(202) 234-4433

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

+ + + + +

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY

APRIL 5, 2024

+ + + + +

The District of Columbia Board of Elections convened via Video/Teleconference, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m. EDT, Gary Thompson, Chair, presiding.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS MEMBERS PRESENT:

GARY THOMPSON, Chair KARYN GREENFIELD, Member J.C. BOGGS, Member

BOARD OF ELECTIONS STAFF PRESENT:

MONICA HOLMAN EVANS, Director TERRI STROUD, General Counsel WILLIAM SANFORD, General Counsel MARISSA CORRENTE, Registrar of Voters

## CONTENTS

Call to Order	4
Ascertainment of a Quorum	4
Adoption of Agenda/Approval of Minutes from February Regular Board Meeting (Wednesday, March 6, 2024)	4
General Counsel's Report -	5
Issuance of Petition to Recall Brianne Nadeau, Ward 1 Councilmember	5
Nominating Petition Challenge Hearings	1
James Harnett v. Wendy Hamilton, US Senate Candidate (Democratic Party)	1
Trezell Ragas v. Wendy Hamilton, US Senate Candidate (Democratic Party)	2
Trezell Ragas v. Ankit Jain, US Senate Candidate (Democratic Party)	6
Referral Hearings	0
In Re Kelechi Ahaghotu	1
Rulemaking	9

Litigation Status	95
Executive Director's Report Monica Evans	.99
Campaign Finance Report Cecily Collier-Montgomery 2	08
Public Comment (none)	16
Adjourn	

	4
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:35 a.m.)
3	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Good morning.
4	Happy Friday, happy Spring, a beautiful day out
5	there. Thanks for being with us today. My name
6	is Gary Thompson, the Chair of the Board of
7	Elections. I see the court reporter is here as
8	well as the Zoom meeting itself being recorded.
9	And with us online is my fellow Board Member,
10	J.C. Boggs. So we have a quorum between the two
11	of us. I don't think our third Board Member,
12	Karen Greenfield, is present. She may be able to
13	appear during this meeting, but we have quorum
14	for purposes of commencing.
15	And the first thing we do is adopt our
16	agenda which has been circulated in advance to
17	the Board members. It's a combination of both
18	certain challenges that might be the subject of a
19	special meeting with our general monthly meeting.
20	So with that, I move we adopt our agenda.
21	MEMBER BOGGS: Second.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. All in

1 favor, between the both of us. Aye. 2 (Ayes.) 3 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. The agenda is 4 adopted. We've also circulated the minutes from 5 your prior meeting, March 6, 2024. We've had a chance to review those and at this time, I would 6 7 move we adopt those minutes. 8 MEMBER BOGGS: Second. 9 CHAIR THOMPSON: Aye. 10 MEMBER BOGGS: Aye. MEMBER BOGGS: So moving then to our 11 12 general counsel's report from General Counsel 13 Terri Stroud. 14 MS. STROUD: Good morning, everyone. 15 The first item in my report is the issuance of a 16 recall petition. This -- as by way of 17 background, on March 8, 2024, Diana Alvarez filed 18 a notice of intent to recall Brianne Nadeau, Ward 19 1 Member of the Council of the District of 20 Columbia. And I first would ascertain whether or 21 not Ms. Alvarez is present. Okay, unmute her, 22 yes.

1	MS. ALVAREZ: Hello. Yes, I'm here.
2	MS. STROUD: Good morning, Ms.
3	Alvarez.
4	MS. ALVAREZ: Good morning. Sorry.
5	I had issues with the mute button.
6	MS. STROUD: No worries.
7	MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.
8	MS. STROUD: March 8th, Ms. Alvarez
9	filed a notice of intent to recall Brianne
10	Nadeau, Ward 1 Member of the Council of the
11	District of Columbia. Ms. Alvarez is a qualified
12	registered elector who resides in Ward 1. Ms.
13	Alvarez's filings did include a copy of a
14	verified statement of contributions that had been
15	filed with the Office of Campaign Finance.
16	Ms. Nadeau was served with notice of
17	the recall on March 8th and was informed at that
18	time that she could file a response to the
19	statement submitted in support of the recall by
20	March 18th, and that such response would be
21	included on the recall petition Council Member
22	Nadeau timely filed a response on March 18th.

The Board staff prepared -- then is prepared to issue to Ms. Alvarez an original petition form.

3 And I want to note for the record that this is the sole purpose of this process. 4 The only purpose of this process is for the Board to 5 ascertain whether or not the proposer adopts the 6 7 petition form prepared by the Board for purposes 8 of circulating the recall petition as the 9 proposers own. And when we're asking whether or 10 not the petition form is adopted, we're only 11 asking whether or not the information that appears on the form, specifically the name, the 12 13 statement of reasons to recall, the proposers 14 address, etcetera is correctly and accurately reflected on the petition form that was prepared. 15 16 The inquiry is not whether or not the 17 proposer approves the elected official's response 18 if one has been provided. And so, Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Ms.
20 Alvarez, thanks for being with us. Quick
21 question or two. Have you had a chance to review
22 the petition that's been prepared by the Board of

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

1	Elections?
2	MS. ALVAREZ: Yes, I have.
3	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much.
4	And you also approved the petition form and adopt
5	it as your own?
6	MS. ALVAREZ: Yes.
7	CHAIR THOMPSON: So in light of that,
8	the petition will be available for circulation.
9	And with that, I would ask our Registrar, Ms.
10	Corrente, to outline the remainder of the recall
11	process.
12	MS. CORRENTE: Thank you, Chair
13	Thompson. So pursuant to DC Official Code
14	1-204.112, a petition for the recall of an
15	elected official from a ward seat shall include
16	the valid number, the valid signatures of 10
17	percent of the registered qualified electors of
18	the affected ward, the number of registered
19	voters used to compute these requirements, quote,
20	The latest official count of registered electors
21	by the Board of Elections which was issued 30 or
22	more days prior to submission of the signatures

for the recall petition. While the signature requirement cannot be determined yet, the current calculations using the published February 29, 2024 monthly voter registration statistics report are as follows. So in Ward 1, there were 54,476, so that would mean 10 percent would be 5,448 signatures. And again, this will change as the period moves forward.

9 Both the proposer of the recall 10 measure and the elected official who is the 11 subject of the recall are advised to check with 12 the Board on a monthly basis of new statistics 13 are issued to get up to date estimates of the 14 signature requirement. In addition, assuming 15 that the prosper of the recall formally, which 16 obviously you did, adopts the original petition 17 form today, the 180-day period for circulating 18 the petition expires on Tuesday, October 1, 2024, 19 at 5:00 p.m. And so I will be following up after 20 this meeting to email you a copy of the petition 21 and some supporting documents that will help with 22 your circulation.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

1 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And did you 2 say how many -- what's the current signature 3 requirement based on today's registered voters? MS. CORRENTE: Five thousand four 4 5 hundred forty-eight. All right. 6 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. 7 And I also wanted to repeat for everybody that's 8 listening, our Board is only issuing this form of 9 petition for Ms. Alvarez to circulate and perhaps 10 gather the requisite number of valid signatures. 11 We don't, in any way, shape, or form support or endorse this, so this is just the process of 12 13 issuing the petition for Ms. Alvarez to take for 14 signatures. 15 With that, Ms. Alvarez, do you have any questions? 16 17 MS. ALVAREZ: No, I do not. 18 CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you very much 19 for being here. 20 MS. STROUD: Okay. And with that, the 21 proposer has adopted -- has officially adopted 22 the form, and it will be made available as

pursuant to Ms. Corrente's instructions, and you will be getting the official form, which should be copied two-sided, but I'm sure those instructions will be included, and so you will have it today.

And that -- with that, the next item 6 7 on my agenda is the nominating petition challenge 8 hearings. On the agenda that was posted, it 9 indicates that the first item is Joseph Henchman 10 v. Franklin Garcia, but Franklin Garcia has 11 officially withdrawn his ballot access candidacy for the Office of Candidate for US Senator for 12 13 the Democratic Party, so we will move to the next 14 matter, which is James Harnett v. Wendy Hamilton, 15 Candidate for US Senator in the democratic 16 primary.

17And we just want to ensure that the18parties in this matter are present. I see Mr.19Harnett and we just need to see Ms. Hamilton.

20 CHAIR THOMPSON: Let's go ahead and 21 unmute both of them.

MS. STROUD: Mr. Harnett, if you could

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

3

4

1	unmute.
2	MR. HARNETT: Hi. James Harnett.
3	MS. STROUD: Okay. And Ms. Hamilton?
4	MS. HAMILTON: Yes. Reverend Wendy
5	Hamilton.
6	MS. STROUD: Okay.
7	MS. HAMILTON: I've brought a
8	representative along with me today as well.
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: And who would that
10	be?
11	MS. HAMILTON: That would be Professor
12	Dr. Jonathan Scriven, Professor of Politics
13	and Political Science.
14	CHAIR THOMPSON: Great. If we could
15	unmute.
16	MR. SCRIVEN: Thank you. I'm unmuted.
17	CHAIR THOMPSON: Professor Scriven,
18	all right. Well, thanks everybody for being
19	here.
20	MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
21	Harnett, if you could state your name and address
0.0	for the record?
22	

1	MR. HARNETT: James Harnett, 2221 I
2	Street NW, 321, Washington, DC 20037.
3	MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you. And
4	Reverend Hamilton, if you could state your name
5	and address for the record?
6	MS. HAMILTON: Sure. Reverend Wendy
7	Hamilton. I live at 85 Danbury Street SW,
8	Washington, DC 20032.
9	MS. STROUD: Okay. And Mr. Scriven,
10	just your professional address for the record?
11	MR. SCRIVEN: My professional address
12	is 7600 Flower Avenue in Tacoma Park.
13	MS. STROUD: Okay. And so how we'll
14	proceed is as follows. We will have the
15	Registrar read a summary of her report detailing
16	her findings with respect to this challenge into
17	the record. And then we're going to have a staff
18	attorney from the Office of the General Counsel
19	discuss what happened at the prehearing
20	conference to outline the issues that remain for
21	the Board to decide. And then we'll have the
22	parties address the Board and if there are any

1	questions, then they'll be asked at that time.
2	And so we have Ms. Corrente, if you
3	could state your name and professional address
4	for the record?
5	MS. CORRENTE: Sure. Good morning.
6	My name is Marissa Corrente, and my professional
7	address here at the Board is 1015 Half Street
8	SW, 750, Washington, DC.
9	So I reissued a memorandum after the
10	prehearing conference. That was issued yesterday
11	to all parties, so I will be reading or
12	summarizing that one. On March 6, 2024, Wendy
13	Hamilton submitted a nominating petition to
14	appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June
15	4, 2024 primary election for the Office of US
16	Senator for the Democratic Party. The minimum
17	requirement to obtain ballot access for this
18	office is 2,000 signatures. Petition contained
19	2,595 signatures. Petition was posted for public
20	inspection for 10 days as required by law.
21	Petition was challenged on March 18,
22	2024 by James Harnett, a registered voter in the

District of Columbia. Challenger Harnett filed challenges to 856 of the 2,595 signatures enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each petition page. The signatures were challenged pursuant to the Board's regulations in Title 3, Chapter 16 of the DC Municipal Regulation, and there were multiple grounds that they were challenged on.

9 My initial review of the challenges indicated that 776 of the 866 challenges were 10 11 valid. On April 2, 2024, the Office of General Counsel convened a prehearing conference 12 13 involving all parties wherein these findings were 14 discussed. Both candidate Hamilton and challenger Harnett contested some of the findings 15 16 but ultimately, only candidate Hamilton asked for 17 further review of specific signers enumerated by their specific sheets and page number. 18

Candidate Hamilton also shared a list
of signers who she believed may have timely filed
address change forms. In total, the candidate
asked for the Board to review 144 signers

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

1 enumerated by their specific sheet and page 2 number. Of these 144 signers, 14 were credited 3 back to the candidate. My updated review of the challenges 4 5 indicates that 762 of the 866 challenges are valid, and there's a breakdown of all the 6 7 different findings. Ultimately, this leaves the 8 candidate's nominating petition with 1,833 9 signatures, 167 signatures below the number 10 required for ballot access. 11 MS. PEMBROKE: And this is --12 PARTICIPANT: Okay. 13 MS. PEMBROKE: -- Ms. Pembroke for the 14 Office of General Counsel. 15 MR. HARNETT: We -- we can't hear you. 16 CHAIR THOMPSON: Can you just turn the 17 mic on and hold the mic a little closer. 18 Apologies -- apologies. MS. PEMBROKE: 19 My name is Christine Pembroke. I'm with the 20 office of General Counsel, and I was the attorney assigned to this matter. With the Board's 21 22 indulgence, I'll just go over a little bit of the

1 history before we to the prehearing conference. 2 So when the candidate picked up her petition 3 form, she was provided with instructions about how to circulate nominating petitions that 4 5 included the fact that if a signers address did not match the address on the Board's records, she 6 7 would have 10 days to obtain a change of address 8 form from the signer to cure that potential In addition, that instruction is stated 9 defect. 10 at the bottom of every single petition page.

11 So she picked up her petition. She 12 says -- the Registrar has indicated she turned in 13 a petition that had 2,595 signatures on it. Ιt 14 was challenged by Mr. Harnett. Mr. Harnett 15 turned in his challenge using a form that is 16 provided by the Board of Elections, and the form 17 specifies across the top that the line number for 18 each page be included, the name and address of 19 the signer be included. And then there's a 20 series of blanks in which the challenger can 21 identify the reason for the challenge. And 22 across the top, there is a field to be filled in

1 that associates that particular sheet of 2 challenges with the page of the petition. 3 So Mr. Harnett filed his challenge on that form specifying the line on each page that 4 5 he was challenging and the name of the person he was challenging. And then in the blanks, he 6 7 indicated what the basis for his challenge was. 8 For example, with respect to one particular voter 9 on the first page, he designated line 6. He 10 typed the name of the voter, their address, and 11 he put in voter is not registered in the same party as the candidate at the time the petition 12 13 is signed. So he turned in that and he 14 challenged more than enough signatures to render 15 the petition numerically insufficient. 16 The candidate was notified the next

16 The candidate was notified the next 17 day of the challenge and informed in that notice 18 that she had 10 days from that date in order to 19 submit address updates. We held the initial 20 prehearing and the candidate appeared, and her 21 concerns were that she believed she had submitted 22 a sufficient number, or she knew of a sufficient

number of address changes to render the petition numerically sufficient; in other words, to counter challenges that were by Mr. Harnett. But she had not provided the names of those individuals at the time of the prehearing to the Board so that we could verify whether or not address cures had been made.

8 She also, through Mr. Scriven, who is 9 here today, argued that Mr. Harnett's challenge 10 should be disregarded in its totality because it 11 hadn't -- did not comply with the Board's regulations regarding the specificity with which 12 13 challenges should be pled. And she also 14 indicated that she had several other signatures 15 that had been challenged which she believed were 16 improperly challenged. But she again did not 17 provide any of that information prior to the 18 prehearing.

19 She was concerned that she didn't have 20 time to review the registrar's report because it 21 was not provided to her until the morning of the 22 prehearing. And although, you know, I explained

1 to her that she had the challenge and she could 2 be working on the challenge to address these 3 issues, we did understand that she did not have very much time to review the registrar's report. 4 5 So we continued the prehearing to the following day to give her some more time to go over the 6 7 challenges that had been made against her and the 8 Registrar's finding with respect to those 9 challenges.

10 The next day at the continued 11 prehearing, the candidate acknowledged that she 12 had not identified enough challenges that could 13 be cured to make her petition numerically 14 sufficient, but she stated she wanted to go 15 before the Board to make a policy argument that 16 she felt the requirement for having the address 17 of the signer match the address on the Board's 18 roll was unfair because she's running for 19 citywide office, and so the mere fact that the 20 signer is a registered voter should be 21 sufficient.

22

She was informed that that requirement

comes from the statute and that the Board really didn't have any discretion with regard to enforcing the requirement, but she still indicated she wanted to come before the Board to present it.

Mr. Scriven reiterated his theory that 6 7 he had espoused at the initial prehearing that the entire challenge should be thrown out. 8 He 9 was advised that even if the challenges were 10 improperly made, once they've been reviewed by 11 the Registrar, we can't unsee what we've seen. 12 And he was also advised that that position was 13 contrary to a number of Board rulings. But 14 nevertheless, he indicated that he wanted to go 15 forward on it.

So based on the fact that the candidate was not willing to withdraw, the only way, really, to resolve this matter was -- would be for the Board to rule on it, and that's why we are here today.

21 CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. I just22 have two questions. One, can you speak a little

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

bit more to your determination that Mr. Harnett complied with our procedures for initiating a ballot challenge?

So the standard MS. PEMBROKE: Yes. 4 5 essentially that's been enunciated in earlier Board cases is that as long as the challenge is 6 7 decipherable by the registrar and the candidate 8 could understand it, the Board will apply its 9 regulation regarding the acceptance of pleadings 10 under a liberal reading rule and will accept 11 those challenges. So that's a very liberal and accommodating standard. And in this case, 12 13 obviously, the Registrar was able to decipher 14 what the challenges were because she ruled on them all. So it met that very liberal standard. 15 16 But aside from that, I mean Mr. Harnett has used 17 It's very clear what line and page our form. 18 he's referring to, and his -- the nature of his 19 challenges is very clearly spelled out.

20 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And my other 21 question, cause we might hear about this in a 22 moment, can you remind us the statutory basis for

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

1 our standard that the address has to match from 2 3 MS. PEMBROKE: Yes. CHAIR THOMPSON: -- the person signs 4 5 at the registration on file. MS. PEMBROKE: Yes. That is under DC 6 7 Code 1-1001.0803, and the statute provides that if they're -- in the case of an address mismatch, 8 9 the address on the petition will be deemed valid 10 if first, the address is within the political 11 jurisdiction of the race that's involved. And in 12 this case, it's a citywide race so that really 13 wasn't the problem. 14 And secondly, and I'll quote, "The 15 signer files a change of address form with the 16 Board no later than 5:00 p.m. on the 10th day after the day the candidate receives notice of 17 the challenge, " close quote. 18 19 CHAIR THOMPSON: We obviously can't 20 change that. We can't make exceptions to that. 21 That's the law as our council has passed it? 22 MS. PEMBROKE: Correct.

1	CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Those are
2	my questions. Before we turn to Reverend
3	Hamilton, anything else from the BOE?
4	MS. STROUD: No.
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
6	MS. STROUD: I would actually just
7	say, Mr. Chair, that the statutory provision that
8	Christine read from Ms. Pembroke read from was
9	an amendment to the statute. Previously, matches
10	were not allowed to be considered but they did
11	say allow for this 10-day period wherein which
12	voters can submit changes of address.
13	Previously, you were not able to correct
14	mismatches.
15	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
16	MS. STROUD: And, you know, there are
17	some administrative concerns with this process,
18	because the whole purpose of the signature
19	matching the one that is on the Board's files is
20	to allow the Board to identify in cases where
21	individuals have the same names
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. STROUD: -- the precise voter that
 signed the petition.

3 CHAIR THOMPSON: Right. So this was a concession. 4 MS. STROUD: 5 Okay. It certainly CHAIR THOMPSON: speaks to the importance of voters, if you move, 6 7 to update your registration, which you can do online through our website. It doesn't take very 8 9 long to do. So know we always remind our 10 citizens to please do that, but if there's a mismatch, it's -- according to the statute, it's 11 an invalid signature unless there's this cure 12 13 that is made. And that's the state of the law, I 14 think, as we sit her today.

So with that, Reverend Hamilton or Professor Scrivin, I don't -- maybe you both would like to speak, or who wants to go first, but please give us your thoughts?

MS. HAMILTON: I will go first and I thank you very much, Board of Elections, for hearing us today. We do, between myself and Professor Scriven, plan to offer three arguments

1 that we feel brings us within the needed amount 2 of 2,000 signatures to get on the primary ballot. 3 I just wanted to reference something that Attorney Pembroke mentioned in her reading 4 when she was talking about the time that I picked 5 up the petitions and what it outlined in terms of 6 7 the challenge period and what options we had. 8 And she mentioned that the 10-day period allows 9 us an opportunity to review the Board's findings 10 in terms of what was challenged. 11 So I just want to reiterate that we 12 received the registrar's report, the Board's 13 findings, and what is in the database, we 14 received that the morning of the pre-conference 15 hearing. We were awaiting that. All we had to 16 operate on at that time up until the 17 pre-conference hearing were the challenges that 18 Mr. Harnett outlined. And we were not given an 19 opportunity to know which of those were valid 20 challenges versus, you know, which ones were 21 accepted by the Board, which ones were rejected 22 by the Board. So we just had to assume that all

(202) 234-4433

of the challenged ones needed to be addressed, and we set out to do that. So I just want to put that on record that the process in and of itself made it very difficult for us to begin to reconcile what the Board had on file without having the convenience of the registrar's report to do that calculation.

That being said, I would like to ask 8 9 Professor Scriven now to address two of the 10 arguments that we'd like to bring today regarding 11 the action of being able to achieve 2,000 12 signatures, valid signatures that we believe that 13 we have at this time. I am asking for some grace 14 My school has suffered the loss of two today. 15 teenagers in the last 48 hours to gun violence, 16 and this is going to be a struggle, so I will ask 17 Dr. Scriven to jump in when I'm unable. Thank 18 you.

19 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. I'm very sorry 20 to hear that. Our condolences, Reverend. 21 Professor Scriven, I think you're unmuted if 22 you'd like to go ahead.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1	MR. SCRIVEN: Okay. Yes. Thank you.
2	I'm sorry. Just thank you very much. I
3	appreciate the opportunity to be here. Just a
4	quick addition to what Reverend Hamilton said.
5	It is also the case that when we did the
6	registrar's report, we received that not only on
7	the morning of the our hearing, but it was
8	actually after the 10-day window for when we
9	could cure some of the address change issues. So
10	we were in a little bit of a bind on that disuse.
11	But what I would like to address very
12	quickly I'll do this in about one minute is
13	one of our other challenges. Our first challenge
14	is a technical one involving what constitutes a
15	valid challenge, and we are basing it on the
16	challenge we're basing this challenge on the
17	DC Board of Elections nominating petition cover
18	sheet on the individual nominating petition
19	challenge form. So on the cover sheet, there's a
20	number of items that are listed, and it says in
21	one please, in order for your challenge to be
22	accepted, you must there are a couple of

things -- the third thing says -- third item says that it must specify the date -- I'm quoting now -- "It must specify the basis for the challenges by siting the regulation that describes the defect in the petition and providing a clear and concise explanation of the alleged petition or signature feedback.

8 On the top of each actual petition 9 challenge form, the following instructions are 10 qiven. It is -- it says that the challenger 11 must, quote, "provide the basis for the challenge 12 including the relevant citation in the right 13 column of this form." Despite two instructions 14 to include both the citation and the description, our contention is that Mr. Harnett's challenges 15 16 do not do this. We recognize this is a challenge 17 based on technicality, but we also recognize that 18 technicalities exist for a reason, often as a way 19 to protect the integrity of an important process 20 such as this.

21 Rule 1606.4 outlines that when the 22 Board can, quote, "search the permanent

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 registrar's records to prepare a recommendation 2 to the board as to the validity of the 3 challenge," and that same rule says that only do this, quote, "after receipt of a properly filed 4 challenge." The Board of Elections has strict 5 standards for the collection of signatures by a 6 7 candidate, and we believe the same standards to 8 apply to a challenger when challenging those 9 signatures.

10 We anticipate that the challenger may 11 argue that challenges of this nature without, 12 quote, "citation and explanation have been 13 accepted in the past, " but we argue that that is 14 not relevant, because just because challenges 15 have been wrongly accepted in the past, that does 16 not mean they should be accepted now. So based 17 on the guidelines and instructions explicitly 18 stated by the Board of Elections and on the very 19 petition form that challengers must fill out, our 20 contention is that any specific challenge that 21 does not follow those quidelines should not be 22 accepted.

1	So anytime we have a challenge on the
2	line that does not include what is specifically
3	asked for, our contention is that those should
4	not or should not have been accepted. With
5	that, I'll pass over to Reverend Hamilton who, I
6	think, will make another I'm sorry unless
7	you have questions for me now. I'm happy to
8	answer questions now.
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: No. Reverend
10	Hamilton
11	MR. SCRIVEN: Okay. Thank you.
12	CHAIR THOMPSON: go ahead. Thank
13	you so much, sir.
14	MR. SCRIVEN: You're welcome. Thank
15	you.
16	CHAIR THOMPSON: Hold on a sec, got to
17	get you unmuted. All right. Go ahead.
18	MS. HAMILTON: Am I unmuted?
19	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, please.
20	MS. HAMILTON: My apologies. And in
21	regard to the issue of a citywide race, I would
22	just like to submit this consideration, this

1 argument and this concern that we have. The 2 Shadow Senator election is a citywide election so 3 any registered voter, regardless of address, can vote in the election and can have a chance to 4 5 vote for the candidate that they signed the petition for. While yes, the burden is upon the 6 7 voter to rectify any address discrepancy before 8 they vote if there is, you know, more than one 9 Jane Doe, voter must prove residence before they 10 vote. We talked about that.

But before voting day, during early voting, during any time leading up to election day, their address does not matter in terms of whether or not they are a registered voter in the District of Columbia. It removes due process.

16 According to 1603.1, candidate must 17 2,000 signatures from registered collect qualified voters. The registered requirement is 18 19 Qualified may be open to interpretation. met. 20 It could mean that the voter meets the standard expression of 1076.1, but it could also just mean 21 22 registered active voter, and we interpret

qualified to mean the latter.

1

2	By signing the petition, registered DC
3	voter is authorizing and expressing their desire
4	to see the candidate on the ballot. Throwing out
5	or rejecting signatures because the information
6	they provide on good faith is inconsistent with
7	the Board's records denies them of that
8	opportunity and removes due process. The
9	expectation for the candidate to file change of
10	address forms does not constitute a reasonable
11	requirement for ballot access.
12	That being said, we made every effort,
13	and I'll finish with this, we made every effort
14	to achieve getting change of address cards from
15	voters. We started out even absent the
16	Registrar's report, we went to homes that were
17	outlined in the challenge. We knocked on doors.
18	Some voters refused. Others compromised what I
19	feel is the safety of my team.
20	I had a gentleman send me a picture in
21	Instagram that he took of one of my team members
22	who went to try to get a change of address card

(202) 234-4433

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

from him, and he said, you know, is this man a part of your team, I did not engage him, I did not open the door. We have a safety concern with our family, a situation with a foster child so I do not open my door to people that I don't know, but if you say he's with your team, then I just need to know that.

8 I did write that person back and 9 assured him that the gentleman on that -- on the 10 porch that he took a picture of and sent to me on 11 Instagram and private message was indeed my team 12 member. That made me nervous for my team because 13 while a number of signatures we collected were at 14 farmer's markets, we did go to some doors, but we 15 met people out in the public.

But what that doesn't do, when you're signing a petition for a candidate, it is not necessarily authorizing us to then follow-up later on and come to their home and ask them to provide additional information. It is one thing to sign a petition real quickly. As you're out there, you want to participate in the democratic

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 process. But then to show up at a door later on 2 and say, I'm sorry, your signature has been marked invalid and in order for me to remain on 3 the ballot, we need you to update this card. 4 5 Could you please fill out all of this change of address information which includes an ask of if 6 7 you don't have your voter number available, the 8 last four digits of your Social Security number. 9 Could you add that to this and then we'll turn 10 that in for you? We had people absolutely decide 11 they were not going to do that, and I can't say that I blame them. 12

13 So what we did was we mailed out over 14 120 voter registration cards, change of address 15 cards with a letter, and we asked voters if you 16 wouldn't mind, this is the situation that we're 17 facing and this is the time crunch that we have, 18 could you please either return this card or go 19 onto the Board of Elections' website and update 20 your registration so that we can make sure that 21 your voice and your signature is counted. We 22 didn't have as many as we, you know, would like

1 to have return that, but we do believe that we 2 made a good faith effort to at least make contact 3 with these folks. And this is still absent the registrar's report, so we -- you know, some of 4 those folks ultimately may have wound up being 5 validated by the registrar, but we had not -- no 6 7 access to that information, so we were just going based on what had been alleged in the challenges, 8 9 and that is not reasonable.

10 So I just ask with this argument, that 11 if you take that into consideration, that 12 registered DC voters are in the jurisdiction of a 13 citywide candidate and, therefore, their 14 signature should be counted. There are over 200 of those in the Harnett challenge that if 15 16 accepted back and not rejected by the registrar 17 would put us well over the 2,000 ballot 18 signatures -- valid ballot signatures that we 19 need to appear on the primary ballot. 20 And so that is my ask today, that you 21 please take all of ramifications into 22 consideration and know that we did our best, and

we tried, and we got more than we needed. We got 2,595 signatures just to try to prepare in case we were challenged. And I would like for my team's efforts to be honored today in acknowledging that we did what we were asked to do. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: 7 Yes. Thank you so 8 much. I really appreciate your words I know 9 it's very hard to gather signatures from people. 10 I've only had to do a little bit of myself as an 11 ANC commissioner. I can only imagine how difficult it is to get 2,000 signatures. 12 If I 13 were on the DC Council, I certainly would be 14 interested in making the process easier and more liberal for candidates. I really like your 15 16 suggestion that if it's a citywide race, it 17 should be instantly curable if the person -- we 18 can validate that the person is otherwise a 19 registered voter in DC regardless of the address 20 change -- if I were a Council member. But I am 21 here today in my capacity as Chair of the BOE and 22 the statute and the regulations that are in place

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

are important for us to operate within. But, you know, I certainly hear you on the difficulties in the process.

You raised a couple of points about the notice period here and the -- your opportunity to understand the nature of the challenge being made by Mr. Harnett. And I just want to give the General Counsel or the Registrar or Ms. Pembroke a chance to comment if they'd like.

11 MS. STROUD: Thank you, Reverend 12 Hamilton. I just have a couple of questions. 13 When you were circulating petitions, did you have 14 the opportunity to, as you were collecting, come 15 in and check what you were getting in terms of 16 like voters' addresses against the Board's 17 records to determine whether or not the voters 18 were the -- the voters whose signatures you were 19 collecting, whether their addresses comported with what the Board's records indicated? 20 MS. HAMILTON: I wish but we were a 21 22 small but might crew, so we didn't have access to

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

1 -- or the capacity, I should say, to sort of 2 check or review signatures realtime nor did we, 3 you know, consider that we would need to do that. We were so fixed, as the Board has just pointed 4 -- Board Chair just pointed out, it is hard to 5 collect 2,000 signatures. And we wanted to go 6 7 above and beyond, so we were out in snow, in 8 rain, and MLK parade in Ward 8, you know, farmers 9 markets, homes.

10 We went wherever we could, but we did 11 not have -- and we were under resourced. I also want to mention that for just people's knowledge. 12 13 Remember the federal positions, US Senator and 14 the delegate, we do not -- we're not eligible for 15 the fair elections program, so we don't receive 16 the matching funds that other candidates are, you 17 know, blessed to receive. So we have to operate 18 out of pocket. So we didn't even have the 19 monetary resources to maybe even hire someone to 20 do that.

21 So the answer is no, we were not 22 checking realtime as we were working to collect

1 the signatures by the March 6th deadline. 2 MS. STROUD: Had you requested a copy 3 of the Board's voter file? 4 MS. HAMILTON: Yes. MS. STROUD: Okay. So you did do 5 that. 6 7 MS. HAMILTON: Yes. 8 MS. STROUD: And then I have a 9 question. And so you received -- when did you receive notification of the challenge? 10 11 MS. HAMILTON: So --12 MS. STROUD: And maybe Ms. Corrente 13 can answer that question if you don't have the 14 date right --15 I actually do. MS. HAMILTON: No. 16 MS. STROUD: Okay. 17 I am -- I received MS. HAMILTON: 18 notification of the Harnett challenge on March 19 the 19th, which was the day after the deadline, 20 but it demonstrated that Mr. Harnett filed his 21 challenge, it indicated at 4:57, on March the 22 18th, which would have been three minutes prior

1 to the deadline of March 18th for filing a 2 challenge. I don't know the process in terms of 3 how many challenges can be filed against a 4 candidate, but you will see that I have another 5 challenge hearing following this one that was submitted the day before Mr. Harnett. So I'm not 6 7 fully sure why Mr. Harnett submitted a second challenge three minutes before the deadline on 8 9 the following day that an initial had already 10 been lodged, but that certainly is his right to 11 do. But I did not find out about his challenge 12 until the 19th. That's when I was notified. 13 So you did get it. MS. STROUD: Okay. 14 And so when you received the challenge -- do you 15 have a copy of the challenge with you to look at 16 to discuss? 17 I can probably pull it MS. HAMILTON: 18 It may be buried in some of my emails but I up. 19 can --20 MS. STROUD: Okay. 21 MS. HAMILTON: Professor Scrivin, do 22 you have it accessible? If not --

1	MR. SCRIVEN: I can pull it up, yes.
2	MS. HAMILTON: Let me see.
3	MS. STROUD: And if you could let me
4	know when you have it once you pull it up?
5	MS. HAMILTON: Yes, sure.
б	MR. SCRIVEN: Okay. I have it up.
7	MS. STROUD: Okay. So just wanted to
8	just go through some of the information that Mr.
9	Harnett provided with respect to his challenge.
10	If we could go to the nominating petition
11	challenge form with respect to sheet 1 of 262?
12	MR. SCRIVEN: Yes.
13	MS. STROUD: And the information that
14	is provided next to line 6 for
15	MR. SCRIVEN: Yes.
16	MS. STROUD: voter at that line
17	where it indicates that the voter is not
18	registered in the same party as the candidate at
19	the time the petition was signed?
20	MR. SCRIVEN: Correct, yes.
21	MS. STROUD: Okay. So is it your
22	assertion that that does not provide an

indication of what was being challenged with respect to the signature?

3 MR. SCRIVEN: So my -- our contention 4 is that that does not follow the rule stipulated 5 in both the cover sheet and at the very top of So at the very top of that very form 6 this form. 7 we're on, it does say -- it talks about put the 8 name and the address, etcetera, and it says 9 provide the basis for the challenge including the 10 relevant citation as well as on the cover sheet 11 where it also explicitly says that both must be 12 present.

13 MS. STROUD: Just so -- just to -- I 14 just want to get some understanding about what you -- were you aware what was being challenged 15 16 or the substance of that challenge, that it is --17 Yes. It is clear on MR. SCRIVEN: 18 line 6 what the challenger is challenging. That 19 is not our contention. Our contention is -- and 20 we recognize this is a technicality but our 21 challenge is that the challenger did not do what

is explicitly required, which is to both provide

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

1 the explanation and to list the citation. MS. STROUD: 2 Okay. And this question 3 is for Ms. Corrente. With that information, were 4 you able to understand what the challenge was 5 that was being made with respect to that signature such that you could assess the 6 7 challenge? 8 MS. CORRENTE: Yes. 9 MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you. And 10 that's all I have. 11 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. MS. CORRENTE: Can I make a -- just a 12 13 14 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes. 15 -- quick clarifying --MS. CORRENTE: 16 CHAIR THOMPSON: Please. 17 MS. CORRENTE: -- point for the 18 I think -- so both the challenges were record? 19 filed on the same day. They were both filed on 20 March 18th, the challenges of Reverend Hamilton, 21 and I think the Harnett one was they were 22 notified the next day because of the time, it

1 coming close to the deadline. The other one came 2 in earlier in the day. And so I think it was notified that same day, on the 18th, but just to 3 be clear that it was a different date in the 4 5 notification at each challenge, but they were both received to the office on the same day. 6 7 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And my 8 understanding is the 10-day cure period starts to 9 run from the date of notice --10 MS. STROUD: Correct. 11 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- in this case, 12 March 19th --13 MS. STROUD: Yes. 14 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- plus 10 days. 15 MS. STROUD: Correct. 16 CHAIR THOMPSON: And the date of the 17 prehearing conference is a different matter, 18 It's not -- it's supposed to run 10 correct? 19 days from the prehearing conference, correct? 20 MS. STROUD: Correct. 21 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes. Okav. Ms. 22 Pembroke, want to add something?

1 Yes. If I could just MS. PEMBROKE: 2 get some clarification for the record, I believe 3 when Reverend Hamilton began to speak, she indicated she had three issues to raise, and I 4 5 think I'm only hearing two. So just to be clear as to what your points are --6 7 Thank you, Ms. Pembroke. MR. SCRIVEN: 8 Thank you. I appreciate that. We did think 9 about three, but we've decided to focus on just 10 two for this hearing. 11 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. All right. 12 Thank you. I think we'll turn now to the 13 challenger, Mr. Harnett. 14 MS. STROUD: Yes. 15 MR. HARNETT: All right. So agree 16 with the finding of the registrar. There are, I 17 think, a number of points that the Reverend 18 brought up that are worthy of discussion by this 19 Board and consideration by the Council, the first 20 being recognizing, obviously, the tremendous 21 amount of work, that challenges -- multiple 22 challenges that are all for candidates that are

required to receive at least 2,000 signatures is a tremendous burden for the registrar's staff to go through in such a compressed timeline.

I do recognize that while the Reverend 4 did have the challenged review and the publicly 5 accessible Board data about candidate -- or about 6 7 voter information, it is helpful to see the 8 registrar's report at least 24 hours before the 9 prehearing conference. I'm not sure if that 10 would be a policy decision for the Board to 11 manage moving forward, but I think it is helpful to ensure that the candidate and the challenger 12 13 have at least some amount of time to review the 14 registrar's preliminary findings. Obviously, 15 those can change after the prehearing conference, 16 as they did in this case, when either the 17 candidate or the challenger identifies signatures 18 that they disagree with the registrar's findings 19 But I do think that it would be helpful in on. 20 the future to have that, not to say that the 21 tremendous work that the registrar does in this 22 and other matters is not a Herculean effort on

1

2

her part and her team's part. But whatever resources are needed for that team to have the resources to get through these as quickly as possible would encourage the Board to consider what that would look like in future elections.

With regard to this challenge, I 6 7 appreciate that the registrar, that the Board 8 attorney talked about the specific examples of 9 the challenge that I made on the challenge sheet. 10 What I did when I identified a signature that 11 matched one of the deficiencies in the Board's 12 regulation, is I would go to the Board's website 13 and from the petition challenge page, I would 14 copy and paste the 12 or so challenge considerations and then paste that into the pdf. 15 16 So I wasn't necessarily referencing the DCMR 17 directly, but I was referencing the Board's 18 materials.

19 If the Board's website was updated 20 with -- for each petition, for each reason that a 21 signature could be found invalid to include the 22 DCMR for each signature, then I would have copied

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

1 and pasted that into the document as well. But. 2 obviously, the document, for the most part, is 3 typed up. It was clear to the registrar what I was trying to get across, which is more than I 4 can say for a number of challenges that I know 5 the Board receives on a regular basis. 6 So I do 7 believe that that is not enough of a material difference to merit the wholesale rejection of 8 9 this challenge.

10 And obviously -- and the 11 recommendation that I know the Board has made to candidates informant he past where at the end of 12 13 the day, there just are not enough signatures to 14 merit inclusion on the ballot, that -- to 15 highlight the importance of collecting, you know, 16 1-1/2 times, twice as many signatures as are 17 actually required, because while everyone I know 18 is operating in good faith and collecting 19 signatures from folks at public events, at the 20 end of the day, you know, a number of voters are 21 not checking the Board's website on a regular 22 basis to ensure their registration remains up to

1 date, active, and that their address is correct. 2 So want to make sure that -- you know, at the end 3 of the day, this is just a very straightforward case of just not enough ballot signatures were 4 collected to merit inclusion of the candidate on 5 the ballot. 6 7 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. 8 Just a quick question. The prehearing conference 9 was, you said, continued for a day? 10 11 MS. PEMBROKE: It was continued, yes. It was continued for just about 24 hours, so we 12 13 had it. No, it was -- no, I'm sorry. We had the 14 prehearing conference, the first prehearing conference, at 1:00 in the afternoon, and we 15 continued it for 9:00 the next morning. 16 So the 17 continued prehearing was about 24 hours after 18 registrar's report had been sent out. 19 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Go ahead, yes, 20 please. 21 MS. PEMBROKE: There was one other 22 procedural issue that Mr. Harnett raised.

Because we did hear both of these matters 1 2 together, this matter and the other challenge, in 3 the prehearing proceedings, he did ask that the 4 cases not be consolidated. His feeling was that 5 the Board should follow a practice it had followed before where it considered the charge 6 7 which raised the most valid challenges first and 8 depending on the outcome of that would rule 9 whether or not the second challenge matter was 10 moot. So I -- you know, I would -- I don't have 11 an opinion on that. I would, of course, defer to whatever the Board would prefer to do. 12

13 I would note that there is a 14 highly-remote possibility that if the Board were 15 to rule on one way in the first matter, say, and 16 that were appealed and the second matter were not 17 appealed and would become final, and the court of 18 appeals were to disagree with the Board's finding 19 on the first matter, there is a very remote 20 potential in unconsolidated matters of 21 conflicting decisions.

22

CHAIR THOMPSON: Well, yes, thank you

1 for that. Just so everybody understands, there's 2 a second challenge against Reverend Hamilton's 3 petitions by Trezell Ragas and in that matter, the registrar found candidate was 119 signatures 4 5 shy of the requirement. The challenges challenged different signatures, so you get 6 7 different numerical outcomes, some overlap. It's 8 like an overlapping Venn diagram and so that, it 9 certainly does raise interesting issues. But I 10 think we'll proceed with this first matter, see 11 how we rule. It might moot need to address the 12 second matter. 13 And barring any other comments, I'd 14 like to go ahead and get the General Counsel's 15 recommendation at this point. 16 MS. STROUD: My recommendation is that 17 -- that --MEMBER BOGGS: Can you put your mic on? 18 19 MS. STROUD: Yes. 20 MEMBER BOGGS: Thank you. 21 MS. STROUD: You're welcome. Μv 22 recommendation with respect to this matter would

1	be that candidate Hamilton be denied ballot
2	access in the contest at issue as a result of
3	having 167 signatures below the minimum
4	requirement necessary for ballot access.
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. With that, I'm
6	just going to go ahead and make a motion, and
7	I'll
8	MEMBER BOGGS: Gary, maybe before you
9	do that, I'm just maybe make an observation and
10	potentially a question, cause I'm just I
11	recognize your earlier comment. You know, I
12	think we're bound by statute and we're not policy
13	makers here. We implement it and we understand
14	that. It's just troubling to me you had and
15	I'll use the word "inconsistency" on two points.
16	Candidate Hamilton mentioned the Fair
17	Election Law. I know it doesn't apply here, but
18	that's in 2018, I think, and it was passed for a
19	very good reason by policy makers that said, you
20	know, try to incentivize more candidates to
21	compete in the electoral process, engage with the
22	average everyday citizen, and encourage greater

participation in the electoral process. So we do have on hand we're actually incentivizing through financial support new candidates, again, in different races, but get involved which is commendable.

