plaintiffs could take their specific machines IDs and make a list of serial numbers off that. So I think that -- I think that is the end goal.

THE COURT: All right. All right. So -- all right. Well, why don't you-all try to check in with each other by 1:00 tomorrow. I have a change of plea at 2:30 and a proceeding at 10:30. And if there is a problem, please communicate with Mr. Martin and I'll talk with you-all in

```
between that.
 1
 2
               All right?
 3
               MR. TYSON:
                           Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
               MR. CROSS: Thank you.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Hopefully you won't need
     that. But if you do, let's just do that.
 6
 7
               Thank you very much.
 8
               MR. CROSS: Thank you.
 9
               MR. TYSON: Thank you, Judge.
10
                      (The proceedings were thereby concluded at 5:54
11
                     P.M.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
4	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
5	
6	I, SHANNON R. WELCH, RMR, CRR, Official Court Reporter of
7	the United States District Court, for the Northern District of
8	Georgia, Atlanta Division, do hereby certify that the foregoing
9	33 pages constitute a true transcript of proceedings had before
10	the said Court, held in the City of Atlanta, Georgia, in the
11	matter therein stated.
12	In testimony whereof, I hereunto set my hand on this, the
13	16th day of June, 2020.
14	
15	
16	
17	SHANNON R. WELCH, RMR, CRR
18	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19	ONTIED DIGINION COOK!
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	