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(HELD IN OPEN COURT AT 9 A.M.)
THE COURT: Good morning. You-all may be seated. Okay. I think we can -- before we get started, any matters I need to take up before we start back this morning? MR. NKWONTA: Yes, Your Honor. May I raise a few logistical matters quickly?

THE COURT: We11, the key word's "quickly."
MR. NKWONTA: Thank you, Your Honor.
For the first logistical matter is Ms. Stinetorf, who is testifying via Zoom. I believe that wé are as far along as we can be in setting up Ms. Stinetori Ideally, she would go after a prescheduled break, like iunchtime, so that the Zoom room can be opened and she can log in, but sort of be in a waiting room such that when it's time for her to testify there won't be, you know, any of the delays that we saw last time.

Obviously defer to Ms. Wright as to what is the best way to do Enat, but we're prepared to have her sort of log in and sit in the waiting room during the lunch hour so that there is a seamless transition to her testimony, if that is permissible.

The second, Mr. Germany is scheduled to testify this afternoon. We subpoenaed him. Defendants subpoenaed Mr. Germany as well, but he is -- he was not on their original witness list. And I just want to clarify or confirm that he would be appearing only as a plaintiffs' witness and wanted to
make sure that the Court agreed.
THE COURT: Well, I think the whole point about witnesses is to let the other side know so they can be prepared. If you have him coming, you don't want them to be able to call to, say, on direct? You just want them to be able to do a cross-examination on him? I don't think they're going to be upset about that at all. Let me think about that one. Let me think about that one.

MR. NKWONTA: Well, the main thing, Your Honor, is that Mr. Germany has been subpoenaed and has concerns about having to come back again after this testimony today. So that's sort of the main thing.

THE COURT: Well, I agree, I hate to have to have him come back. Mr. Wynne, incther words, can you take care of what you need to take care of on cross-examination this afternoon?

MR. WYiñ: Your Honor, we'll do what we can. I can't guarantee, because it's going to depend on what else happens. We'11 do our very best. I suggest, you know, we leave these issues in the hands of Your Honor to make the calls as they come up.

THE COURT: Well, that's definitely going to happen.
MR. WYNNE: It's going to happen anyway.
THE COURT: It's going to happen anyway.
MR. WYNNE: So I'm going to leave it to you.

THE COURT: You subpoenaed Mr. Germany? MR. WYNNE: We did subpoena Mr. Germany. MR. NKWONTA: But he was not on their witness list, so...

THE COURT: Sometimes if you know about it -MR. WYNNE: Look --

MR. NKWONTA: Your Honor, what I'm suggesting is Mr. Germany just appear today. Because he was subpoenaed by plaintiffs. He appeared today. So he's notdriving back and forth from Atlanta.

THE COURT: I agree with you there. I guess, can you -- would you allow them to cali him out of place and then do a direct on him today?

MR. NKWONTA: Your Honor, we stand on our objection. We believe their examination should be confined within the scope of the direct because he was not a witness that they designated.

THE COURT: I understand that. My only concern is that -- I agree with you. I have already excluded -- like Secretary of State Raffensperger, not on the list, but you have a situation where you know he's coming, you've got him coming, he's here. Sometimes it's just a little maybe a courtesy both ways.

MR. NKWONTA: I understand, Your Honor.
THE COURT: With Raffensperger, I agree with you totally. He's out.

MR. NKWONTA: Understood Your Honor. Next point, briefly --

THE COURT: Well, we've got to resolve, though, how we're going to handle it generally.

MR. WYNNE: Your Honor, I want to make one thing clear about this nitpicking. As you know, we --

THE COURT: It's not nitpicking.
MR. WYNNE: No.
THE COURT: It's like people that tell me, where's the technicality? Well, I call it the Constitution, so.... MR. WYNNE: We refer to they refer to the original witness list, the original exhibit list, May 24th. Our prior counsel did not designate an expert, did not take a deposition of expert, did not askfor a jury trial. We got all the exhibits in relativity -- we're scrambling at last minute. I'm sorry if we didn't include it, but we're doing the darn best we can with our hands tied behind our back.

THE COURT: Let me say this again. I have no comments on what Mr. Bopp did or didn't do. But I cannot go against what the plaintiffs have a right to say and argue. It's just because Mr. Bopp -- and I'm not saying he didn't do anything correctly, but either way, plaintiffs have a right to say we insist on the rules being followed. We're going to follow them.

So what I'm suggesting, talk it over with your fellow counsel. It's when Ryan Germany comes today, you do your direct.

MR. EVANS: And, Judge, I'11 -- Ryan Germany --
THE COURT: Well, we can only one have attorney at a time.