On the other hand, we're making -- we 6 7 -- not we but the statutes have a very high bar 8 for many candidates to want to run and contribute 9 money to get involved. And maybe 2,000 or 2,500 10 doesn't sound like a lot but it's, we've heard 11 today on both sides, a lot of work to get those 12 signatures and then to get ballot signatures. 13 And you don't know if the addresses are up to 14 date and so forth, and this is citywide.

And then there's a lot of work, Mr. Harnett, on your side, too, to go through these signatures to make sure they're valid. I don't know, is that a public service, election integrity service you provide or -- as a citizen, or just something that you're engaged or retained to do by a party?

22

1

2

3

4

5

MR. HARNETT: I'm not paid by anybody

to do what I do.

1

2 MEMBER BOGGS: Okay. That's a lot of 3 work, too, so commend you for that. It's 4 important.

5 So the consistent piece, you know, I just wonder if this is consistent with the more 6 7 recent Fair Election Law. It's something that perhaps the City Council will take another look 8 9 at in the future. And on the one hand, we 10 provide a very liberal interpretation of the 11 technical requirements to Mr. Harnett's challenges and said, okay, that -- it didn't --12 13 maybe didn't check all the boxes, but it's okay. 14 And on the other hand with Ms. Hamilton, we --15 Reverend Hamilton we notice there were some 16 technical glitches. We say, well, that's not 17 okay.

So it's a consistency issue and, you know, I always like Ralph Waldo Emerson, his quote on consistency, which is a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds and adored by little statesmen and philosophers and

1	minds, but with consistency simply nothing you
2	can do. So I like that quote. I'm actually
3	arguing maybe the opposite here, I'm inconsistent
4	so that the consistency in some cases is
5	important.
6	So I just wanted to make those
7	observations and before, Gary, you, Mr. Chairman,
8	had made your might be final comment here.
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Yes.
10	Thank you for that Board Member. Go ahead.
11	MS. STROUD: You have made a motion
12	and I would just want to establish that we take a
13	roll call vote, with respect to that.
14	CHAIR THOMPSON: Well, let me finish
15	the motion. But, yeah, Board Member Boggs, thank
16	you so much for those comments. I wholeheartedly
17	agree. My experience on this Board has shown me
18	that our, maybe our Council needs to revisit some
19	of the details of petition challenges and clear
20	some things up.
21	And, you know, I sympathize greatly
22	with candidates like Reverend Hamilton who are in

this position. You know, that said, the statute is pretty specific here with respect to the requirement that the signer be registered at the address listed. There's a window of time to cure that, but that particular requirement is in the statute at, I think you cited it, 1-1001.0803, something like that. It's quite clear.

8 When you turn to the form for the 9 petition challenge, it does state at the top that 10 the challenger should list the basis and cite the 11 statute. That is not specifically required in a 12 statute or regulation, that the listing, the 13 reference to the regulation. It's really, it's 14 substance over form and it's of a liberal nature.

15 And in this particular case, it's 16 really clear when you go down the petition 17 challenge sheet, you know, starting at line six, 18 et cetera, where the challenger has stated the 19 substantive basis. It's pretty straightforward, 20 you know, voter not registered, registration at a different address. Each one of those does have a 21 22 particular DCMR reference, if you want to drill

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

down on the regulation.

2	But my understand is, it's the point
3	of the instruction on the sheet is to assist the
4	Registrar to make sure that she understands the
5	nature of the challenge. And, you know, taking
6	substance over form in this case, it certainly
7	was quite clear, and also clear to the candidate,
8	what the substance of the challenge was. So,
9	that particular point to reference the regulation
10	is not it's a guideline, not a statutory
11	requirement. So I'm just that's, at least,
12	that's my reading, so
13	MS. STROUD: And Mr. Chair, to your
14	point, with respect to that, what the statute
15	provides specifically in Section Eight of the
16	statute 1-1001.0801 is that any registered
17	qualified elector may, within the ten-day
18	challenge period, challenge the validity of a
19	petition by written statement, signed by the
20	challenger and filed with the Board, and
21	specifying concisely the alleged defects in the
22	petition. So that is what the statute requires.

1	And then, through rulemaking, in order
2	for us to assist challengers and candidates and
3	our team, with respect to how to effectuate that,
4	we added, we promulgated that regulation. But
5	the statute requires precisely what was done in
6	this instance, which is the precise specification
7	of concisely the alleged defects in the petition.
8	And so that was, that occurred in this matter, in
9	this instance.
10	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. It's this
11	is the most painful part of being on the Board,
12	we have to follow the letter of the statutes and
13	regulations here, so I very reluctantly move to
14	adopt the General Counsel's recommendation and
15	deny the candidate ballot access, based on Mr.
16	Harnett's challenge.
17	MS. STROUD: Okay. And the Chair
18	having made the motion, we'll just take a roll
19	call vote. Mr. Chair?
20	CHAIR THOMPSON: Aye.
21	MS. STROUD: Mr. Boggs, Member Boggs?
22	MEMBER BOGGS: Reluctantly, aye.

1	MR. HARNETT: Sorry, just a procedural
2	question. Does that motion need to be seconded?
3	CHAIR THOMPSON: Well
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, I guess. The
6	motion's made. J.C., do you second it?
7	MEMBER BOGGS: I second it, yes.
8	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. For the
9	record, the Chair votes aye.
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	MS. STROUD: And the vote and Mr.
12	Boggs?
13	MEMBER BOGGS: Aye.
14	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
15	MR. HARNETT: Sorry. Your microphone
16	is off.
17	MS. STROUD: My apologies. With that
18	the Board has unanimously ruled that Reverend
19	Hamilton be denied ballot access in the contest
20	for U.S. Senator in the June 4, 2024 Democratic
21	Primary Election.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you,
	(202) 234 4433 Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

1 everybody. Reverend Hamilton, again, our 2 condolences for what you're dealing with today. 3 I'm very sorry to hear that, and you hang in there and keep the faith. And we were really 4 5 fortunate that, for your candidacy and I hope you return in that regard in another day, another 6 7 capacity. You want to have some final words, 8 Reverend, please go ahead.

9 Thank you all, and MS. HAMILTON: 10 thank you for being willing to be sensitive to 11 the state of my emotions right now, while also 12 giving me an opportunity to articulate what we 13 feel is, you know, two worthy challenges, if you 14 will, to this. The next steps after being denied 15 by the Board are, could you articulate those for 16 me?

MS. STROUD: Well, you have the ability to appeal the Board's decision, which was announced today, within three days. And so the appeal would be due on Monday --MS. HAMILTON: Okay.

MS. STROUD: -- File an appeal with

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	the D.C. Court of Appeals.
2	MS. HAMILTON: Okay. Just for the
3	record, we do plan to do that. Thank you.
4	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you for that.
5	And as I've said before, I'm very happy that
6	there is an appellate process above us. I think,
7	you know, everybody's work, everybody's
8	determination should be reviewed by somebody
9	else. So we welcome the appeal, for sure.
10	So, with that we will turn to the
11	next matter is Trezell Ragas versus Hamilton,
12	which challenges the same candidate. And in
13	light of the determination we just made, I was
14	going to move that we declare the matter moot.
15	But I see Mr. Quintana is here, do you want to
16	comment on this, or?
17	MR. QUINTANA: On the mootness of it?
18	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah.
19	MR. QUINTANA: Yes, Mr. Chair. The
20	challenger in this case had a smaller number of
21	challenges. In the end the candidate came up 119
22	valid signatures short, so it's a smaller

1	universe than the previous challenge. But, with
2	the Registrar's report I feel very comfortable
3	with it, so if it's moot then it's moot.
4	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Well, let me
5	ask the General Counsel's opinion. Should we
6	nevertheless proceed with this and make a
7	separate determination, or should we
8	MS. STROUD: I think, yes, for the
9	benefit of the parties, or to allow candidate,
10	Challenger Ragas to just state for the record
11	I mean, I don't think it's necessary but I just
12	want to provide the opportunity for Ms. Ragas,
13	should she wish to proceed with this matter.
14	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. So thank you.
15	I withdraw my motion, that was just my instinct,
16	more looking at the clock than anything else. So
17	we should certainly go through this process and
18	hear from the challenger here, and also Reverend
19	Hamilton if she would like to speak to this
20	challenge. So I'll
21	MS. STROUD: Yes. So, Ms. Ragas, if
22	you could just state your name and address for

the record?

1

2	MS. RAGAS: Yes. Good morning,
3	everyone. Trezell Ragas, address is 3504 7
4	Street Southeast, Washington, D.C. 20032. And I
5	have my attorney, James Abely, on and I was
6	wondering if you all could unmute him so he can
7	speak on my behalf, please?
8	MS. STROUD: Thank you.
9	MR. ABELY: Thank you, Members of the
10	Board and staff. I'm James Abely, I'm here on
11	behalf of Ms. Ragas, my D.C. bar number is
12	443585. We really need to preserve our right to
13	appeal, so on the record I would like to preserve
14	our right to appeal, please.
15	MS. STROUD: If you could, both of
16	you, state your if you could state your
17	professional address for the record, Mr. Abely?
18	MR. ABELY: Yes, ma'am. My mailing
19	address is Post Office Box 30010 in Sea Island,
20	Georgia that's S-E-A, Island, Georgia and
21	the zip code is 31561. I have a mailing address
22	in the District of Columbia but I'm not very

the mail there is slow.

1

MS. STROUD: Okay, so what we'll do is, we'll have the Registrar read her report and then have Mr. Quintana outline what the issues are, and then proceed in the manner as we did in the hearing before this one.

7 MS. CORRENTE: Thank you. So 8 similarly, because these were similar challenges, 9 the reports were, or the challenges were kind of 10 reviewed together, to make sure that they were 11 consistent. And so the reports were issued in 12 the same time period. So, an initial report was 13 issued and then, this was a follow-up report that 14 was issued April 4 following the pre-hearing 15 conference.

So, on March 6 Wendy Hamilton submitted a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate for the primary election for U.S. Senator for the Democratic Party. The requirement is 2,000 signatures, the petition contained 2,595 signatures. During the ten-day challenge period, the petition was challenged on

1	March 18, 2024 by Trezell Ragas, a registered
2	voter in the District of Columbia.
3	Challenger Ragas filed challenges to
4	1,119 of the signatures submitted, enumerated by
5	line and page number on individual challenge
6	sheets. The signatures were challenged pursuant
7	to the Board's regulations in Title 3 Chapter 16
8	of the D.C. Municipal Regulations. There were a
9	number of different challenges made of the
10	signatures, which are outlined in my report.
11	My initial review of the challenges
12	indicated that 725 of the 1,119 challenges were
13	valid. Then, on April 2, 2024 the Office of
14	General Counsel convened a pre-hearing conference
15	involving all parties, wherein these findings
16	were discussed. At the pre-hearing conference,
17	Candidate Hamilton contested some of the findings
18	and ultimately asked for further review of
19	specific signers, enumerated by their specific
20	sheet and page number. Candidate Hamilton also
21	shared a list of signers who she believed may
22	have timely filed address change forms.

1 So the scope of that, of those 2 additional names, was 144 signers, and of those, in this instance, 11 were credited back to the 3 candidate. My updated review of the challenge 4 5 indicates that 714 of the 1,119 challenges are valid, again for specific regulatory defects. 6 7 This leaves the candidate's nominating petition 8 at 1,881 signatures which is 119 signatures below 9 the number required for ballot access. 10 CHAIR THOMPSON: And I just note for 11 the record, looking at the report, I mean, some 12 of those reasons are beyond dispute. Like 203, 13 the signer is not registered to vote at all, 146 14 not registered to vote in the same party as the 15 candidate, and other examples like that. In this 16 particular case, 240 is the mismatch on the 17 address and, which we've talked about, so. 18 And a note about that, MS. CORRENTE: 19 So, if we see somebody who has the same as well. 20 name as the signer, we see that they're a 21 registered voter, we code it as an address 22 change. But in the instance of some of the forms

that Candidate Hamilton submitted, it ended up being that the voter was actually a new registration. So that wouldn't, that's not an address update, and if we had just given that, it's actually a voter who's not registered.

Or, there was another instance where 6 7 an address change form was given and it turned 8 out it was a voter who was actually inactive at 9 But, again, because there's a list of the time. 10 names, we give -- we can't determine exactly who 11 it is, we give them the option to try to correct 12 it. So it's not always the case that it turns 13 out to be credited back, it sometimes turns out 14 to be still a valid challenge.

15 CHAIR THOMPSON: Right. So, in other 16 words, if we, D.C. Council did pass this new law 17 that all, as long as you're registered to vote 18 somewhere in the District in a city-wide race, it 19 counts as a signature. And then you did drill 20 down on the 240 that were identified as having this address mismatched, it wouldn't all 21 22 necessarily pass. There might be all kinds of

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

other reasons why that particular challenge is nevertheless valid, because of, they're not registered or they're inactive or, in fact, it is a different person with the same name. Am I correct?

## MS. CORRENTE: Correct.

7 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. So we just 8 don't know whether, in this particular case, 9 among those 240 we would find 119 or more to 10 credit. It's an unknown. So it's not an 11 assumption. Okay. All right, Mr. Quintana, 12 would you want to take us through the pre-hearing 13 conference in this regard?

14 Thank you, Mr. Chair, MR. QUINTANA: 15 Members of the Board. First of all, as the 16 previous, counsel Christine mentioned, these two 17 pre-trial -- pre-hearing conferences were held at 18 the same time, so it's a lot of repetition. Ι 19 would ask that the Board incorporate by reference 20 the previous description of the pre-hearing 21 conference, and I'll just add a little bit more 22 to that --

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

1 CHAIR THOMPSON: So noted. 2 MR. QUINTANA: The most important 3 thing is that the candidate, at the continuation of the conference, of the pre-hearing conference, 4 5 acknowledged that she had not identified a sufficient number of address cures to get her to 6 7 the required 2,000 required signatures. 8 Her issues, the lack of the 9 Registrar's report, and while, yes, it is nice to 10 have someone else limit your work, the purpose of 11 that statute is not to establish the residency requirements of the signers of the petition but 12 13 to help the Registrar identify the voter, if 14 they're a valid voter. It's the only way to 15 ensure that the signer is that signer, can only 16 be conclusively proven with some other 17 information. We're not going to ask for last four or other things like that, we ask for the 18 19 address so we can verify. It's not a residency 20 requirement, it's, the purpose of the statute is 21 to assist the Registrar.

22

The lack of the -- the notice, as you

1 heard, did say that it was ten days from the 2 notice of the challenge, it repeats the statutory 3 law. The statutory scheme basically outsources the review of signatures to the voters of the 4 5 District of Columbia, and that's what happened in She had the challenges and she could 6 this case. 7 have gone through all of them to see which ones 8 were valid on her own. The need for the ten days 9 is severe, we have to do the lottery after this, 10 there's a whole schedule, and that's why the 11 ten-day requirement is there.

With respect to the one she did submit 12 13 a change of address, the register dealt with 14 those, the Registrar. Her second issue was a, 15 just a general bad faith argument. But there 16 weren't any specific signatures that were 17 addressed, and counsel for the challenger 18 vehemently opposed the idea that any of this was 19 done in bad faith.

20 And then, finally, the technical 21 requirements that you already dealt with. But 22 besides that, at the end of the day there just

are

1

aren't enough valid signatures.

2 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, thank you for 3 that. I think we'll turn now to Reverend 4 Hamilton or Professor Scriven, if you'd like to 5 comment at this time with respect to this 6 challenge?

7 I'll go first and just MS. HAMILTON: 8 make a couple of observations, then I will defer 9 to Dr. Scriven. But let me just say, the 10 Registrar, you all just had a discussion about 11 even if the 240 with, or within those there could 12 be some additional things that, you know, may 13 become revealed that invalidate that signature 14 but there's just no way of knowing. If it's that 15 difficult, or if all of that could happen to the 16 Registrar, in terms of deciphering the validity 17 of the signature, how in the world can a 18 candidate, without the access to the same 19 information and techniques that a Registrar has, 20 be expected to validate in the same manner and in 21 the same way? 22 I think it's unrealistic. This is

just me putting that on the record. Based on that conversation, you all just talked about even how difficult it can be and that there may be one or two things wrong. We don't have access to that kind of knowledge to know that, so we have to go on the good faith of what the signers are, you know, giving us at the time that they're giving us. I just wanted to say that.

And then, secondly, Attorney Quintana 9 10 just mentioned that we had the time to go through 11 the challenge, the challenges, and rectify them. Let it be clear, Ms. Ragas challenged 1,119 of 12 13 our signatures. Out of the 2,595 signatures that 14 we submitted, she challenged 1,119 signatures. To suggest that we would have time or a ten-day 15 16 window to go through, review, and rectify 1,119 17 signatures, before even having the Registrar's 18 report available to us to know if the Registrar 19 had found that same number of challenges valid, 20 is, it's very difficult to do.

21 So I just want to go on record about 22 what is being expected of the candidate, in terms

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1 of this challenge process. Now, yes, we had an 2 argument, Mr. Quintana brought it up, regarding 3 good faith and bad faith. And I will let him 4 make that argument as it pertains to the Ragas 5 challenge. 6 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Yes, so, Dr. 7 Scriven, please go ahead. MR. SCRIVEN: Yes. Thank you very 8 9 much, Reverend, I appreciate it. So we'll just This will be less than one minute. 10 be brief. 11 Yes, so we do have a concern with the 12 nature of the challenges in the Ragas challenge, 13 and we're basing this challenge on Regulation 14 1606.2(d) which states that a petition is 15 properly filed "if it appears on its face to be 16 based on good faith review of each signature and 17 circulator affidavit." 18 So our concern is that in the Ragas 19 challenge, more than one in three of the 20 challenges were overturned by the registry. And 21 we think we have some reasons that might explain 22 this. And I'll just give one or two examples and

I'll be finished.

1

2 First of all, several pages on this 3 challenge include a regulation. The same 4 regulation listed for every page. For example, 5 on Sheet 13 every single line says that the challenge is being made because the signature is 6 7 illegible. Well the registrar found, as we did 8 9 when we checked it, that actually seven of those 10 are perfectly legible. And when you have entire 11 sheets saying the same thing that's an example of what we consider to be not in good faith. 12 But 13 what it also does is put some undue burden on the 14 candidate to do a bunch of work that shouldn't 15 really need to be done. 16 Another example. Sheet 71 to 73 17 frequently cite regulations that don't exist. 18 1607.3, 1607.4, 1607.5. But we're not aware of 19 any of those things existing so we're spending 20 time looking, what are these regulations. 21 So beyond that we found examples, and 22 this is backed up by the registrar, there are

1 more than a hundred examples of challenges that were later tossed and found to be valid based on 2 3 what can be called simple mistakes. For example, the challenger wrote the name White as a surname 4 5 rather than Wright. Or Horbert rather than Hurbert. Or McCan rather than McCarn. Or Honter 6 7 rather than Hunter. Or in one case claiming 8 someone's name was Petal's when it was actually 9 Peter.

10 Now these errors are indeed quite 11 simple and they're expected in a challenge like 12 this. However, they are not expected at the 13 frequency in which they occur in this particular 14 challenge. It is very easy to reconcile with a 15 quick look at the voter records that the name 16 that is Hunter, but you are identifying as 17 Honter, is probably one that should be allowed. 18 Finally, in providing the grounds for 19 their challenge this form includes a key. It's 20 up at the top of the challenge. A key that 21 includes at the beginning, a key where they

22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

describe their challenge based on a key they are

1 using. And that key, I believe, is in reference 2 to the codes that are provided by the Board of 3 Education in 1607. And the code says things like 1607(a) 4 5 equals inactive, (b) equals wrong address, et Those are all fine. And there's one 6 cetera. 7 code, it says 1607, I'm quoting here, "1607.1(g) 8 equals (f)." So we're trying to figure out what 9 does that mean. 10 And then when they say what code it 11 corresponds to, they say that anytime they 12 mention 1607.1(f), that means unqualified 13 circulator. Well that's not quite, that's 14 confusing because in fact Code f is what should 15 correspond to illegible signature. 16 But as we're going through this form 17 we're very confused and saying to ourselves, well 18 wait, are they saying the ungualified, the 19 circulator's signature is incorrect or is it the 20 signature itself? So that was very confusing. 21 So my last point is, to summarize 22 this, we contend therefore that there is

1 sufficient evidence to suggest that this 2 challenge was made not in good faith. Creating 3 an unnecessary burden on the candidate to do work 4 that should not have been needed, and should not 5 have been needed to be done. So we're asking the Board to consider whether this challenge should 6 7 be accepted as valid at all. Thank you. 8 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, thank you so Let me ask the registrar, or Mr. Quintana, 9 much. 10 if they have any comment on this? 11 MS. CORRENTE: So we have some

12 conflicting pre-hearing conferences. I wasn't in 13 all of this one. I'll defer to Mr. Quintana to 14 speak to, the conversation from the pre-hearing 15 conference just because I wasn't in all of it.

MS. STROUD: So as an initial question, was this argument raised at the pre-hearing conference because of course issues that were going to be brought before the Board had to be raised at that level in order to be presented to the Board. So to the extent that this was, this argument was raised they're not,

is something that we need to --

1

2	MR. QUINTANA: At the Board hearing it
3	was vaguely alleged. It was not alleged with the
4	specificity as it was here. And honestly, most
5	of it dealt with Mr. Harnett's challenge. And
6	they seemed to have dropped the faith argument on
7	that. So it was briefly alluded to. And like I
8	said, Counsel strenuously objected to the idea of
9	bad faith.
10	I will say in response to those
11	comments, while it may be difficult to collect
12	these signatures that the statutory scheme places
13	the burden on the person seeking access to
14	provide 2,000 ballot addresses, not 2,000 ballot
15	addresses if it's easy.
16	I would also add that as someone who,
17	like yourself has collected signatures, you can
18	go on our website as you collect the signatures
19	and verify the voter status simultaneous, you
20	can't do that anymore?
21	MS. CORRENTE: No.
22	MR. QUINTANA: I'm sorry. I was
	(202) 234-4433 Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC www.nealrgrose

www.nealrgross.com

1	trying to do it before the hearing, it seemed to
2	work. Never mind.
3	(Off microphone comment.)
4	MR. QUINTANA: What's that?
5	(Off microphone comment.)
6	MR. QUINTANA: Oh.
7	CHAIR THOMPSON: Each individual can.
8	(Off microphone comment.)
9	MR. QUINTANA: on our website.
10	Okay, never mind. But they do have access to it.
11	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.
12	MR. QUINTANA: And I will say in terms
13	of bad faith, there were 719 ballot challenges
14	here. So the counsel mentioned, or
15	representative mentioned that a third of them
16	were overturned. In my experience you try to get
17	50 to 100 percent signatures than you need to
18	(audio interference) So it's hard to argue bad
19	faith when there were 719 ballot
20	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.
21	MR. QUINTANA: challenges.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: It strikes me that

1 two-thirds of the challenges are upheld and the 2 overall challenge is upheld is pretty hard to say 3 that the challenger has acted in bad faith. MR. QUINTANA: And if anything, and I 4 5 understand what he was saying about 1606, 1607 and what they put, but it's easy to tell that 6 7 they meant 1606, not 1607. 8 MS. HAMILTON: Can I add something 9 And, Mr. Harnett -here. 10 CHAIR THOMPSON: Briefly. 11 MS. HAMILTON: Mr. Harnett did put in the chat, we did raise this issue. One thing 12 13 I'll say is that the pre-hearing conference, we 14 were encouraged at the time to, that they were 15 going to pretty much focus on the Harnett 16 challenge because it had more, a higher number of 17 invalid signatures. A 181 at the, originally, 18 to, I believe it was 130, for the Ragas 19 challenge. And so the bulk of the pre-conference 20 21 hearing focused on the Harnett challenge. So we 22 did raise this particular issue about the bad

1 faith, or excuse me, good faith. But it was 2 really talked about as the decision was made 3 early on in the pre-conference hearing to focus 4 on the Harnett challenge due to the fact that it 5 had found that more invalid signatures had been found on that challenge than on the Ragas 6 7 challenge at the time. 8 MR. SCRIVEN: If I may just briefly, 9 I thank you. I appreciate that. Also, thank 10 you, Mr. Harnett, for confirming. 11 We did bring up this. We absolutely 12 did bring this up. We did not go into the 13 details because we were told that we needed to 14 just bring up the issues we wanted to discuss. 15 So I did not go into the detail that I went 16 through today, but we did certainly bring it up. 17 MS. HAMILTON: And I want to say one 18 more thing. There's a lot of signatures. I work 19 full-time, I want to put that out, as does my 20 At the beginning of the pre-hearing team. 21 conference when we expressed concern about not 22 having received the registrar's report until the

day of the hearing, so therefore we had not had the time, as a team, to kind of look over and review it.

You know, we were instructed that that was not, you know, that was not a good enough reason and that we needed to prioritize this report when we received it. And that's not an option for working people.

9 So I want that on the record, that 10 whatever comes of these hearings, that we take 11 these things into consideration if we really want 12 the regular every day person to be able to 13 participate in the political process. The 14 discouraging that but suggesting somehow that we 15 compromise what we do every day in an effort to 16 participate I think is counterproductive.

17 CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. Here's 18 how we're going to proceed. I just want to make 19 sure, see if Mr. Quintana has a comment, and then 20 we're going to hear from Mr. Abely on behalf of 21 the --

MR. QUINTANA: That's what I was going

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

3

1 to say. 2 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- the challenger. 3 MR. QUINTANA: Yes. My only comment 4 is that the statutory scheme is clear, we don't 5 have enough numbers. So let's hear 6 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. 7 from the challenger, I think Mr. Albany you're 8 going to speak, Abely, sorry, on behalf of the challenger from your seaside location in Georgia. 9 10 MR. ABELY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 And thank you Staff, we appreciate everything 12 that, sometimes the unsung people behind the 13 scene at the Board of Elections do. Thank you so 14 much, Staff. 15 Very important. Mr. Harnett, I'm 16 sorry, Ms. Ragas did cite DCMR in her challenges. 17 That is different from what Mr. Harnett 18 apparently did. I'm impressed with the work that 19 Mr. Harnett did. But I want to point out that 20 Ms. Ragas went further. She actually did cite 21 the DCMR. 22 We are going to incorporate please,

1 and if we can have this on the record, we'd like 2 to incorporate by reference all of Mr. Harnett's 3 arguments. We need to preserve our right to appeal. I think we are going to have to go 4 5 forward with this hearing because I don't know what's going to happen with the Harnett case. 6 7 I don't, I'm concerned that Mr. 8 Harnett might, for some reason, withdraw his challenge. We need to continue ours. We need to 9 10 preserve our right to seek review at the D.C. 11 Court of Appeals if necessary. 12 With respect to the comment I've heard 13 here today about difficulty, I'm probably the 14 oldest person in this room who's been involved 15 with D.C. politics. My first, I worked on my 16 first collection of signatures in 1994. 17 It is a lot of work. And what used to 18 happen back in the day is, as you collected 19 signatures you verified them as you went. You 20 don't have to wait till the end of the process to 21 check your signatures and make sure they're 22 valid.

1	So the argument that there is this,
2	oh, it may be, maybe the number 2,000 is too
3	heavy. Maybe it is too much. And it is a lot of
4	work to collect 2,000 signatures. I've done more
5	signature collecting on so many D.C. campaigns I
6	can't remember them all.
7	And it is a lot of work. Your
8	Saturdays are gone, you're at Easter Market,
9	you're at the Safeways, you're at ANC meetings.
10	And it's work. But that's an argument for the
11	D.C. Council. Maybe they need to reduce the
12	number to 2,000.
13	But what you can do is check them as
14	you collect them. And that's what we used to do.
15	Didn't always, you knew if you did that
16	properly you could get to 2,000 by the end of the
17	day, the time. If you checked as you went you
18	actually knew, you don't have to wait until the
19	end.
20	With regard to legibility, I want to
21	get into the good faith issue. Obviously, Ms.
22	Ragas should be commended. She's doing a civic

duty as a citizen. This is her participation in
 the process.

3 And I have to tell you, I'm a little 4 offended that somebody who is not a D.C. resident 5 comes in and criticizes the work and the, of a D.C. citizen to participate in the political 6 7 I don't know how things are done out in process. 8 Maryland, but here we recognize our citizens who 9 engage in the process positively as Ms. Ragas did. 10 11 With respect to, you know, legibility, legibility is a subjected matter. What may be 12 13 legible to some is not legible to others. 14 Again, I want to incorporate Mr. 15 Harnett's arguments by reference. I'd like to 16 point out that Ms. Ragas did cite the DCMR and 17 we're preserving, please, all of our rights to 18 seek review at the D.C. Court of Appeals. Thank 19 you. 20 MR. OUINTANA: If I may? 21 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Yes, Mr. 22 Ouintana.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

MR. QUINTANA: And, Counsel, when you
say you want to incorporate all of his arguments,
do you also mean you want to incorporate all of
his signature challenges?
MR. ABELY: Yes, sir. Please.
MR. QUINTANA: Is that
CHAIR THOMPSON: I think each
challenge will stand on its own based on the,
because there's a process for identifying what is
being challenged that's incorporated into this
particular challenge. And I was just, I'm just
thinking out loud. I don't see how you can adopt
challenges from a different challenge that
weren't made here.
MS. STROUD: Right. Yes, the
challenge period is closed and so the challenges
have to stand on their own.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. STROUD: So challenges that were
not made with respect to one petition cannot be
made, you know
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.

1 MS. STROUD: -- to that petition at 2 this point, so. 3 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes. MR. QUINTANA: And I wanted to make 4 5 sure I understood --6 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. -- his comment now. 7 MR. QUINTANA: 8 CHAIR THOMPSON: I took the comment to 9 mean, I adopt his arguments or contentions --10 MS. STROUD: Correct. 11 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- but I -- okay. 12 MR. SCRIVEN: May I ask a question? 13 Just one question of the Counsel? 14 CHAIR THOMPSON: Like just a, Yes. 15 Board you mean. Real quick because I want to get 16 the general --17 MR. SCRIVEN: Okay, very quickly. So 18 I just want to, so for the future, because the 19 statutes does say that something is not 20 considered in good faith if "a substantial amount 21 of challenges are found to be, to not reasonably 22 apply."

89

1	Is there a precedent for what would,
2	like, you know, if I'm claiming one out of three
3	is there a precedent that would establish what
4	would be considered a substantial amount?
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: I'll turn to the
б	General Counsel for that, and then we'll hear her
7	recommendation.
8	MS. STROUD: So
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: Your mic.
10	MS. STROUD: I just want to make
11	sure I'm clear on your question. You're asking
12	about the regulation pertaining to what
13	constitutes a good faith, a challenge
14	MR. SCRIVEN: Yes. Correct.
15	MS. STROUD: that's not
16	MR. SCRIVEN: Yes.
17	MS. STROUD: What's your particular
18	question again?
19	MR. SCRIVEN: So the wording is that
20	it can be considered that if a substantial amount
21	of the challenges are found to not reasonably
22	apply. So I'm just wondering if there is some

1	number or a rough number where the Board would
2	say, yes, actually this is too many challenges
3	that have been overturned. So one-third
4	apparently is not enough so what would be the
5	number? Is it half, is it three-quarters?
6	MS. STROUD: Well, so the registrar,
7	in her review of the challenges, would (audio
8	interference) that her review has revealed, I
9	mean, substantial I would suspect, we have not,
10	the Board has not ruled on what that number would
11	be specifically.
12	But in the review, when you're looking
13	at, when the registrar is looking at the
	at, when the registrar is rooking at the
14	challenges, if she determines that a large volume
14 15	
	challenges, if she determines that a large volume
15	challenges, if she determines that a large volume of challenges are alleged to have defects that
15 16	challenges, if she determines that a large volume of challenges are alleged to have defects that they could reasonably be construed to have, then
15 16 17	challenges, if she determines that a large volume of challenges are alleged to have defects that they could reasonably be construed to have, then a determination would be made. And on that basis
15 16 17 18	challenges, if she determines that a large volume of challenges are alleged to have defects that they could reasonably be construed to have, then a determination would be made. And on that basis either just that portion of signatures could be
15 16 17 18 19	challenges, if she determines that a large volume of challenges are alleged to have defects that they could reasonably be construed to have, then a determination would be made. And on that basis either just that portion of signatures could be stricken or challenges could be, you know, rules
15 16 17 18 19 20	challenges, if she determines that a large volume of challenges are alleged to have defects that they could reasonably be construed to have, then a determination would be made. And on that basis either just that portion of signatures could be stricken or challenges could be, you know, rules could be not valid challenges, or the whole

1	MR. SCRIVEN: Okay, thank you.
2	Because I noticed Mr. Harnett's overturn rate, I
3	don't know if that's the correct phrase, was
4	about 10.2 percent. And for Ms. Ragas it was
5	more than 35 percent.
6	CHAIR THOMPSON: All right, so noted.
7	Yes.
8	MS. STROUD: Yes.
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: So at this time let
10	me ask General Counsel Stroud if she has a
11	recommendation.
12	MS. STROUD: My recommendation would
13	be that Reverend Hamilton be denied valid access
14	in this matter for the reason of not having a
15	sufficient amount of valid signatures to, or the
16	200, 2,000 signatures needed to gain ballot
17	access in this contest.
18	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And before I
19	make a motion, Board Members Boggs, do you have
20	any comment?
21	MEMBER BOGGS: I do not.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: So I will make the
	Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

1 motion as recommended by the General Counsel that 2 on the basis of this separate challenge by Ms. 3 Ragas that the candidate be denied valid access. And I do want to say specifically in my motion 4 5 that I find Ms. Ragas' challenge to be in good It's something that goes to character 6 faith. 7 really, and so I want to be clear on the record 8 that I do believe the challenge was made in good 9 faith, as Mr. Abely argued. Is there a second? 10 MEMBER BOGGS: I second. 11 MS. STROUD: Okay. And the roll call 12 vote, the Chair has made the motion. Mr. Chair? 13 The Chair votes aye. CHAIR THOMPSON: 14 MS. STROUD: Member Boggs? 15 MEMBER BOGGS: Aye. 16 MS. STROUD: And with that, in this matter, the Board has unanimously ruled that 17 18 Candidate Hamilton is denied ballot access on the 19 grounds that she does not have a sufficient 20 amount of signatures on her petition to gain ballot access in the contest of U.S. Senator in 21 22 the June 4th, 2024, democratic primary election.

1 CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. And also, 2 I stand well corrected on the, my initial comment 3 about mootness. I think it is important. I verv clearly see now that these challenges be handled 4 5 separately, ruled upon separately. The point was made Mr. Harnett might withdraw his challenge, 6 7 and so this challenge would still stand 8 separately. 9 It also can be appealed in the same 10 manner. And maybe those appeals will be 11 consolidated, but --12 MS. HAMILTON: Chair, I'd like to 13 state that I would, first and foremost, let me 14 say that our suggestion of good faith is not a 15 testament to Ms. Ragas' character. I don't know 16 Ms. Ragas, I've never met her, I am not in a 17 place to make any judgment regarding her 18 character or motivation. We are utilizing 19 specifically the good faith description that is 20 in the code and the statute speaking to the 21 validity of the signatures, not to the challenger 22 herself. So please put that on record that it's

1	not any type of indictment on her character. And
2	also that we do plan to appeal the Board's
3	decision in this matter as well. Thank you.
4	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. And I
5	didn't, thank you for your additional comment.
6	Having made it I want to make sure the other
7	side, if they, Mr. Abely wants to comment for the
8	last word here on that point?
9	MR. ABELY: I just want to thank you,
10	Mr. Chairman, for recognizing the good faith of
11	Ms. Ragas. And I thank you, Ms. Hamilton, for
12	recognizing that as well. Thank you.
13	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. All right,
14	thank you, everybody. I know that was not easy.
15	MR. SCRIVEN: Thank you so much.
16	Appreciate you hearing our case.
17	CHAIR THOMPSON: Never easy. And I
18	certainly share in the comments, thanking the
19	registrar in particular, and everybody on the BOE
20	staff that had to do, has done so much work on
21	these challenges. It's really a tremendous
22	amount of very detailed work. So it's very much

1 appreciate, I think by everybody recognizes that 2 regardless of the outcomes and determinations. 3 So thank you. 4 We're not done. We have one more challenge. Ms. Ragas has also challenged Ankit 5 Jain's candidacy. And I'll turn to the General 6 7 Counsel for that. 8 MS. STROUD: Thank you. And we just want, I just want to be an, I think, I know Ms. 9 10 Ragas is here. 11 (Off microphone comments.) 12 MS. STROUD: Ms. Ragas? 13 MS. RAGAS: Yes, ma'am, I am here. 14 Okay, thank you. MS. STROUD: And if 15 you could just state your name and address for 16 the record? 17 Sorry, it accidentally MS. RAGAS: 18 muted me again. Trezell Ragas, address, 3504 7th 19 Street, Southeast, Washington, D.C. 20032. And I 20 would love for my Attorney, James Abely, to speak 21 on my behalf during this hearing. Thank you so 22 much.

1	MS. STROUD: Okay. And, Mr. Jain, if
2	you can state your name and address for the
3	record?
4	MR. JAIN: Yes. My name is Ankit Jain
5	and I'm at 1117 10th Street, Northwest, Number
б	109, Washington, D.C. 20001.
7	MS. STROUD: Okay. So we will hear
8	first from the registrar, and then we will hear
9	from the State Attorney, LaKetha Walker. And
10	then the parties will have the opportunity to
11	respond to the reports given.
12	MS. CORRENTE: Thank you. So an
13	initial report was provided to the parties, and
14	then after the pre-hearing conference an updated
15	report was provided dated yesterday, April 4th,
16	2024.
17	On March 6, 2024, Ankit Jain submitted
18	a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as
19	a candidate in the June 4th, 2024, primary
20	election for the Office of U.S. Senator for the
21	Democratic Party. The minimum requirement to
22	obtain ballot access for the office is 2,000

signatures. The petition contained 3,201
 signatures.

3	The petition was posted for the
4	Republican inspection for the ten day challenge
5	period. And it was challenged on March 18th,
6	2024, by Trezell Ragas, a registered voter in the
7	District of Columbia. Challenger Ragas filed
8	challenges to 100 and, sorry, 1,556 of the 3,201
9	signatures submitted, numerated by line and page
10	number on individual challenge sheets pertaining
11	to Title 3, Chapter 16 of the DCMR, D.C.
12	Municipal Regulations, on many different grounds.
13	I will also note that additionally
14	signatures that were, appeared to be written and
15	collected digitally through a commercial software
16	program were also challenged.
17	On March 29th, 2024, Candidate Jain
18	alerted the Board to six potential address update
19	forms timely submitted. Two of these forms, one
20	is for Sheet 40, and 220 resulted in addressed
21	updates and were applied accordingly.
22	By initial review of the challenges

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

1 with these ballot address updated incorporated 2 indicated that 813 of the 1,556 challenges were 3 valid, which left the candidates nominated petition with 2,288 signatures, 388 signatures 4 above the number required for ballot access. 5 Should be noted, in the absence of 6 7 this challenge -- sorry. It should be noted as 8 well that this challenge did not fully appear on 9 its face due to a good faith review of each 10 signature, pursuant to Title 3 of the DCMR, 11 1606.2(d). 12 There were multiple challenge sheets 13 that alleged defects versus a substantial number 14 of signatures that were not reasonably found to 15 apply to such signatures. So on Sheet 342, ten 16 lines were challenged. The last eight lines that were challenged on the grounds that the signer 17 was not a registered voter were actually blank. 18 19 On sheet 322, all ten signatures were challenged, 20 either as illegible or inactive signature not 21 matching wrong party respectively, yet none of 22 these defects applied to any of those signatures.

1	These are just two examples from
2	multiple challenge sheets in which defects were
3	alleged that could not reasonably be found to
4	apply to the signatures challenged. Due to this
5	finding, all sheets that exhibited this pattern
6	could have been dismissed from the review
7	process. Ultimately though, the challenge with
8	or without these pages did not bring the
9	candidate below the threshold for ballot access.
10	On April 2nd, 2024, the Office of
11	General Counsel convened a pre-hearing conference
12	involving all parties wherein these findings were
13	discussed. Both Candidate Jain and Challenger
14	Ragas raised their opposition to the validity of
15	either the challenge or the petition respectfully
16	in its totally.
17	Each party also contested specific
18	points regarding the findings. Ultimately, only
19	Challenger Ragas asked for an additional review
20	of the findings.
21	Any items referenced in the narrative
22	portion of the challenge that Challenger Ragas

submitted did not, and that did not correspond entirely with the page and line number of the portion of the challenge were not given a secondary review. In addition, any contested findings that were not directly identified by their page and line number at the pre-hearing conference were not given a secondary review.

8 Challenger Ragas also shared a 9 document the day, that day in advance of the 10 pre-hearing conference contested the initial 11 findings and sheets, 276, 277 and 292, connected to circulator Ashish Kanswal. That itemized list 12 13 contained a university of 30 signatures across 14 the three sheets. Six were not originally 15 itemized on the nominating petition form sheet by 16 line number so were not reconsidered. Of the 17 remaining 24 signatures, 19 were already credited 18 as valid challenges. The remaining five 19 signatures were reviewed and determined to be 20 valid challenges.

As such, my secondary review indicates that 818 of the 1,556 challenges are valid.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

1 Ultimately this leaves the candidates nominating 2 petition with 2,383 signatures, 383 signatures 3 above the number required for ballot access. 4 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. MS. WALKER: Good morning, Mr. Chair, 5 and to the Board. 6 7 Good morning. CHAIR THOMPSON: 8 MS. WALKER: As stated previously, we 9 did convene the pre-hearing conference. I will 10 advise, the challenge itself was filed on March 11 18th, the notice was sent to the parties on March the 19th of the hearing conference. 12 13 At the conference the challenger did 14 ask that her Counsel, Mr. Abely, speak on her 15 behalf. At which time the majority of their 16 argument lay in the issues dealing with fraud or 17 forgery pertaining to two specific signatures 18 that were found within pages that were circulated 19 by Mr. Ashish Kanswal as stated by the registrar. 20 And beyond that, there was also a 21 concern by the challenger with digital signatures 22 that were collected. And also with circulator

1

affidavits that predated voter signatures.

2 I will note that within the challenge 3 itself, aside from the individually marked pages that list valid line and page number of 4 challenges, that there was also a four-page 5 multi-page narrative that was filed along with 6 7 their challenge that described other issues that 8 the challenger took issue with. Within that they 9 specifically cited 14 pages that were enunciated 10 by, or excuse me, that were circulated by Mr. 11 Kanswal and ask that there be a review of the 12 entirety of the 14 pages that were filed in the 13 petition for him.

Aside from that, the other issues that were raised by the candidate, specifically were to the fact they disagreed by the findings, particularly by the registrar, as they felt that the entire math of the challenge should be found out because it was not made in good faith.

As mentioned by the registrar, she cites to two specific examples within her report where she did feel like on the face of those

particular pages, as well as maybe some others within the actual petition, they may not have had the potential for good faith.

Mr. Abely did argue also during the 4 5 pre-hearing conference that because he felt that there was fraud within the body of the petition, 6 7 as in as much as they were articulating, that the 8 entirety of the candidate's petition should be 9 thrown out. And he cited to a case, in fact 10 naming Williams v. Brazil, which the Board 11 previously dealt with an issue of fraud. We did 12 not go into an expanse of that, but those were 13 the solitaire confides of what we discussed.

14 And so, with that, knowing that there 15 was going to be such a separate agreement, and if 16 the parties were very far aligned from one 17 another, this matter was turned over for Board 18 hearing on today's date.

19 All right, thank you CHAIR THOMPSON: 20 for that. Given that the finding is that the 21 candidate is 383 signatures above the number 22 required and therefore would qualify for ballot

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

1	access, we'll turn first to the challenging side.
2	And Mr. Abely will speak to that.
3	MR. ABELY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4	Make sure I'm unmuted.
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
6	MR. ABELY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	Preliminarily I'd like to go, mention
8	three things. We have a witness today, who's
9	made great efforts to join us and who has studied
10	this issue. Dr. Fenoff. Dr. Roy Fenoff. And
11	I'm hoping he can testify soon. I think the
12	Board is going to find his testimony to be
13	compelling.
14	I also want to point out that we
15	requested that one circulator, a non-D.C.
16	resident circulator, be subpoenaed to appear
17	today. That would be, and I may mispronounce his
18	name for which I apologize, I hope I won't, Mr.
19	Ashish Kanswal. Who circulated, as Counsel has
20	indicated, a large number of petitions. I argue
21	that all of his sheets should be excluded. And I
22	think there was massive fraud.

www.nealrgross.com

1	And I think this is really important.
2	The case that we are hearing today is unique, is
3	sui generis. I think it's unprecedented in the
4	District of Columbia.
5	As I indicated earlier, I've been
б	involved with challenging petitions and
7	collecting signatures for 30 years in D.C. I
8	have never, in all of that time, ever even heard
9	of the case in which deceased persons signed
10	petitions. In 2002 of course there was the Tony
11	Williams case, Mayor Williams was kicked off the
12	ballot.
13	But even in that case, Scotty Bishop
14	did not put dead people's name on the mayor's
15	pages. Engaged in fraud, but he didn't use dead
16	people's names.
17	But in the Jain petition there are two
18	deceased people signing the petitions that I know
19	of. And I'm going to argue there's a lot more
20	fraud.
21	I think they're all, and I'm asking
22	this bard to throw out all of Mr. Jain's

1 petitions. He should be removed from the ballot. 2 He can run as a write-in candidate just as Mayor 3 Williams did. This Board removed Mayor Williams from the ballot in 2002. I was a volunteer for 4 5 Mayor Williams at that time. We had to order 30,000 pencils with his name on it so that the 6 7 Mayor could run as an incumbent as a write-in 8 candidate.

I think that Mr. Jain should be 9 10 removed from the ballot, he can run as a write-in 11 candidate. But this Board has to send a message 12 today. And the message has to be, you cannot 13 commit fraud in the District of Columbia, that 14 the Board will take it seriously. Thank you. 15 Okay. Yes, thank CHAIR THOMPSON: 16 You mentioned a witness, Roy Fenoff? you. MR. ABELY: Dr. Roy Fenoff. Yes, sir. 17 18 CHAIR THOMPSON: And is this somebody 19 with personal knowledge of these facts? 20 MR. ABELY: He's an expert. Α 21 handwriting expert. He is a renowned nationally 22 recognized handwriting expert. I hope he is on

I	
1	with us now. He's a professor of this, he has a
2	PhD in handwriting analysis of all things.
3	CHAIR THOMPSON: What's the purpose
4	MR. ABELY: And I think his testimony
5	will be compelling. And I'm asking for the Board
6	to consider it.
7	MS. WALKER: Mr. Chair, before we of
8	that I want to add, if it's all right?
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.
10	MS. WALKER: The names that are being
11	mentioned specifically here, and the two names
12	that were brought up at the pre-hearing
13	conference, while they were names that were
14	within the petition, I will add that these were
15	not part of a challenge that were enunciated for
16	the grounds in which were brought up during the
17	pre-hearing. So the fraud that was alleged for
18	those particular signatures, those were not the
19	challenge reasons that were brought up within the
20	challenge that Ms. Ragas filed.
21	So upon the registrar's review of that
22	sheet in particular, those were not a basis or a

1 reason to, for consideration, am I correct? The 2 reference to the two names? 3 MS. CORRENTE: I'm sorry, you're --CHAIR THOMPSON: The two "deceased" 4 5 people. MS. WALKER: They were found to be not 6 7 registered. 8 MS. CORRENTE: Not registered. 9 MS. WALKER: Right. 10 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. 11 MS. WALKER: So, as in as much as there is an argument today with referenced to 12 13 these are deceased persons and we need to verify 14 the validity of those signatures, I don't know if 15 that's so much at play today --16 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes. 17 MS. WALKER: -- because those were not 18 issues that were challenged by Ms. Ragas when it 19 was presented. That was not the basis for which 20 they asked for a review. 21 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okav. 22 MR. ABELY: And that's --

1	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you for using,
2	hold on. Thank you for using the word alleged
3	because I don't know if there was fraud or
4	somebody intentionally meant to write down a
5	person they knew to be deceased. I just don't
6	know.
7	But I also wanted to clarify, if all
8	of the signatures collected by the circulator,
9	Mr. Kanswal, were thrown out, how many signatures
10	are we talking about? Is it more than 383?
11	MS. CORRENTE: No. So Mr. Kanswal
12	circulated 14 petition sheets, and that's a total
13	of 133 signatures. And in my initial review, 51
14	of them were thrown out. And then in the review
15	of the three pages that were asked at the
16	pre-hearing conference, which was Page 276, 277
17	and 291, I removed five more signatures.
18	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
19	MS. CORRENTE: Now I'll note that on
20	these pages that not each line was challenged.
21	So we only looked at, we only reviewed the lines
22	that were challenged. Reconsidered those. And

1 so ultimately the number of signatures that we invalidated from Circulator Kanswal was 56. And 2 3 so I believe, if my math is correct, that leaves 4 77 --5 CHAIR THOMPSON: Oh. 6 MS. CORRENTE: -- in place. 7 I got 87, but. CHAIR THOMPSON: 8 MS. CORRENTE: Oh, is it 80, maybe it 9 But 133, no, I think it's 77. is. 10 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, thank you. 11 (Laughter.) CHAIR THOMPSON: 12 Seventy-seven. So 13 we're talking this idea that we should throw out 14 all of Mr. Kanswal's signatures if we, even if we 15 said yes to that we're talking about 77 more, I'm 16 not saying we're doing that --17 MS. CORRENTE: Yes. 18 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- but it would only 19 be 77 more. MS. WALKER: And if I could add one 20 21 other point, Mr. Chair? I do want to also just 22 talk about, there is, I think patently mistake in

1 understanding what the Williams v. Brazil matter 2 response was from the Board at that time. There was indeed an issue with fraud 3 4 dealing with a number of circulators in that 5 particular case. And in that instance the Board 6 said, if we throw out the particular sheets 7 affecting that circulator that would be 8 appropriate, not to throw out the entirety of the 9 petition itself. So I think there is a difference 10 11 between what is being stated by Mr. Abely as 12 opposed to what he's asking the Board to do 13 today. 14 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, thank you. 15 Thank you. But even in the William's case we 16 didn't throw out the entire --17 MS. WALKER: Correct. 18 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- candidate, on that 19 case. 20 That's correct. MS. WALKER: 21 CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. I do want 22 to hear from the witness. Any other comments?

1	MR. ABELY: May I? May I address
2	those issues briefly?
3	CHAIR THOMPSON: Mr. Abely, yes,
4	briefly. And then if you could just present your
5	witness and maybe voir dire
6	MR. ABELY: Yes, sir. And, you know,
7	the point by Counsel is well taken, ma'am. What
8	I do want to point out is that the court of
9	appeals stated in its opinion in the Williams
10	case, that the Board had authority to throw out
11	all petitions, a candidate off the ballot, if,
12	and I'm quoting from the decision, "if the
13	nominating petitions were so tainted by fraud, a
14	strong appearance of fraud, they may be
15	discounted in their entirety by the election
16	board."
17	And I also point out, and if you look
18	at Footnote 3 of the Williams decision, the court
19	of appeals stated that they understood that Mayor
20	Williams himself did not authorize the fraud.
21	Was not aware of the fraud.
22	I argue that this is a different case.

	-
1	That Mr. Ashish Kanswal is an agent of the
2	candidate Mr. Jain. Thank you.
3	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. So we'll turn
4	next to your witness, Dr. Fenoff. We'll unmute
5	you, sir. And if you could just introduce
6	yourself, tell us your qualifications real quick,
7	and I'm sure we'll recognize you as an expert.
8	MR. FENOFF: Yes, sir. Good morning.
9	My name is Roy Fenoff. My business address is
10	1969 Jefferson Street, Laramie, Wyoming 82070.
11	I do a couple of different things.
12	I'm an associate professor at the Citadel in the
13	Department of Criminal Justice. And I'm also
14	forensic document examiner and handwriting expert
15	in private practice. I've been doing that, the
16	handwriting work, for 16, 17 years now. And I do
17	a lot of handwriting related cases.
18	And I do work all across United
19	States. Testified in multiple courts in
20	different jurisdictions. And if you would like
21	me to go any further on my experience and stuff
22	I'd be happy to do so.

1	CHAIR THOMPSON: No. And I assumed
2	those courts recognized you as an expert?
3	MR. FENOFF: Yes, sir.
4	CHAIR THOMPSON: Well that's very
5	sufficient. So the Board recognizes your
6	expertise, and we appreciate you being here to
7	provide your testimony. I don't know if Mr.
8	Abely wants to lead you through a direct
9	examination or if you just want to, you can
10	proceed with your findings if you like. We don't
11	have too much procedure here in that regard. Up
12	to you.
13	Sorry. Apologize, we have to
14	continually unmute people. Go ahead, Mr. Abely.
15	MR. ABELY: Yes. I want to make
16	things easier for the Board. I'm more than happy
17	to do a direct with Mr. Fenoff but if, I, you
18	know, if you all are willing to dispense with
19	where you went to college and all that we can go
20	right into his testimony?
21	CHAIR THOMPSON: Please. Yes, tell us
22	what you left out, Mr. Fenoff, and what you found
_	

and what your opinions are.

1

2	MR. FENOFF: Okay. I submitted some
3	exhibits. I don't know if you have those. I
4	guess my question for you is, do you want me just
5	to state what my opinion was and what I did or do
6	you want me to show you anything, because the
7	exhibits. But I could do it either way.
8	MR. ABELY: The exhibits were
9	submitted. We got them this morning, and I
10	thank, Dr. Fenoff, for working probably overnight
11	to do them. And I think he pulled an all
12	nighter. They were emailed in this morning. And
13	I don't know if the Board has had a chance to
14	look at them.
15	CHAIR THOMPSON: I have not. I'm
16	seeing them now on the screen. But
17	MS. STROUD: I guess my question first
18	is, are you going to be testifying with respect
19	to the signatures that were circulated by Mr.
20	Kanswal or are there others that you're going to
21	be testifying to?
22	MR. ABELY: Just Kanswal.
	Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. So why 2 don't you just go ahead and summarize what you 3 left out and what you found with respect to Mr. Kanswal's signatures that he obtained. 4 5 So I, normally when you, MR. FENOFF: when you see pages, you know, for petitions like 6 7 this, what we normally see are signatures with a 8 lot of uniqueness and variation in them. Because 9 they're purportedly authored by individuals, and 10 handwriting is identifiable because your 11 signature is unique to you. No one has the same 12 handwriting features and characteristics. 13 But what we saw, what I saw in this 14 petition, was that there were a lot of clusters 15 of signatures with similar characteristics and 16 features. For examine like, for example, like 17 the placement of the signature on the signature 18 line, the upward slopping of some signatures. 19 You also had this underscoring of the signatures. 20 And I can tell you, after doing this 21 for more than 15 years I'm looking at literally 22 thousands or tens of thousands of signatures that

1 people that sign their name and underscore their 2 signature isn't as common. I'm sure there are 3 people that do that, but when you have a petition with ten signatures on it and several of them on 4 5 the same page have the same placement and the same slopping and the same underscoring and the 6 7 same, what we call line quality which is like the 8 rhythm and the smoothness of the signature, then 9 that raises a flag that those things are, you 10 know, not actually varying or actually similar in 11 a way.

12 So then what I did was, is I took the 13 four pages of petitions, which each had ten 14 signatures, so a total of 40, and I started 15 grouping them. And that's what that exhibit 16 shows, is like I put in a group one, a group two, 17 and a group three and a group four, and I just 18 grouped them based on, you know, commonality.

19 So for example, some of them was only 20 like the first name was written, no last name was 21 signed. And then they were sloping up with the 22 underscore. And then others were less legible.

1 And so then, I grouped them in that way. And 2 then after I grouped them, meaning like, you 3 know, all of the ones in group one were authored by the same person, all of the ones in group two 4 were authored by the same person, and so on. 5 And then when I finished that then you 6 7 can start comparing the groups to each other. 8 Are there features within one group that you're 9 finding in another group. And then, so you just 10 keep narrowing it down until you get to a point 11 where, all right, how many different writers are 12 potentially there. 13 And what I found, and what I think is, 14 is that more likely than not all of the signatures on the document were probably authored 15 16 by one person. 17 And the second thing was, when I 18 looked at the circulator, at the bottom of the 19 petition there is a bunch of printing of the 20 address and information, then a signature. And 21 what you notice with the signature is it, the 22 line quality is very similar to all the

1 signatures on the document. The upward slope is 2 similar to a lot of those signatures on the 3 document. You have the underscoring. There's a lot of letter forms that are consistent. 4 5 But then if when you go to the petition and you look at the address side of it, 6 7 not the signature side but the address side of each individual, there is variation in there. 8 9 There is some variation, but there is a lot of 10 letter forms and things that are consistent with 11 spacing and letter forms, line quality. 12 There was definitely features that I 13 think were intentionally maybe incorporated into 14 it to make some things look different. Disguise, 15 intentional alterations is something that we tend 16 to see. You know, if you have one or two authors 17 trying to sign a bunch of names they don't want 18 them to look alike so they're trying to make 19 these signatures look as different as they can to 20 get pass the guardian and be accepted as 21 authentic. 22 But what they focus on when they do

1 this really is more of the pictorial quality of 2 So they're trying to make them look it. 3 different or look the same, but they're not necessarily focusing on like arrangement, 4 5 placement on the signature line, some of the connecting strokes, the beginning and ending 6 7 strokes, size and proportions. Those are things 8 like experts, like myself, that's what we look 9 People, you know, signing other people's at. 10 name or trying to simulate, they don't think 11 about those things, they're just thinking about, how does it look in the end. 12

13 So I found a lot of similarities to 14 the circulator, in both the printed addresses. 15 And then when you look at the writing of the 16 printed address and then you compare it to the 17 signature, what you notice is, in a lot of the 18 signatures there's a lot of similarity to the 19 printed address.

20 And if the printed address has 21 handwriting features and similarities that are 22 consistent with the circulator, then you conclude

that the circulator signed the printed portion of the address. And then the printed portion of the address has handwriting features and characteristics that are found within some of the signatures, then the conclusion is, is that the circulator filled out that part and they signed the name.

8 Now some of the other signatures it's 9 not so clear, necessarily, who the author is 10 because it's either not really legible, like in 11 some of the signatures you'll get what we call a 12 thready writing where you'll have like, maybe you 13 can make out the first letter, the capital letter 14 of the first name, and then all of the letters, 15 the lower case letters in the middle, they're 16 just really like a thready stroke, you can't 17 really make them out. And then there is like 18 some printing and other things, and there is 19 nothing really to compare back to the circulator 20 to determine whether or not they did that.

But when you compare the line quality and other things you can start combining groups,

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

then it becomes pretty clear that, you know, all of the signatures on there are most likely not authored by the person's name that is associated with them.

1

2

3

4

And then on that exhibit, one more 5 thing, there was on Page 2, there were a few 6 7 signatures, and you can look at that, that I 8 received from Mr. Abely, that were pulled from 9 the voter record. And so there was one, two, 10 three, four, five, six, seven of them I had. And 11 then I pulled the name off the sheet to match 12 that. And you can see none of those are 13 consistent at all. In fact, they're not even 14 So that's a red flag in and of itself. close.

15 When you see that immediately a red 16 flag should fly up and you should say, all right, 17 pull that signature out, we need to take another 18 look at that because that's a red flag. In fact 19 two of them, from my understanding the two at the 20 top, Ethel Spencer and John Tisdale, were both, 21 are both deceased from my understanding. 22 But one thing you'll also notice on

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

(202) 234-4433

1	that Page 2, is if you look at all of the
2	comparison signatures, the petition signatures,
3	notice how similar they all appear in line
4	quality placement within the box. And what that
5	is telling you is that all of those signatures
6	there were authored by the same individual. And
7	that individual was not any of the individuals
8	identified in that voter record.
9	And so that's what I found throughout
10	all four of those pages. They were all
11	relatively consistent with each other, so my
12	conclusion on that is more likely than not all of
13	the signatures on there are fraudulent.
14	CHAIR THOMPSON: And you say those
15	four pages, how many signatures are we talking
16	about on those four pages?
17	MR. FENOFF: Each page had ten.
18	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
19	MR. FENOFF: And I had sheet 276, 277,
20	278 and 291. And each had ten, so a total of 40
21	that I looked at.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And is it your

1 opinion that those 40 signatures on those four 2 sheets were more likely than not fraudulently 3 created by the circulator? MR. FENOFF: Yes. 4 CHAIR THOMPSON: And if you look 5 beyond those four sheets, at all of the sheets 6 7 that the circulator signed or just those four? 8 MR. FENOFF: Sir, those were the only 9 four I looked at so I can't testify to any other sheets. 10 Just those four. 11 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. I don't have 12 any other questions. Let me just ask Ms. Walker, 13 anybody else --14 MS. WALKER: No, I do not. 15 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- on our team? 16 MS. WALKER: No, sir. 17 All right, well thank CHAIR THOMPSON: 18 you very much, Dr. Fenoff, that was fascinating. 19 Could we, could I ask Dr. MR. ABELY: 20 Fenoff a couple questions? 21 CHAIR THOMPSON: Oh yes, sure. Keep 22 qoing. He's your witness.

Washington DC

	12
1	MR. ABELY: I'll keep it brief because
2	I know the Board is busy. And I don't know if
3	the Board Members can take a look at Sheet 276.
4	And, Dr. Fenoff, if you happen to have 276
5	available, please sir.
6	MR. FENOFF: I do.
7	MR. ABELY: I'm just going to, you've
8	done such a great narrative, thank you. But I
9	think it might help the Board to just go through
10	an example of some of the things you discussed.
11	Could you take a look at 276, and I'll
12	come back to two signatures on that page in just
13	a moment. But could you perhaps provide the
14	Board with some examples of some of the things
15	you just discussed?
16	MR. FENOFF: Yes. So if you look at,
17	on Sheet 276, Lines 6, 7 and 8. You'll notice
18	the signatures, as how they all are located in
19	the exact same location in each one of those
20	boxes. Where you had, if you consider the four
21	sides of a box, and as you're looking at that box
22	you look to the far left-hand side where it says,

sign here, there's a certain distance from that edge of the box to where the beginning stroke of each signature begins. And you'll notice that they all are very consistent, not only where they start but how they rise, and how the underscore is similar in all of those.

7 You'll also notice that even if you 8 just look at them, and you're not a handwriting 9 expert you don't know, but you look at those, you 10 go, they just look similar to me. And the reason 11 for that is, is because the size and proportion in what we call the line quality is consistent. 12 13 They were all done by the same person. And so, 14 although they're different names you can see what 15 the line quality, the letter forms, the spacing, 16 the arrangement, the sloping and stuff that 17 they're all the same.

Now if you go over to six, seven and eight again, but go to the address side of the page, and what you'll notice, is if you start looking at those letters and numbers, like the number two and so one, that even though there is

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

some variation in how those letters might be made, like there might be bigger or smaller, the spacing may be a little different. But you'll notice that a lot of the letters and numbers, like the number 2, the letters S come to mind, they're similar in a sense because those addresses were filled out by the same person.

And so then, when you start comparing, what I was talking about earlier, that printed script down to the bottom of the page when you look at the circulator, look at the number 2, look at the S's, you start looking at that in the spacing and what you see is those are consistent.

14 In some of the signatures where there 15 is printing and things you'll see some of these 16 letters are very clear. And then if you compare 17 the address side back to the signature you go, 18 okay, yes, the address and the signature were 19 authored by the same person, and the address line 20 was authored by the circulator, therefore logic, 21 right, the circulator is the one who authored 22 that signature. And that's how I came to some of

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 my conclusions that way. 2 But throughout these pages you can see You'll find signatures that are very 3 that. 4 consistent with each other in their arrangement 5 spacing, and then there is some variations with some too. 6 But --7 (Simultaneous speaking.) 8 MR. FENOFF: Go ahead --9 MR. ABELY: Go ahead, Board, I'm 10 sorry. 11 CHAIR THOMPSON: No, no, I'm --MR. ABELY: 12 Okay. 13 CHAIR THOMPSON: -- I --14 (Simultaneous speaking.) 15 MR. ABELY: If I could ask you, Dr. 16 Fenoff, you just mentioned Line 8 on Sheet 276, 17 could you please describe, just tell us a little 18 about that if you could? If everyone could 19 please look at Line 8 because it's the heat of 20 our argument. 21 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes. 22 MR. ABELY: On 276 please.

MR. FENOFF: Yes. So if you look at the John Tisdale written out, look at the J in the John, and then look at the J in the signature. Those are done by the same individual, right? So just that one stroke along.

7 Even how the J connects to the O. 8 Look on the side with the address, look how the J 9 connects to the O, and then look how the J 10 connects to the O in the signature. The distance between the O and the J, and the arrangement and 11 12 all of that is very similar there. Even the 13 ending strokes to the end, and then moving in the 14 same movement and moving in the same direction.

15 So that's another example of how that 16 individual, who signed it, is the one who 17 authored the address. So then if you take that 18 address and go, well, you know, there is some 19 differences there, that looks a little different 20 than say, Line 10 down below. Oh I absolutely 21 agree with that, it does. But when you go 22 through the whole petition and you do that to all

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

the addresses and things and you start comparing them back, what you're seeing there is signatures, in my opinion, being intentionally altered in ways to make them look different to you.

6 But a lot of the connecting strokes, 7 the placement, the spacing, the size and 8 proportion, the line quality, they're very 9 consistent throughout. Those are things that a 10 forger or someone trying to simulate or disguise 11 don't think about. They're focused more on, I 12 need to make it look different.

13 But as you go through all four pages 14 and you start comparing those, that's why you 15 have to group things first to get 16 similar-to-similar. And then once you get them 17 in those groups then you can start comparing 18 And then it kind of completes a story of back. 19 what was going on.

20 MR. ABELY: Dr. Fenoff, can you tell, 21 compare some of these signatures to the 22 circulator's signature? You made a conclusion, I

1

2

3

4

1	think I heard you say that you thought that the
2	circulator signed some of these signatures.
3	Could you please describe that please?
4	MR. FENOFF: Yes. So if you look at
5	the circulator's signature down at the bottom of
6	the page, notice how it rises from left to the
7	right. So it has an upward sloping. You also
8	have that underscore.
9	Now keep in mind, the underscore is
10	not as common as you might think within the
11	general population. Yes, there are people who do
12	this, but I can go weeks and months looking at
13	hundreds of thousands of signatures and not see
14	someone underscore their name.
15	The fact that he does that, and then
16	you look up above and you have numerous examples
17	of signatures all signed by the same person, you
18	have an underscore, you have an upward slanting
19	signature, and then on top of that you have a
20	very similar line quality, size and proportion
21	measurements with it.
22	The key here is, is that no two people
	(202) 234-4433 Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC www.nealrgros

www.nealrgross.com

1 have the exact same handwriting. You can't sign 2 your name the exact same way twice. 3 So what I'm describing to you are identifying features within the body of 4 5 handwriting. And so when you identify those key features that are unique to you, and you find 6 7 them multiple times throughout the petition 8 signature, and then you look at the circulator 9 and that person has those same key identifying 10 characteristics, there's only one conclusion you 11 can make there is that, well, you found yourself your author of a lot of those signatures. 12 13 MR. ABELY: And you think that author 14 is Mr. Kanswal? 15 MR. FENOFF: Yes. 16 MR. ABELY: Thank you. Going back to 17 Mr. Tisdale, who I believe died, you compared Mr. Tisdale's signature as it appears in the 18 19 petitions, to what you found in the Board of 20 Election's exemplar. Could you please describe 21 that? 22 MR. FENOFF: So on that Page 2 Yes.

1 of my exhibits, I was given some voter record 2 signatures. Not the best quality, but, you know, 3 if you look at the John Tisdale signature as it was in the voter record and you look at the one 4 5 here, first off, you just the first name John. By the way, which is unusual in and of itself. 6 7 You know, most people sign their first and last 8 name, and you have a document here where you have 9 half, I don't know what the total number is I 10 had, but you had, I don't know, 15 or more 11 signatures where there is only the first name signed or the last name signed. And same line 12 13 quality, same, again.

But when you look at the John Tisdale signature as it is in the voter record compared to that one they're not even close. It's not even there. They're just not even close. He doesn't underscore. He doesn't, you know, his signature doesn't slant up.

And by the way, handwriting is habit form, this is not something we consciously think about. So anytime you sign your name you don't

think about how you're going to sign your name you just sign it. And if you signed it five times in a row it would remain relatively consistent not exactly the same, but you're not thinking about it.

And so if you have a signature that 6 7 you don't underscore your name, you don't just 8 one day just change it and start underscoring it 9 and leaving out the last part of your name. That 10 isn't something you do because it's a habit form. 11 So that, in and of itself, is a pretty 12 significant indicator that these are different 13 authors.

CHAIR THOMPSON: If --

MR. FENOFF: Let alone in fact thatMr. Tisdale was deceased.

17 CHAIR THOMPSON: If I could interject 18 in the interest of time? I mean, we haven't used 19 time limits but I think, I for one have heard 20 some very convincing expert testimony with 21 respect to these 40 signatures, and I don't know 22 if we need to go through other examples to kind

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

135

1

2

3

4

5

1 of drive the point home. I think we've heard it. 2 I'm not saying I'm cutting you off, 3 but I was going to suggest that if we could conclude with the expert, and then Mr. Abely, if 4 5 you could summarize your argument? Because I think you're going to make some inferences from 6 this about the remainder of the circulator --7 8 MR. ABELY: Yes. I --9 (Simultaneous speaking.) 10 MR. JAIN: Am I allowed to --11 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. 12 MR. JAIN: Am I allowed to ask him three yes or no questions? I don't know how the 13 14 process works here. 15 CHAIR THOMPSON: I was going to 16 suggest that we conclude with the expert, Mr. 17 Abely summarize, and then, oh, and then I'll ask, 18 Mr. Jain, you can cross examine the witness, and 19 then we'll turn to Mr. Jain's side of this 20 challenge. 21 At some point we're going to need a 22 break. We've been going for more than, almost

1 two and a half ways and I for one could use a 2 little break. And so why don't we see if we can 3 conclude with the witness for starters and then take a break. 4 5 May I ask one question? MR. JAIN: Т have one witness who needs to leave by 12:45. 6 Ι 7 don't know if it's possible to just go out of 8 order and have, he's like a five minute witness, 9 three minute witness maybe. 10 CHAIR THOMPSON: Hold on, let me make 11 sure that Mr. Abely, do you have anything? MR. ABELY: I'd like to just, if I 12 13 may, just, I really want to just, if I can ask 14 one more question of Dr. Fenoff and then I'll 15 just go into injecting in on cross? 16 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, one more 17 question. Go ahead. 18 MR. ABELY: Okay. So, Dr. Fenoff, one 19 Looking at the pages you got in front of more. 20 you, could you just help the Board understand why 21 you believe Ashish Kanswal signed these 22 signatures? And you don't have to stick to Page

1	276.
2	MR. FENOFF: Well, the consistency and
3	line quality, the underscoring, letter form
4	similarities.
5	MR. ABELY: Could you provide an
6	example? That you haven't provided yet. Is
7	there an example you can provide?
8	MR. FENOFF: Well, there are many.
9	I'll try to find another one. A different one
10	maybe that might be helpful to you.
11	(Pause.)
12	MR. FENOFF: I thought I had one
13	written down here. If you look at 278.
14	MR. ABELY: 278.
15	MR. FENOFF: Go to Line 8. Isaiah
16	James.
17	MR. ABELY: Yes, sir.
18	MR. FENOFF: If you look at the M, and
19	how the M is written, not only in James, but if
20	you look at that James and the, J-A-M-E-S, on the
21	printed side you'll see those M's are consistent
22	and the same. The J, again. But you have many

of those in there. If you go down to the
 circulator name part of that you see the same
 kind of M's form there.

So that's just another example of, not 4 only is there a line quality similarity, not only 5 is that signature consistent with those other 6 7 signatures I pointed out earlier from that first 8 page, 276 I think it was, where it's the 9 arrangement in the box, the sloping up, the underscoring and stuff, but you also have those 10 11 letter forms. And what you'll notice too on the 12 circulator, if you take the four address parts of 13 each page, there is variation between them for 14 that circulator as well.

15 So you have to take all of that into 16 common, but that's just another example of it. 17 But really it comes down to the arrangement, the 18 line quality, the size and proportions, the 19 underscoring and legibility and things like that. 20 It's a combination of many things. It's not just 21 one thing I can really just point at and say, 22 that's the key, you know. It's a multiple of

many things.

1

2	And you have to factor in that you
3	have an individual here that is writing things
4	and making things, trying to make things look
5	different and incorporating what I would call
6	some disguise or distorted writing to get it past
7	a guardian.
8	MR. ABELY: Thank you.
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. So just to be
10	clear, Mr. Jain, you can now cross examine the
11	witness. I mean, just you can ask him questions.
12	MR. JAIN: Yes.
13	CHAIR THOMPSON: But you can ask him
14	questions. And then we will get to your case,
15	and then you also can present your witness as
16	well.
17	MR. JAIN: Yes.
18	CHAIR THOMPSON: So
19	MR. JAIN: I just have three very
20	short questions. So, Mr. Fenoff, you looked at
21	four pages, correct?
22	MR. FENOFF: Yes.

1 MR. JAIN: That's 40 signatures, 2 correct? 3 MR. FENOFF: Yes. MR. JAIN: And every single page you 4 5 looked at was from Circulator Ashish Kanswal, 6 correct? 7 MR. FENOFF: Yes. 8 MR. JAIN: Okay, no further questions. 9 So with that, and CHAIR THOMPSON: 10 I'll ask Mr. Abely to, I guess before you rest 11 your case so to speak, do you have any, like a 12 concluding, you know, summary argument to make 13 here? 14 Yes, sir. MR. ABELY: Please. 15 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, go ahead. 16 MR. ABELY: I think we've heard today, 17 one of the things I will point out is that I have 18 here, we didn't get into Ms. Ethel Hope Spencer, 19 who is one of the signatures, but Dr. Fenoff 20 looked at her signature as well. I know his 21 testimony is concluded, but I think he's 22 testified that Ms. Ethel Hope Spencer's signature

142

was fraudulent.

1

2	I have here her obituary. Ms. Ethel
3	Hope Spencer died on July 5th of 2022. Mr.
4	Tisdale died in January of 2022. But somehow
5	they both signed these petitions for Mr. Jain.
6	Having a dead person sign nominating
7	petitions is, I believe, unprecedented in the
8	District of Columbia. I have never heard of a
9	case like that before. Maybe it has happened and
10	I didn't hear about it. It makes the Scotty
11	Bishop fraud and the Williams case look minor.
12	And I want to point out that I did
13	request during the pre-hearing that Mr. Kanswal
14	be available today to testify. I made a request
15	to the Board that he be subpoenaed. I asked Mr.
16	Jain specifically to have him here. And he's not
17	here. My guess is if he were here he'd have to
18	plead the Fifth Amendment. Just as Scotty Bishop
19	did in the Williams case.
20	I think this is very, very serious.
21	I think the Board has to send a message that it
22	will not tolerate election fraud like this in the

I	
1	District of Columbia. We're not going to allow,
2	Mr. Kanswal lives in Virginia, we're not going to
3	allow people to come in from out of state and
4	sign dead people's name to a U.S. Senate
5	position. We're not going to allow it.
6	And I think the Board needs to stand
7	firm and say, Mr. Jain, you're not going to be on
8	the ballot. If you want to run as a write-in
9	candidate you can, but you're off. This is
10	unprecedented. This case is sui generis. It is
11	egregious.
12	Mr. Jain could have come in and said,
13	you know what, I'm sorry, it was wrong, we
14	encourage the Board to take action. You could
15	have had your witness here. Your circulator
16	here. This is very, very serious.
17	And I think the Board has to kick Mr.
18	Jain off the ballot. And it is authorized to do
19	so. The Williams case makes that clear. It says
20	that an election board can remove a candidate
21	from the ballot when there is a strong indicia of
22	fraud for the purpose of protecting election

integrity.

1

2

3

4

And if this, if that's not the case here then I don't know what the case is. Thank you.

5 All right. Thank you CHAIR THOMPSON: I tell you what, before we hear before 6 so much. 7 Mr. Jain, and Mr. Jain, you can take just as much 8 time to tell us your view of things and present 9 your witnesses, I'm just going to move for a five 10 minute recess so we can stretch our legs, you 11 know, use the facilities.

I'll say "five minutes," but I'll make sure everybody is back. But let's try to be efficient in our break and resume in five minutes.

16 PARTICIPANT: If it's the Chair's 17 prerogative then --18 MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes.

19 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, I'll call for a 20 recess. And I think J.C. is still out there 21 somewhere. There he is.

MEMBER BOGGS: Yes.

1	CHAIR THOMPSON: So, and Karyn has
2	joined us. Karyn Greenfield.
3	MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes, Chair.
4	CHAIR THOMPSON: Our Board Members are
5	here, I'll note for the record. I think because
6	she hasn't heard all this evidence she won't
7	participate in the determination on this
8	particular matter, but when we get to the next
9	item she will. So I'll see everybody, it's
10	12:04, how about at 12:10 we'll resume. Thank
11	you.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
13	went off the record at 12:05 p.m. and resumed at
14	12:10 p.m.)
15	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. It's time
16	to hear from Mr. Jain. And before you proceed,
17	I'll just put this in perspective. I do want to
18	repeat that if we invalidate all 133 of the
19	signatures on Mr. Kanswal's sheets, the candidate
20	would still be 306 by my count above the required
21	amount. So you know, I don't know if that
22	impacts the scope of what you want to talk about,

Mr. Jain, but I think -- And I think maybe the sort of big question I have anyway before you start is did you have any involvement with Mr. Kanswal as he went about filling out his sheets. Go ahead, Mr. Jain.

6 MR. JAIN: Yeah, thank you. I'm going 7 to try not to belabor my points. I think we can 8 keep this relatively brief, although I do want to 9 make sure I get, you know, everything we need in 10 the record in case Challenger pursues this to the 11 bitter end.

12 So by my count, I had 307, could be 13 306 signatures above the limit if every single 14 one of Circular Kanswal's signatures are removed. And I think just like getting to the heart of the 15 16 point, they would have to prove a massive -- I 17 think the phrase they use is "massive fraud" to 18 knock this campaign off the ballot. They pointed 19 to four sheets from one circulator, 40 signatures 20 out of 3,300 signatures that they claimed were 21 fraudulent. And they did not point to a single 22 signature -- not a single signature by any other

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

circulator other than Mr. Kanswal that they allege are fraudulent. And yet they are alleging this campaign committed a massive fraud upon the people of D.C. So I think that is the heart of the matter. They didn't show any sort of massive fraud.

7 So I want to go through three things. 8 I just want to start by explaining why the Board 9 should dismiss the challenge on its face without 10 any consideration of its specifics as made in bad 11 faith. Then I'm going to talk about how the case law and the Williams case among other cases, cuts 12 13 against the argument that the Challenger is 14 And finally, while it is not our burden making. 15 to prove -- to disprove fraud, it is the 16 Challenger's burden to prove fraud, we will still 17 call several witnesses.

I'm sorry. I am in a hotel room and there was an earthquake and so I'm wondering if it's related to that. Give me a second. Maybe this is going to stop. Okay, I think I'm going to go ahead and go forward and I'll let you know

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

1

if I have to stop for some reason.

Okay. 2 CHAIR THOMPSON: No worries. 3 MR. JAIN: Yeah. Okay, so the third 4 thing I'm going to do is we're going to call 5 several witnesses who will testify about the campaign's process and who will make sure that 6 7 the Board knows that there was no massive fraud 8 committed by this campaign, including our field director and deputy field director. And they can 9 10 speak more to interactions with Mr. Kanswal. I'm 11 happy to add on if there's any questions you have 12 for me, but maybe I'll start with them and then 13 we can have me add on as necessary. 14 And so I'm going to go a little bit 15 out of order though because we have one witness 16 who has a 12:45 stop and so I'm wondering -- I'm 17 going to start with calling a witness who was a 18 circulator for this campaign who will discuss his 19 process for circulating and that he did not 20 commit fraud if I may. 21 CHAIR THOMPSON: You may and I'm not

going to call on you, Mr. Abely, but you will get

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1 a chance to cross examine the witness with each 2 So go ahead and present your witness, Mr. round. 3 Jain. MR. JAIN: Okay. Mr. Rothman --4 5 Harris Rothman, can you -- can we unmute him? 6 CHAIR THOMPSON: And we're going to 7 swear the witness in as well. 8 MR. ROTHMAN: Good afternoon. 9 CHAIR THOMPSON: Good afternoon. You 10 want to swear -- We're just going to swear you in 11 real quick, Mr. Rothman. MS. STROUD: Hi, Mr. Rothman. 12 Do you 13 swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and 14 nothing but the truth with respect to -- swear or 15 affirm to do so with respect to the testimony 16 you're about to give? 17 MR. ROTHMAN: I so swear. 18 CHAIR THOMPSON: So go ahead, Mr. 19 Jain. You can ask -- You can key it up with 20 questions or we can just hear directly from the 21 witness. 22 MR. JAIN: Yeah. Mr. Rothman, do you

150

just want to talk about your involvement in circulating petitions and how you went about it in your interaction with the campaign in doing so?

5 MR. ROTHMAN: Sure. So to begin with, I circulated petitions on three days, very 6 7 briefly on one of those days and I don't think I 8 collected any signatures. But I went to bat with 9 a clip board seeking to collect signatures on 10 February 3rd, February 13th very briefly, and 11 February 24th.

My process generally was that I had a clip board and I had some of Mr. Jain's campaign literature and that I would stand in public and flag down people that I thought weren't walking too quickly by me and ask them if they would be willing to sign a petition for Mr. Jain if they were registered Democrats in D.C.

19MR. JAIN: Mr. Rothman, did you ever20fraudulently sign a petition for anybody?

MR. ROTHMAN: No.

MR. JAIN: Okay. And when you had

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

21

22

1

2

3

1	your (audio interference), who was the one who
2	signed their signature on any petition you did?
3	MR. ROTHMAN: The people that I
4	flagged down.
5	MR. JAIN: Okay. And how many how
6	many sheets would you say you turned in about?
7	MR. ROTHMAN: I believe I had two on
8	the first day. I didn't get any signatures on
9	the second day as far as I recall. And I think
10	it was just one on the third day. Outside of
11	that, I did collect a signature from now that
12	I'm thinking, outside of those three dates where
13	I was collecting publically, it was just from my
14	girlfriend when she was in my residence. I don't
15	know if that was on a separate sheet, so if so,
16	that would have been a fourth sheet, but it would
17	have been, I suppose, either three or four then.
18	MR. JAIN: Okay. Did you interact or
19	witness any other volunteer circulators?
20	MR. ROTHMAN: Well, I actually at one
21	point volunteered alongside you, Mr. Jain, so I
22	suppose I witnessed you collecting signatures.

1	MR. JAIN: Did you see any other
2	any circulators you volunteered with in this
3	campaign committing fraud?
4	MR. ROTHMAN: No.
5	MR. JAIN: Okay. I have no further
б	questions. I don't know if anybody else would
7	like to ask any questions.
8	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. I'm going to
9	turn to Mr. Abely. It's not an episode of law
10	and order. If you've got a legitimate cross
11	examination question, please go ahead.
12	MR. ABELY: Yes, sir. I'm sorry.
13	Really, I have an administrative matter. Can we
14	please excuse Dr. Fenoff?
15	CHAIR THOMPSON: Oh, yeah. Sorry, I
16	didn't mention that. Yes. Dr. Fenoff, you're
17	excused. We thank you for being here. And so
18	with that, do you have a question for this
19	witness?
20	MR. ABELY: No, I don't. I just
21	wanted to excuse Dr. Fenoff. Thank you.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. And Mr.

1 Rothman, you're also excused. We have -- I quess 2 we have kind of a time crunch. We have a board 3 member that needs to leave by 12:30. You know, I'm tempted to make a motion before then so as 4 not to lose his participation. But let's go 5 ahead, Mr. Jain, maybe to see how much --6 7 (Simultaneous speaking.) 8 MR. JAIN: Yeah. Maybe what I'll do 9 is I'll shorten it to just talk about, you know, 10 the precedent and then I'll call my field 11 director so that she can talk about her 12 interactions with Mr. Kanswal. 13 CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, that would be 14 Go ahead. great. 15 Yeah, okay. MR. JAIN: So the 16 Challenger continually cites the Williams case as 17 a reason to disgualify every single petition 18 collected by any circulator in this campaign due 19 to alleged fraud by one circulator. The Williams 20 case said nothing of that -- of the sort as I 21 think the Council for this Board has pointed out. 22 I think the phrase was patently mistaken

1

misunderstanding of the Williams case.

2 So the Challenger argues that there 3 was -- argues that alleged forgeries by one petition circulator who collected less than 3 4 5 percent of all signatures collected in this campaign to disgualify every circulator's 6 7 petition signatures. You know, the Board Chair 8 has already reconsidered this argument in the 9 motion for a subpoena and rejected it. And we 10 agree with the Board Chair and the case law supports that view. What case law shows is that 11 12 only the signatures collected by a circulator who 13 committed fraud are to be disqualified. And it 14 argues against signatures by other circulators 15 not accused of fraud from being disgualified. 16 In the Williams case, as the Board 17 attorney mentioned, this Board and the DC Court 18 of Appeals explicitly only considered invaliding 19 signatures on sheets circulated by the circulator 20 the Board found had committed fraud. And I'm 21 just going to give you one guote. This Board 22 wrote, "The Board was prepared to review the

1 entire nominating petition signature by signature 2 and rule on the validity of each individual 3 challenge. However, it became perfectly clear that even if the Board accepted all of the 4 Mayor's legal arguments, there was still no 5 scenario possible in which the Mayor could obtain 6 7 2,000 signatures without including signatures 8 attributable to the --" So you can see there, 9 they're only considering invaliding the 10 signatures collected by the circulators who 11 committed fraud.

12 One more quote from the DC Court of 13 Appeals. They wrote that, "We hold it was within 14 the Board's authority to disallow all of the 15 signatures affected by the wrongdoing." Affected 16 by the wrongdoing, which is only the signatures 17 collected by the circulators who were alleged to 18 have committed fraud.

I will note that this case is not sui generis as Mr. Abely keeps on saying. And in fact, in that case there was a dead person who the Williams campaign put on. The Williams

campaign signed for St. Paul I in that case who I believe is a historical figure who is now dead. And so there's at least one example of a dead person being signed for in a fraud case. And in that case, the Board only threw out the signatures by the circulators who committed fraud.

8 I mean just as an example of some 9 other people who were signed in this case. 10 Jehovah's Witness, Robert DeNiro, Rosa Parks, 11 Tony Blair. Someone signed June 31st -- One of the circulars wrote June 31st as a date that the 12 13 signature happened, which is a date that does not 14 exist. And one circulator reportedly collected 15 540 signatures in that case in one 24-hour 16 period, which would be one signature every two 17 minutes for 24 hours straight.

So I don't think that this case is actually sui generis. And one of the main reasons I think that it's actually not sui generis or I'll say Mr. Abely says that this case is worse than the Williams case. In the Williams

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

case, over 78 percent of all signatures collected by the campaign were collected by the three circulators who had committed forgeries. And the person who was in charge of the signature collection process was himself someone who had committed forgeries.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

In our case as our field director will 8 testify, the person who is accused of forgery, 9 10 Asheesh Kanswal was one of two paid petition 11 circulators who collected 3 percent of all 12 signatures collected by the campaign. And the 13 campaign actually had no connection with Mr. 14 Kanswal before the need came up to have a paid 15 signature collector. So if we're talking about 16 the facts of the situation, the facts were much, 17 much more egregious in the Williams case. And 18 even in that case, the Board decided not to toss 19 every single signature collected by every 20 circulator.

21 This case is -- I'm just going to cite 22 one more case for the record, I won't go into it,

1 that supports our allegations. It's the case of 2 Citizens against Legalized Gaming v. District of 3 Columbia 501 Federal Supplement 786, District of DC 1980. That case also supports our arguments. 4 Now this case is more akin to the case 5 -- the Board of Elections case of Henderson v. 6 7 Ryan by Ms. Kathy Henderson than it is to the 8 Williams case. There as here, the Challenger, 9 Ms. Kathy Henderson asked that the entire 10 petition be rejected for alleged forgeries. And 11 the Board pointed out in that case that Ms. 12 Henderson produced no voter who signed Ms. Ryan's 13 petition and denied having done so, nor did she 14 offer credible forensic evidence calling into 15 question the validity of the signatures such as 16 testimony from a handwriting expert. Moreover, 17 Ms. Henderson subjected opinion as the 18 authenticity of the petition signatures was 19 rebutted by the signature authentication 20 conducted by the Board's Registrar, as well as by Mr. Ryan's contrary testimony. 21 22 So just as in that case, here, the

1 Challenger has produced no voter who denied 2 having any signature or having any -- who denied 3 having signed any petition circulated by anyone other than Mr. Kanswal. They have not offered 4 any evidence contesting the validity of the 5 signatures of the 40+ circulators who are not Mr. 6 7 In fact, they only contested four pages Kanswal. from Mr. Kanswal out of the 12 total. And so 8 9 they obviously had the ability to look through all of them and didn't seem to think that the 10 11 others were problematic.

And the Board has looked at numerous allegations of signature forgery by other circulators alleged during this challenge and rejected those challenges. I'll repeat. The Board has already looked through several signatures and found that they matched the ones the Board has on file.

Now I just want to point out that electronic signatures are perfectly valid as long as it's actually physically signed by the -- by the person signing it, which is the case here.

And if the Board would like, we do have a witness who signed an electronic signature petition who's welcome to testify. But I don't -- I'm looking at the clock and I don't want to take too long. So I just want to call my field director, Ali Lenk and see if she can testify to her relationship with Mr. Kanswal.

8 CHAIR THOMPSON: And before we hear 9 from her also, don't worry about the time. Ιf 10 Board Member Boggs needs to go, that's fine. We 11 can finish hearing the evidence. I can make a motion on the record. We would then, you know, 12 13 table that and since Board Member Greenfield is 14 here, she can review the evidence -- the 15 transcript and the recording. And then we'll 16 come back on the record at like 4 o'clock today 17 and do, you know, a quick vote -- roll call vote. 18 So we can -- We have a way under our regulations 19 to go ahead and finish off with the evidence 20 here, notwithstanding that Mr. Boggs has to go. 21 MEMBER BOGGS: I'll try to hang in to 22 get this one done if possible.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Okay, that
2	would help. So let's hear from your field
3	director then.
4	MR. JAIN: I believe she's unmuted.
5	MS. LENK: I'm unmuted. Can you hear
6	me?
7	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes. And if you
8	could state your name and then we'll swear you in
9	please.
10	MS. LENK: Great. My name is
11	Alexandria Lenk. Do you need my address as well?
12	CHAIR THOMPSON: Sure. Okay. I live
13	at 3601 38th Street NW, Apartment 304, Washington
14	DC 20016.
15	MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. Do you
16	promise swear or affirm to tell the whole
17	truth the truth, the whole truth, and nothing
18	but the truth with respect to the testimony that
19	you're about to give in this matter?
20	MS. LENK: I do. I so swear.
21	MR. JAIN: Okay. Ali, could you just
22	describe the process the campaign took in

training circulators and assigning circulators to locations? And then your relationship with Mr. Kanswal?

So as you mentioned, 4 MS. LENK: Yes. we had nearly 50 people collecting signatures 5 over the course of our campaign throughout the 6 7 signature collection period. I came on about 8 mid-February. So prior to me coming on, Zemzem 9 Lemma was acting as field director. When I came 10 on, those responsibilities were transferred over 11 to me. I would reach out to volunteers, get them scheduled for shifts. We would try to have 12 13 volunteers scheduling with another person, 14 usually myself or Zemzem or another person who 15 had collected signatures with us before.

Prior to their shift, we would reach out to them, kind of give them a breakdown of how the signature collection process would go. We would inform them that we were only collecting signatures from registered democratic voters in D.C. And then we would provide them with the materials, the literature, the petition forms,

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

and a clip board. And then I would provide them with a location, usually farmer's markets, sometimes like outside metro stations, or at other events in D.C. where we expected there would be a large number of extra voters. And then we had them collect those signatures and return those forms back to us.

8 Then as far as my relationship with 9 Asheesh, he was already collecting signatures for 10 the campaign when I came on in February. The 11 extent of my communications with him were via WhatsApp message. I would send him locations as 12 13 I did with our other signature collectors for him 14 to collect those signatures. And then I would 15 check in with him at the end of his shift, asking 16 how many signatures he had collected. And then 17 he would turn in those -- the copies of those 18 sheets. I never -- He never turned any of those 19 sheets into me.

20 Were there any other questions? Oh, 21 he also -- he quit. He quit, I think about two 22 weeks before the end of the signature collection

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1	period abruptly without notice.
2	MR. JAIN: Also paid?
3	MS. LENK: Yes, he was a paid
4	signature collector one of two.
5	MR. JAIN: And was he paid how was
6	he paid, Ali?
7	MS. LENK: How was he paid? Per
8	signature.
9	MR. JAIN: Okay. Who did he turn
10	signatures into the sheets into when he
11	completed a circulator sheet?
12	MS. LENK: I believe he either
13	uploaded a copy to a shared platform or turned in
14	those copies physically to another volunteer who
15	turned them into you or turned into you
16	indirectly to the best of my knowledge.
17	MR. JAIN: Yeah. Yeah, I think he
18	turned in the vast majority of the sheets
19	directly to me. Let me ask you, did you ever
20	tell any circulators to commit fraud to
21	fraudulently collect signatures?
22	MS. LENK: Absolutely not.

1 Did you tell Mr. Kanswal to MR. JAIN: 2 fraudulently collect signatures? 3 MS. LENK: Absolutely not. MR. JAIN: And did you yourself 4 5 collect signatures? MS. LENK: I did collect signatures, 6 7 yes. 8 MR. JAIN: Did you yourself 9 fraudulently collect any signatures? 10 MS. LENK: Absolutely not. 11 MR. JAIN: Did you observe other 12 people -- other volunteers collecting signatures? I did observe other 13 No. MS. LENK: 14 volunteers collecting signatures, but none of 15 them were fraudulent. 16 MR. JAIN: Okay, yes. Still let me 17 just ask the question. Did you observe any 18 circulators fraudulently collecting signatures? 19 Absolutely not. MS. LENK: 20 MR. JAIN: Did you observe volunteer 21 circulators collecting signatures from actual 22 registered voters?

1	MS. LENK: Yes, many.
2	MR. JAIN: Let me see if I have any
3	other questions. I think that those are all my
4	questions for you, Ali. If the Board has any
5	questions, they're welcome to ask. We also have
б	our deputy field director, Zemzem Lemma on who
7	can also speak to her relationship with Mr.
8	Kanswal.
9	CHAIR THOMPSON: No questions from the
10	Board. So now yes, Ms. Lenk, some possible cross
11	examination from Mr. Abely.
12	MR. ABELY: I'll keep it brief. Thank
13	you, ma'am. How much was Mr. Kanswal paid per
14	signature?
15	MS. LENK: I was not in charge of
16	negotiating the per signature amount that he was
17	paid. I believe it was either \$2 I think it
18	was \$2 or \$3, or \$5, but that is not that
19	would be a question for Ankit. I do not know off
20	the top of my head.
21	MR. ABELY: Thank you, ma'am.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Yeah, Mr.
	Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

	-
1	Jain, it's your case. Do you want to call
2	another witness or
3	MR. JAIN: Yeah, I'll call Zemzem
4	Lemma, my deputy field director.
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
6	MS. LEMMA: Hello.
7	CHAIR THOMPSON: Welcome. Could you
8	state your name and address please?
9	MS. LEMMA: Yeah. My name is Zemzem
10	Lemma. My address is 11700 Decade Court Reston,
11	Virginia 20191.
12	MS. STROUD: Thank you, Ms. Lemma and
13	if you could swear or affirm that the testimony
14	you're about to give is the truth, the whole
15	truth, and nothing but the truth?
16	MS. LEMMA: I do so swear.
17	MR. JAIN: Thank you. Zemzem, can you
18	just describe your process of interacting with
19	volunteers and asking them assigning them
20	roles to collect signatures and your relationship
21	with Mr. Kanswal?
22	MS. LEMMA: Yeah. So like Ali
	(202) 224 4422 Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

1 mentioned, she came in, in February. So I was 2 kind of in charge of training the volunteers 3 before that. And similar to what Ali said, it was a pretty simple process. We just told them 4 5 what you had to do to collect the signatures on the sheet. And then we also just gave them the 6 7 material to collect the signatures. So we had a 8 Zoom call with all the signature collectors at 9 the time, which also included Asheesh -- Mr. 10 Kanswal. And that was the first time I had 11 interacted with him and also trained him on that call. So we went through the protocol of how to 12 13 collect signatures. And then from there, he was 14 able to go out in the field and do it on his own. 15 And could you describe like MR. JAIN: 16 more specifically your interactions with Mr. 17 Kanswal like over the course of like when you 18 were field director? 19 I personally didn't MS. LEMMA: Yeah. 20 interact with him one on one too much. If we did 21 interact it was like in a group setting with all

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

of the volunteers. Just would tell me where to

1 go, which locations to go to on which date. But 2 aside from that, there wasn't too much of a 3 relationship. 4 MR. JAIN: Mmm hmm. Do you know, Ms. 5 Lemma, how many paid circulators the campaign 6 had? 7 MS. LEMMA: Two. 8 MR. JAIN: And do you know about how 9 many volunteer circulators the campaign had? MS. LEMMA: I think it was like about 10 11 50. 12 MR. JAIN: Okay. Do you know -- If 13 you had to estimate, what percentage of the 14 signatures were collected by Mr. Kanswal? 15 MS. LEMMA: Definitely less than 5 16 percent. 17 MR. JAIN: Did you ever encourage or 18 suggest to any volunteer circulator they 19 fraudulently collect signatures? 20 MS. LEMMA: Absolutely not. 21 MR. JAIN: Did you yourself collect 22 signatures?

1	MS. LEMMA: I did.
2	MR. JAIN: Did you ever fraudulently
3	collect signatures?
4	MS. LEMMA: No.
5	MR. JAIN: Did you witness other
6	circulators collecting signatures?
7	MS. LEMMA: I did.
8	MR. JAIN: Did you ever witness any or
9	hear Did you ever witness any circulator
10	fraudulently signing for people?
11	MS. LEMMA: No, I did not.
12	MR. JAIN: Did you witness circulators
13	collecting signatures from registered voters?
14	MS. LEMMA: I did.
15	MR. JAIN: Who signed those circulator
16	sheets when they collected the signatures from
17	registered voters?
18	MS. LEMMA: The registered voters.
19	MR. JAIN: Okay. I think I have no
20	further questions for Ms. Lemma.
21	MS. LEMMA: Thank you.
22	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much for
	Neal P. Gross and Co. Inc.

171

being here. Mr. Jain, what I'm going to suggest is you take up to three minutes to conclude your case. And then I'll give up to three minutes to Mr. Abely for a rebuttal comment. And then we'll ask the General Counsel for her opinion, and then I'll make a motion.

7 Okay, that sounds good. MR. JAIN: So 8 what Mr. Abely is suggesting here is a massive 9 fraud committed by this campaign to the degree 10 where every single signature collected by any 11 circulator for the campaign should be 12 invalidated. As you just heard, no such fraud 13 occurred. And again, it is Mr. -- I'm going to 14 quote the regulation. Under 3 DCMR Section 15 424.1, "The party who asserts the claims bears 16 affirmative duty of establishing the truth of the assertion." Therefore, it's Challenger's 17 18 obligation to prove that fraud occurred through 19 the campaign's petition process, not just fraud, 20 but massive fraud that invalidates every 21 signature. The Challenger has provided no such 22 evidence.

1

2

3

4

5

You just heard evidence from our witnesses that no such fraud occurred. The Registrar has already gone through and adjudicated many challenges of signatures not matching from the campaign and found that signatures do in fact match. So the Registrar already has evidence that no such fraud occurred.

8 And Mr. Abely tries to cite the 9 Williams case to argue that because of alleged 10 fraud by one circulator, every single circulator 11 affidavit should be -- should be thrown out by 12 this Board. But the Williams case says no such 13 The Williams case specifically stated thing. 14 that only fraud committed -- only circulator 15 petition sheets collected by circulators who are 16 alleged to have committed fraud are the ones that 17 should be thrown out.

And this Court considered a case very similar to the one that Mr. Abely's making just two years ago when Ms. Kathy Henderson tried to throw out every single petition sheet from three different challengers -- from three different

candidates for ANC. The Board rejected those challenges in every single case and in fact, Ms. Henderson cited the Williams case in arguing that the petition should be thrown out. The Board rejected that argument saying that those cases had nothing to do with the Williams case, just as this case does not.

8 And finally, I just want to note again 9 that Mr. Abely is alleging that the entire 10 campaign committed a massive fraud, but did not 11 cite a single signature collected by any 12 circulator other than Mr. Kanswal that he is 13 alleging is fraudulent. And to accept Mr. 14 Abely's contention, would have to go against 15 years of Board case law and against basic common 16 And so I ask the Board, one, not to sense. 17 accept his claim.

And two, I would ask that the Board dismiss the challenge completely as in bad faith because it was not properly filed as it did not adhere on its face to be based on a good faith review of each signature and circulator

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

affidavit. In the interest of time, I didn't really make that argument today, but you heard the Registrar point that out. And there are numerous instances of the challenger just making bad faith challenges and as a result, the entire challenge should be thrown out.

7 So we ask that the entire challenge be 8 thrown out. If not, we ask that the Board follow 9 precedent, listen to the evidence that it heard 10 today, follow basic common sense, and reject this 11 argument that every single signature collected by 12 any circulator in this campaign should be thrown 13 out. Thank you very much.

14 CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. 15 And thank you to all the witness that appeared on 16 your behalf. We'll turn now to Mr. Abely for 17 three minutes of rebuttal.

MR. ABELY: Thank you, sir. I do want to refer quickly to the Williams case. So the Williams decision by the Court of Appeals -- The Court of Appeals stated in the Williams case that the Board did have authority to throw out a

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

1 candidate -- throw a candidate off the ballot, even if there was sufficient number of 2 3 signatures. I'll read directly from the case. "Other courts have generally concluded that 4 5 nominating petitions tainted by fraud or the strong appearance of fraud may be discounted in 6 7 their entirety by an election board." And it 8 cites an example of an Arizona case where a 9 mayoral candidate was thrown off the ballot 10 because of fraud in some of the petitions, even 11 though there was a minimum number required in the 12 remaining petitions.

13 I think this is that case. If you 14 look at footnote 3 of the Williams case, the 15 Court of Appeals suggests that Mayor Williams 16 knew nothing about the fraud. And frankly as 17 somebody who was involved with that, I can tell 18 you that's true. He didn't know. In this case, 19 I'm making the argument that this is a smaller 20 That's it's being run by a candidate campaign. 21 who was more involved. He was collecting the 22 signatures himself, he said that. Mayor

Williams, nobody was turning in the petitions to Mayor Williams who was running the city. I argue that Mr. Jain was the principal of his agent, Asheesh Kanswal.

5 I think the Board has to send a message. And it's that we're not going to 6 7 tolerate fraud in the petition process. Sure, 8 maybe we're asking for too many signatures and that's an issue for the Council. But the Board 9 10 has to send a message today, we're not going to 11 tolerate it. Remove Mr. Jain from the ballot. 12 Let him run as a write-in candidate. He can do 13 And send a message and maybe this will that. 14 never happen again. Thank you.

15 CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Thank you 16 again for the excellent presentation. I am going 17 to -- unless the Registrar or Ms. Walker has any 18 comment, I will ask the General Council to make a 19 recommendation.

20 MS. STROUD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I 21 would recommend in light of the evidence in the 22 record, including the testimony that we've heard

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

1 today that the Board grant Mr. Jain ballot access 2 in the context, but that he not be credited with 3 the 77 signatures that were circulated by Mr. Kanswal that were not already invalidated by the 4 5 Registrar voters and her findings. So he circulated 133 signatures, I believe 56 of those 6 7 were found to be invalid already as a result of 8 her review of the sheets at issue. And so I 9 would recommend that the other remaining 10 signatures that were not invalidated not be 11 credited to the petition, which would still leave him with a number of signatures sufficient for 12 13 ballot access, I think 2,306 over, I believe. 14 That would be my recommendation.

15 CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. I will 16 adopt that recommendation and so move consistent 17 with everything the General Council just said. 18 I'll just comment briefly that, you know, the 19 expert, Dr. Fenoff presented a compelling case 20 that the circulator, Mr. Kanswal forged 21 signatures. And that's a very serious matter as 22 Mr. Abely has noted. And it's something we do

178

1	take seriously. We're taking it seriously by
2	this motion to strike all the signatures he
3	collected. And we of course have the authority
4	to pursue that matter in a separate proceeding
5	involving Mr. Kanswal. So you know, to be
б	continued with respect to Mr. Kanswal.
7	But meantime with respect to the
8	candidate, Mr. Jain, I fully credit the testimony
9	of his three witnesses that they, you know,
10	witnessed valid signatures in the field by
11	registered voters. That they had no knowledge or
12	involvement whatsoever in Mr. Kanswal's
13	circulator activity. In other words, this has
14	every appearance of Mr. Kanswal being a rogue
15	circulator. And I don't I just don't accept
16	any inference that this impugns the candidate,
17	Mr. Jain or his campaign in any way.
18	So I want to make it clear that this

So I want to make it clear that this is a rogue circulator. So those signatures are out. The rest of the signatures remain and the candidate is still 306 valid signatures above the required amount, so I agree that he should be

1	granted ballot access. So that explains my
2	rationale. And I'll see if there's a motion. I
3	think Board member Boggs is still here.
4	MEMBER BOGGS: I second.
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: We have to unmute
б	J.C. Boggs.
7	MEMBER BOGGS: There we go. Thank
8	you. Yes, second.
9	MS. STROUD: Okay. So purposes of the
10	roll call vote. Mr. Chair.
11	CHAIR THOMPSON: The Chair votes aye.
12	MS. STROUD: Member Boggs.
13	MEMBER BOGGS: Aye.
14	MS. STROUD: And with that, Candidate
15	Jain is allowed ballot access in the context at
16	issue for the June 4th, 2024 ballot primary
17	election ballot. And again, this matter may be
18	appealed to the D.C. Court of Appeals within 3
19	days of today as the Board has announced its
20	decision on the record.
21	CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. And I also
22	want to thank again, the challenger, Ms. Ragas

for bringing this -- and Council, Mr. Abely. These are important issues. We've learned a lot about this. You brought something very important to our attention. And as I mentioned, we'll look into further proceedings in that regard. So thank you so much for your time and your effort in this challenge.

8 Okay, that concludes our nominating 9 petition challenges. We've got some other items 10 on our agenda -- I guess the regular part of our 11 meeting agenda. And I'll turn to Terri Stroud 12 for that.

13 So the next item on MS. STROUD: Yes. 14 the agenda is the poll matters. There were 15 initially two, but one has been -- Oh, I'm sorry. 16 My apologies. The next matter on the agenda is 17 the matter of referrals concerning the double 18 voting matters that the Board has been 19 investigating with respect to the 2020 general 20 election. And we had two matters that were going 21 before the Board, but one, Duncan is being 22 continued to the next board meeting, which will

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 take place in May. And so we only have today, 2 the matter of in re Ahaghotu. And our senior 3 staff attorney, Christine Pembroke will be presenting with respect to the Board -- to the 4 Board with respect to this matter. 5 I just want to note 6 CHAIR THOMPSON: 7 for the record, I believe Board member Boggs 8 needs to go, which is fine. Board member 9 Greenfield is here, so we continue to have a 10 quorum with respect to these remaining matters. 11 MS. PEMBROKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So as the General Council mentioned, this matter 12 13 involves a suspected double voting or illegal 14 voting. It came to our attention through a 15 report that was generated as a result of the 16 Board of Elections participation in an 17 organization called ERIC in which states share 18 information about voting activity. And ERIC 19 produced a report as part of its voter 20 participation project regarding the 2020 general election. 21 22 And that report indicated that an

1 individual named Kelechi Ahaghotu voted in D.C. 2 and also voted in Texas. And as a result of that, we began to investigate how it came about 3 that an individual had voted twice in the same 4 5 That was a presidential election. election. So what we found was that Kelechi Ahaghotu -- and I 6 7 interviewed her during a pre-hearing conference 8 was living in Texas at the time and she denied 9 voting in D.C. -- in the D.C. election, but she 10 admitted voting in Texas. She stated that it 11 would have been impossible for her to have voted 12 in D.C. because she could not have traveled for 13 various reasons to the District at that time. 14 I obtained the voting records from Fort Bend County, Texas, which is where she had

15 16 voted and compared her signature there. She 17 voted in-person, so she signed what we call a 18 poll pad here. There was an electronic signature 19 for her on file. I compared that signature to 20 the signature for Kelechi Ahaghotu of the same date of birth in the D.C. records and the 21 22 signatures did not match. Now I'm not a

1 handwriting expert, but it seemed on the face of 2 them that the signatures were not a good match. 3 So the question then was who had voted in the District? And to discount the possibility 4 5 of some mistake, I also looked for other Ahaghtou's who were living in D.C. and found that 6 7 there were several Ahaghtou's living at the 8 address for Ms. Kelechi Ahaghotu. She had lived 9 here for a while and then moved to Texas. And 10 there were also several Ahaghotu's living in a 11 residence just around the corner from her 12 residence. And so I looked at the signatures for 13 those individuals and there were none that were a 14 good match, but there was one that was somewhat 15 close.

It turned out that, that individual was a sibling of Ms. Ahaghotu's. I spoke to him and he stated that he did not vote in the D.C. general election in 2020, that he was in Maryland at the time. He did note that the vote center where the ballot was cast in Ms. Ahaghotu's name was just around the corner from the residence,

which is also around the corner from the other residence where a number of Ahaghotu's lived. And he had some theories about how a ballot might have been erroneously cast in his sister's name, but we really at that point didn't have the capacity to pursue any of those leads.

7 So the issue before the Board at this 8 point is whether or not based on these 9 circumstances, the Board wants to refer the case 10 to a prosecutorial authority for further 11 investigation. And in connection with that, I 12 would just note there have been a couple of cases 13 the Board recently decided with similar types of 14 There was the Lynfield case where it situations. 15 appeared somebody had erroneously or fraudulently 16 cast a ballot in Mr. Lynfield's name. And the 17 pool of individuals that might have had access to 18 that ballot was the pool of individuals who might 19 have gotten into the mail room for a multi-unit 20 apartment complex. And the Chair commented on 21 the record that it would be really futile to 22 refer the case because trying to find out who

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

cast that ballot four years ago would really be impossible. There were no cameras. It would be really impossible to find out who was involved in that.

5 And then there was another case where a ballot was cast in the name of a voter who was 6 7 living in Florida and she denied having cast it. And the residence at which she had lived in D.C. 8 9 previously and where the ballot was sent could 10 have been accessed by her family members or a 11 smaller group of individuals that her family 12 members might have been aware of, so there was 13 some prospect there that the culprit could be 14 identified. And in that case, the Board did 15 refer the matter to prosecutorial authorities.

This case has maybe a broader pool of possible culprits involved than the second matter, but certainly nowhere near the number that might have been involved with the Lynfield case, which involved an apartment building. So just to provide context to where in the past you've made the decision to refer or not to

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

1

refer, I would just point that out.

2 I would also ask if Ms. Ahaghotu or 3 any of her family members are here. I know they 4 did try and get on -- they did try and join this 5 morning and they waited a long time for the case to be called, but they may have had to leave. 6 So 7 I don't know if we can see if they can maybe 8 raise their hand. It looks like they were --9 they were not able to stay on the call. Ms. 10 Ahaghotu did contact me the other day to say she 11 was having some health issues and didn't think 12 she could attend. And her brother was here 13 apparently at the meeting earlier this morning 14 and I just don't know if he could wait through 15 all of these matters. 16 But depending on what the Board 17 decides, one option would be to leave the record 18 open if she wanted to make comments, depending on 19 what your decision is today. Well, it certainly 20 CHAIR THOMPSON: 21 sounds like there's zero suspicion of Ms. 22 Ahaghotu and little to no suspicion of the

1	brother. You know, who else could have
2	intercepted this mail ballot filled it out?
3	MS. STROUD: It wasn't a mail ballot.
4	It was somebody who voted in-person.
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: Oh, in-person.
6	MS. STROUD: And that's partly why I
7	was so concerned about the possibility of an
8	innocent mistake because there were so many
9	Ahaghotu's from that house that could have
10	checked in. It was the Turkey Thicket vote
11	center right around the corner from the house.
12	So there might have been a mistake at check-in at
13	the voting place.
14	CHAIR THOMPSON: They walk in, they
15	give their name and address, and this is
16	(Simultaneous speaking.)
17	MS. STROUD: Exactly.
18	CHAIR THOMPSON: So I mean personally
19	I wouldn't take up DOJ resources on this, so my
20	gut is to not refer it and let it rest. I mean,
21	any other views on that?
22	MS. STROUD: No, that was going to be
	Neal R. Gross and Co. Inc.

my recommendation --

1

2	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
3	MS. STROUD: in this regard with
4	respect to this matter, Mr. Chair. And we've
5	seen in other matters that may come before the
6	Board that, that has been the case. Well, they
7	actually won't come before the Board, but we've
8	seen that, that has been the case with error at
9	the site.
10	CHAIR THOMPSON: I'll just say no
11	referral at this time. You know, maybe there
12	will be additional information that would bring
13	this back before the Board, but I don't know I
14	don't know if I need to make a motion to not
15	refer it
16	MS. STROUD: I wouldn't.
17	CHAIR THOMPSON: but I'm just not.
18	No motion to refer.
19	MS. STROUD: Yeah. I guess the motion
20	would be to not.
21	CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. I move that we
22	don't refer this at this time.

1	MS. STROUD: Is there a second?
2	CHAIR THOMPSON: Is there a second
3	from Board member Greenfield? Sorry, we've got
4	to unmute you.
5	MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes, I second.
6	MS. STROUD: Okay. And so the roll
7	call vote would be the Chair has voted
8	CHAIR THOMPSON: Chair votes aye.
9	MS. STROUD: Member Greenfield?
10	MEMBER GREENFIELD: Aye.
11	MS. STROUD: And thus the Board will
12	not refer the matter to prosecutorial authorities
13	at this time.
14	CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you very much.
15	MS. STROUD: The next item on my
16	agenda is rulemaking to Title 3 of the DCMR,
17	titled "Elections and Ethics". The first
18	rulemaking is a final rulemaking, the purpose of
19	which is to conform the Board's regulations to
20	the Elections Modernization Amendment Act of
21	2022, provide for consistency between Board
22	regulations, provide clarity regarding the

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

commencement of the appeal period for Board decisions, adopt rules of conduct for attendees at board meetings, and make other nonsubstantive housekeeping updates and corrections of typographical errors.

A second notice of proposed rulemaking 6 7 with respect to this rulemaking was published in 8 the DC Register on March 15th, 2024 at 71 DCR 9 002912 for a 7-day comment and review period in 10 accordance with 1 DCMR Section 309.5. The Board 11 did receive comments from the public concerning 12 the rulemaking that expressed concerns about its 13 validity. And if the Board has any comments with 14 respect to the comments that we received from two 15 individuals, then we can -- Do you want to 16 discuss them?

17 CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. When this 18 rulemaking was originally proposed, it included a 19 proposed Section 106 called "barring procedures". 20 We certainly studied all of the comments that 21 were submitted at that time. We heard from 22 additional witnesses in our last meeting on this

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

1 subject -- three witnesses. And we then decided 2 to exclude Section 106. 3 MS. STROUD: Yes. CHAIR THOMPSON: It was for public 4 5 I have also studied very closely notice. 6 additional comments that have been submitted 7 either through that public notice process or we 8 also received some emails directly. I have been 9 through them and carefully, you know, considered And at this time, I would move that we 10 them. 11 adopt the final rulemaking as we proposed and 12 republish. 13 MS. STROUD: So with respect -- Is 14 there a second? 15 MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes, I'm sorry. 16 There is a second. 17 MS. STROUD: And so with the roll call 18 vote, the Chair votes --19 The Chair votes aye. CHAIR THOMPSON: 20 MS. STROUD: And Member Greenfield? 21 MEMBER GREENFIELD: Aye. 22 MS. STROUD: And so with that, this

notice of final rulemaking will be sent to the DC Register for publication in upcoming edition of the DC Register. And we will submit that today for publication.

5 And the next rulemaking is a proposed rulemaking that will impact the District's voter 6 7 registration agencies. One moment. The purpose 8 of these amendment to Chapter 5 of the DCMR --9 titled through the DCMR is to clarify the 10 obligations of the District's voter registration 11 agencies under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 or the NVRA and the enforcement 12 13 process that applies in the event of 14 noncompliance with the Act.

15 And so what the intention of these 16 rules are is to ensure that not only the Board, 17 but also the District's voter registration 18 agencies who are either designated under the NVRA 19 as voter registration agencies or have been 20 designated by the mayor and the Council as voter 21 registration agencies comply with monitoring 22 requirements that have been set up too, so that

1

2

3

we are aware of the activity with respect to the voter registration at these various agencies around the District.

We have training -- a training program 4 5 where site coordinators, agency heads come to training at our offices to become familiar with 6 7 how to comply with the NVRA. And we ask that the agencies provide us with data on these activities 8 9 in terms of how many voters vote, how many voters 10 declined to register. And we also want to ensure 11 that they are complying with all rules regarding the NVRA. 12

13 And so this just allows us to have 14 some teeth with which to get, you know, the 15 agencies to do their part. And it also makes clear that the Board's Executive Director who is 16 17 the Chief Administrative Officer with respect to 18 the NVRA for the District of Columbia, it allows 19 her to bring civil action to Superior Court for 20 declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to 21 any noncompliance. And I mean that is something 22 that is set forth in the statute. But we are

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

194

1

2

3

4

just promulgating regulations to ensure that everybody is meeting their obligations under the NVRA in terms of the voter registration agencies.

And so as with every rulemaking, we'll 5 publish this on the dedicated page on our website 6 7 that pertains to rulemaking so that individuals can review the text of the rulemaking and review 8 9 it so that they can provide comments. And so 10 once this is published in the DC Register, there 11 will be a 30-day review period during which people can review and provide comments. 12 And so 13 before the rulemaking is published in the DC 14 Register, it will appear on our website. In 15 fact, that will happen today.

And so with that, I ask for a motion to submit this proposed rulemaking to the DC Register for publication to begin that 30-day review period that we can hear from the public in terms of their opinions with respect to this rulemaking.

22

CHAIR THOMPSON: The Chair so moves.

1	MS. STROUD: Is there a second?
2	MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes. I second.
3	MS. STROUD: Okay and we'll take the
4	roll call vote. Mr. Chair?
5	CHAIR THOMPSON: The Chair votes aye.
б	MS. STROUD: Member Greenfield?
7	MEMBER GREENFIELD: Aye.
8	MS. STROUD: Thank you. And so this
9	will be submitted for publication in the DC
10	Register for a 30-day review and submit period.
11	MS. STROUD: Okay. And I think the
12	final item in my report is litigation status. So
13	we are actually reporting today that we're
14	closing out three matters. The first one is
15	Public Interest Legal Foundation v Monica Evans
16	in her official capacity. This matter was filed
17	in U.S. District Court for the District of
18	Columbia under the NVRA. The suit alleged that
19	the Board was out of compliance with NVRA's
20	public records provision. PILF requested records
21	from the Board that were denied due to the
22	requested records not being subject to the public

disclosure. On February 20th, 2024, the parties filed a joint proposed order to settle the matter. And that settlement was accepted by the Court. And so this matter is closed for purposes of reporting.

Stacia Hall v the Board is another 6 7 case that has been resolved at the U.S. District 8 Court level. This was a challenge to legislation 9 that allowed non-citizens to vote in local 10 elections. On March 20th, the Court granted the 11 Board's motion to dismiss, finding that Plaintiff's lack standing to assert their claims. 12 13 This matter is subject to appeal, so we'll see 14 what happens, but for now it's closed in terms of 15 the District Court.

The third matter that's being closed out is DC Democratic Party , et al., v. Muriel Bowser. This was a challenge -- And this is in the DC Superior Court. This is a challenge to the Board's acceptance of Initiative Measure 83. On March 28th, the DC Superior Court granted the Board's motion to dismiss ruling that the

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

challenge was not timely filed.

2	The fourth matter, which is ongoing is
3	Dr. Shiva Ayyaurai v Merrick Garland and the
4	Board. The Plaintiff in this matter sought a
5	declaration that he was eligible to serve as
б	President that he is eligible to serve
7	notwithstanding the Constitution's Natural Borne
8	Citizens Clause. The Plaintiff was born in
9	India. Or alternatively that this qualification
10	matter presents a nonjusticible political issue
11	for voters.
12	The most recent activity in this case
13	is that motions to dismiss were filed by the
14	District and the Board and Defendant Garland.
15	The District Court Judge ordered that the
16	Plaintiff respond to the motions to dismiss by
17	March 22nd. The Plaintiff's response was filed
18	on March 21st. On March 27th, the Justice
19	Department on behalf of Defendant Garland sought
20	an extension of time in which to reply.
21	The fifth matter is a matter having to
22	do with an election worker who filed a matter

1 that was previously dismissed in DC Superior 2 Court without prejudice. This Plaintiff is 3 seeking \$10,000 in damages based on a claim concerning an overdraft cost to his bank account 4 5 when a stop payment was imposed on a \$500 check issued for his service as an election worker. 6 7 The complaint was dismissed -- all claims in this 8 complaint were dismissed except for the claim 9 dealing with liquidated damages for breach of 10 contract. An answer is due this coming Monday 11 with respect to that claim. And the Court has 12 set a status conference for May 31st, 2024.

13 And the final matter is John Page v 14 Monica Evans and that is in the U.S. District 15 Court. On March 8th, the Plaintiff filed a 16 complaint that seeks to prevent Donald Trump from 17 appearing on the ballot. The complaint alleges 18 that the Supreme Court's recent decision in Trump 19 v Anderson does not apply to the District of 20 Columbia because that decision pertains to the 21 State's rights under the 14th Amendment and the 22 Plaintiff is saying that D.C. is not a state. So

1 that opinion, which basically said that the 2 states could not take action to prevent the 3 President from ballot access with respect to any role he might have played on January 6th. 4 That 5 it's not within the State's purview to deny ballot access to the President. That, that is a 6 7 matter that is left to Congress. And the OAG is 8 filing a motion to dismiss on the Board's behalf 9 in this matter.

And that concludes litigation statusand that concludes my entire report.

12 CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. I don't 13 know if that's a new record for the length of 14 General Council's report. We'll turn then to the 15 Executive Director's report. Thank you for 16 sitting patiently through all this, Monica Evans. 17 MS. EVANS: Thank you and good 18 afternoon. Executive Director's report for March 19 March engagements: On March 6th, the 2024. 20 Journal of National Security, Law, and Policy 21 held a symposium at Georgetown University Law 22 I was asked to be a panelist. Center. We

discussed lessons learned and challenges to election integrity as a result of the 2020 election cycle.

On March 18th, the Council's Committee 4 on Executive Administration and Labor convened a 5 public round table with DC BOE to discuss 2024 6 7 election cycle readiness. Specifically, we 8 talked about communications, election worker 9 recruitment and training, equipment purchases, 10 and staff vacancies. We were able to convey key 11 dates and timelines leading up to the June 12 primary.

13 Precinct mapping: As required by our 14 regulations, DC BOE looked at our current 15 precinct boundaries to divide the District into 16 appropriate voting precincts based on our 17 election boards. During the 2024 election cycle, 18 we will keep the current precinct assignments 19 with modifications to address precincts that 20 cross ward boundaries.

21 ANC vacancies: We currently have 14 22 ANC vacancies for the 2023-2025 term. These

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

positions are in different stages of being filled after candidate filing requirements are met in open vote of registered voters of the affected SMD will be held during regularly scheduled ANC meetings.

LIS maintenance: We are now in the 6 7 90-day blackout window before the June primary. 8 Therefore we will not be removing any additional 9 voters from our registry as a result of LIS 10 maintenance. During the 2023 LIS maintenance 11 process, we removed 108,698 individuals from our 12 voter registry and moved another 95,220 active 13 voters to an inactive status. As of March 31, we 14 have 451,499 active voters. We are still in the 15 process of updating addresses and validating new addresses within D.C. Our communications and 16 17 outreach divisions are continuing their work to 18 establish partnerships with local universities to 19 aid and maintain the accuracy of our voter roll. 20 We have developed a flyer that the Voter 21 Education and Outreach Division is using during 22 their outreach efforts.

1

2

3

4

1	Voter registration rolls: In March,
2	we registered 2,884 new voters and process 2,010
3	registration changes. In total, we prepared
4	4,894 voter registration cards to be mailed.
5	Additionally, 50 registered voters moved out of
6	D.C., 209 voters cancelled their D.C.
7	registrations and registered with other
8	jurisdictions, and 1,175 voters registered in
9	D.C. after cancelling their registrations in
10	other states. We are continuing to register
11	voters using our website portal. To date, we
12	have processed 44,898 applications using the
13	portal. These include new voter registrations
14	and updates to existing registrations.
15	Under the Local Resident Voting Rights
16	Amendment Act, we are also registering
17	non-citizens to vote in local elections using the
18	database solution developed by VR Systems. We
19	have deployed online registration. And
20	non-citizens may also register to vote in our
21	office using paper registration form.
22	Translations are available in Spanish,

Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, Amharic, and French. We have developed a flyer to assist with our outreach efforts and we are planning a town hall. In March, we registered 122 non-citizens to vote in local elections. Total non-citizen registration is at 208.

7 Media information requests: As 8 mentioned last month, we have developed a policy 9 regarding media and information requests that we 10 receive. This is in effort to provide 11 transparency and convey the process to the 12 public. Essentially, we prefer that public 13 information requests and media questions be 14 submitted in writing. Requests are most often 15 answered in the order in which they are received. And those with immediate deadlines from official 16 17 media publications may be considered higher 18 priority. Response time and answers available 19 for public release may vary upon competing 20 deadlines, external and internal factors, and 21 readily available information. Opinions or 22 comments that require information from DC BOE

1

2

3

4

5

leadership may require additional time.

2	In addition, inquiries may be
3	converted to a FOYA request as needed or as
4	determined by the FOYA officer and/or
5	communications director. The requester will be
6	notified if such need arises and FOYA deadlines
7	will apply.
8	2024 election cycle year planning:
9	Our draft primary and general election calendars
10	for the 2024 election cycle are posted on our
11	website. Our vote center and mail ballot drop
12	box locations are also posted. The last day to
13	submit candidate nominating petitions was March
14	6th. And as we have heard, we are currently in
15	the nominating petition challenge period.
16	2024 voting options: During the 2024
17	election cycle, all registered DC voters will
18	receive a mail-in ballot. Voters may vote by
19	mail, in-person, or by depositing a ballot in a
20	drop box. BOE will have 55 mail ballot drop
21	boxes that will be placed throughout the city.
22	We will also operate 25 early vote centers and a

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

total of 75 election day vote centers. We are working with MPD to provide security and the Department of Public Works to place the mail ballot drop boxes. We are working with our mail house to begin mailing ballots during the week of April 29th.

Accessibility: 7 We are conducting an 8 accessibility survey of all 2024 vote centers 9 before the primary election to ensure they are 10 accessible. We have partnered with Disability 11 Rights at University of Legal Services and the 12 Office of Disability Rights to conduct surveys. 13 As is our practice, we will also work with DGS to 14 ensure vote centers are structurally accessible. 15 Our accessibility coordinator has started 16 conducting these visits.

Democracy Live: We have a meeting with Democracy Live to discuss the implementation of the electronic OmniBallot returns for ADA and -voters. This portal will enable qualified voters to submit their ballots electronically. These voters will receive a unique pin code for portal

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

1 access, safequarding the integrity of the voting 2 process. The system is slated to go live no later 3 than April 19th. We are also working with OCTO GIS to update the ARC GIS platform with the most 4 5 recent data on vote center and mail ballot drop box locations. The where can I vote locator tool 6 7 provides a user friendly interface where 8 individuals can input any address and immediately 9 find information regarding the closest vote center or mail ballot drop box location within 10 11 the city. This information is available on our website under the voter section. 12

13 Election Worker Division: The 14 Election Worker Training Division is actively 15 recruiting and training election workers. During 16 the 2024 election cycle, our goal is to recruit 17 and train between 2,000 and 2,500 election 18 We will deploy approximately 1,700 workers. 19 election workers to serve at both center. 20 Election worker training began on Tuesday, March 12th, 2024. As of March 30, we have trained 841 21 22 election workers.

1 Voter education and outreach: During 2 the month of March, the Voter Education and Outreach Division conducted 41 outreach events on 3 behalf of the Agency. Events included outreach 4 5 to the DC Department of Employment Services, George Washington University's GW Latina Voice, 6 7 the DC Bar Pro Bono Center, and American 8 University Athletics.

9 DC BOE also celebrated Civic Learning 10 Week from March 11th through March 15th. The 11 purpose of Civic Learning Week is to focus on the 12 importance of becoming active in civic engagement 13 and democracy. DC BOE had an opportunity to 14 visit schools in Wards 5 and 6. Students 15 completed election worker applications and tested 16 their voter registration knowledge.

17 Restore The Vote: The Restore the 18 Vote Division held five outreach events in March. 19 DC BOE partnered with Court Services and Offender 20 Supervision Agency or CSOSA for three of the 21 events as we addressed re-entering citizens. We 22 participated in events with the Federal Pre-trial

Services Agency and the Federal Correction Institution in Hazleton, West Virginia. The even in Hazleton was the second event of its kind that tested the viability of future WebEx meetings with those incarcerate in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Discussions have begun regarding adding additional events.

8 On March 25th, 2024, DC BOE met with 9 DataNet to discuss a home page redesign. DataNet 10 presented a visual design and shared a PDF file 11 containing the proposed layout, which is 12 currently under review by our Communications 13 Team. And that concludes my report.

14 All right. CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you 15 very much. Next, we'll hear the campaign finance 16 report. I think General Counsel, William Sanford 17 is going to deliver that in lieu of Director 18 Collier Montgomery and then also give us his own 19 report. Welcome.

20 MR. SANFORD: Good afternoon. Good 21 afternoon. Is it on? I believe so. Good 22 afternoon. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 distinguished Boardmember Greenfield. William 2 Sanford representing the Office of Campaign 3 Finance today. CHAIR THOMPSON: Pull the mic a little 4 5 closer. MR. SANFORD: How's this, sir? 6 CHAIR THOMPSON: 7 Yeah. 8 MR. SANFORD: Okay. I will present 9 the Director's Report. I will summarize the 10 report. The entire report will be posted at the 11 Office of Campaign Finance website. 12 On March 14th, 2024, the Office of 13 Campaign Finance partnered with the District of 14 Columbia Public Library and joined other District 15 agencies to participate in the Civic Fair. On 16 March 27, 2024, the Office of Campaign Finance 17 presented at a meeting of Advisory Neighborhood 18 Commission Single Member District 1E07 and shared 19 information regarding campaign finance programs. 20 In the Fair Elections Division, as of 21 today's date, there are 14 certified 22 participating candidates in the Fair Elections

Program. And the Office of Campaign Finance has authorized the disbursement of a total sum of \$1,782,253.95 from the Fair Elections fund in base amounts and matching payments. During the month of March 2024, the Fair Elections Division completed 32 desk reviews and issued 11 requests for additional information letters.

8 As of March 2024, the total sum of 9 871,502.58 has been remitted for deposit in the 10 Fair Elections fund. During the month of March, 11 the Office of Campaign Finance received 12 remissions from the following former candidates: 13 Erin for DC principal campaign committee remitted 14 \$68,215.85 on March 22nd, 2024. Carisa Stanley 15 Beatty, principal campaign committee remitted 16 \$79.53 on March 25th, 2024.

During the month of March 2024, the Office of Campaign Finance issued 42 post-election forwarded letters for the June '22 primary election and on November 8th, 2022 general election. Orders were initiated on March 13, 2023 and March 24, 2023. Today, Fair

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

Elections has issued 21 preliminary statements of all the findings and 21 final audit reports for the 2022 election cycle.

In the Public Information and Records 4 Management Division, March 10th was required filing day. And in the traditional candidates committee area, there was a total of 17 required filers, 14 timely filed, 3 failed to file, and 3 were referred to the Office of the General 10 Counsel.

11 In the area of Political Actions 12 Committee, there was a total of 43 required 13 filers, 33 timely filed, 1 requested an 14 extension, which was granted, and 9 failed to 15 file and were referred to the Office of General 16 Counsel.

17 And now with regard to Independent 18 Expenditure Committees, the total number of 19 required filers filed timely. Regarding the Fair 20 Elections Committee for March 10 required report, a total number of 22 filers were required to file 21 22 reports, 19 timely filed, 3 failed to file their

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

reports and were referred to the Office of the General Counsel.

3 During the month of March 8th, new 4 candidates registered for the 2024 primary 5 election and they included the following: Yolanda Fields registered on March 3rd, 2024. 6 7 David Gatling registered on March 11th, 2024. 8 Vilareal Johnson registered on March 14th, 2024. 9 And they all registered for the Ward 7 primary 10 election.

Michael Reese registered on March 7th,
2024. Nathan Derenge registered on March 7th,
2024. Trayon White registered on March 28th,
2024. And they all registered for the Ward 8
primary election.

16 On March 6th, 2024, Quinn Nii 17 registered for the Office of U.S. Shadow Senator 18 primary election. And on March 4th, Joanne Young 19 registered for the Republican National Committee 20 primary election.

21 During the month of March 2024, two 22 new candidates registered for the general

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

election and they were the following: Sherice Muhammad registered on March 24th, 2024 for DC State Board of Education Ward 7 general election. And LaJoy Johnson registered on March 6th, 2024 for the Office of State Board of Education Ward 8.

7 In the Report's Analysis and Audit Division, that division conducted 36 desk reviews 8 9 of political action committees. One desk review of Constituents Services fund, 28 desk reviews of 10 11 principal campaign committees, 8 desk reviews of 12 Independent Expenditure Committees, 8 desk 13 reviews of Initiative Recall Committees, issued 14 11 audit letters and requests for additional 15 information and referred 3 cases to the Office of 16 the General Counsel.

During the month of March 2024, the Report Analysis Division issued periodic random letters to the following committees: Ward 3 Democratic Committee and the documents were received on March 25th. Metro Washington DC PAC and the documents were received on the 22nd of

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

March 2024.

1

2	During the month of March the Report's
3	Analysis and Audit Division also issued random
4	audit letters to the following committees:
5	Friends of Ebbon Allen Ward 7. The notification
6	letter was issued on the 18th of March 2024. And
7	the Committee to Elect Roscoe Grant Ward 7, audit
8	notification letter was issued on March 18, 2024.
9	In the General Counsel's Division,
10	during the month of March 2024, the Office of the
11	General Counsel received 16 referrals, completed
12	16 informal hearings, and issued 19 orders, which
13	included the following: Two orders to vacate were
14	issued. Two orders in which a total of \$18,550
15	in fines was imposed were issued. And 15 orders
16	in which no fines were imposed were issued.
17	During the month of March 2024, the
18	Office of the General Counsel imposed fines
19	against the following respondents: A fine of
20	\$450 was imposed against the Service Employees
21	International Union PAC and a fine of \$18,100 was
22	imposed against the Trayon for Mayor principal

1

campaign committee.

2	During the month of March 2024, the
3	Office of the General Counsel had maintained to
4	open investigations and they include the
5	following: Docket No. OCFFI-2023-004. It was
6	docketed on the 29th of December. Complainant
7	was Edward Hanlon. The respondent was Brooke
8	Pinto and the Committee to Elect Brooke Pinto
9	2024. The allegation was use of Government
10	resources for campaign-related purposes. The
11	order in this matter was issued on March 22nd,
12	2024.
13	The second matter was OCFFI-2023-005,
14	docketed on the 29th of December 2023.
15	Complainant again was Edward Hanlon, respondent
16	again Brooke Pinto and the Committee to Reelect
17	Brooke Pinto 2024. The allegation again was use
18	of Government resources for campaign-related
19	
	purposes. The order in this matter was issued on
20	purposes. The order in this matter was issued on March 25th, 2024.
20 21	
	March 25th, 2024.
21	March 25th, 2024. During the month of March 2024, there

show cause proceedings were conducted. And that should conclude both the Director's report and the Office of the General Report. The contents of both reports will be posted at the Office of Campaign Finance website by the close of business on today's date, the 5th of April 2024. And that concludes our report.

8 CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much and 9 a continued thank you to the OCF staff, as well 10 as the BOE staff as we head towards the final two 11 months before the primary. Much appreciated.

With that, our meeting will conclude 12 13 with some open public comment. And we'll ask 14 people to raise their hand by -- with their Zoom hands. When I call on folks, if you could start 15 16 by stating your name and your address. And we'll 17 go by a three minute clock if you could make all 18 your comments within those three minutes. And 19 then I'll see if anybody would like to respond. 20 And so we're looking now to see if any hands are 21 up and I'm not seeing any. I'll just give it a 22 second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

1 We did get some emails requesting to 2 speak and I see them present. I think Ms. Brazil 3 sent us an email requesting to speak, so I want 4 to be clear on the record that I'm giving her 5 that opportunity. I don't see a hand raised. Yeah, so it's been a long meeting. So I don't 6 7 know, you know, maybe folks didn't get a chance to stick around, but we'll be back next month for 8 9 public comment as well. 10 So with that, I will move that we 11 adjourn. 12 MEMBER GREENFIELD: I will second. 13 CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Chair 14 All in favor? votes aye. 15 MS. STROUD: Member Greenfield? 16 CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor? 17 MEMBER GREENFIELD: Aye. 18 CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you everybody 19 for all your patience today. We really 20 appreciate it. 21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 22 went off the record at 1:34 p.m.)

Α a.m 1:12 4:2 Abely 64:5,9,10,17,18 83:20 84:8,10 88:5 93:9 95:7,9 96:20 102:14 104:4 105:2,3 105:6 107:17.20 108:4 109:22 112:11 113:1,3,6 115:8,14,15 116:8,22 123:8 125:19 126:1,7 129:9 129:12,15,22 131:20 133:13,16 136:4,8,17 137:11,12,18 138:5 138:14,17 140:8 141:10.14.16 148:22 152:9,12,20 155:20 156:21 166:11,12,21 171:4,8 172:8 173:9 174:16,18 177:22 180:1 Abely's 172:19 173:14 ability 61:18 159:9 able 4:12 22:13 24:13 27:11 44:4 83:12 168:14 186:9 200:10 above-entitled 145:12 217:21 abruptly 164:1 absence 99:6 absent 33:15 36:3 absolutely 35:10 82:11 130:20 164:22 165:3 165:10,19 169:20 accept 22:10 173:13,17 178:15 acceptance 22:9 196:20 accepted 26:21 28:22 30:13,15,16,22 31:4 36:16 78:7 120:20 155:4 196:3 access 11:11 14:17 16:10 33:11 36:7 38:22 53:2,4 59:15 60:19 67:9 72:18 73:4 79:13 80:10 92:13.17 93:3,18,21 97:22 99:5 100:9 102:3 105:1 177:1,13 179:1,15 184:17 199:3,6 206:1 accessed 185:10 accessibility 205:7,8 205:15 accessible 41:22 47:6 205:10.14 accidentally 96:17 accommodating 22:12

account 198:4 accuracy 201:19 accurately 7:14 accused 154:15 157:9 achieve 27:11 33:14 acknowledged 20:11 70:5 acknowledging 37:5 Act 189:20 192:12,14 202:16 acted 81:3 acting 162:9 action 27:11 143:14 193:19 199:2 213:9 Actions 211:11 active 32:22 50:1 201:12,14 207:12 actively 206:14 activities 193:8 activity 178:13 181:18 193:1 197:12 actual 29:8 104:2 165:21 ADA 205:19 add 35:9 45:22 69:21 79:16 81:8 108:8.14 111:20 148:11,13 added 59:4 adding 208:6 addition 9:14 17:9 28:4 101:4 204:2 additional 34:20 67:2 72:12 95:5 100:19 188:12 190:22 191:6 201:8 204:1 208:7 210:7 213:14 additionally 98:13 202:5 address 7:14 12:21 13:5,10,11,22 14:3,7 15:21 17:5,6,7,18 18:10,19 19:1,7 20:2 20:16,17 23:1,8,9,10 23:15 24:12 27:9 28:9 28:11 32:3,7,13 33:10 33:14,22 35:6,14 37:19 43:8 50:1 52:11 57:4.21 63:22 64:3.17 64:19,21 66:22 67:17 67:21 68:4,7,21 70:6 70:19 71:13 77:5 96:15,18 97:2 98:18 99:1 113:1 114:9 119:20 120:6,7 121:16,19,20 122:2,3 127:19 128:17,18,19 130:8,17,18 139:12 161:11 167:8,10

183:8 187:15 200:19 206:8 216:16 addressed 27:1 71:17 98:20 207:21 addresses 38:16,19 54:13 79:14,15 121:14 128:7 131:1 201:15,16 adhere 173:21 adjourn 3:6 217:11 adjudicated 172:4 Administration 200:5 administrative 24:17 152:13 193:17 admitted 182:10 adopt 4:15,20 5:7 8:4 59:14 88:12 89:9 177:16 190:2 191:11 adopted 5:4 7:10 10:21 10:21 Adoption 2:4 adopts 7:6 9:16 adored 55:22 advance 4:16 101:9 advise 102:10 advised 9:11 21:9.12 Advisory 209:17 affidavit 74:17 172:11 174:1 affidavits 103:1 affirm 149:15 161:16 167.13 affirmative 171:16 afternoon 50:15 149:8 149:9 199:18 208:20 208:21,22,22 agencies 192:7,11,18 192:19,21 193:2,8,15 194:3 209:15 agency 193:5 207:4,20 208:1 agenda 4:16,20 5:3 11:7,8 180:10,11,14 180:16 189:16 Agenda/Approval 2:4 agent 114:1 176:3 ago 172:20 185:1 agree 46:15 56:17 130:21 154:10 178:22 agreement 104:15 Ahaghotu 2:18 181:2 182:1,6,20 183:8 186:2,10,22 Ahaghotu's 183:10,17 183:21 184:2 187:9 **Ahaghtou's** 183:6,7 ahead 11:20 27:22 31:12,17 50:19 52:14

53:6 56:10 61:8 74:7 115:14 117:2 129:8,9 137:17 141:15 146:5 147:22 149:2,18 152:11 153:6,14 160:19 aid 201:19 akin 158:5 al 196:17 Albany 84:7 alerted 98:18 Alexandria 161:11 Ali 160:5 161:21 164:6 166:4 167:22 168:3 aligned 104:16 alike 120:18 allegation 215:9,17 allegations 158:1 159:13 allege 147:2 alleged 29:6 36:8 58:21 59:7 79:3,3 91:15 99:13 100:3 108:17 110:2 153:19 154:3 155:17 158:10 159:14 172:9.16 195:18 alleges 198:17 alleging 147:2 173:9,13 Allen 214:5 allow 24:11,20 63:9 143:1.3.5 allowed 24:10 76:17 136:10,12 179:15 196:9 allows 26:8 193:13,18 alluded 79:7 alongside 151:21 alterations 120:15 altered 131:4 alternatively 197:9 Alvarez 5:17,21 6:1,3,4 6:7,8,11 7:2,20 8:2,6 10:9,13,15,17 Alvarez's 6:13 amendment 24:9 142:18 189:20 192:8 198:21 202:16 American 207:7 Amharic 203:1 amount 26:1 46:21 47:13 89:20 90:4,20 92:15 93:20 95:22 145:21 166:16 178:22 amounts 210:4 analysis 108:2 213:7,18 214:3 ANC 37:11 86:9 173:1 200:21,22 201:4

and/or 204:4 Anderson 198:19 Ankit 2:15 96:5 97:4,17 166:19 announced 61:19 179:19 answer 31:8 39:21 40:13 198:10 answered 203:15 answers 203:18 anticipate 30:10 anybody 54:22 125:13 150:20 152:6 216:19 anymore 79:20 anytime 31:1 77:11 134:22 anyway 146:2 apartment 161:13 184:20 185:20 **apologies** 16:18,18 31:20 60:17 180:16 apologize 105:18 115:13 apparently 84:18 91:4 186:13 appeal 61:18.20.22 62:9 64:13,14 85:4 95:2 190:1 196:13 appealed 51:16,17 94:9 179:18 appeals 51:18 62:1 85:11 87:18 94:10 113:9,19 154:18 155:13 174:20,21 175:15 179:18 appear 4:13 14:14 36:19 65:17 97:18 99:8 105:16 124:3 194:14 appearance 113:14 175:6 178:14 appeared 18:20 98:14 174:15 184:15 appearing 198:17 appears 7:12 74:15 133:18 appellate 62:6 applications 202:12 207:15 applied 98:21 99:22 applies 192:13 apply 22:8 30:8 53:17 89:22 90:22 99:15 100:4 198:19 204:7 appreciate 28:3 37:8 46:8 48:7 74:9 82:9 84:11 95:16 96:1 115:6 217:20

appreciated 216:11 appropriate 112:8 200:16 approved 8:4 approves 7:17 approximately 206:18 **April** 1:9 15:11 65:14 66:13 97:15 100:10 205:6 206:3 216:6 **ARC** 206:4 area 211:7,11 argue 30:11,13 80:18 104:4 105:20 106:19 113:22 172:9 176:2 argued 19:9 93:9 argues 154:2,3,14 arguing 56:3 173:3 argument 20:15 32:1 36:10 71:15 74:2,4 78:17,22 79:6 86:1,10 102:16 109:12 129:20 136:5 141:12 147:13 154:8 173:5 174:2,11 175:19 arguments 25:22 27:10 85:3 87:15 88:2 89:9 155:5 158:4 arises 204:6 Arizona 175:8 arrangement 121:4 127:16 129:4 130:11 139:9.17 articulate 61:12,15 articulating 104:7 ascertain 5:20 7:6 Ascertainment 2:3 Asheesh 157:10 163:9 168:9 176:4 Ashish 101:12 102:19 105:19 114:1 137:21 141:5 aside 22:16 103:3,14 169:2 asked 14:1 15:16.22 31:3 35:15 37:5 66:18 100:19 109:20 110:15 142:15 158:9 199:22 asking 7:9,11 27:13 78:5 90:11 106:21 108:5 112:12 163:15 167:19 176:8 assert 196:12 assertion 42:22 171:17 asserts 171:15 assess 44:6 assigned 16:21 assigning 162:1 167:19 assignments 200:18

assist 58:3 59:2 70:21 203:2 associate 114:12 associated 123:3 associates 18:1 assume 26:22 assumed 115:1 assuming 9:14 assumption 69:11 assured 34:9 Athletics 207:8 attend 186:12 attendees 190:2 attention 180:4 181:14 attorney 13:18 16:20 26:4 48:8 64:5 73:9 96:20 97:9 154:17 181:3 attributable 155:8 audio 80:18 91:7 151:1 audit 211:2 213:7,14 214:3,4,7 authentic 120:21 authentication 158:19 authenticity 158:18 author 122:9 133:12,13 authored 117:9 119:3.5 119:15 123:3 124:6 128:19,20,21 130:17 authorities 185:15 189:12 authority 113:10 155:14 174:22 178:3 184:10 authorize 113:20 authorized 143:18 210:2 authorizing 33:3 34:18 authors 120:16 135:13 available 8:8 10:22 35:7 73:18 126:5 142:14 202:22 203:18,21 206:11 Avenue 13:12 average 53:22 awaiting 26:15 aware 43:15 75:18 113:21 185:12 193:1 **aye** 5:1,9,10 59:20,22 60:9,13 93:13,15 179:11,13 189:8,10 191:19,21 195:5,7 217:14,17 Ayes 5:2 Ayyaurai 197:3 В **b** 77:5

**back** 16:3 34:8 36:16 67:3 68:13 85:18 122:19 126:12 128:17 131:2,18 133:16 144:13 160:16 163:7 188:13 217:8 backed 75:22 background 5:17 bad 71:15,19 74:3 79:9 80:13,18 81:3,22 147:10 173:19 174:5 ballot 11:11 14:14,17 16:10 22:3 26:2 33:4 33:11 35:4 36:17,18 36:19 49:14 50:4,6 53:1,4 54:12 59:15 60:19 65:18 67:9 79:14,14 80:13,19 92:16 93:18,21 97:18 97:22 99:1,5 100:9 102:3 104:22 106:12 107:1,4,10 113:11 143:8,18,21 146:18 175:1,9 176:11 177:1 177:13 179:1.15.16 179:17 183:21 184:3 184:16,18 185:1,6,9 187:2,3 198:17 199:3 199:6 204:11,18,19 204:20 205:4 206:5 206:10 ballots 205:5.21 bank 198:4 **bar** 54:7 64:11 207:7 bard 106:22 barring 52:13 190:19 **base** 210:4 based 10:3 21:16 29:17 30:16 36:8 59:15 73:1 74:16 76:2,22 88:8 118:18 173:21 184:8 198:3 200:16 basic 173:15 174:10 basically 71:3 199:1 basing 28:15,16 74:13 basis 9:12 18:7 22:22 29:3,11 43:9 49:6,22 57:10,19 91:17 93:2 108:22 109:19 bat 150:8 bears 171:15 Beatty 210:15 beautiful 4:4 becoming 207:12 began 46:3 182:3 206:20 beginning 76:21 82:20 121:6 127:2

Brazil 104:10 112:1 begins 127:3 116:13 126:2,3,9,14 162:6 163:10 169:5.9 **begun** 208:6 129:9 133:19 137:20 217:2 171:9,11 172:5 behalf 64:7,11 83:20 142:15,21 143:6,14 breach 198:9 173:10 174:12 175:20 84:8 96:21 102:15 143:17,20 145:4 break 136:22 137:2,4 178:17 208:15 209:2 174:16 197:19 199:8 147:8 148:7 150:9,13 144:14 209:11,13,16,19 207:4 153:2,21 154:7,10,16 breakdown 16:6 162:17 210:1,11,13,15,18 belabor 146:7 154:17,20,21,22 Brianne 2:8 5:18 6:9 213:11 215:1 216:5 believe 27:12 30:7 36:1 155:4 156:5 157:18 brief 74:10 126:1 146:8 campaign's 148:6 46:2 49:7 77:1 81:18 158:6,11 159:12,16 166:12 171:19 93:8 111:3 133:17 briefly 79:7 81:10 82:8 159:18 160:1,10,13 campaign-related 137:21 142:7 151:7 163:1 166:4,10 113:2,4 150:7,10 215:10,18 156:2 161:4 164:12 172:12 173:1,4,15,16 177:18 campaigns 86:5 bring 27:10 82:11,12,14 166:17 177:6,13 173:18 174:8,22 cancelled 202:6 181:7 208:21 175:7 176:5,9 177:1 82:16 100:8 188:12 cancelling 202:9 believed 15:20 18:21 179:3,19 180:18,21 193:19 candidacy 11:11 61:5 19:15 66:21 180:22 181:4,5,7,8,16 bringing 180:1 96:6 Bend 182:15 184:7,9,13 185:14 brings 26:1 candidate 2:12,14,16 benefit 63:9 186:16 188:6,7,13 broader 185:16 11:12,15 14:14 15:14 best 36:22 134:2 189:3,11,21 190:1,3 Brooke 215:7,8,16,17 15:16,19,21 16:3 17:2 164:16 190:10,13 192:16 brother 186:12 187:1 18:12,16,20 20:11 beyond 39:7 67:12 195:19,21 196:6 brought 12:7 46:18 21:17 22:7 23:17 30:7 74:2 78:19 108:12,16 75:21 102:20 125:6 197:4,14 213:3,5 32:5,16 33:4,9 34:17 Board's 15:6 16:21 17:6 108:19 180:3 36:13 41:4 42:18 47:6 **big** 146:2 **bigger** 128:2 19:11 20:17 24:19 **building** 185:20 47:12,17 50:5 52:4 **bind** 28:10 26:9,12 33:7 38:16,20 53:1.16 58:7 59:15 **bulk** 81:20 birth 182:21 40:3 48:11,12,17,19 bunch 75:14 119:19 62:12.21 63:9 65:18 **Bishop** 106:13 142:11 49:21 51:18 61:18 120:17 66:17,20 67:4,15 68:1 142:18 66:7 95:2 155:14 burden 32:6 47:2 75:13 70:3 72:18 73:22 **bit** 16:22 22:1 28:10 158:20 189:19 193:16 78:3 79:13 147:14,16 75:14 78:3 93:3,18 37:10 69:21 148:14 196:11,20,22 199:8 Bureau 208:5 97:19 98:17 100:9,13 bitter 146:11 Boardmember 209:1 buried 41:18 103:15 104:21 107:2 blackout 201:7 boards 200:17 business 114:9 216:5 107:8,11 112:18 Blair 156:11 **body** 104:6 133:4 **busy** 126:2 113:11 114:2 143:9 blame 35:12 **BOE** 24:3 37:21 95:19 button 6:5 143:20 145:19 175:1 blank 99:18 200:6,14 203:22 175:1,9,20 176:12 С blanks 17:20 18:6 204:20 207:9,13,19 178:8,16,21 179:14 **blessed** 39:17 208:8 216:10 calculation 27:7 201:2 204:13 **board** 1:4,6,11,13,17 **Boggs** 1:15 4:10,21 5:8 calculations 9:3 candidate's 16:8 67:7 2:5 4:6,9,11,17 7:1,5 5:10,11 52:18,20 53:8 calendars 204:9 104:8 7:7,22 8:21 9:12 10:8 55:2 56:15 59:21,21 call 2:2 56:13 59:19 candidates 37:15 39:16 13:21,22 14:7 15:22 59:22 60:7,12,13 93:11 118:7 122:11 46:22 49:12 53:20 17:16 19:6 20:15 21:1 92:19,21 93:10,14,15 127:12 140:5 144:19 54:3,8 56:22 59:2 21:4,13,19 22:6,8 144:22 160:10,20,21 147:17 148:4,22 99:3 102:1 173:1 209:22 210:12 211:6 23:16 24:20 25:20 179:3,4,6,7,12,13 153:10 160:5,17 26:21,22 27:5 28:17 181:7 167:1,3 168:8,12 212:4,22 29:22 30:2,5,18 35:19 Bono 207:7 capacity 37:21 39:1 179:10 182:17 186:9 39:4,5 46:19 47:6,10 **born** 197:8 189:7 191:17 195:4 61:7 184:6 195:16 48:4,7 49:6,11 51:5 Borne 197:7 capital 122:13 216:15 bottom 17:10 119:18 51:12,14 56:10,15,17 called 76:3 181:17 card 33:22 35:4,18 cards 33:14 35:14,15 58:20 59:11 60:18 128:10 132:5 186:6 190:19 61:15 64:10 69:15,19 bound 53:12 202:4 calling 148:17 158:14 77:2 78:6,19,21 79:2 boundaries 200:15,20 cameras 185:2 carefully 191:9 84:13 89:15 91:1,10 Bowser 196:18 Carisa 210:14 campaign 3:3 6:15 92:19 93:17 98:18 box 64:19 124:4 126:21 case 22:12 23:8,12 28:5 146:18 147:3 148:8 126:21 127:2 139:9 102:6 104:10,17 37:2 45:11 47:16 50:4 148:18 150:3,13 105:12 107:3,11,14 204:12,20 206:6,10 152:3 153:18 154:6 57:15 58:6 62:20 boxes 55:13 126:20 155:22 156:1 157:2 67:16 68:12 69:8 71:6 108:5 112:2,5,12 113:10,16 115:5,16 204:21 205:4 157:12,13 161:22 76:7 85:6 95:16 104:9

1		1	
106:2,9,11,13 112:5	88:7,18,22 89:3,6,8	79:5 81:2,16,19,21	43:18 105:1 106:6
112:15,19 113:10,22	89:11,14 90:5,9 92:6	82:4,6,7 85:9 88:8,11	<b>chance</b> 5:6 7:21 32:4
122:15 140:14 141:11	92:9,18,22 93:12,12	88:13,16 90:13 93:2,5	38:9 116:13 149:1
142:9,11,19 143:10	93:13,13 94:1,12 95:4	93:8 94:6,7 96:5 98:4	217:7
143:19 144:2,3	95:13,17 102:4,5,7	98:10 99:7,8,12 100:2	change 9:7 15:21 17:7
146:10 147:11,12	104:19 105:5 107:15	100:7,15,22 101:3	23:15,20 28:9 33:9,14
153:16,20 154:1,10	107:18 108:3,7,9	102:10 103:2,7,18	33:22 35:5,14 37:20
154:11,16 155:19,21	109:4,10,16,21 110:1	108:15,19,20 136:20	47:15 66:22 67:22
156:1,4,5,9,15,18,21	110:18 111:5,7,10,12	147:9 155:3 159:14	68:7 71:13 135:8
156:22 157:1,8,17,18	111:18,21 112:14,18	173:19 174:6,7 180:7	changes 19:1 24:12
157:21,22 158:1,4,5,5	112:21 113:3 114:3	196:8,18,19 197:1	202:3
158:6,8,11,22 159:22	115:1,4,21 116:15	204:15	Chapter 15:6 66:7
167:1 171:3 172:9,12	117:1 124:14,18,22	challenged 14:21 15:5	98:11 192:8
172:13,18 173:2,3,6,7	125:5,11,15,17,21	15:8 17:14 18:14	character 93:6 94:15,18
173:15 174:19,21	129:11,13,21 135:14	19:15,16 26:10 27:1	95:1
175:3,8,13,14,18	135:17 136:11,15	37:3 43:1,15 47:5	characteristics 117:12
177:19 184:9,14,22	137:10,16 140:9,13	52:6 65:22 66:6 73:12	117:15 122:4 133:10
185:5,14,16,20 186:5	140:18 141:9,15	73:14 88:10 96:5 98:5	charge 51:6 157:4
188:6,8 196:7 197:12	144:5,19 145:1,3,4,15	98:16 99:16,17,19	166:15 168:2
cases 22:6 24:20 51:4	148:2,21 149:6,9,18	100:4 109:18 110:20	chat 81:12
56:4 114:17 147:12	152:8,15,22 153:13	110:22	check 9:11 38:15 39:2
173:5 184:12 213:15	154:7,10 160:8 161:1	challenger 15:1,15	55:13 85:21 86:13
cast 183:21 184:4,16	161:7,12 166:9,22	17:20 29:10 30:8,10	163:15 198:5
185:1,6,7	167:5,7 170:22	43:18,21 46:13 47:12	check-in 187:12
cause 22:21 53:10	174:14 176:15,20	47:17 57:10,18 58:20	checked 75:9 86:17
216:1	177:15 179:5,10,11	62:20 63:10,18 66:3	187:10
Cecily 3:4	179:11,21 181:6,11	71:17 76:4 81:3 84:2	checking 39:22 49:21
celebrated 207:9	184:20 186:20 187:5	84:7,9 94:21 98:7	Chief 193:17
<b>center</b> 183:20 187:11	187:14,18 188:2,4,10	100:13,19,22 101:8	child 34:4
199:22 204:11 206:5	188:17,21 189:2,7,8,8	102:13,21 103:8	Chinese 203:1
206:10,19 207:7 centers 204:22 205:1,8	189:14 190:17 191:4 191:18,19,19 194:22	146:10 147:13 153:16 154:2 158:8 159:1	Christine 16:19 24:8 69:16 181:3
205:14	194:22 195:4,5,5	171:21 174:4 179:22	<b>Circular</b> 146:14
certain 4:18 127:1	199:12 208:14 209:4	Challenger's 147:16	circulars 156:12
certainly 25:5 37:13	209:7 216:8 217:13	171:17	circulate 10:9 17:4
38:2 41:10 52:9 58:6	217:13,16,18	challengers 30:19 59:2	<b>circulated</b> 4:16 5:4
63:17 82:16 95:18	<b>Chair's</b> 144:16	172:22	102:18 103:10 105:19
185:18 186:20 190:20	<b>Chairman</b> 56:7 84:10	challenges 4:18 15:2,9	110:12 116:19 150:6
certified 209:21	95:10 105:3,6 208:22	15:10 16:4,5 18:2	154:19 159:3 177:3,6
cetera 57:18 77:6	challenge 2:10 11:7	19:3,13 20:7,9,12	circulating 7:8 9:17
Chair 1:12,14 4:3,6,22	13:16 15:4 17:15,21	21:9 22:11,14,19	38:13 148:19 150:2
5:3,9 7:18,19 8:3,7,12	18:3,7,17 19:9 20:1,2	26:17,20 28:13 29:3	circulation 8:8 9:22
10:1,6,18 11:20 12:9	21:8 22:3,6 23:18	29:15 30:11,14 36:8	circulator 74:17 77:13
12:14,17 16:16 21:21	26:7 28:13,15,16,16	41:3 44:18,20 46:21	101:12 102:22 105:15
22:20 23:4,19 24:1,5	28:19,21 29:9,11,16	46:22 49:5 51:7 52:5	105:16 110:8 111:2
24:7,15,22 25:3,5	30:3,5,20 31:1 33:17	55:12 56:19 61:13	112:7 119:18 121:14
27:19 31:9,12,16,19	36:15 38:7 40:10,18	62:12,21 65:8,9 66:3	121:22 122:1,6,19
37:7,21 39:5 44:11,14	40:21 41:2,5,8,11,14	66:9,11,12 67:5 71:6	125:3,7 128:11,20,21
44:16 45:7,11,14,16	41:15 42:9,11 43:9,16	73:11,19 74:12,20	132:2 133:8 136:7
45:21 46:11 50:7,19	43:21 44:4,7 45:5	76:1 80:13,21 81:1	139:2,12,14 141:5
51:22 53:5 56:9,14	48:6,9,9,13,14 49:9	84:16 88:4,13,16,19	143:15 146:19 147:1
58:13 59:10,17,19,20	51:2,9 52:2 57:9,17	89:21 90:21 91:2,7,14	148:18 153:18,19
60:3,5,8,9,14,22 62:4	58:5,8,18,18 59:16	91:15,19,20 94:4	154:4,12,19 156:14
62:18,19 63:4,14 67:10 68:15 60:7 14	63:1,20 65:22 66:5 67:4 68:14 60:1 71:2	95:21 98:8,22 99:2	157:20 164:11 169:18
67:10 68:15 69:7,14 70:1 72:2 74:6 78:8	67:4 68:14 69:1 71:2 72:6 73:11 74:1,5,12	101:18,20,22 103:5	170:9,15 171:11 172:10,10,14 173:12
80:7,11,20,22 81:10	74:13,19 75:3,6 76:11	159:15 172:4 173:2 174:5 180:9 200:1	172.10,10,14 173.12
83:17 84:2,6 87:21	76:14,19,20,22 78:2,6	challenging 18:5,6 30:8	178:13,15,19
00.11 04.2,0 07.21	10.11,10,20,22 10.2,0		110.10,10,10
11			

circulator's 77:19 131:22 132:5 154:6 circulators 112:4 151:19 152:2 154:14 155:10,17 156:6 157:3,11 159:6,14 162:1,1 164:20 165:18,21 169:5,9 170:6,12 172:15 circumstances 184:9 Citadel 114:12 citation 29:12,14 30:12 43:10 44:1 cite 57:10 75:17 84:16 84:20 87:16 157:21 172:8 173:11 cited 57:6 103:9 104:9 173:3 cites 103:21 153:16 175:8 citizen 53:22 54:19 87:1 87:6 citizens 25:10 87:8 158:2 197:8 207:21 city 55:8 176:2 204:21 206:11 citv-wide 68:18 citywide 20:19 23:12 31:21 32:2 36:13 37:16 54:14 civic 86:22 207:9,11,12 209:15 civil 193:19 claim 173:17 198:3,8,11 claimed 146:20 claiming 76:7 90:2 claims 171:15 196:12 198:7 clarification 46:2 clarify 110:7 192:9 clarifying 44:15 clarity 189:22 Clause 197:8 clear 22:17 29:5 43:17 45:4 46:5 49:3 56:19 57:7,16 58:7,7 73:12 84:4 90:11 93:7 122:9 123:1 128:16 140:10 143:19 155:3 178:18 193:16 217:4 clearly 22:19 94:4 clip 150:9,13 163:1 clock 63:16 160:4 216:17 close 23:18 45:1 123:14 134:16,17 183:15 216:5 closed 88:16 196:4,14

196:16 closely 191:5 closer 16:17 209:5 **closest** 206:9 closing 195:14 clusters 117:14 code 8:13 23:7 64:21 67:21 77:4,7,10,14 94:20 205:22 codes 77:2 collect 32:17 39:6,22 79:11,18 86:4,14 150:9 151:11 163:6 163:14 164:21 165:2 165:5,6,9 167:20 168:5,7,13 169:19,21 170:3 collected 34:13 50:5 79:17 85:18 98:15 102:22 110:8 150:8 153:18 154:4,5,12 155:10,17 156:14 157:1,2,11,12,19 162:15 163:16 169:14 170:16 171:10 172:15 173:11 174:11 178:3 collecting 38:14,19 49:15,18 86:5 106:7 151:13,22 162:5,19 163:9 165:12,14,18 165:21 170:6,13 175:21 collection 30:6 85:16 157:5 162:7,18 163:22 collector 157:15 164:4 collectors 163:13 168:8 college 115:19 **Collier** 208:18 **Collier-Montgomery** 3:4 Columbia 1:2,11 5:20 6:11 15:1 32:15 64:22 66:271:598:7106:4 107:13 142:8 143:1 158:3 193:18 195:18 198:20 209:14 column 29:13 combination 4:17 139:20 combining 122:22 come 21:4 34:19 38:14 126:12 128:5 143:3 143:12 160:16 188:5 188:7 193:5 comes 21:1 83:10 87:5 139:17 comfortable 63:2

coming 45:1 162:8 198:10 commencement 190:1 commencing 4:14 commend 55:3 commendable 54:5 commended 86:22 comment 3:5 38:9 53:11 56:8 62:16 72:5 78:10 80:3,5,8 83:19 84:3 85:12 89:7,8 92:20 94:2 95:5,7 171:4 176:18 177:18 190:9 216:13 217:9 commented 184:20 comments 52:13 56:16 79:11 95:18 96:11 112:22 186:18 190:11 190:13,14,20 191:6 194:9,12 203:22 216:18 commercial 98:15 Commission 209:18 commissioner 37:11 **commit** 107:13 148:20 164:20 committed 147:3 148:8 154:13,20 155:11,18 156:6 157:3,6 171:9 172:14,16 173:10 committee 200:4 210:13,15 211:7,12 211:20 212:19 213:20 214:7 215:1.8.16 committees 211:18 213:9,11,12,13,19 214:4 committing 152:3 common 118:2 132:10 139:16 173:15 174:10 commonality 118:18 communications 163:11 200:8 201:16 204:5 208:12 compare 121:16 122:19 122:21 128:16 131:21 compared 133:17 134:15 182:16,19 comparing 119:7 128:8 131:1,14,17 comparison 124:2 compelling 105:13 108:5 177:19 compete 53:21 competing 203:19 **Complainant** 215:6,15 **complaint** 198:7,8,16 198:17

completed 164:11 207:15 210:6 214:11 completely 173:19 **completes** 131:18 complex 184:20 compliance 195:19 complied 22:2 comply 19:11 192:21 193:7 complying 193:11 comported 38:19 compressed 47:3 compromise 83:15 compromised 33:18 compute 8:19 concern 32:1 34:3 74:11,18 82:21 102:21 concerned 19:19 85:7 187:7 concerning 180:17 190:11 198:4 concerns 18:21 24:17 190:12 concession 25:4 concise 29:6 concisely 58:21 59:7 conclude 121:22 136:4 136:16 137:3 171:2 216:2.12 concluded 141:21 175:4concludes 180:8 199:10,11 208:13 216:7 concluding 141:12 conclusion 122:5 124:12 131:22 133:10 conclusions 129:1 conclusively 70:16 condolences 27:20 61:2 conduct 190:2 205:12 conducted 158:20 207:3 213:8 216:1 conducting 205:7,16 conference 13:20 14:10 15:12 17:1 45:17,19 47:9,15 50:8,14,15 65:15 66:14,16 69:13 69:21 70:4,4 78:15,18 81:13 82:21 97:14 100:11 101:7,10 102:9,12,13 104:5 108:13 110:16 182:7 198:12 conferences 69:17 78:12

confides 104:13 confirming 82:10 conflicting 51:21 78:12 conform 189:19 confused 77:17 confusing 77:14,20 Congress 199:7 connected 101:11 connecting 121:6 131:6 connection 157:13 184:11 connects 130:7,9,10 consciously 134:21 consider 39:3 48:4 75:12 78:6 108:6 126:20 consideration 31:22 36:11,22 46:19 83:11 109:1 147:10 considerations 48:15 considered 24:10 51:6 89:20 90:4,20 154:18 172:18 191:9 203:17 considering 155:9 consistency 55:18,20 55:21 56:1.4 138:2 189:21 consistent 55:5.6 65:11 120:4,10 121:22 123:13 124:11 127:4 127:12 128:13 129:4 131:9 135:4 138:21 139:6 177:16 consolidated 51:4 94:11 Constituents 213:10 constitute 33:10 constitutes 28:14 90:13 Constitution's 197:7 construed 91:16 contact 36:2 186:10 contained 14:18 65:21 98:1 101:13 containing 208:11 contend 77:22 contention 29:15 30:20 31:3 43:3,19,19 173:14 contentions 89:9 contents 2:1 216:3 contest 53:2 60:19 92:17 93:21 contested 15:15 66:17 100:17 101:4,10 159:7 contesting 159:5 context 177:2 179:15 185:21

(202) 234-4433

continually 115:14 153:16 continuation 70:3 continue 85:9 181:9 continued 20:5,10 50:9 50:11,12,16,17 178:6 180:22 216:9 continuing 201:17 202:10 contract 198:10 contrary 21:13 158:21 contribute 54:8 contributions 6:14 convene 102:9 convened 1:11 15:12 66:14 100:11 200:5 convenience 27:6 conversation 73:2 78:14 converted 204:3 convey 200:10 203:11 convincing 135:20 coordinator 205:15 coordinators 193:5 copied 11:3 48:22 copies 163:17 164:14 **copy** 6:13 9:20 40:2 41:15 48:14 164:13 corner 183:11,22 184:1 187:11 correct 23:22 24:13 42:20 45:10.15.18.19 45:20 50:1 68:11 69:5 69:6 89:10 90:14 92:3 109:1 111:3 112:17 112:20 140:21 141:2 141:6 corrected 94:2 Correction 208:1 corrections 190:4 correctly 7:14 **Corrente** 1:20 8:10,12 10:4 14:2,5,6 40:12 44:3,8,12,15,17 65:7 67:18 69:6 78:11 79:21 97:12 109:3,8 110:11,19 111:6,8,17 Corrente's 11:1 correspond 77:15 101:1 corresponds 77:11 **cost** 198:4 council 5:19 6:10,21 23:21 37:13,20 46:19 55:8 56:18 68:16 86:11 153:21 176:9 176:18 177:17 180:1 181:12 192:20

Council's 199:14 200:4 Councilmember 2:9 counsel 1:19,19 5:12 13:18 15:12 16:14.20 38:8 66:14 69:16 71:17 79:8 80:14 88:1 89:13 90:6 92:10 93:1 96:7 100:11 102:14 105:19 113:7 171:5 208:16 211:10,16 212:2 213:16 214:11 214:18 215:3 counsel's 2:6 5:12 52:14 59:14 63:5 214:9 count 8:20 145:20 146:12 counted 35:21 36:14 counter 19:3 counterproductive 83:16 counts 68:19 County 182:15 couple 28:22 38:4,12 72:8 114:11 125:20 184:12 course 51:11 78:18 106:10 162:6 168:17 178:3 court 4:7 51:17 62:1 85:11 87:18 113:8,18 154:17 155:12 167:10 172:18 174:20,21 175:15 179:18 193:19 195:17 196:4,8,10,15 196:19,21 197:15 198:2,11,15 207:19 **Court's** 198:18 courts 114:19 115:2 175:4 cover 28:17,19 43:5,10 created 125:3 Creating 78:2 credible 158:14 credit 69:10 178:8 credited 16:2 67:3 68:13 101:17 177:2 177:11 crew 38:22 Criminal 114:13 criticizes 87:5 cross 136:18 137:15 140:10 149:1 152:10 166:10 200:20 crunch 35:17 153:2 **CSOSA** 207:20 culprit 185:13 culprits 185:17

curable 37:17 cure 17:8 25:12 28:9 45:8 57:4 cured 20:13 cures 19:7 70:6 current 9:2 10:2 200:14 200:18 currently 200:21 204:14 208:12 cuts 147:12 cutting 136:2 **cycle** 200:3,7,17 204:8 204:10,17 206:16 211:3 D **D** 2:7 **D.C** 62:1 64:4.11 66:8 68:16 85:10,15 86:5 86:11 87:4,6,18 96:19 97:6 98:11 106:7 147:4 150:18 162:21 163:4 179:18 182:1,9 182:9,12,21 183:6,18 185:8 198:22 201:16 202:6.6.9 damages 198:3,9 **Danbury** 13:7 data 47:6 193:8 206:5 database 26:13 202:18 DataNet 208:9.9 date 9:13 18:18 29:2 40:14 45:4,9,16 50:1 54:14 104:18 156:12 156:13 169:1 182:21 202:11 209:21 216:6 dated 97:15 dates 151:12 200:11 David 212:7 day 4:4 18:17 20:6,10 23:16,17 32:11,13 40:19 41:6,9 44:19,22 45:2,3,6 49:13,20 50:3,9 61:6 71:22 83:1,12,15 85:18 86:17 98:4 101:9,9 135:8 151:8,9,10 186:10 204:12 205:1 211:6 days 8:22 14:20 17:7 18:18 45:14,19 61:19 71:1,8 150:6,7 179:19 **DC** 8:13 13:2,8 14:8 15:7 23:6 28:17 33:2 36:12 37:13,19 154:17 155:12 158:4

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

161:14 190:8 192:1,3

194:10,13,17 195:9

196:17,19,21 198:1 200:6,14 203:22 204:17 207:5,7,9,13 207:19 208:8 210:13 213:2.21 **DCMR** 48:16,22 57:22 84:16,21 87:16 98:11 99:10 171:14 189:16 190:10 192:8.9 **DCR** 190:8 dead 106:14,15 142:6 143:4 155:21 156:2,3 deadline 40:1,19 41:1,8 45:1 deadlines 203:16,20 204:6 dealing 61:2 102:16 112:4 198:9 dealt 71:13,21 79:5 104:11 Decade 167:10 deceased 106:9,18 109:4,13 110:5 123:21 135:16 **December** 215:6.14 decide 13:21 35:10 decided 46:9 157:18 184:13 191:1 decides 186:17 decipher 22:13 decipherable 22:7 deciphering 72:16 decision 47:10 61:18 82:2 95:3 113:12,18 174:20 179:20 185:22 186:19 198:18,20 decisions 51:21 190:2 declaration 197:5 declaratory 193:20 declare 62:14 declined 193:10 dedicated 194:6 deemed 23:9 defect 17:9 29:5 defects 58:21 59:7 67:6 91:15 99:13,22 100:2 **Defendant** 197:14,19 defer 51:11 72:8 78:13 deficiencies 48:11 definitely 120:12 169:15 degree 171:9 delegate 39:14 deliver 208:17 democracy 205:17,18 207:13 democratic 2:12,14,16 11:13,15 14:16 34:22

60:20 65:19 93:22 97:21 162:20 196:17 213:20 **Democrats** 150:18 demonstrated 40:20 denied 53:1 60:19 61:14 92:13 93:3,18 158:13 159:1,2 182:8 185:7 195:21 denies 33:7 DeNiro 156:10 deny 59:15 199:5 Department 114:13 197:19 205:3 207:5 depending 51:8 186:16 186:18 deploy 206:18 deployed 202:19 deposit 210:9 depositing 204:19 deputy 148:9 166:6 167:4 **Derenge** 212:12 describe 76:22 129:17 132:3 133:20 161:22 167:18 168:15 described 103:7 describes 29:4 describing 133:3 description 29:14 69:20 94:19 design 208:10 designated 18:9 192:18 192:20 desire 33:3 desk 210:6 213:8,9,10 213:11,12 **Despite** 29:13 detail 82:15 detailed 95:22 detailing 13:15 details 56:19 82:13 determination 22:1 62:8.13 63:7 91:17 145:7 determinations 96:2 determine 38:17 68:10 122:20 determined 9:2 91:21 101:19 204:4 determines 91:14 developed 201:20 202:18 203:2,8 DGS 205:13 diagram 52:8 **Diana** 5:17 died 133:17 142:3,4 difference 49:8 112:10

differences 130:19 different 16:7 45:4,17 52:6,7 54:4 57:21 66:9 69:4 84:17 88:13 98:12 113:22 114:11 114:20 119:11 120:14 120:19 121:3 127:14 128:3 130:19 131:4 131:12 135:12 138:9 140:5 172:22,22 201:1 difficult 27:4 37:12 72:15 73:3,20 79:11 difficulties 38:2 difficulty 85:13 digital 102:21 digitally 98:15 digits 35:8 dire 113:5 direct 115:8,17 direction 130:14 directly 48:17 101:5 149:20 164:19 175:3 191:8 director 1:18 148:9.9 153:11 157:8 160:5 161:3 162:9 166:6 167:4 168:18 193:16 204:5 208:17 Director's 3:2 199:15 199:18 209:9 216:2 **Disability** 205:10,12 disagree 47:18 51:18 disagreed 103:16 disallow 155:14 disbursement 210:2 disclosure 196:1 discount 183:4 discounted 113:15 175:6 discouraging 83:14 discrepancy 32:7 discretion 21:2 discuss 13:19 41:16 82:14 148:18 190:16 200:6 205:18 208:9 discussed 15:14 66:16 100:13 104:13 126:10 126:15 200:1 discussion 46:18 72:10 Discussions 208:6 disguise 120:14 131:10 140:6 dismiss 147:9 173:19 196:11,22 197:13,16 199:8 dismissed 100:6 198:1 198:7.8

dispense 115:18 disprove 147:15 dispute 67:12 disgualified 154:13,15 disqualify 153:17 154:6 disregarded 19:10 distance 127:1 130:10 distinguished 209:1 distorted 140:6 District 1:2,11 5:19 6:11 15:1 32:15 64:22 66:2 68:18 71:5 98:7 106:4 107:13 142:8 143:1 158:2,3 182:13 183:4 193:3,18 195:17,17 196:7,15 197:14,15 198:14,19 200:15 209:13,14,18 District's 192:6,10,17 disuse 28:10 divide 200:15 division 201:21 206:13 206:14 207:3,18 209:20 210:5 211:5 213:8,8,18 214:3,9 divisions 201:17 Docket 215:5 docketed 215:6,14 document 49:1,2 101:9 114:14 119:15 120:1 120:3 134:8 documents 9:21 213:20 213:22 Doe 32:9 doing 86:22 111:16 114:15 117:20 150:3 **DOJ** 187:19 **Donald** 198:16 door 34:3,5 35:1 doors 33:17 34:14 double 180:17 181:13 Dr 12:12 27:17 72:9 74:6 105:10,10 107:17 114:4 116:10 125:18,19 126:4 129:15 131:20 137:14 137:18 141:19 152:14 152:16,21 177:19 197:3 draft 204:9 drill 57:22 68:19 drive 136:1 drop 204:11,20,20 205:4 206:5,10 dropped 79:6 due 32:15 33:8 61:20 82:4 99:9 100:4 153:18 195:21 198:10

Duncan 180:21 duty 87:1 171:16 Е earlier 22:5 45:2 53:11 106:5 128:9 139:7 186:13 early 32:11 82:3 204:22 earthquake 147:19 easier 37:14 115:16 Easter 86:8 easy 76:14 79:15 81:6 95:14.17 Ebbon 214:5 edge 127:2 edition 192:2 **EDT** 1:12 education 77:3 201:21 207:1,2 213:3,5 Edward 215:7,15 effectuate 59:3 efficient 144:14 effort 33:12,13 36:2 47:22 83:15 180:6 203:10 efforts 37:4 105:9 201:22 203:3 egregious 143:11 157:17 eiaht 58:15 99:16 127:19 either 35:18 47:16 91:18 99:20 100:15 116:7 122:10 151:17 164:12 166:17 191:7 192:18 Elect 214:7 215:8 elected 7:17 8:15 9:10 election 14:15 32:2,2,4 32:12 53:17 54:18 55:7 60:21 65:18 93:22 97:20 113:15 142:22 143:20,22 175:7 179:17 180:20 181:21 182:5,5,9 183:19 197:22 198:6 200:2,3,7,8,17,17 204:8,9,10,17 205:1,9 206:13,14,15,16,17 206:19,20,22 207:15 210:20,21 211:3 212:5,10,15,18,20 213:1,3 Election's 133:20 elections 1:4,11,13,17 4:7 8:1,21 17:16 25:20 28:17 30:5,18 39:15 48:5 84:13

158:6 181:16 189:17 189:20 196:10 202:17 203:5 209:20,22 210:3,5,10 211:1,20 Elections' 35:19 elector 6:12 58:17 electoral 53:21 54:1 electors 8:17,20 electronic 159:20 160:2 182:18 205:19 electronically 205:21 eligible 39:14 197:5,6 email 9:20 217:3 emailed 116:12 emails 41:18 191:8 217:1 Emerson 55:19 emotions 61:11 Employees 214:20 Employment 207:5 enable 205:20 encourage 48:4 53:22 143:14 169:17 encouraged 81:14 ended 68:1 endorse 10:12 enforcement 192:12 enforcing 21:3 engage 34:2 53:21 87:9 engaged 54:20 106:15 engagement 207:12 engagements 199:19 ensure 11:17 47:12 49:22 70:15 192:16 193:10 194:1 205:9 205:14 entire 21:8 75:10 103:18 112:16 155:1 158:9 173:9 174:5,7 199:11 209:10 entirely 101:2 entirety 91:22 103:12 104:8 112:8 113:15 175:7 enumerated 15:3,17 16:1 66:4,19 enunciated 22:5 103:9 108:15 episode 152:9 equals 77:5,5,8 equipment 200:9 **ERIC** 181:17,18 Erin 210:13 erroneously 184:4,15 error 188:8 errors 76:10 190:5 espoused 21:7 essentially 22:5 203:12

establish 56:12 70:11 90:3 201:18 establishing 171:16 estimate 169:13 estimates 9:13 et 57:18 77:5 196:17 etcetera 7:14 43:8 Ethel 123:20 141:18,22 142:2 Ethics 189:17 Evans 1:18 3:2 195:15 198:14 199:16,17 event 192:13 208:3 events 49:19 163:4 207:3,4,18,21,22 208:7 everybody 10:7 12:18 52:1 61:1 95:14,19 96:1 144:13 145:9 194:2 217:18 everybody's 62:7,7 everyday 53:22 evidence 78:1 145:6 158:14 159:5 160:11 160:14,19 171:22 172:1.7 174:9 176:21 exact 126:19 133:1.2 exactly 68:10 135:4 187:17 examination 115:9 152:11 166:11 examine 117:16 136:18 140:10 149:1 **examiner** 114:14 example 18:8 75:4.11 75:16 76:3 117:16 118:19 126:10 130:15 138:6,7 139:4,16 156:3,8 175:8 examples 48:8 67:15 74:22 75:21 76:1 100:1 103:21 126:14 132:16 135:22 excellent 176:16 exceptions 23:20 exclude 191:2 excluded 105:21 excuse 82:1 103:10 152:14.21 excused 152:17 153:1 Executive 3:2 193:16 199:15,18 200:5 exemplar 133:20 exhibit 118:15 123:5 exhibited 100:5 exhibits 116:3,7,8 134:1 exist 29:18 75:17

156:14 existing 75:19 202:14 **expanse** 104:12 expectation 33:9 expected 72:20 73:22 76:11,12 163:4 Expenditure 211:18 213:12 experience 56:17 80:16 114:21 expert 107:20,21,22 114:7,14 115:2 127:9 135:20 136:4,16 158:16 177:19 183:1 expertise 115:6 experts 121:8 expires 9:18 explain 74:21 explained 19:22 explaining 147:8 explains 179:1 explanation 29:6 30:12 44:1 explicitly 30:17 43:11 43:22 154:18 expressed 82:21 190:12 expressing 33:3 expression 32:21 extension 197:20 211:14 extent 78:21 163:11 external 203:20 extra 163:5 F

## **f** 77:8,14

face 74:15 99:9 103:22 147:9 173:21 183:1 facilities 144:11 facing 35:17 fact 17:5 20:19 21:16 69:3 77:14 82:4 103:16 104:9 123:13 123:18 132:15 135:15 155:21 159:7 172:6 173:2 194:15 factor 140:2 factors 203:20 facts 107:19 157:16,16 failed 211:8,14,22 fair 39:15 53:16 55:7 209:15,20,22 210:3,5 210:10,22 211:19 faith 33:6 36:2 49:18 61:4 71:15,19 73:6 74:3,3,16 75:12 78:2 79:6,9 80:13,19 81:3

82:1.1 86:21 89:20 90:13 93:6,9 94:14,19 95:10 99:9 103:19 104:3 147:11 173:19 173:21 174:5 familiar 193:6 family 34:4 185:10,11 186:3 far 104:16 126:22 151:9 163:8 farmer's 34:14 163:2 farmers 39:8 fascinating 125:18 favor 5:1 217:14,16 features 117:12,16 119:8 120:12 121:21 122:3 133:4,6 February 2:4 9:3 150:10,10,11 163:10 168:1 196:1 federal 39:13 158:3 207:22 208:1,5 feedback 29:7 feel 26:1 33:19 61:13 63:2 103:22 feelina 51:4 fellow 4:9 felt 20:16 103:17 104:5 **Fenoff** 105:10,10 107:16,17 114:4,8,9 115:3,17,22 116:2,10 117:5 124:17,19 125:4,8,18,20 126:4,6 126:16 129:8,16 130:1 131:20 132:4 133:15,22 135:15 137:14,18 138:2,8,12 138:15,18 140:20,22 141:3,7,19 152:14,16 152:21 177:19 field 17:22 148:8,9 153:10 157:8 160:5 161:2 162:9 166:6 167:4 168:14,18 178:10 Fields 212:6 **fifth** 142:18 197:21 figure 77:8 156:2 file 6:18 23:5 27:5 33:9 40:3 61:22 159:18 182:19 208:10 211:8 211:15,21,22 filed 5:17 6:9,15,22 15:1,4,20 18:3 30:4 40:20 41:3 44:19,19 58:20 66:3,22 74:15 98:7 102:10 103:6,12 108:20 173:20 195:16

196:2 197:1.13.17.22 198:15 211:8,13,19 211:22 filers 211:8,13,19,21 files 23:15 24:19 filing 41:1 199:8 201:2 211:6 filings 6:13 fill 30:19 35:5 filled 17:22 122:6 128:7 187:2 201:1 **filling** 146:4 final 51:17 56:8 61:7 189:18 191:11 192:1 195:12 198:13 211:2 216:10 finally 71:20 76:18 147:14 173:8 finance 3:3 6:15 208:15 209:3,11,13,16,19 210:1,11,18 216:5 financial 54:3 find 41:11 69:9 93:5 105:12 129:3 133:6 138:9 184:22 185:3 206:9 finding 20:8 46:16 51:18 100:5 104:20 119:9 196:11 findings 13:16 15:13,15 16:7 26:9,13 47:14,18 66:15,17 100:12,18 100:20 101:5,11 103:16 115:10 177:5 211:2 fine 77:6 160:10 181:8 214:19,21 fines 214:15,16,18 finish 33:13 56:14 160:11.19 finished 75:1 119:6 **firm** 143:7 first 4:15 5:15,20 11:9 18:9 23:10 25:17,19 28:13 46:19 50:14 51:7,15,19 52:10 69:15 72:7 75:2 85:15 85:16 94:13 97:8 105:1 116:17 118:20 122:13,14 131:15 134:5,5,7,11 139:7 151:8 168:10 189:17 195:14 five 10:4 101:18 110:17 123:10 135:2 137:8 144:9,12,14 207:18 **fixed** 39:4 **flag** 118:9 123:14,16,18

150:15 flagged 151:4 **Florida** 185:7 Flower 13:12 **fly** 123:16 flyer 201:20 203:2 focus 46:9 81:15 82:3 120:22 207:11 focused 81:21 131:11 focusing 121:4 folks 36:3,5 49:19 216:15 217:7 follow 30:21 43:4 51:5 59:12 174:8,10 follow-up 34:18 65:13 followed 51:6 following 9:19 20:5 29:9 41:5,9 65:14 210:12 212:5 213:1 213:19 214:4,13,19 215:5 follows 9:5 13:14 foolish 55:20 footnote 113:18 175:14 foremost 94:13 forensic 114:14 158:14 forged 177:20 forger 131:10 forgeries 154:3 157:3,6 158:10 forgery 102:17 157:9 159:13 form 7:2,7,10,12,15 8:4 9:17 10:8,11,22 11:2 17:3,8,15,16 18:4 22:17 23:15 28:19 29:9,13 30:19 42:11 43:6,6 57:8,14 58:6 68:7 76:19 77:16 101:15 134:21 135:10 138:3 139:3 202:21 formally 9:15 former 210:12 forms 15:21 33:10 66:22 67:22 98:19,19 120:4,10,11 127:15 139:11 162:22 163:7 Fort 182:15 forth 54:14 193:22 fortunate 61:5 forty-eight 10:5 forward 9:8 21:15 47:11 85:5 147:22 forwarded 210:19 foster 34:4 found 48:21 52:4 73:19 75:8,21 76:2 82:5,6 89:21 90:21 99:14

100:3 102:18 103:18 109:6 115:22 117:3 119:13 121:13 122:4 124:9 133:11,19 154:20 159:17 172:5 177:7 182:6 183:6 Foundation 195:15 four 10:4 35:8 70:18 118:13,17 123:10 124:10,15,16 125:1,6 125:7,9,10 126:20 131:13 139:12 140:21 146:19 151:17 159:7 185:1 four-page 103:5 fourth 151:16 197:2 **FOYA** 204:3,4,6 Franklin 11:10,10 frankly 175:16 fraud 102:16 104:6,11 105:22 106:15,20 107:13 108:17 110:3 112:3 113:13,14,20 113:21 142:11,22 143:22 146:17 147:3 147:6.15.16 148:7.20 152:3 153:19 154:13 154:15,20 155:11,18 156:4,7 164:20 171:9 171:12,18,19,20 172:2,7,10,14,16 173:10 175:5,6,10,16 176:7 fraudulent 124:13 142:1 146:21 147:2 165:15 173:13 fraudulently 125:2 150:20 164:21 165:2 165:9,18 169:19 170:2.10 184:15 French 203:1 frequency 76:13 frequently 75:17 Friday 1:8 4:4 friendly 206:7 Friends 214:5 front 137:19 full-time 82:19 fully 41:7 99:8 178:8 fund 210:3,10 213:10 funds 39:16 further 15:17 66:18 84:20 114:21 141:8 152:5 170:20 180:5 184:10 futile 184:21 future 47:20 48:5 55:9 89:18 208:4

G gain 92:16 93:20 Gaming 158:2 Garcia 11:10,10 **Garland** 197:3,14,19 Gary 1:12,14 4:6 53:8 56:7 gather 10:10 37:9 Gatling 212:7 general 1:19,19 2:6 4:19 5:12,12 13:18 15:11 16:14,20 38:8 52:14 59:14 63:5 66:14 71:15 89:16 90:6 92:10 93:1 96:6 100:11 132:11 171:5 176:18 177:17 180:19 181:12,20 183:19 199:14 204:9 208:16 210:21 211:9,15 212:2,22 213:3,16 214:9,11,18 215:3 216:3 generally 150:12 175:4 generated 181:15 generis 106:3 143:10 155:20 156:19,21 gentleman 33:20 34:9 George 207:6 Georgetown 199:21 Georgia 64:20,20 84:9 getting 11:2 33:14 38:15 146:15 girlfriend 151:14 **GIS** 206:4,4 **give** 20:6 25:18 38:8 68:10,11 74:22 147:20 149:16 154:21 161:19 162:17 167:14 171:3 187:15 208:18 216:21 **given** 26:18 29:10 68:4 68:7 97:11 101:3,7 104:20 134:1 giving 61:12 73:7,8 217:4 glitches 55:16 go 11:20 16:22 20:6,14 21:14 25:17,19 27:22 31:12,17 34:14 35:18 39:6 42:8,10 47:3 48:12 50:19 52:14 53:6 54:16 56:10 57:16 61:8 63:17 72:7 73:6,10,16,21 74:7 79:18 82:12,15 85:4 104:12 105:7 114:21 115:14,19 117:2

120:5 126:9 127:10 127:18,19 128:17 129:8,9 130:18,21 131:13 132:12 135:22 137:7,15,17 138:15 139:1 141:15 146:5 147:7,22,22 148:14 149:2,18 152:11 153:5,14 157:22 160:10,19,20 162:18 168:14 169:1,1 173:14 179:7 181:8 206:2 216:17 goal 206:16 goes 93:6 going 13:17 27:16 35:11 36:7 53:6 62:14 70:17 77:16 78:19 81:15 83:18,20,22 84:8,22 85:4,6 104:15 105:12 106:19 116:18 116:20 125:22 126:7 131:19 133:16 135:1 136:3,6,15,21,22 143:1,2,5,7 144:9 146:6 147:11,21,21 148:4,4,14,17,22 149:6,10 152:8 154:21 157:21 171:1 171:13 176:6,10,16 180:20 187:22 208:17 **qood** 4:3 5:14 6:2,4 14:5 33:6 36:2 49:18 53:19 64:2 73:6 74:3 74:16 75:12 78:2 82:1 83:5 86:21 89:20 90:13 93:5,8 94:14,19 95:10 99:9 102:5,7 103:19 104:3 114:8 149:8,9 171:7 173:21 183:2,14 199:17 208:20,20,21,22 gotten 184:19 Government 1:1 215:9 215:18 grace 27:13 grant 177:1 214:7 granted 179:1 196:10 196:21 211:14 great 12:14 105:9 126:8 153:14 161:10 greater 53:22 greatly 56:21 Greenfield 1:15 4:12 144:18 145:2,3 160:13 181:9 189:3,5 189:9,10 191:15,20 191:21 195:2,6,7

209:1 217:12,15,17 grounds 15:8 76:18 93:19 98:12 99:17 108:16 group 118:16,16,17,17 119:3,4,8,9 131:15 168:21 185:11 grouped 118:18 119:1 119:2 grouping 118:15 groups 119:7 122:22 131:17 quardian 120:20 140:7 guess 60:5 116:4,17 141:10 142:17 153:1 180:10 188:19 guideline 58:10 guidelines 30:17,21 gun 27:15 gut 187:20 **GW** 207:6 н habit 134:20 135:10 half 14:7 91:5 134:9 137:1 hall 196:6 203:3 Hamilton 2:12,14 11:14 11:19 12:3,4,5,7,11 13:4.6.7 14:13 15:14 15:16,19 24:3 25:15 25:19 28:4 31:5,10,18 31:20 38:12,21 40:4,7 40:11,15,17 41:17,21 42:2,5 44:20 46:3 53:1,16 55:14,15 56:22 60:19 61:1,9,21 62:2,11 63:19 65:16 66:17,20 68:1 72:4,7 81:8,11 82:17 92:13 93:18 94:12 95:11 Hamilton's 52:2 hand 54:2,6 55:9,14 186:8 216:14 217:5 handled 94:4 hands 216:15,20 handwriting 107:21,22 108:2 114:14,16,17 117:10,12 121:21 122:3 127:8 133:1,5 134:20 158:16 183:1 hang 61:3 160:21 Hanlon 215:7,15 happen 72:15 85:6,18 126:4 176:14 194:15 happened 13:19 71:5 142:9 156:13 happens 196:14

happy 4:4,4 31:7 62:5 114:22 115:16 148:11 hard 37:9 39:5 80:18 81.2 Harnett 2:11 11:14,19 11:22 12:2,2,21 13:1 13:1 14:22 15:1,15 16:15 17:14,14 18:3 19:3 22:1,16 26:18 36:15 38:7 40:18,20 41:6,7 42:9 44:21 46:13,15 50:22 54:16 54:22 60:1,15 81:9,11 81:15,21 82:4,10 84:15,17,19 85:6,8 94:6 Harnett's 19:9 29:15 55:11 59:16 79:5 85:2 87:15 92:2 Harris 149:5 Hazleton 208:2,3 head 166:20 216:10 heads 193:5 health 186:11 hear 16:15 22:21 27:20 38:2 51:1 61:3 63:18 83:20 84:6 90:6 97:7 97:8 112:22 142:10 144:6 145:16 149:20 160:8 161:2,5 170:9 194:19 208:15 heard 54:10 71:1 85:12 106:8 132:1 135:19 136:1 141:16 142:8 145:6 171:12 172:1 174:2,9 176:22 190:21 204:14 hearing 25:21 26:15,17 28:7 41:5 46:5,10 65:6 79:2 80:1 81:21 82:3 83:1 85:5 95:16 96:21 102:12 104:18 106:2 160:11 hearings 2:10,17 11:8 83:10 214:12 heart 146:15 147:4 heat 129:19 heavy 86:3 held 18:19 69:17 199:21 201:4 207:18 Hello 6:1 167:6 help 9:21 70:13 126:9 137:20 161:2 helpful 47:7,11,19 138:10 Henchman 11:9 Henderson 158:6,7,9 158:12,17 172:20

173:3 Herculean 47:22 **Hi** 12:2 149:12 high 54:7 higher 81:16 203:17 highlight 49:15 highly-remote 51:14 hire 39:19 historical 156:2 history 17:1 hmm 169:4 hobgoblin 55:21 hold 16:17 31:16 110:2 137:10 155:13 **HOLMAN** 1:18 home 34:19 136:1 208:9 homes 33:16 39:9 honestly 79:4 honored 37:4 Honter 76:6,17 hope 61:5 105:18 107:22 141:18,22 142:3 hoping 105:11 **Horbert** 76:5 hotel 147:18 hours 27:15 47:8 50:12 50:17 156:17 house 187:9,11 205:5 housekeeping 190:4 How's 209:6 hundred 10:5 76:1 hundreds 132:13 Hunter 76:7.16 Hurbert 76:6 idea 71:18 79:8 111:13 identifiable 117:10 identified 20:12 48:10 68:20 70:5 101:5 124:8 185:14 identifies 47:17 identify 17:21 24:20 70:13 133:5 identifying 76:16 88:9 133:4,9 illegal 181:13 illegible 75:7 77:15 99:20 imagine 37:11 immediate 203:16 immediately 123:15 206:8 impact 192:6 impacts 145:22 implement 53:13

implementation 205:18 importance 25:6 49:15 207:12 important 29:19 38:1 55:4 56:5 70:2 84:15 94:3 106:1 180:2,3 imposed 198:5 214:15 214:16,18,20,22 impossible 182:11 185:2.3 impressed 84:18 improperly 19:16 21:10 impugns 178:16 in-person 182:17 187:4 187:5 204:19 inactive 68:8 69:3 77:5 99:20 201:13 incarcerate 208:5 incentivize 53:20 incentivizing 54:2 include 6:13 8:15 29:14 31:2 48:21 75:3 202:13 215:4 included 6:21 11:4 17:5 17:18.19 168:9 190:18 207:4 212:5 214:13 includes 35:6 76:19,21 including 29:12 43:9 148:8 155:7 176:22 inclusion 49:14 50:5 inconsistency 53:15 inconsistent 33:6 56:3 incorporate 69:19 84:22 85:2 87:14 88:2 88:3 incorporated 88:10 99:1 120:13 incorporating 140:5 incorrect 77:19 incumbent 107:7 Independent 211:17 213:12 India 197:9 indicated 15:10 17:12 18:7 19:14 21:4,14 38:20 40:21 46:4 66:12 99:2 105:20 106:5 181:22 indicates 11:9 16:5 42:17 67:5 101:21 indication 43:1 indicator 135:12 indicia 143:21 indictment 95:1 indirectly 164:16 individual 15:3 28:18 66:5 80:7 98:10 120:8

124:6.7 130:5.16 140:3 155:2 182:1,4 183:16 individually 103:3 individuals 19:5 24:21 117:9 124:7 183:13 184:17,18 185:11 190:15 194:7 201:11 206:8 indulgence 16:22 inference 178:16 inferences 136:6 inform 162:19 informal 214:12 informant 49:12 information 7:11 19:17 33:5 34:20 35:6 36:7 42:8,13 44:3 47:7 70:17 72:19 119:20 181:18 188:12 203:7 203:9,13,21,22 206:9 206:11 209:19 210:7 211:4 213:15 informed 6:17 18:17 20:22 initial 15:9 18:19 21:7 41:9 65:12 66:11 78:16 94:2 97:13 98:22 101:10 110:13 initially 180:15 initiated 210:21 initiating 22:2 Initiative 196:20 213:13 injecting 137:15 injunctive 193:20 innocent 187:8 input 206:8 inquiries 204:2 inquiry 7:16 inspection 14:20 98:4 Instagram 33:21 34:11 instance 59:6,9 67:3,22 68:6 112:5 instances 174:4 instantly 37:17 instinct 63:15 Institution 208:2 instructed 83:4 instruction 17:9 58:3 instructions 11:1,4 17:3 29:9,13 30:17 insufficient 18:15 integrity 29:19 54:19 144:1 200:2 206:1 intent 5:18 6:9 intention 192:15 intentional 120:15 intentionally 110:4

120:13 131:3 interact 151:18 168:20 168:21 interacted 168:11 interacting 167:18 interaction 150:3 interactions 148:10 153:12 168:16 intercepted 187:2 interest 135:18 174:1 195:15 interested 37:14 interesting 52:9 interface 206:7 interference 80:18 91:8 151:1 interject 135:17 internal 203:20 International 214:21 interpret 32:22 interpretation 32:19 55:10 interpretive 215:22 interviewed 182:7 introduce 114:5 invalid 25:12 35:3 48:21 81:17 82:5 177:7 invalidate 72:13 145:18 invalidated 111:2 171:12 177:4.10 invalidates 171:20 invaliding 154:18 155:9 investigate 182:3 investigating 180:19 investigation 184:11 investigations 215:4 involved 23:11 54:4,9 85:14 106:6 175:17 175:21 185:3,17,19 185:20 involvement 146:3 150:1 178:12 involves 181:13 involving 15:13 28:14 66:15 100:12 178:5 Isaiah 138:15 Island 64:19,20 issuance 2:8 5:15 **issue** 7:2 31:21 50:22 53:2 55:18 71:14 81:12,22 86:21 103:8 104:11 105:10 112:3 176:9 177:8 179:16 184:7 197:10 issued 8:21 9:13 14:10 65:11,13,14 198:6 210:6,18 211:1

			229
	1	1	1
213:13,18 214:3,6,8	joint 196:2	know 19:22 24:16 25:9	lead 115:8
214:12,14,15,16	Jonathan 12:12	26:19,20 32:8 34:1,5	leadership 204:1
215:11,19	Joseph 11:9	34:7 35:22 36:4,22	leading 32:12 200:11
issues 6:5 13:20 20:3	Journal 199:20	37:8 38:2 39:3,8,17	leads 184:6
28:9 46:4 52:9 65:4	Judge 197:15	41:2 42:4 49:5,11,15	learned 180:2 200:1
70:8 78:18 82:14	judgment 94:17	49:17,20 50:2 51:10	Learning 207:9,11
102:16 103:7,14	<b>July</b> 142:3	53:11,17,20 54:13,18	leave 137:6 153:3
109:18 113:2 180:2	jump 27:17	55:5,19 56:21 57:1,17	177:11 186:6,17
186:11	June 14:14 60:20 93:22	57:20 58:5 61:13 62:7	leaves 16:7 67:7 102:1
issuing 10:8,13	97:19 156:11,12	69:8 72:12 73:5,7,18	111:3
item 5:15 11:6,9 29:1	179:16 200:11 201:7	83:4,5 85:5 87:7,11	leaving 135:9
145:9 180:13 189:15	210:19	88:21 90:2 91:19 92:3	left 99:3 115:22 117:3
195:12		94:15 95:14 96:9	
	jurisdiction 23:11		132:6 199:7
itemized 101:12,15	36:12	106:18 109:14 110:3	left-hand 126:22
items 28:20 100:21	jurisdictions 114:20	110:6 113:6 115:7,18	legal 155:5 195:15
180:9	202:8	116:3,13 117:6	205:11
	Justice 114:13 197:18	118:10,18 119:3	Legalized 158:2
J		120:16 121:9 123:1	legibility 86:20 87:11
<b>J</b> 130:2,3,7,8,9,11	ĸ	126:2,2 127:9 130:18	87:12 139:19
138:22	Kanswal 101:12 102:19	134:2,7,9,10,18	legible 75:10 87:13,13
J-A-M-E-S 138:20		135:21 136:13 137:7	118:22 122:10
	103:11 105:19 110:9		
<b>J.C</b> 1:15 4:10 60:6	110:11 111:2 114:1	139:22 141:12,20	legislation 196:8
144:20 179:6	116:20,22 133:14	143:13 144:3,11	legitimate 152:10
Jain 2:15 97:1,4,4,17	137:21 141:5 142:13	145:21,21 146:9	legs 144:10
98:17 100:13 106:17	143:2 146:4 147:1	147:22 151:15 152:6	Lemma 162:9 166:6
107:9 114:2 136:10	148:10 153:12 157:10	153:3,9 154:7 160:12	167:4,6,9,10,12,16,22
136:12,18 137:5	157:14 159:4,7,8	160:17 166:19 169:4	168:19 169:5,7,10,15
140:10,12,17,19	160:7 162:3 165:1	169:8,12 175:18	169:20 170:1,4,7,11
141:1,4,8 142:5,16	166:8,13 167:21	177:18 178:5,9 186:3	170:14,18,20,21
143:7,12,18 144:7,7	168:10,17 169:14	186:7,14 187:1	length 199:13
145:16 146:1,5,6	173:12 176:4 177:4	188:11,13,14 191:9	Lenk 160:6 161:5,10,11
148:3 149:3,4,19,22	177:20 178:5,6,14	193:14 199:13 217:7	161:20 162:4 164:3,7
150:17,19,22 151:5	Kanswal's 111:14	217:7	164:12,22 165:3,6,10
151:18,21 152:1,5	117:4 145:19 146:14	knowing 72:14 104:14	165:13,19 166:1,10
153:6,8,15 161:4,21	178:12	knowledge 39:12 73:5	166:15
164:2,5,9,17 165:1,4	Karen 4:12	107:19 164:16 178:11	lessons 200:1
165:8,11,16,20 166:2	Karyn 1:15 145:1,2	207:16	let's 11:20 84:6 144:13
167:1,3,17 168:15	Kathy 158:7,9 172:20	knows 148:7	153:5 161:2
169:4,8,12,17,21	keep 61:4 119:10	Korean 203:1	letter 35:15 59:12 120:4
	125:21 126:1 132:9		120:10,11 122:13,13
170:2,5,8,12,15,19			
171:1,7 176:3,11	146:8 166:12 200:18		127:15 138:3 139:11
177:1 178:8,17	keeps 155:20	Labor 200:5	214:6,8
179:15	Kelechi 2:18 182:1,6,20	lack 70:8,22 196:12	letters 122:14,15
Jain's 96:6 106:22	183:8	LaJoy 213:4	127:21 128:1,4,5,16
136:19 150:13	key 76:19,20,21,22 77:1	LaKetha 97:9	210:7,19 213:14,19
James 2:11 11:14 12:2	132:22 133:5,9	Laramie 114:10	214:4
13:1 14:22 64:5,10	139:22 149:19 200:10	large 91:14 105:20	level 78:20 196:8
96:20 138:16,19,20	kick 143:17	163:5	liberal 22:10,11,15
Jane 32:9	kicked 106:11	latest 8:20	37:15 55:10 57:14
January 142:4 199:4	kind 65:9 73:5 83:2	Latina 207:6	Library 209:14
Jefferson 114:10	131:18 135:22 139:3	Laughter 111:11	lieu 208:17
<b>Jehovah's</b> 156:10	153:2 162:17 168:2	law 14:20 23:21 25:13	light 8:7 62:13 176:21
<b>Joanne</b> 212:18	208:3	53:17 55:7 68:16 71:3	limit 70:10 146:13
<b>John</b> 123:20 130:2,3	kinds 68:22	147:12 152:9 154:10	limits 135:19
134:3,5,14 198:13	knew 18:22 86:15,18	154:11 173:15 199:20	line 15:3 17:17 18:4,9
Johnson 212:8 213:4	110:5 175:16	199:21	22:17 31:2 42:14,16
join 105:9 186:4	knock 146:18	lay 102:16	43:18 57:17 66:5 75:5
joined 145:2 209:14	knocked 33:17	layout 208:11	98:9 101:2,6,16 103:4
			00.0 101.2,0,10 100.4
Ш			

110:20 117:18 118:7 119:22 120:11 121:5 122:21 124:3 127:12 127:15 128:19 129:16 129:19 130:20 131:8 132:20 134:12 138:3 138:15 139:5,18 lines 99:16,16 110:21 126:17 liquidated 198:9 **LIS** 201:6,9,10 **list** 15:19 44:1 57:10 66:21 68:9 101:12 103:4 listed 28:20 57:4 75:4 listen 174:9 listening 10:8 listing 57:12 literally 117:21 literature 150:14 162:22 litigation 3:1 195:12 199:10 little 16:17,22 21:22 28:10 37:10 55:21,22 69:21 87:3 128:3 129:17 130:19 137:2 148:14 186:22 209:4 live 13:7 161:12 205:17 205:18 206:2 lived 183:8 184:2 185:8 lives 143:2 living 182:8 183:6,7,10 185:7 local 196:9 201:18 202:15,17 203:5 located 126:18 location 84:9 126:19 163:2 206:10 locations 162:2 163:12 169:1 204:12 206:6 locator 206:6 lodged 41:10 logic 128:20 long 22:6 25:9 68:17 159:20 160:4 186:5 217:6 look 41:15 48:5 55:8 76:15 83:2 113:17 116:14 120:6,14,18 120:19 121:2,3,8,12 121:15 123:7,18 124:1 125:5 126:3,11 126:16,22 127:8,9,10 128:11,11,12 129:19 130:1,2,3,8,8,9 131:4 131:12 132:4,16 133:8 134:3,4,14

138:13,18,20 140:4 142:11 159:9 175:14 180:4 looked 110:21 119:18 124:21 125:9 140:20 141:5,20 159:12,16 183:5,12 200:14 looking 63:16 67:11 75:20 91:12,13 117:21 126:21 127:21 128:12 132:12 137:19 160:3 216:20 looks 130:19 186:8 lose 153:5 loss 27:14 lot 54:10,11,15 55:2 69:18 82:18 85:17 86:3,7 106:19 114:17 117:8,14 120:2,4,9 121:13,17,18 128:4 131:6 133:12 180:2 lottery 71:9 loud 88:12 love 96:20 lower 122:15 Lvnfield 184:14 185:19 Lynfield's 184:16 Μ M 138:18.19 **M's** 138:21 139:3 ma'am 64:18 96:13 113:7 166:13.21 mail 65:1 184:19 187:2 187:3 204:11.19.20 205:3,4 206:5,10 mail-in 204:18 mailed 35:13 202:4 mailing 64:18,21 205:5 main 156:19 maintain 201:19 maintained 215:3 maintenance 201:6,10 201:10 majority 102:15 164:18 makers 53:13,19 making 37:14 54:6 140:4 147:14 172:19 174:4 175:19 man 34:1 manage 47:11 Management 211:5 manner 65:5 72:20 94:10 mapping 200:13 March 2:5 5:5,17 6:8,17 6:20,22 14:12,21 40:1 40:18,21 41:1 44:20

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

45:12 65:16 66:1 97:17 98:5,17 102:10 102:11 190:8 196:10 196:21 197:17,18,18 198:15 199:18,19,19 200:4 201:13 202:1 203:4 204:13 206:20 206:21 207:2,10,10 207:18 208:8 209:12 209:16 210:5,8,10,14 210:16,17,21,22 211:5,20 212:3,6,7,8 212:11,12,13,16,18 212:21 213:2,4,17,21 214:1,2,6,8,10,17 215:2,11,20,21 Marissa 1:20 14:6 marked 35:3 103:3 Market 86:8 markets 34:14 39:9 163:2 Maryland 87:8 183:19 massive 105:22 146:16 146:17 147:3,5 148:7 171:8,20 173:10 match 17:6 20:17 23:1 123:11 172:6 182:22 183:2.14 matched 48:11 159:17 matches 24:9 matching 24:19 39:16 99:21 172:5 210:4 material 49:7 168:7 materials 48:18 162:22 math 103:18 111:3 matter 11:14,18 16:21 21:18 32:13 45:17 51:2,9,15,16,19 52:3 52:10,12,22 59:8 62:11,14 63:13 87:12 92:14 93:17 95:3 104:17 112:1 145:8 145:12 147:5 152:13 161:19 177:21 178:4 179:17 180:16,17 181:2,5,12 185:15,18 188:4 189:12 195:16 196:3,4,13,16 197:2,4 197:10,21,21,22 198:13 199:7,9 215:11,13,19 217:21 matters 47:22 51:1,20 180:14,18,20 181:10 186:15 188:5 195:14 mayor 106:11 107:2,3,5 107:7 113:19 155:6 175:15,22 176:2 192:20 214:22

mayor's 106:14 155:5 mayoral 175:9 McCan 76:6 McCarn 76:6 mean 9:6 22:16 30:16 32:20,21 33:1 63:11 67:11 77:9 88:3 89:9 89:15 91:9 135:18 140:11 156:8 187:18 187:20 193:21 meaning 119:2 means 77:12 meant 81:7 110:4 measure 9:10 196:20 measurements 132:21 media 203:7,9,13,17 meeting 1:6 2:5 4:8,13 4:19,19 5:5 9:20 180:11,22 186:13 190:22 194:2 205:17 209:17 216:12 217:6 meetings 86:9 190:3 201:5 208:4 meets 32:20 member 1:15,15 4:9,11 4:21 5:8,10,11,19 6:10,21 34:12 37:20 52:18,20 53:8 55:2 56:10,15 59:21,22 60:7,13 92:21 93:10 93:14,15 144:18,22 145:3 153:3 160:10 160:13,21 179:3,4,7 179:12,13 181:7,8 189:3,5,9,10 191:15 191:20,21 195:2,6,7 209:18 217:12,15,17 members 1:13 4:17 33:21 64:9 69:15 92:19 126:3 145:4 185:10,12 186:3 memorandum 14:9 mention 39:12 77:12 105:7 152:16 mentioned 26:4,8 53:16 69:16 73:10 80:14,15 103:20 107:16 108:11 129:16 154:17 162:4 168:1 180:4 181:12 203:8 mere 20:19 merit 49:8,14 50:5 Merrick 197:3 message 34:11 107:11 107:12 142:21 163:12 176:6,10,13 met 22:15 32:19 34:15 94:16 201:2 208:8

metro 163:3 213:21 mic 16:17,17 52:18 90:9 209:4 Michael 212:11 microphone 60:15 80:3 80:5,8 96:11 mid-February 162:8 middle 122:15 mind 35:16 80:2.10 128:5 132:9 minds 55:21 56:1 minimum 14:16 53:3 97:21 175:11 minor 142:11 minute 28:12 74:10 137:8,9 144:10 216:17 minutes 2:4 5:4,7 40:22 41:8 144:12,15 156:17 171:2,3 174:17 216:18 mismatch 23:8 25:11 67:16 mismatched 68:21 mismatches 24:14 mispronounce 105:17 mistake 111:22 183:5 187:8.12 mistaken 153:22 mistakes 76:3 misunderstanding 154:1 MLK 39:8 **Mmm** 169:4 Modernization 189:20 modifications 200:19 moment 22:22 126:13 192:7 Monday 61:20 198:10 monetary 39:19 money 54:9 Monica 1:18 3:2 195:15 198:14 199:16 monitoring 192:21 Montgomery 208:18 month 203:8 207:2 210:5,10,17 212:3,21 213:17 214:2,10,17 215:2,21 217:8 monthly 4:19 9:4,12 months 132:12 216:11 **moot** 51:10 52:11 62:14 63:3.3 mootness 62:17 94:3 morning 4:3 5:14 6:2,4 14:5 19:21 26:14 28:7 50:16 64:2 102:5,7 114:8 116:9,12 186:5

186:13 motion 53:6 56:11,15 59:18 60:2 63:15 92:19 93:1,4,12 153:4 154:9 160:12 171:6 178:2 179:2 188:14 188:18,19 194:16 196:11,22 199:8 motion's 60:6 motions 197:13,16 motivation 94:18 move 4:20 5:7 11:13 25:6 59:13 62:14 144:9 177:16 188:21 191:10 217:10 moved 183:9 201:12 202:5 movement 130:14 moves 9:8 194:22 moving 5:11 47:11 130:13,14 MPD 205:2 Muhammad 213:2 multi-page 103:6 multi-unit 184:19 multiple 15:7 46:21 99:12 100:2 114:19 133:7 139:22 Municipal 15:7 66:8 98:12 Muriel 196:17 mute 6:5 muted 96:18 Ν Nadeau 2:8 5:18 6:10 6:16.22 name 4:5 7:12 12:21 13:4 14:3,6 16:19 17:18 18:5,10 43:8 63:22 67:20 69:4 76:4 76:8,15 96:15 97:2,4 105:18 106:14 107:6 114:9 118:1,20,20 121:10 122:7,14 123:3,11 132:14 133:2 134:5,8,11,12 134:22 135:1,7,9 139:2 143:4 161:8,10 167:8,9 183:21 184:4 184:16 185:6 187:15 216:16 named 182:1 names 19:4 24:21 67:2 68:10 106:16 108:10 108:11,13 109:2 120:17 127:14 naming 104:10

narrative 100:21 103:6 126:8 narrowing 119:10 Nathan 212:12 National 192:11 199:20 212:19 nationally 107:21 Natural 197:7 nature 22:18 30:11 38:6 57:14 58:5 74:12 near 185:18 nearly 162:5 necessarily 34:18 48:16 68:22 121:4 122:9 necessary 53:4 63:11 85:11 148:13 need 11:19 34:7 35:4 36:19 39:3 52:11 60:2 64:12 71:8 75:15 79:1 80:17 85:3,9,9 86:11 91:21 109:13 123:17 131:12 135:22 136:21 146:9 157:14 161:11 188:14 204:6 needed 26:1 27:1 37:1 48:2 78:4.5 82:13 83:6 92:16 204:3 needs 56:18 137:6 143:6 153:3 160:10 181:8 negotiating 166:16 Neighborhood 209:17 nervous 34:12 never 80:2,10 94:16 95:17 106:8 142:8 163:18,18 176:14 nevertheless 21:14 63:6 69:2 new 9:12 54:3 68:2,16 199:13 201:15 202:2 202:13 212:3,22 nice 70:9 nighter 116:12 Nii 212:16 nominated 99:3 **nominating** 2:10 11:7 14:13 16:8 17:4 28:17 28:18 42:10 65:17 67:7 97:18 101:15 102:1 113:13 142:6 155:1 175:5 180:8 204:13,15 non-citizen 203:5 non-citizens 196:9 202:17,20 203:4 non-D.C 105:15 noncompliance 192:14

193:21 nonjusticible 197:10 nonsubstantive 190:3 normally 117:5,7 Northwest 97:5 note 7:3 51:13 67:10,18 98:13 103:2 110:19 145:5 155:19 173:8 181:6 183:20 184:12 noted 70:1 92:6 99:6,7 177:22 notice 1:12 5:18 6:9,16 18:17 23:17 38:5 45:9 55:15 70:22 71:2 102:11 119:21 121:17 123:22 124:3 126:17 127:3,7,20 128:4 132:6 139:11 164:1 190:6 191:5,7 192:1 noticed 92:2 notification 40:10,18 45:5 214:5.8 notified 18:16 41:12 44:22 45:3 204:6 notwithstanding 160:20 197:7 **November** 210:20 number 8:16,18 10:10 15:3,18 16:2,9 17:17 18:22 19:1 21:13 28:20 34:13 35:7.8 46:17 49:5,20 62:20 64:11 66:5,9,20 67:9 70:6 73:19 81:16 86:2 86:12 91:1,1,5,10 97:5 98:10 99:5,13 101:2,6,16 102:3 103:4 104:21 105:20 111:1 112:4 127:22 128:5,11 134:9 163:5 175:2,11 177:12 184:2 185:18 211:18 211:21 numbers 84:5 127:21 128:4 numerated 98:9 numerical 52:7 numerically 18:15 19:2 20:13 numerous 132:16 159:12 174:4 NVRA 192:12,18 193:7 193:12,18 194:3 195:18 NVRA's 195:19 NW 13:2 161:13 0

**O** 130:7.9.10.11 o'clock 160:16 **OAG** 199:7 obituary 142:2 objected 79:8 obligation 171:18 obligations 192:10 194:2 observation 53:9 observations 56:7 72:8 observe 165:11,13,17 165:20 obtain 14:17 17:7 97:22 155:6 obtained 117:4 182:14 obviously 9:16 22:13 23:19 46:20 47:14 49:2.10 86:21 159:9 occur 76:13 occurred 59:8 171:13 171:18 172:2,7 **OCF** 216:9 OCFFI-2023-004 215:5 OCFFI-2023-005 215:13 **OCTO** 206:3 **October** 9:18 offended 87:4 Offender 207:19 offer 25:22 158:14 offered 159:4 office 6:15 11:12 13:18 14:15,18 15:11 16:14 16:20 20:19 45:6 64:19 66:13 97:20,22 100:10 202:21 205:12 209:2,11,12,16 210:1 210:11,18 211:9,15 212:1,17 213:5,15 214:10,18 215:3 216:3.4 officer 193:17 204:4 offices 193:6 official 8:13,15,20 9:10 11:2 195:16 203:16 official's 7:17 officially 10:21 11:11 oh 80:6 86:2 111:5,8 125:21 130:20 136:17 152:15 163:20 180:15 187:5 okay 4:3 5:3,21 6:7 10:1 10:6,20 12:3,6,20 13:3,9,13 16:12 22:20 24:5,15 25:5 27:19 28:1 31:11 40:5,16 41:13,20 42:6,7,21 44:2,9,11 45:7,21 46:11 50:7,19 53:5

55:2.12.13.17 59:17 60:8,14,22 61:21 62:2 63:4,14 65:2 69:11 72:2 74:6 78:8 80:10 84:6 87:21 89:6,11,17 92:1,18 93:11 95:13 96:14 97:1,7 102:4 105:5 107:15 109:10 109:21 110:18 111:10 112:14 114:3 116:2 124:18,22 125:11 128:18 129:12 136:11 137:16,18 140:9 141:8,15 147:21 148:2,3 149:4 150:22 151:5,18 152:5,8 153:13,15 161:1,1,12 161:15,21 164:9 165:16 166:22 167:5 169:12 170:19 171:7 179:9 180:8 188:2,21 189:6 195:3,11 209:8 oldest 85:14 OmniBallot 205:19 once 21:10 42:4 131:16 194:10 one-third 91:3 ones 26:20,21 27:1 71:7 119:3,4 159:17 172:16 ongoing 197:2 online 4:9 25:8 202:19 open 32:19 34:3,5 186:18 201:3 215:4 216:13 operate 26:16 38:1 39:17 204:22 operating 49:18 opinion 51:11 63:5 113:9 116:5 125:1 131:3 158:17 171:5 199:1 opinions 116:1 194:20 203:21 215:22 opportunity 26:9,19 28:3 33:8 38:6,14 61:12 63:12 97:10 207:13 217:5 opposed 71:18 112:12 opposite 56:3 opposition 100:14 option 68:11 83:8 186:17 options 26:7 204:16 order 2:2 18:18 28:21 35:3 59:1 78:20 107:5 137:8 148:15 152:10 196:2 203:15 215:11

215:19 ordered 197:15 orders 210:21 214:12 214:13,14,15 organization 181:17 original 7:2 9:16 originally 81:17 101:14 190:18 outcome 51:8 outcomes 52:7 96:2 outline 8:10 13:20 65:4 outlined 26:6,18 33:17 66:10 outlines 29:21 outreach 201:17,21,22 203:3 207:1,3,3,4,18 outside 151:10,12 163:3 outsources 71:3 overall 81:2 overdraft 198:4 overlap 52:7 overlapping 52:8 overnight 116:10 overturn 92:2 overturned 74:20 80:16 91:3 Ρ P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4:1 p.m 9:19 23:16 145:13 145:14 217:22 PAC 213:21 214:21 pad 182:18 page 15:3,4,18 16:1 17:10,18 18:2,4,9 22:17 48:13 66:5,20 75:4 98:9 101:2,6 103:4 110:16 118:5 123:6 124:1,17 126:12 127:20 128:10 132:6 133:22 137:22 139:8,13 141:4 194:6 198:13 208:9 pages 75:2 100:8 102:18 103:3,9,12 104:1 106:15 110:15 110:20 117:6 118:13 124:10,15,16 129:2 131:13 137:19 140:21 159:7 paid 54:22 157:10,14 164:2,3,5,6,7 166:13 166:17 169:5 painful 59:11 panelist 199:22 paper 202:21

parade 39:8 Park 13:12 Parks 156:10 part 34:2 48:1,1 49:2 59:11 108:15 122:6 135:9 139:2 180:10 181:19 193:15 PARTICIPANT 16:12 144:16 participate 34:22 83:13 83:16 87:6 145:7 209:15 participated 207:22 participating 209:22 participation 54:1 87:1 153:5 181:16,20 particular 18:1,8 57:5 57:15,22 58:9 67:16 69:1,8 76:13 81:22 88:11 90:17 95:19 104:1 108:18,22 112:5.6 145:8 particularly 103:17 parties 11:18 13:22 14:11 15:13 63:9 66:15 97:10.13 100:12 102:11 104:16 196:1 partly 187:6 partnered 205:10 207:19 209:13 partnerships 201:18 parts 139:12 party 2:12,14,16 11:13 14:16 18:12 42:18 54:21 65:19 67:14 97:21 99:21 100:17 171:15 196:17 pass 31:5 68:16,22 120:20 passed 23:21 53:18 paste 48:14,15 pasted 49:1 patently 111:22 153:22 patience 217:19 patiently 199:16 pattern 100:5 Paul 156:1 Pause 138:11 payment 198:5 payments 210:4 pdf 48:15 208:10 Pembroke 16:11,13,13 16:18,19 22:4 23:3,6 23:22 24:8 26:4 38:9 45:22 46:1,7 50:11,21 181:3,11 pencils 107:6

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

			23
people 34:5,15 35:10	89:1 91:21 93:20	87:17 88:5 94:22	pre-hearing 65:14
37:9 83:8 84:12	97:18 98:1,3 99:4	115:21 126:5 129:17	66:14,16 69:12,17,2
106:18 109:5 115:14	100:15 101:15 102:2	129:19,22 132:3,3	70:4 78:12,14,18
118:1,3 121:9 132:11	103:13 104:2,6,8	133:20 141:14 152:11	81:13 82:20 97:14
132:22 134:7 143:3	106:17 108:14 110:12	152:14 161:9 167:8	100:11 101:6,10
147:4 150:15 151:3	112:9 117:14 118:3	<b>pled</b> 19:13	102:9 104:5 108:12
156:9 162:5 165:12	119:19 120:6 124:2	<b>plus</b> 45:14	108:17 110:16 142:1
170:10 194:12 216:14	130:22 133:7 150:17	pocket 39:18	182:7
people's 39:12 106:14	150:20 151:2 153:17	point 44:17 52:15 58:2	pre-trial 69:17 207:22
106:16 121:9 143:4	154:4,7 155:1 157:10	58:9,14 77:21 84:19	precedent 90:1,3
percent 8:17 9:6 80:17	158:10,13,18 159:3	87:16 89:2 94:5 95:8	153:10 174:9
92:4,5 154:5 157:1,11	160:2 162:22 171:19	105:14 111:21 113:7	precinct 200:13,15,18
169:16	172:15,21 173:4	113:8,17 119:10	precincts 200:16,19
percentage 169:13	176:7 177:11 180:9	136:1,21 139:21	precise 25:1 59:6
perfectly 75:10 155:3	204:15	141:17 142:12 146:16	precisely 59:5
159:20	petitions 17:4 26:6	146:21 151:21 159:19	predated 103:1
period 9:8,17 24:11	38:13 52:3 105:20	174:3 184:5,8 186:1	prefer 51:12 203:12
26:7,8 38:5 45:8	106:6,10,18 107:1	pointed 39:4,5 139:7	prehearing 13:19 14:
58:18 65:12,22 88:16	113:11,13 117:6	146:18 153:21 158:11	15:12 17:1 18:20 19
98:5 156:16 162:7	118:13 133:19 142:5	points 38:4 46:6,17	19:18,22 20:5,11 21
164:1 190:1,9 194:11	142:7 150:2,6 175:5	53:15 100:18 146:7	45:17,19 47:9,15 50
194:19 195:10 204:15	175:10,12 176:1	policy 20:15 47:10	50:14,14,17 51:3
periodic 213:18	204:13	53:12,19 199:20	prejudice 198:2
permanent 29:22	PhD 108:2	203:8	Preliminarily 105:7
person 18:5 23:4 34:8	philosophers 55:22	political 12:13 23:10	preliminary 47:14
37:17,18 69:4 79:13	phrase 92:3 146:17	83:13 87:6 197:10	211:1
83:12 85:14 110:5	153:22	211:11 213:9	prepare 30:1 37:2
119:4,5,16 127:13	physically 159:21	politics 12:12 85:15	prepared 7:1,1,7,15,2
128:7,19 132:17	164:14	poll 180:14 182:18	154:22 202:3
133:9 142:6 155:21	picked 17:2,11 26:5	<b>pool</b> 184:17,18 185:16	prerogative 144:17
156:4 157:4,9 159:22	pictorial 121:1	population 132:11	present 1:13,17 4:12
162:13,14	picture 33:20 34:10	<b>porch</b> 34:10	5:21 11:18 21:5 43:
person's 123:3	<b>piece</b> 55:5	portal 202:11,13 205:20	113:4 140:15 144:8
personal 107:19	<b>PILF</b> 195:20	205:22	149:2 209:8 217:2
personally 168:19	pin 205:22	portion 91:18 100:22	presentation 176:16
187:18	<b>Pinto</b> 215:8,8,16,17	101:3 122:1,2	presented 78:21 109:
	place 37:22 94:17 111:6	position 21:12 57:1	177:19 208:10 209:
persons 106:9 109:13	•		
perspective 145:17	181:1 187:13 205:3	143:5	presenting 181:4
pertaining 90:12 98:10	placed 204:21	positions 39:13 201:1	presents 197:10
102:17	placement 117:17	positively 87:9	preserve 64:12,13 85
pertains 74:4 194:7	118:5 121:5 124:4	possibility 51:14 183:4	85:10
198:20	131:7	187:7	preserving 87:17
Petal's 76:8	<b>places</b> 79:12	possible 48:4 137:7	President 197:6 199:3
<b>Peter</b> 76:9	Plaintiff 197:4,8,16	155:6 160:22 166:10	199:6
petition 2:8,10 5:16	198:2,15,22	185:17	presidential 182:5
6:21 7:2,7,8,10,15,22	Plaintiff's 196:12	<b>Post</b> 64:19	presiding 1:12
8:4,8,14 9:1,16,18,20	197:17	post-election 210:19	pretty 57:2,19 81:2,15
10:9,13 11:7 14:13,18	plan 25:22 62:3 95:2	posted 11:8 14:19 98:3	123:1 135:11 168:4
14:19,21 15:4 16:8	planning 203:3 204:8	204:10,12 209:10	prevent 198:16 199:2
	platform 164:13 206:4	216:4	previous 63:1 69:16,2
17:2.10.11.13 18:2 12		potential 17:8 51:20	previously 24:9,13
17:2,10,11,13 18:2,12 18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9	play 109.15		
18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9	play 109:15		102.8 104.11 185.0
18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9 25:2 28:17,18 29:5,6	<b>played</b> 199:4	98:18 104:3	102:8 104:11 185:9
18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9 25:2 28:17,18 29:5,6 29:8 30:19 32:6 33:2	played 199:4 plead 142:18	98:18 104:3 potentially 53:10	198:1
18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9 25:2 28:17,18 29:5,6 29:8 30:19 32:6 33:2 34:17,21 42:10,19	played 199:4 plead 142:18 pleadings 22:9	98:18 104:3 potentially 53:10 119:12	198:1 primary 11:16 14:15
18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9 25:2 28:17,18 29:5,6 29:8 30:19 32:6 33:2 34:17,21 42:10,19 48:13,20 56:19 57:9	played 199:4 plead 142:18 pleadings 22:9 please 25:10,18 28:21	98:18 104:3 <b>potentially</b> 53:10 119:12 <b>practice</b> 51:5 114:15	198:1 <b>primary</b> 11:16 14:15 26:2 36:19 60:21
18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9 25:2 28:17,18 29:5,6 29:8 30:19 32:6 33:2 34:17,21 42:10,19 48:13,20 56:19 57:9 57:16 58:19,22 59:7	played 199:4 plead 142:18 pleadings 22:9 please 25:10,18 28:21 31:19 35:5,18 36:21	98:18 104:3 <b>potentially</b> 53:10 119:12 <b>practice</b> 51:5 114:15 205:13	198:1 primary 11:16 14:15 26:2 36:19 60:21 65:18 93:22 97:19
18:15 19:1 20:13 23:9 25:2 28:17,18 29:5,6 29:8 30:19 32:6 33:2 34:17,21 42:10,19 48:13,20 56:19 57:9	played 199:4 plead 142:18 pleadings 22:9 please 25:10,18 28:21	98:18 104:3 <b>potentially</b> 53:10 119:12 <b>practice</b> 51:5 114:15	198:1 primary 11:16 14:15 26:2 36:19 60:21

212:4,9,15,18,20 216:11 principal 176:3 210:13 210:15 213:11 214:22 printed 121:14,16,19,20 122:1,2 128:9 138:21 printing 119:19 122:18 128:15 prior 5:5 8:22 19:17 40:22 162:8,16 prioritize 83:6 priority 203:18 **Prisons** 208:6 private 34:11 114:15 Pro 207:7 probably 41:17 76:17 85:13 116:10 119:15 problem 23:13 problematic 159:11 procedural 50:22 60:1 procedure 115:11 procedures 22:2 190:19 proceed 13:14 52:10 63:6.13 65:5 83:18 115:10 145:16 proceeding 178:4 proceedings 51:3 180:5 216:1 process 7:4,5 8:11 10:12 24:17 27:3 29:19 32:15 33:8 35:1 37:14 38:3 41:2 53:21 54:1 62:6 63:17 74:1 83:13 85:20 87:2,7,9 88:9 100:7 136:14 148:6,19 150:12 157:5 161:22 162:18 167:18 168:4 171:19 176:7 191:7 192:13 201:11,15 202:2 203:11 206:2 processed 202:12 produced 158:12 159:1 181:19 professional 13:10,11 14:3,6 64:17 professor 12:11,12,17 25:16,22 27:9,21 41:21 72:4 108:1 114:12 program 39:15 98:16 193:4 210:1 programs 209:19 project 181:20 promise 161:16 promulgated 59:4 promulgating 194:1

properly 30:4 74:15 86:16 173:20 proportion 127:11 131:8 132:20 proportions 121:7 139:18 proposed 190:6,18,19 191:11 192:5 194:17 196:2 208:11 proposer 7:6,17 9:9 10:21 proposers 7:9,13 prosecutorial 184:10 185:15 189:12 prospect 185:13 prosper 9:15 protect 29:19 protecting 143:22 protocol 168:12 prove 32:9 146:16 147:15,16 171:18 proven 70:16 provide 19:17 29:11 33:6 34:20 42:22 43:9 43:22 54:19 55:10 63:12 79:14 115:7 126:13 138:5.7 162:21 163:1 185:21 189:21,22 193:8 194:9,12 203:10 205:2 provided 7:18 17:3,16 19:4,21 42:9,14 77:2 97:13,15 138:6 171:21 provides 23:7 58:15 206:7 providing 29:5 76:18 provision 24:7 195:20 public 3:5 14:19 34:15 49:19 54:18 150:14 190:11 191:4,7 194:19 195:15,20,22 200:6 203:12.12.19 205:3 209:14 211:4 216:13 217:9 publically 151:13 publication 192:2,4 194:18 195:9 publications 203:17 publicly 47:5 publish 194:6 published 9:3 190:7 194:10,13 pull 41:17 42:1,4 123:17 209:4 pulled 116:11 123:8,11 purchases 200:9

purportedly 117:9 purpose 7:4,5 24:18 70:10,20 108:3 143:22 189:18 192:7 207:11 purposes 4:14 7:7 179:9 196:4 215:10 215:19 pursuant 1:12 8:13 11:1 15:5 66:6 99:10 pursue 178:4 184:6 **pursues** 146:10 purview 199:5 put 18:11 27:2 36:17 43:7 52:18 75:13 81:6 81:11 82:19 94:22 106:14 118:16 145:17 155:22 putting 73:1 Q qualification 197:9 qualifications 114:6 qualified 6:11 8:17 32:18,19 33:1 58:17 205:20 qualify 104:22 quality 118:7 119:22 120:11 121:1 122:21 124:4 127:12.15 131:8 132:20 134:2 134:13 138:3 139:5 139:18 question 7:21 22:21 40:9,13 44:2 50:8 53:10 60:2 78:17 89:12,13 90:11,18 116:4,17 137:5,14,17 146:2 152:11.18 158:15 165:17 166:19 183:3 questions 10:16 14:1 21:22 24:2 31:7,8 38:12 125:12.20 136:13 140:11,14,20 141:8 148:11 149:20 152:6,7 163:20 166:3 166:4,5,9 170:20 203:13 quick 7:20 28:4 44:15 50:8 76:15 89:15 114:6 149:11 160:17 quickly 28:12 34:21 48:3 89:17 150:16 174:19 Quinn 212:16 Quintana 62:15,17,19 65:4 69:11,14 70:2

73:974:278:9,13 79:2,22 80:4,6,9,12 80:21 81:4 83:19,22 84:3 87:20,22 88:1,6 89:4,7 quit 163:21,21 quite 57:7 58:7 76:10 77:13 quorum 2:3 4:10,13 181:10 quote 8:19 23:14,18 29:11,22 30:4,12 55:20 56:2 154:21 155:12 171:14 quoting 29:2 77:7 113:12 R race 23:11,12 31:21 37:16 68:18 races 54:4 **Ragas** 2:13,15 52:3 62:11 63:10,12,21 64:2,3,11 66:1,3 73:12 74:4,12,18 81:18 82:6 84:16,20 86:22 87:9,16 92:4 93:3 94:16 95:11 96:5 96:10,12,13,17,18 98:6.7 100:14.19.22 101:8 108:20 109:18 179:22 Ragas' 93:5 94:15 rain 39:8 raise 46:4 52:9 81:12 81:22 186:8 216:14 raised 38:4 50:22 51:7 78:17,20,22 100:14 103:15 217:5 raises 118:9 **Ralph** 55:19 ramifications 36:21 random 213:18 214:3 rate 92:2 rationale 179:2 re-entering 207:21 **reach** 162:11,16 read 13:15 24:8,8 65:3 175:3 readily 203:21 readiness 200:7 reading 14:11 22:10 26:4 58:12 real 34:21 89:15 114:6 149:11 really 21:1,18 23:12 37:8,15 57:13,16 61:4 64:12 75:15 82:2

83:11 93:7 95:21 106:1 121:1 122:10 122:16,17,19 137:13 139:17,21 152:13 174:2 184:5,21 185:1 185:3 217:19 realtime 39:2,22 reason 17:21 29:18 48:20 53:19 83:6 85:8 92:14 109:1 127:10 148:1 153:17 **reasonable** 33:10 36:9 reasonably 89:21 90:21 91:16 99:14 100:3 reasons 7:13 67:12 69:1 74:21 108:19 156:20 182:13 rebuttal 171:4 174:17 rebutted 158:19 recall 2:8 5:16,18 6:9 6:17,19,21 7:8,13 8:10,14 9:1,9,11,15 151:9 213:13 receipt 30:4 receive 39:15,17 40:10 47:1 190:11 203:10 204:18 205:22 received 26:12,14 28:6 40:9,17 41:14 45:6 82:22 83:7 123:8 190:14 191:8 203:15 210:11 213:21,22 214:11 receives 23:17 49:6 recess 144:10,20 recognize 29:16,17 43:20 47:4 53:11 87:8 114:7 recognized 107:22 115:2 recognizes 96:1 115:5 recognizing 46:20 95:10.12 recommend 176:21 177:9 recommendation 30:1 49:11 52:15,16,22 59:14 90:7 92:11,12 176:19 177:14,16 188:1 recommended 93:1 reconcile 27:5 76:14 reconsidered 101:16 110:22 154:8 record 7:3 12:22 13:5 13:10,17 14:4 27:3 44:18 46:2 60:9 62:3 63:10 64:1,13,17

67:11 73:1,21 83:9 85:1 93:7 94:22 96:16 97:3 123:9 124:8 134:1,4,15 145:5,13 146:10 157:22 160:12 160:16 176:22 179:20 181:7 184:21 186:17 199:13 217:4,22 recorded 4:8 recording 160:15 records 17:6 30:1 33:7 38:17,20 76:15 182:14,21 195:20,20 195:22 211:4 recruit 206:16 recruiting 206:15 recruitment 200:9 rectify 32:7 73:11,16 red 123:14,15,18 redesign 208:9 reduce 86:11 Reelect 215:16 Reese 212:11 **refer** 174:19 184:9,22 185:15,22 186:1 187:20 188:15.18.22 189:12 reference 26:3 57:13.22 58:9 69:19 77:1 85:2 87:15 109:2 referenced 100:21 109:12 referencing 48:16,17 referral 2:17 188:11 referrals 180:17 214:11 referred 211:9,15 212:1 213:15 referring 22:18 reflected 7:15 refused 33:18 regard 21:2 31:21 48:6 61:6 69:13 86:20 115:11 180:5 188:3 211:17 regarding 19:12 22:9 27:10 74:2 94:17 100:18 181:20 189:22 193:11 203:9 206:9 208:6 209:19 211:19 regardless 32:3 37:19 96:2 register 71:13 190:8 192:2,3 193:10 194:10,14,18 195:10 202:10,20 registered 6:12 8:17,18 8:20 10:3 14:22 18:11 20:20 32:3,14,17,18

32:22 33:2 36:12 37:19 42:18 57:3,20 58:16 66:1 67:13,14 67:21 68:5,17 69:3 98:6 99:18 109:7.8 150:18 162:20 165:22 170:13,17,18 178:11 201:3 202:2,5,7,8 203:4 204:17 212:4,6 212:7,8,9,11,12,13,14 212:17,19,22 213:2,4 registering 202:16 registrar 1:20 8:9 13:15 17:12 21:11 22:7,13 36:6,16 38:8 46:16 47:21 48:7 49:3 52:4 58:4 65:3 70:13,21 71:14 72:10,16,19 73:18 75:8,22 78:9 91:6,13 95:19 97:8 102:19 103:17,20 158:20 172:3.6 174:3 176:17 177:5 registrar's 19:20 20:4,8 26:12 27:6 28:6 30:1 33:16 36:4 47:2.8.14 47:18 50:18 63:2 70:9 73:17 82:22 108:21 registration 9:4 23:5 25:7 35:14,20 49:22 57:20 68:3 192:7,10 192:11,17,19,21 193:2 194:3 202:1,3,4 202:19,21 203:6 207:16 registrations 202:7,9 202:13,14 registry 74:20 201:9,12 regular 1:6 2:4 49:6,21 83:12 180:10 regularly 201:4 regulation 15:7 22:9 29:4 48:12 57:12,13 58:1,9 59:4 74:13 75:3,4 90:12 171:14 regulations 15:6 19:12 37:22 59:13 66:7,8 75:17,20 98:12 160:18 189:19,22 194:1 200:14 regulatory 67:6 reissued 14:9 reiterate 26:11 reiterated 21:6 **reject** 91:22 174:10 rejected 26:21 36:16 154:9 158:10 159:15 173:1,5

rejecting 33:5 rejection 49:8 related 114:17 147:20 relationship 160:7 162:2 163:8 166:7 167:20 169:3 relatively 124:11 135:3 146:8 release 203:19 relevant 29:12 30:14 43:10 relief 193:20 **reluctantly** 59:13,22 remain 13:20 35:3 135:3 178:20 remainder 8:10 136:7 **remaining** 101:17,18 175:12 177:9 181:10 remains 49:22 remember 39:13 86:6 remind 22:22 25:9 remissions 210:12 remitted 210:9,13,15 remote 51:19 remove 143:20 176:11 removed 107:1.3.10 110:17 146:14 201:11 removes 32:15 33:8 removing 201:8 render 18:14 19:1 renowned 107:21 repeat 10:7 145:18 159:15 repeats 71:2 repetition 69:18 reply 197:20 **report** 2:6 3:2,3 5:12,15 9:4 13:15 19:20 20:4 26:12 27:6 28:6 33:16 36:4 47:8 50:18 63:2 65:3,12,13 66:10 67:11 70:9 73:18 82:22 83:7 97:13,15 103:21 181:15,19,22 195:12 199:11,14,15 199:18 208:13,16,19 209:9,10,10 211:20 213:18 216:2,3,7 **Report's** 213:7 214:2 reportedly 156:14 reporter 4:7 reporting 195:13 196:5 reports 65:9,11 97:11 211:2,22 212:1 216:4 representative 12:8 80:15 representing 209:2 Republican 98:4

235

212:19 republish 191:12 request 142:13,14 204:3 requested 40:2 105:15 195:20,22 211:13 requester 204:5 requesting 217:1,3 requests 203:7,9,13,14 210:6 213:14 215:22 require 203:22 204:1 required 14:20 16:10 43:22 47:1 49:17 57:11 67:9 70:7,7 99:5 102:3 104:22 145:20 175:11 178:22 200:13 211:5,7,12,19 211:20,21 requirement 9:2,14 10:3 14:17 20:16,22 21:3 32:18 33:11 52:5 53:4 57:3,5 58:11 65:20 70:20 71:11 97:21 requirements 8:19 55:11 70:12 71:21 192:22 201:2 requires 58:22 59:5 requisite 10:10 **residence** 32:9 151:14 183:11,12,22 184:2 185:8 **residency** 70:11,19 resident 87:4 105:16 202:15 resides 6:12 **resolve** 21:18 resolved 196:7 resourced 39:11 resources 39:19 48:2,3 187:19 215:10,18 respect 13:16 18:8 20:8 42:9,11 43:2 44:5 52:22 56:13 57:2 58:14 59:3 71:12 72:5 85:12 87:11 88:20 116:18 117:3 135:21 149:14,15 161:18 178:6,7 180:19 181:4 181:5,10 188:4 190:7 190:14 191:13 193:1 193:17,20 194:20 198:11 199:3 respectfully 100:15 respectively 99:21 respond 97:11 197:16 216:19 respondent 215:7,15

respondents 214:19 **response** 6:18,20,22 7:17 79:10 112:2 197:17 203:18 responsibilities 162:10 rest 141:10 178:20 187:20 **Reston** 167:10 **Restore** 207:17.17 result 53:2 174:5 177:7 181:15 182:2 200:2 201:9 resulted 98:20 resume 144:14 145:10 resumed 145:13 retained 54:20 return 35:18 36:1 61:6 163:7 returns 205:19 revealed 72:13 91:8 Reverend 12:4 13:4,6 24:2 25:15 27:20 28:4 31:5,9 38:11 44:20 46:3,17 47:4 52:2 55:15 56:22 60:18 61:1.8 63:18 72:3 74:9 92:13 review 5:6 7:21 15:9,17 15:22 16:4 19:20 20:4 26:9 39:2 47:5,13 66:11,18 67:4 71:4 73:16 74:16 83:3 85:10 87:18 91:7,8,12 98:22 99:9 100:6,19 101:4,7,21 103:11 108:21 109:20 110:13 110:14 154:22 160:14 173:22 177:8 190:9 194:8.8.11.12.19 195:10 208:12 213:9 reviewed 21:10 62:8 65:10 101:19 110:21 reviews 210:6 213:8,10 213:11.13 revisit 56:18 **rhythm** 118:8 right 4:22 7:19 10:6 12:18 21:21 24:1 25:3 29:12 31:17 40:14 41:10 46:11,15 56:9 61:11 64:12,14 68:15 69:11 85:3,10 88:15 92:6 94:1 95:13 104:19 108:8 109:9 112:21 115:20 117:1 119:11 123:16 125:17 128:21 130:5 132:7 144:5 176:15 187:11

208:14 217:13 rights 87:17 198:21 202:15 205:11,12 **rise** 127:5 rises 132:6 **Robert** 156:10 rogue 178:14,19 **role** 199:4 roles 167:20 roll 20:18 56:13 59:18 93:11 160:17 179:10 189:6 191:17 195:4 201:19 rolls 202:1 room 85:14 147:18 184:19 **Rosa** 156:10 Roscoe 214:7 Rothman 149:4,5,8,11 149:12,17,22 150:5 150:19,21 151:3,7,20 152:4 153:1 rough 91:1 round 149:2 200:6 **row** 135:3 Rov 105:10 107:16.17 114:9 rule 21:19 22:10 29:21 30:3 43:4 51:8,15 52:11 155:2 ruled 22:14 60:18 91:10 93:17 94:5 rulemaking 2:19 59:1 189:16,18,18 190:6,7 190:12,18 191:11 192:1,5,6 194:5,7,8 194:13,17,21 rules 91:19 190:2 192:16 193:11 ruling 196:22 rulings 21:13 **run** 45:9,18 54:8 107:2 107:7,10 143:8 175:20 176:12 running 20:18 176:2 **Ryan** 158:7 **Ryan's** 158:12,21 S S 128:5 S's 128:12 S-E-A 64:20 safeguarding 206:1 safety 33:19 34:3 Safeways 86:9 Sanford 1:19 208:16,20 209:2.6.8

saw 117:13.13 saying 75:11 77:17,18 81:5 111:16 136:2 155:20 173:5 198:22 says 17:12 28:20 29:1,1 29:10 30:3 43:8,11 75:5 77:4,7 126:22 143:19 156:21 172:12 scenario 155:6 scene 84:13 schedule 71:10 **scheduled** 162:12 201:4 scheduling 162:13 scheme 71:3 79:12 84:4 school 27:14 schools 207:14 Science 12:13 scope 67:1 145:22 Scotty 106:13 142:10 142:18 screen 116:16 script 128:10 Scriven 12:12,16,17 13:9,11 19:8 21:6 25:22 27:9,17,21 28:1 31:11,14 42:1,6,12,15 42:20 43:3,17 46:7 72:4,9 74:7,8 82:8 89:12,17 90:14,16,19 92:1 95:15 Scrivin 25:16 41:21 Sea 64:19 search 29:22 seaside 84:9 seat 8:15 **sec** 31:16 second 4:21 5:8 41:7 51:9,16 52:2,12 60:6 60:7 71:14 93:9,10 119:17 147:20 151:9 179:4,8 185:17 189:1 189:2,5 190:6 191:14 191:16 195:1,2 208:3 215:13 216:22 217:12 secondary 101:4,7,21 seconded 60:2 secondly 23:14 73:9 section 58:15 171:14 190:10,19 191:2 206:12 security 35:8 199:20 205:2 **see** 4:7 11:18,19 33:4 41:4 42:2 47:7 52:10 62:15 67:19,20 71:7 83:19 88:12 94:4

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

Saturdays 86:8

117:6,7 120:16 123:12,15 127:14 128:13,15 129:2 132:13 137:2 138:21 139:2 145:9 152:1 153:6 155:8 160:6 166:2 179:2 186:7 196:13 216:19,20 217:2.5 seeing 116:16 131:2 216:21 seek 85:10 87:18 seeking 79:13 150:9 198:3 seeks 198:16 seen 21:11 188:5,8 **Senate** 2:12,14,16 143:4 Senator 11:12,15 14:16 32:2 39:13 60:20 65:19 93:21 97:20 212:17 send 33:20 107:11 142:21 163:12 176:5 176:10.13 senior 181:2 sense 128:6 173:16 174:10 sensitive 61:10 sent 34:10 50:18 102:11 185:9 192:1 217:3separate 63:7 93:2 104:15 151:15 178:4 **separately** 94:5,5,8 series 17:20 serious 142:20 143:16 177:21 seriously 107:14 178:1 178:1 serve 197:5,6 206:19 served 6:16 service 54:18,19 198:6 214:20 Services 205:11 207:5 207:19 208:1 213:10 set 27:2 192:22 193:22 198:12 setting 168:21 settle 196:2 settlement 196:3 seven 75:9 123:10 127:18 Seventy-seven 111:12 **severe** 71:9 Shadow 32:2 212:17 **shape** 10:11 share 95:18 181:17

shared 15:19 66:21 101:8 164:13 208:10 209:18 sheet 16:1 18:1 28:18 28:19 42:11 43:5,10 48:9 57:17 58:3 66:20 75:5,16 98:20 99:15 99:19 101:15 108:22 123:11 124:19 126:3 126:17 129:16 151:15 151:16 164:11 168:6 172:21 sheets 15:4,18 66:6 75:11 98:10 99:12 100:2,5 101:11,14 105:21 110:12 112:6 125:2,6,6,10 145:19 146:4,19 151:6 154:19 163:18,19 164:10,18 170:16 172:15 177:8 Sherice 213:1 shift 162:16 163:15 shifts 162:12 Shiva 197:3 short 62:22 140:20 shorten 153:9 **show** 35:1 116:6 147:5 216:1 **shown** 56:17 shows 118:16 154:11 shy 52:5 **sibling** 183:17 side 54:16 95:7 105:1 120:6,7,7 126:22 127:19 128:17 130:8 136:19 138:21 sides 54:11 126:21 sign 34:21 118:1 120:17 127:1 133:1 134:7,22 135:1,2 142:6 143:4 150:17 150:20 signature 9:1,14 10:2 24:18 25:12 29:7 35:2 35:21 36:14 43:2 44:6 48:10,21,22 68:19 72:13,17 74:16 75:6 77:15,19,20 86:5 88:4 99:10,20 117:11,17 117:17 118:2,8 119:20,21 120:7 121:5,17 123:17 127:3 128:17,18,22 130:4,10 131:22 132:5,19 133:8,18 134:3,15,19 135:6 139:6 141:20,22

146:22.22 151:2.11 155:1,1 156:13,16 157:4,15,19 158:19 159:2,13 160:2 162:7 162:18 163:13,22 164:4,8 166:14,16 168:8 171:10,21 173:11,22 174:11 182:16,18,19,20 signatures 8:16,22 9:7 10:10,14 14:18,19 15:2,5 16:9,9 17:13 18:14 19:14 26:2 27:12,12 30:6,9 32:17 33:5 34:13 36:18,18 37:2,9,12 38:18 39:2 39:6 40:1 47:1,17 49:13,16,19 50:4 52:4 52:6 53:3 54:12,12,17 62:22 65:20,21 66:4,6 66:10 67:8,8 70:7 71:4,16 72:1 73:13,13 73:14,17 79:12,17,18 80:17 81:17 82:5,18 85:16,19,21 86:4 91:18 92:15,16 93:20 94:21 98:1,2,9,14 99:4,4,14,15,19,22 100:4 101:13,17,19 102:2,2,17,21 103:1 104:21 106:7 108:18 109:14 110:8,9,13,17 111:1,14 116:19 117:4,7,15,18,19,22 118:4,14 119:15 120:1,2,19 121:18 122:5,8,11 123:2,7 124:2,2,5,13,15 125:1 126:12,18 128:14 129:3 131:3,21 132:2 132:13,17 133:12 134:2,11 135:21 137:22 139:7 141:1 141:19 145:19 146:13 146:14,19,20 150:8,9 151:8,22 154:5,7,12 154:14,19 155:7,7,10 155:15,16 156:6,15 157:1,12 158:15,18 159:6,17,20 162:5,15 162:20 163:6,9,14,16 164:10,21 165:2,5,6,9 165:12,14,18,21 167:20 168:5,7,13 169:14,19,22 170:3,6 170:13,16 172:4,6 175:3,22 176:8 177:3 177:6,10,12,21 178:2

178:10.19.20.21 182:22 183:2,12 signed 18:13 25:2 32:5 42:19 58:19 106:9 118:21 122:1,6 125:7 130:16 132:2,17 134:12,12 135:2 137:21 142:5 151:2 156:1,4,9,11 158:12 159:3,21 160:2 170:15 182:17 signer 17:8,19 20:17,20 23:15 57:3 67:13,20 70:15,15 99:17 signers 15:17,20,22 16:2 17:5 66:19,21 67:2 70:12 73:6 significant 135:12 signing 33:2 34:17 106:18 121:9 159:22 170:10 signs 23:4 similar 65:8 117:15 118:10 119:22 120:2 124:3 127:6,10 128:6 130:12 132:20 168:3 172:19 184:13 similar-to-similar 131:16 similarities 121:13,21 138:4 similarity 121:18 139:5 similarly 65:8 **simple** 76:3,11 168:4 simply 56:1 simulate 121:10 131:10 simultaneous 60:4,10 79:19 129:7,14 136:9 153:7 187:16 single 17:10 75:5 141:4 146:13,21,22 153:17 157:19 171:10 172:10 172:21 173:2,11 174:11 209:18 sir 31:13 88:5 107:17 113:6 114:5,8 115:3 125:8,16 126:5 138:17 141:14 152:12 174:18 209:6 sister's 184:4 sit 25:14 site 188:9 193:5 siting 29:4 sitting 199:16 situation 34:4 35:16 157:16 situations 184:14 six 57:17 98:18 101:14

123:10 127:18 size 121:7 127:11 131:7 132:20 139:18 slant 134:19 slanting 132:18 slated 206:2 **slope** 120:1 sloping 118:21 127:16 132:7 139:9 **slopping** 117:18 118:6 **slow** 65:1 small 38:22 smaller 62:20,22 128:2 175:19 185:11 **SMD** 201:4 smoothness 118:8 snow 39:7 Social 35:8 software 98:15 **sole** 7:4 solitaire 104:13 solution 202:18 somebody 62:8 67:19 87:4 107:18 110:4 175:17 184:15 187:4 someone's 76:8 somewhat 183:14 soon 105:11 sorry 6:4 27:19 28:2 31:6 35:2 50:13 60:1 60:15 61:3 79:22 84:8 84:16 96:17 98:8 99:7 109:3 115:13 129:10 143:13 147:18 152:12 152:15 180:15 189:3 191:15 **sort** 39:1 146:2 147:5 153:20 sought 197:4,19 sound 54:10 sounds 171:7 186:21 Southeast 64:4 96:19 spacing 120:11 127:15 128:3,13 129:5 131:7 Spanish 202:22 speak 21:22 25:17 46:3 63:19 64:7 78:14 84:8 96:20 102:14 105:2 141:11 148:10 166:7 217:2,3 speaking 60:4,10 94:20 129:7,14 136:9 153:7 187:16 speaks 25:6 special 4:19 **specific** 15:17,18 16:1 30:20 48:8 57:2 66:19 66:19 67:6 71:16

100:17 102:17 103:21 specifically 7:12 31:2 57:11 58:15 91:11 93:4 94:19 103:9,15 108:11 142:16 168:16 172:13 200:7 specification 59:6 **specificity** 19:12 79:4 specifics 147:10 specifies 17:17 specify 29:2,3 specifying 18:4 58:21 spelled 22:19 Spencer 123:20 141:18 142:3 **Spencer's** 141:22 spending 75:19 spoke 183:17 Spring 4:4 St 156:1 Stacia 196:6 staff 1:17 7:1 13:17 47:2 64:10 84:11,14 95:20 181:3 200:10 216:9.10 stages 201:1 stand 88:8,17 94:2,7 143:6 150:14 standard 22:4,12,15 23:1 32:20 standards 30:6.7 standing 196:12 Stanley 210:14 start 119:7 122:22 127:5,20 128:8,12 131:1,14,17 135:8 146:3 147:8 148:12 148:17 216:15 started 33:15 118:14 205:15 starters 137:3 starting 57:17 starts 45:8 state 12:21 13:4 14:3 25:13 57:9 61:11 63:10,22 64:16,16 94:13 96:15 97:2,9 116:5 143:3 161:8 167:8 198:22 213:3.5 State's 198:21 199:5 stated 17:9 20:14 30:18 57:18 102:8,19 112:11 113:9,19 172:13 174:21 182:10 183:18 statement 6:14,19 7:13 58:19 statements 211:1

states 74:14 114:19 181:17 199:2 202:10 statesmen 55:22 stating 216:16 stations 163:3 statistics 9:4,12 status 3:1 79:19 195:12 198:12 199:10 201:13 statute 21:1 23:7 24:9 25:11 37:22 53:12 57:1,6,11,12 58:14,16 58:22 59:5 70:11,20 94:20 193:22 statutes 54:7 59:12 89:19 statutory 22:22 24:7 58:10 71:2,3 79:12 84:4 stay 186:9 steps 61:14 stick 137:22 217:8 stipulated 43:4 stop 147:21 148:1,16 198:5 story 131:18 straight 156:17 straightforward 50:3 57:19 Street 13:2,7 14:7 64:4 96:19 97:5 114:10 161:13 strenuously 79:8 stretch 144:10 stricken 91:19 strict 30:5 strike 178:2 strikes 80:22 stroke 122:16 127:2 130:5 strokes 121:6,7 130:13 131:6 strong 113:14 143:21 175:6 Stroud 1:19 2:7 5:13.14 6:2,6,8 10:20 11:22 12:3,6,20 13:3,9,13 24:4,6,16 25:1,4 38:11 40:2,5,8,12,16 41:13,20 42:3,7,13,16 42:21 43:13 44:2,9 45:10,13,15,20 46:14 52:16,19,21 56:11 58:13 59:17,21 60:11 60:17 61:17,22 63:8 63:21 64:8,15 65:2 78:16 88:15,19 89:1 89:10 90:8,10,15,17 91:6 92:8,10,12 93:11

93:14,16 96:8,12,14 97:1,7 116:17 149:12 161:15 167:12 176:20 179:9,12,14 180:11 180:13 187:3,6,17,22 188:3,16,19 189:1,6,9 189:11,15 191:3,13 191:17,20,22 195:1,3 195:6,8,11 217:15 structurally 205:14 struggle 27:16 Students 207:14 studied 105:9 190:20 191:5 stuff 114:21 127:16 139:10 subject 4:18 9:11 191:1 195:22 196:13 subjected 87:12 158:17 submission 8:22 submit 18:19 24:12 31:22 71:12 192:3 194:17 195:10 204:13 205:21 submitted 6:19 14:13 18:21 41:6.7 65:17 66:4 68:1 73:14 97:17 98:9,19 101:1 116:2,9 190:21 191:6 195:9 203:14 subpoena 154:9 subpoenaed 105:16 142:15 substance 43:16 57:14 58:6.8 substantial 89:20 90:4 90:20 91:9 99:13 substantive 57:19 suffered 27:14 sufficient 18:22,22 19:2 20:14,21 70:6 78:1 92:15 93:19 115:5 175:2 177:12 suggest 73:15 78:1 136:3,16 169:18 171:1 suggesting 83:14 171:8 suggestion 37:16 94:14 suggests 175:15 **sui** 106:3 143:10 155:19 156:19,20 suit 195:18 sum 210:2,8 summarize 77:21 117:2 136:5,17 209:9 summarizing 14:12 summary 13:15 141:12 Superior 193:19 196:19

196:21 198:1 Supervision 207:20 Supplement 158:3 support 6:19 10:11 54:3 supporting 9:21 supports 154:11 158:1 158:4 suppose 151:17,22 supposed 45:18 **Supreme** 198:18 sure 11:3 13:6 14:5 35:20 41:7 42:5 47:9 50:2 54:17 58:4 62:9 65:10 83:19 85:21 89:5 90:11 95:6 105:4 114:7 118:2 125:21 137:11 144:13 146:9 148:6 150:5 161:12 176:7 surname 76:4 survey 205:8 surveys 205:12 suspect 91:9 suspected 181:13 suspicion 186:21.22 SW 13:7 14:8 swear 149:7,10,10,13 149:14,17 161:8,16 161:20 167:13,16 sympathize 56:21 symposium 199:21 **system** 206:2 **Systems** 202:18 Т table 160:13 200:6 Tacoma 13:12 tainted 113:13 175:5 take 10:13 25:8 36:11 36:21 55:8 56:12 59:18 69:12 83:10 107:14 123:17 126:3 126:11 130:17 137:4 139:12,15 143:14 144:7 160:4 171:2 178:1 181:1 187:19 195:3 199:2 taken 113:7 talk 111:22 145:22 147:11 150:1 153:9 153:11 talked 32:10 48:8 67:17 73:2 82:2 200:8 talking 26:5 110:10 111:13,15 124:15 128:9 157:15 talks 43:7

team 33:19.21 34:2.6 34:11,12 48:2 59:3 82:20 83:2 125:15 208:13 team's 37:4 48:1 technical 28:14 55:11 55:16 71:20 technicalities 29:18 technicality 29:17 43:20 techniques 72:19 teenagers 27:15 teeth 193:14 tell 81:6 87:3 114:6 115:21 117:20 129:17 131:20 144:6,8 149:13 161:16 164:20 165:1 168:22 175:17 telling 124:5 tempted 153:4 ten 71:1,8 98:4 99:15 99:19 118:4,13 124:17,20 ten-day 58:17 65:21 71:11 73:15 tend 120:15 tens 117:22 term 200:22 terms 26:6,10 32:13 38:15 41:2 72:16 73:22 80:12 193:9 194:3,20 196:14 Terri 1:19 2:7 5:13 180:11 testament 94:15 tested 207:15 208:4 testified 114:19 141:22 testify 105:11 125:9 142:14 148:5 157:9 160:3.6 testifying 116:18,21 testimony 105:12 108:4 115:7,20 135:20 141:21 149:15 158:16 158:21 161:18 167:13 176:22 178:8 **Texas** 182:2,8,10,15 183:9 text 194:8 thank 8:3,12 10:18 12:16,20 13:3 25:20 27:17 28:1,2 31:11,12 31:14 37:6,7 38:11 44:9 46:7,8,12 50:7 51:22 52:20 56:10,15 60:22 61:9,10 62:3,4 63:14 64:8,9 65:7 69:14 72:2 74:8 78:7

78:8 82:9.9 83:17 84:10,11,13 87:18 92:1 95:3,4,5,9,11,12 95:14,15 96:3,8,14,21 97:12 104:19 105:3,6 107:14,15 110:1,2 111:10 112:14,15 114:2 116:10 125:17 126:8 133:16 140:8 144:3,5 145:10,15 146:6 152:17,21,22 161:15 166:12,21 167:12,17 170:21,22 174:13,14,15,18 176:14,15,20 177:15 179:7,22 180:6 181:11 189:14 195:8 199:12,15,17 208:14 216:8,9 217:18 thanking 95:18 thanks 4:5 7:20 12:18 theories 184:3 theory 21:6 they'd 38:9 **Thicket** 187:10 thing 4:15 29:1 34:20 70:3 75:11 81:12 82:18 119:17 123:6 123:22 139:21 148:4 172:13 things 29:1 56:20 70:18 72:12 73:4 75:19 77:4 83:11 87:7 105:8 108:2 114:11 115:16 118:9 120:10.14 121:7,11 122:18,22 126:10,14 128:15 131:1,9,15 139:19,20 140:1,3,4,4 141:17 144:8 147:7 think 4:11 25:14 27:21 31:6 44:18,21 45:2 46:5,8,12,17 47:11,19 52:10 53:12,18 57:6 62:6 63:8,11 72:3,22 74:21 83:16 84:7 85:4 88:7 94:3 96:1,9 105:11,22 106:1,3,21 107:9 108:4 111:9.22 112:10 116:11 119:13 120:13 121:10 126:9 131:11 132:1,10 133:13 134:21 135:1 135:19 136:1,6 139:8 141:16,21 142:20,21 143:6,17 144:20 145:5 146:1,1,7,15,17 147:4,21 150:7 151:9

153:21,22 156:18,20 159:10 163:21 164:17 166:3,17 169:10 170:19 175:13 176:5 177:13 179:3 186:11 195:11 208:16 217:2 thinking 88:12 121:11 135:5 151:12 third 4:11 29:1,1 80:15 148:3 151:10 196:16 **Thompson** 1:12,14 4:3 4:6,22 5:3,9 7:19 8:3 8:7,13 10:1,6,18 11:20 12:9,14,17 16:16 21:21 22:20 23:4,19 24:1,5,15,22 25:3,5 27:19 31:9,12 31:16,19 37:7 44:11 44:14,16 45:7,11,14 45:16,21 46:11 50:7 50:19 51:22 53:5 56:9 56:14 59:10,20 60:3,5 60:8,14,22 62:4,18 63:4,14 67:10 68:15 69:7 70:1 72:2 74:6 78:8 80:7.11.20.22 81:10 83:17 84:2,6 87:21 88:7,18,22 89:3 89:6,8,11,14 90:5,9 92:6,9,18,22 93:13 94:1 95:4,13,17 102:4 102:7 104:19 105:5 107:15,18 108:3,9 109:4,10,16,21 110:1 110:18 111:5,7,10,12 111:18 112:14,18,21 113:3 114:3 115:1,4 115:21 116:15 117:1 124:14,18,22 125:5 125:11,15,17,21 129:11,13,21 135:14 135:17 136:11,15 137:10,16 140:9,13 140:18 141:9,15 144:5,19 145:1,4,15 148:2,21 149:6,9,18 152:8,15,22 153:13 160:8 161:1,7,12 166:9,22 167:5,7 170:22 174:14 176:15 177:15 179:5,11,21 181:6 186:20 187:5 187:14,18 188:2,10 188:17,21 189:2,8,14 190:17 191:4,19 194:22 195:5 199:12 208:14 209:4,7 216:8 217:13,16,18

thought 132:1 138:12 150:15 thoughts 25:18 thousand 10:4 thousands 117:22,22 132:13 thready 122:12,16 three 25:22 40:22 41:8 46:4,9 61:19 74:19 90:2 101:14 105:8 110:15 118:17 123:10 136:13 137:9 140:19 147:7 150:6 151:12 151:17 157:2 171:2,3 172:21,22 174:17 178:9 191:1 195:14 207:20 216:17,18 three-quarters 91:5 threshold 100:9 threw 156:5 throw 106:22 111:13 112:6,8,16 113:10 172:21 174:22 175:1 Throwing 33:4 thrown 21:8 104:9 110:9.14 172:11.17 173:4 174:6,8,12 175:9 till 85:20 time 5:6 6:18 14:1 18:12 19:5,20 20:4,6 26:5.16 27:13 32:12 35:17 42:19 44:22 47:13 57:4 65:12 68:9 69:18 72:5 73:7.10.15 75:20 81:14 82:7 83:2 86:17 92:9 102:15 106:8 107:5 112:2 135:18,19 144:8 145:15 153:2 160:9 168:9,10 174:1 180:6 182:8,13 183:20 186:5 188:11,22 189:13 190:21 191:10 197:20 203:18 204:1 timeline 47:3 timelines 200:11 timely 6:22 15:20 66:22 98:19 197:1 211:8,13 211:19,22 times 49:16 133:7 135:3 Tisdale 123:20 130:2 133:17 134:3,14 135:16 142:4 **Tisdale's** 133:18 Title 15:6 66:7 98:11 99:10 189:16

titled 189:17 192:9 today 4:5 9:17 11:5 12:8 19:9 21:20 25:14 25:21 27:10,14 36:20 37:4,21 54:11 61:2,19 82:16 85:13 105:8,17 106:2 107:12 109:12 109:15 112:13 141:16 142:14 160:16 174:2 174:10 176:10 177:1 179:19 181:1 186:19 192:3 194:15 195:13 209:3 210:22 217:19 today's 10:3 104:18 209:21 216:6 told 82:13 168:4 tolerate 142:22 176:7 176:11 Tony 106:10 156:11 tool 206:6 top 17:17,22 29:8 43:5 43:6 57:9 76:20 123:20 132:19 166:20 toss 157:18 tossed 76:2 total 15:21 110:12 118:14 124:20 134:9 159:8 202:3 203:5 205:1 210:2,8 211:7 211:12,18,21 214:14 totality 19:10 totally 100:16 town 203:3 traditional 211:6 train 206:17 trained 168:11 206:21 training 162:1 168:2 193:4,4,6 200:9 206:14,15,20 transcript 160:15 transferred 162:10 Translations 202:22 transparency 203:11 traveled 182:12 Trayon 212:13 214:22 tremendous 46:20 47:2 47:21 95:21 Trezell 2:13,15 52:3 62:11 64:3 66:1 96:18 98:6 tried 37:1 172:20 tries 172:8 troubling 53:14 true 175:18 **Trump** 198:16,18 truth 149:13,13,14 161:17,17,17,18 167:14,15,15 171:16

try 33:22 37:2 53:20 68:11 80:16 138:9 144:13 146:7 160:21 162:12 186:4,4 trying 49:4 77:8 80:1 120:17,18 121:2,10 131:10 140:4 184:22 Tuesday 9:18 206:20 Turkey 187:10 turn 16:16 24:2 35:9 46:12 57:8 62:10 72:3 90:5 96:6 105:1 114:3 136:19 152:9 163:17 164:9 174:16 180:11 199:14 turned 17:12,15 18:13 68:7 104:17 151:6 163:18 164:13,15,15 164:18 183:16 turning 176:1 turns 68:12,13 twice 49:16 133:2 182:4 **two** 4:10 7:21 21:22 27:9,14 29:13 46:5,10 53:15 61:13 69:16 73:4 74:22 98:19 100:1 102:17 103:21 106:17 108:11 109:2 109:4 118:16 119:4 120:16 123:9,19,19 126:12 127:22 132:22 137:1 151:7 156:16 157:10 163:21 164:4 169:7 172:20 173:18 180:15,20 190:14 212:21 214:13,14 216:10 two-sided 11:3 two-thirds 81:1 type 95:1 typed 18:10 49:3 **types** 184:13 typographical 190:5 U U.S 60:20 65:19 93:21 97:20 143:4 195:17 196:7 198:14 212:17 ultimately 15:16 16:7 36:5 66:18 100:7,18 102:1 111:1 unable 27:17 unanimously 60:18 93:17 unconsolidated 51:20 **underscore** 118:1,22 127:5 132:8,9,14,18 134:18 135:7

underscoring 117:19 118:6 120:3 135:8 138:3 139:10,19 understand 20:3 22:8 38:6 44:4 53:13 58:2 81:5 137:20 understanding 43:14 45:8 112:1 123:19,21 understands 52:1 58:4 understood 89:5 113:19 undue 75:13 unfair 20:18 Union 214:21 unique 106:2 117:11 133:6 205:22 uniqueness 117:8 **United** 114:18 universe 63:1 universities 201:18 university 101:13 199:21 205:11 207:8 University's 207:6 unknown 69:10 unmute 5:21 11:21 12:1 12:15 64:6 114:4 115:14 149:5 179:5 189:4 unmuted 12:16 27:21 31:17,18 105:4 161:4 161:5 unnecessary 78:3 unprecedented 106:3 142:7 143:10 ungualified 77:12.18 unrealistic 72:22 unsee 21:11 unsung 84:12 unusual 134:6 upcoming 192:2 update 25:7 35:4,19 68:4 98:18 206:4 updated 16:4 48:19 67:4 97:14 99:1 updates 18:19 98:21 190:4 202:14 updating 201:15 upheld 81:1,2 uploaded 164:13 upward 117:18 120:1 132:7,18 use 53:15 106:15 137:1 144:11 146:17 215:9 215:17 user 206:7 **usually** 162:14 163:2 utilizing 94:18

240

			241
v	volunteered 151:21	<b>Waldo</b> 55:19	216:13,16 217:8
	152:2	walk 187:14	we're 7:9,10 13:17
<b>v</b> 2:11,13,15 11:10,14	volunteers 162:11,13	Walker 97:9 102:5,8	28:16 35:16 39:14
104:10 112:1 158:2,6	165:12,14 167:19	108:7,10 109:6,9,11	43:7 53:12,12 54:2,6
195:15 196:6,17	168:2,22	109:17 111:20 112:17	70:17 74:13 75:18,19
197:3 198:13,19	vote 32:4,5,8,10 56:13	112:20 125:12,14,16	77:8,16,17 78:5 83:18
vacancies 200:10,21,22	59:19 60:11 67:13,14	176:17	83:20 87:17 96:4
vacate 214:13	68:17 93:12 160:17	walking 150:15	111:13,15,16 136:21
vaguely 79:3	160:17 179:10 183:18	want 7:3 11:17 26:11	143:1,2,5 148:4 149:6
valid 8:16,16 10:10	183:20 187:10 189:7	27:2 34:22 38:8 39:12	149:10 157:15 176:6
15:11 16:6 23:9 26:19			
27:12 28:15 36:18	191:18 193:9 195:4 196:9 201:3 202:17	43:14 45:22 50:2 54:8 56:12 57:22 61:7	176:8,10 178:1 195:13 216:20
51:7 54:17 62:22			
66:13 67:6 68:14 69:2	202:20 203:4 204:11	62:15 63:12 69:12	we've 5:4,5 21:11 46:9
70:14 71:8 72:1 73:19	204:18,22 205:1,8,14	73:21 82:17,19 83:9	54:10 67:17 136:1,22
76:2 78:7 85:22 91:20	206:5,6,9 207:17,18	83:11,18 84:19 86:20	141:16 176:22 180:2
92:13,15 93:3 99:3	voted 182:1,2,4,11,16	87:14 88:2,3 89:15,18	180:9 188:4,7 189:3
101:18,20,22 103:4	182:17 183:3 187:4	90:10 93:4,7 95:6,9	WebEx 208:4
159:20 178:10,21	189:7	96:9,9 105:14 108:8	website 25:8 35:19
validate 37:18 72:20	voter 9:4 14:22 18:8,10	111:21 112:21 113:8	48:12,19 49:21 79:18
validated 36:6	18:11 20:20 25:1 32:3	115:9,15 116:4,6	80:9 194:6,14 202:11
alidating 201:15	32:7,9,14,20,22 33:3	120:17 137:13 142:12	204:11 206:12 209:11
validity 30:2 58:18	35:7,14 37:19 40:3	143:8 145:17,22	216:5
72:16 94:21 100:14	42:16,17 47:7 57:20	146:8 147:7,8 149:10	Wednesday 2:5
109:14 155:2 158:15	66:2 67:21 68:2,5,8	150:1 159:19 160:4,5	week 205:5 207:10,11
159:5 190:13	70:13,14 76:15 79:19	167:1 173:8 174:18	weeks 132:12 163:22
variation 117:8 120:8,9	98:6 99:18 103:1	178:18 179:22 181:6	welcome 31:14 52:21
128:1 139:13	123:9 124:8 134:1,4	190:15 193:10 217:3	62:9 160:3 166:5
variations 129:5	134:15 158:12 159:1	wanted 10:7 20:14 21:4	167:7 208:19
various 182:13 193:2	181:19 185:6 192:6	21:14 26:3 39:6 42:7	Wendy 2:11,13 11:14
vary 203:19	192:10,11,17,19,20	56:6 73:8 82:14 89:4	12:4 13:6 14:12 65:16
varying 118:10	193:2 194:3 201:12	110:7 152:21 186:18	went 33:16,22 39:10
vast 164:18	201:19,20 202:1,4,13	wants 25:17 95:7 115:8	82:15 84:20 85:19
vehemently 71:18	206:12 207:1,2,16	184:9	86:17 115:19 145:13
Venn 52:8	voters 1:20 8:19 10:3	ward 2:9 5:18 6:10,12	146:4 150:2,8 168:12
verified 6:14 85:19	24:12 25:6 32:18	8:15,18 9:5 39:8	217:22
verify 19:6 70:19 79:19	33:15,18 35:15 36:12	200:20 212:9,14	weren't 71:16 88:14
109:13	38:17,18 49:20 71:4	213:3,5,19 214:5,7	150:15
versus 26:20 62:11	162:20 163:5 165:22	Wards 207:14	West 208:2
99:13	170:13,17,18 177:5	Washington 13:2,8	WhatsApp 163:12
viability 208:4	178:11 193:9,9	14:8 64:4 96:19 97:6	whatsoever 178:12
Video/Teleconference	197:11 201:3,9,13,14	161:13 207:6 213:21	White 76:4 212:13
1:11	202:2,5,6,8,11 204:17	wasn't 23:13 48:16	wholeheartedly 56:16
/ietnamese 203:1	204:18 205:20,20,22	78:12,15 169:2 187:3	wholesale 49:8
<b>/iew</b> 144:8 154:11	voters' 38:16	way 5:16 10:11 21:18	William 1:19 208:16
views 187:21	votes 60:9 93:13	29:18 51:15 70:14	209:1
Vilareal 212:8	179:11 189:8 191:18	72:14,21 116:7	William's 112:15
violence 27:15	191:19 195:5 217:14	118:11 119:1 129:1	Williams 104:10 106:11
Virginia 143:2 167:11	voting 32:11,12 180:18	133:2 134:6,20	106:11 107:3,3,5
208:2	181:13,14,18 182:9	160:18 178:17	112:1 113:9,18,20
visit 207:14	182:10,14 187:13	ways 131:4 137:1	142:11,19 143:19
visits 205:16	200:16 202:15 204:16	we'll 13:13,21 35:9	147:12 153:16,19
visual 208:10	206:1	46:12 52:10 59:18	154:1,16 155:22,22
voice 35:21 207:6	<b>VR</b> 202:18	65:2,3 72:3 74:9 90:6	156:22,22 157:17
/oir 113:5		105:1 114:3,4,7	158:8 172:9,12,13
volume 91:14	W	136:19 145:10 160:15	173:3,6 174:19,20,21
volunteer 107:4 151:19	wait 77:18 85:20 86:18	161:8 171:4 174:16	175:14,15 176:1,2
164:14 165:20 169:9	186:14	180:4 194:5 195:3	willing 21:17 61:10
104.14 100.20 109.9			
169:18	waited 186:5	196:13 199:14 208:15	115:18 150:17

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 241

window 28:8 57:4 73:16 201:7 wish 38:21 63:13 withdraw 21:17 63:15 85:8 94:6 withdrawn 11:11 witness 105:8 107:16 112:22 113:5 114:4 125:22 136:18 137:3 137:6,8,9 140:11,15 143:15 148:15,17 149:1,2,7,21 151:19 152:19 156:10 160:1 167:2 170:5,8,9,12 174:15 witnessed 151:22 178:10 witnesses 144:9 147:17 148:5 172:2 178:9 190:22 191:1 wonder 55:6 wondering 64:6 90:22 147:19 148:16 word 53:15 95:8 110:2 wording 90:19 words 19:2 37:8 61:7 68:16 178:13 work 46:21 47:21 54:11 54:15 55:3 62:7 70:10 75:14 78:3 80:2 82:18 84:18 85:17 86:4,7,10 87:5 95:20.22 114:16 114:18 201:17 205:13 worked 85:15 worker 197:22 198:6 200:8 206:13,14,20 207:15 workers 206:15,18,19 206:22 working 20:2 39:22 83:8 116:10 205:2,4 206:3 works 136:14 205:3 world 72:17 worries 6:6 148:2 worry 160:9 worse 156:22 worthy 46:18 61:13 wouldn't 35:16 68:3,21 187:19 188:16 wound 36:5 Wright 76:5 write 34:8 110:4 write-in 107:2,7,10 143:8 176:12 writers 119:11 writing 121:15 122:12 140:3,6 203:14

written 58:19 98:14 118:20 130:2 138:13 138:19 wrong 73:4 77:5 99:21 143:13 wrongdoing 155:15,16 wrongly 30:15 wrote 76:4 154:22 155:13 156:12 Wyoming 114:10 Х Υ yeah 56:15 59:10 60:5 62:18 69:7 146:6 148:3 149:22 152:15 153:8,15 164:17,17 166:22 167:3,9,22 168:19 179:21 188:19 190:17 209:7 217:6 vear 204:8 years 106:7 114:16 117:21 172:20 173:15 185:1 yesterday 14:10 97:15 Yolanda 212:6 Young 212:18 Ζ **Zemzem** 162:8,14 166:6 167:3,9,17 zero 186:21 zip 64:21 **Zoom** 4:8 168:8 216:14 0 002912 190:9 1 **1** 2:9 5:19 6:10,12 9:5 9:18 42:11 190:10 211:13 **1-1/2** 49:16 1-1001.0801 58:16 1-1001.0803 23:7 57:6 1-204.112 8:14 1,119 66:4,12 67:5 73:12,14,16 1,175 202:8 1,556 98:8 99:2 101:22 1,700 206:18 1,782,253.95 210:3 **1.833** 16:8 **1.881** 67:8 1:00 50:15 1:34 217:22 **10** 8:16 9:6 14:20 17:7

18:18 45:14.18 130:20 211:20 **10-day** 24:11 26:8 28:8 45:8 10,000 198:3 **10.2** 92:4 **100** 80:17 98:8 1015 14:7 106 190:19 191:2 1076.1 32:21 108,698 201:11 **109** 97:6 10th 23:16 97:5 211:5 **11** 2:10,12 67:3 210:6 213:14 1117 97:5 **11700** 167:10 **119** 52:4 62:21 67:8 69:9 **11th** 207:10 212:7 **12** 48:14 159:8 12:04 145:10 12:05 145:13 **12:10** 145:10,14 **12:30** 153:3 12:45 137:6 148:16 **120** 35:14 122 203:4 12th 206:21 13 75:5 210:22 **130** 81:18 **133** 110:13 111:9 145:18 177:6 13th 150:10 **14** 16:2 103:9.12 110:12 200:21 209:21 211:8 **144** 15:22 16:2 67:2 **146** 67:13 14th 198:21 209:12 212:8 **15** 117:21 134:10 214:15 **15th** 190:8 207:10 **16** 15:6 66:7 98:11 114:16 214:11,12 1603.1 32:16 1606 81:5,7 1606.2(d) 74:14 99:11 1606.4 29:21 1607 77:3,7 81:5,7 1607(a) 77:4 1607.1(f) 77:12 1607.1(g) 77:7 1607.3 75:18 **1607.4** 75:18 **1607.5** 75:18 167 16:9 53:3 **17** 114:16 211:7

**18** 14:21 66:1 214:8 **18,100** 214:21 18,550 214:14 180 2:17 180-day 9:17 **181** 2:18 81:17 189 2:19 18th 6:20,22 40:22 41:1 44:20 45:3 98:5 102:11 200:4 214:6 19 101:17 211:22 214:12 195 3:1 1969 114:10 **1980** 158:4 199 3:2 1993 192:12 **1994** 85:16 19th 40:19 41:12 45:12 102:12 206:3 1E07 209:18 2 **2** 15:11 66:13 123:6 124:1 128:5,11 133:22 166:17,18 2,000 14:18 26:2 27:11 32:17 36:17 37:12 39:6 47:1 54:9 65:20 70:7 79:14.14 86:2.4 86:12,16 92:16 97:22 155:7 206:17 2,010 202:2 **2,288** 99:4 2.306 177:13 2,383 102:2 **2,500** 54:9 206:17 **2,595** 14:19 15:2 17:13 37:2 65:21 73:13 2,884 202:2 200 36:14 92:16 **20001** 97:6 20016 161:14 2002 106:10 107:4 **20032** 13:8 64:4 96:19 **20037** 13:2 2018 53:18 20191 167:11 **2020** 180:19 181:20 183:19 200:2 **2022** 142:3,4 189:21 210:20 211:3 **2023** 201:10 210:22,22 215:14 **2023-2025** 200:22 **2024** 1:9 2:5 5:5,17 9:4 9:18 14:12,15,22 15:11 60:20 66:1,13

93:22 97:16,17,19	211:8,22 213:15,19	202:5	<b>9</b> 211:14
98:6,17 100:10	<b>3.201</b> 98:1,8	<b>500</b> 198:5	<b>9:00</b> 50:16
179:16 190:8 196:1	<b>3,300</b> 146:20	<b>501</b> 158:3	<b>9:30</b> 1:12
198:12 199:19 200:6	<b>30</b> 8:21 101:13 106:7	<b>51</b> 110:13	9:35 4:2
200:17 204:8,10,16	206:21	<b>54,476</b> 9:5	90-day 201:7
204:16 205:8 206:16	<b>30-day</b> 194:11,18	<b>540</b> 156:15	<b>95,220</b> 201:12
206:21 208:8 209:12	195:10	<b>55</b> 204:20	<b>96</b> 2:16
209:16 210:5,8,14,16	<b>30,000</b> 107:6	<b>56</b> 111:2 177:6	002.10
210:17 212:4,6,7,8,12	<b>30010</b> 64:19	5th 142:3 216:6	
212:13,14,16,21	<b>304</b> 161:13	501 142.5 2 10.0	
213:2,4,17 214:1,6,8	<b>306</b> 145:20 146:13	6	
214:10,17 215:2,9,12	178:21	<b>6</b> 2:5 5:5 14:12 18:9	
215:17,20,21 216:6	<b>307</b> 146:12	42:14 43:18 65:16	
<b>203</b> 67:12	<b>309.5</b> 190:10	97:17 126:17 207:14	
<b>208</b> 3:4 203:6	<b>31</b> 201:13	<b>62</b> 2:14	
<b>208</b> 3.4 203.0 <b>209</b> 202:6	<b>31561</b> 64:21		
		68,215.85 210:14	
<b>20th</b> 196:1,10	<b>31st</b> 156:11,12 198:12	6th 40:1 199:4,19 204:14 212:16 213:4	
<b>21</b> 211:1,2	<b>32</b> 210:6	204.14 212.10 213.4	
<b>216</b> 3:5	<b>321</b> 13:2	7	
<b>21st</b> 197:18	<b>322</b> 99:19		
<b>22</b> 210:19 211:21	<b>33</b> 211:13	<b>7</b> 64:3 126:17 212:9	
<b>220</b> 98:20	<b>342</b> 99:15	213:3 214:5,7	
<b>2221</b> 13:1	<b>35</b> 92:5	<b>7-day</b> 190:9	
<b>22nd</b> 197:17 210:14	<b>3504</b> 64:3 96:18	<b>71</b> 75:16 190:8	
213:22 215:11	<b>36</b> 213:8	<b>714</b> 67:5	
<b>24</b> 47:8 50:12,17 101:17	<b>3601</b> 161:13	<b>719</b> 80:13,19	
156:17 210:22	<b>383</b> 102:2 104:21	<b>725</b> 66:12	
<b>24-hour</b> 156:15	110:10	<b>73</b> 75:16	
<b>240</b> 67:16 68:20 69:9	<b>388</b> 99:4	<b>75</b> 205:1	
72:11	<b>38th</b> 161:13	<b>750</b> 14:8	
<b>24th</b> 150:11 213:2	<b>3rd</b> 150:10 212:6	<b>7600</b> 13:12	
<b>25</b> 204:22		<b>762</b> 16:5	
<b>25th</b> 208:8 210:16	4	<b>77</b> 111:4,9,15,19 177:3	
213:21 215:20	<b>4</b> 2:2,3,5 14:15 60:20	<b>776</b> 15:10	
<b>262</b> 42:11	65:14 160:16	<b>78</b> 157:1	
<b>27</b> 209:16	<b>4,894</b> 202:4	<b>786</b> 158:3	
<b>276</b> 101:11 110:16	<b>4:57</b> 40:21	<b>79.53</b> 210:16	
124:19 126:3,4,11,17	<b>40</b> 98:20 118:14 124:20	7th 96:18 212:11,12	
129:16,22 138:1	125:1 135:21 141:1		
139:8	146:19 159:6	8	
<b>277</b> 101:11 110:16	<b>41</b> 207:3	<b>8</b> 5:17 39:8 126:17	
124:19	<b>42</b> 210:18	129:16,19 138:15	
<b>278</b> 124:20 138:13,14	<b>424.1</b> 171:15	212:14 213:6,11,12	
<b>27th</b> 197:18	<b>43</b> 211:12	<b>80</b> 111:8	
<b>28</b> 213:10	<b>44,898</b> 202:12	<b>813</b> 99:2	
28th 196:21 212:13	<b>443585</b> 64:12	<b>818</b> 101:22	
<b>29</b> 9:3	<b>450</b> 214:20	<b>82070</b> 114:10	
<b>291</b> 110:17 124:20	<b>451,499</b> 201:14	<b>83</b> 196:20	
<b>292</b> 101:11	<b>48</b> 27:15	<b>841</b> 206:21	
<b>29th</b> 98:17 205:6 215:6	4th 93:22 97:15,19	<b>85</b> 13:7	
215:14	179:16 212:18	<b>856</b> 15:2	
<b>2nd</b> 100:10		866 15:10 16:5	
	5	<b>87</b> 111:7	
3	<b>5</b> 1:9 2:7,9 166:18	871,502.58 210:9	
<b>3</b> 15:6 66:7 98:11 99:10	169:15 192:8 207:14	8th 6:8,17 198:15	
		210:20 212:3	1
113:18 154:4 157:11	<b>5,448</b> 9:6	210.20 212.3	
	<b>5,448</b> 9:6 <b>5:00</b> 9:19 23:16		

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Board Meeting

Before: DC BOE

Date: 04-05-24

Place: teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate complete record of the proceedings.

near Lans &

Court Reporter

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE. 200 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-7831

(202) 234-4433