MR. WYNNE: Your Honor, one other thing, and I know and we're bound by the rules and we respect that. What I'm saying is, we have almost a full courtroom here. I'm sure we have some reporters. So we do not want Mr. Bopp's failings inured to our client or these fine lamyers here and I want to make that clear to whoever's listcining that he made some huge mistakes and that's why we find ourselves here and I'd ask your counsel not to take if out on us.

THE COURT: Nell, that's the last time I'm going to talk about Mr. Boco now. Whatever concerns you-all have with Mr. Bopp, that's-- it's between his clients and you-all. The Court may have to get involved with it later, but right now it's not an issue we're going to deal with.

Here's what I suggest. You talk it over with your fellow attorneys. When Ryan Germany comes this afternoon, I really would like to ask you, you do your direct, and then when you finish your direct, let them call him out of turn, let them do their direct, they can do their cross, then you get to do your cross.

Again, legal standing I am not disagreeing with you. If it's not on their list. But I always take the position, if he's coming anyway and you know about him, you've got him on your list, why not just -- Ryan Germany is not going to say anything that anybody in this courtroom doesn't know what he's going to say. You know? So let's do that.

But talk to fellow counsel. You know, there are two witnesses I've tried -- how many of these cases have I tried now? Ryan Germany and the Pastor that's over the Sixth District AME churches testify at just aboút every one of them. So I practically know what the two of them are going to say before they say it. I can almost say it for them. They can put me on that stand and testafy. Let's work it out, okay?

MR. NKWONTA: Understood, Your Honor. We'11 work it out.

THE COURT All right. Reverend Jackson -- no, not Reverend Jackson -- Pastor -- Bishop Jackson. We're supposed to go to lunch when all these cases are over with. He's paying.

Let's do that. Okay? All right. What's the next thing?

MR. NKWONTA: The next point, briefly, Your Honor, yesterday Your Honor made an evidentiary ruling with respect to a statement that Mr. Turner made during the cross-examination. We would respectfully request an
opportunity to seek reconsideration of that ruling. And what we would propose is, first, we have a very short bench brief that we can make available to the Court, but what might be --

THE COURT: Just tell me now. Why does that hearsay get to come in?

MR. NKWONTA: Well, there is Eleventh Circuit case law and case law from other courts, within the Eleventh Circuit and outside, that establishes that once opposing counsel elicits the potentially inadmissible evidence during cross-examination, either by directly asking about the potentially inadmissible evidence or taking a position that requires the witness to testify about that inadmissible evidence or to create an inference that requires admission of that evidence, then that opens the door to the other side on redirect being able to explore that topic or to be able to have that evidence comes in.

THE COURT: A11 right. Let me say, at this point in time I'm sticking by my ruling. I'll think about it and get back with you. I don't need a brief.

MR. NKWONTA: Fair enough.
But what I would suggest or request is, if we be permitted to make a proffer of that testimony which can be sequestered just to preserve our rights --

THE COURT: I'11 allow you to do that at the appropriate time, but not right now.

MR. NKWONTA: Mr. Turner is about to testify. So in other words, during the redirect --

THE COURT: Go ahead and make your proffer and then I'11 hear from you, Mr. Evans.

MR. NKWONTA: No. The proffer -- what I mean by the proffer is, during the redirect there would be a section of the redirect where we would stop the redirect and then make a proffer and ask the witness those questions so that we can preserve on the record --

THE COURT: At this point in tiné I'm going to stick by my ruling.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Jidge.
THE COURT: Thank ycu.
What's next?
MR. NKWONTA: We also have deposition designations that we wish to play at some point before the close of our case.

THE COURT: I think what my ruling was that, as it comes up, if you present your case and as they present their case, if there's a deposition designation just say it. If there's no objection, you can either read it into the record or point out to me where it's at and I can read it later when I'm getting ready to make a determination. I really don't need a video, but if you've got a video of it, I will watch the video of it. I'd rather do it as it comes up, that way I
can rule on objections and go from there.
MR. NKWONTA: Thank you, Your Honor.
And last point. I want to renew our request for judicial notice, which we were not able to address yesterday. We sent the underlying documents to opposing counsel.

The request for judicial notice relates to the lawsuit that was filed by True the Vote and some subpoenas that were issued by defendants. And I believe opposing counsel's objection was relating to the documents not being certified, but I -- I -- what we are seeking --

THE COURT: That's not a requirement.
MR. NKWONTA: What we are seeking to admit are adjudicated facts based on incontrovertible statements.

THE COURT: What do you -- I guess I'm going to ask, what -- I'm going to hear from you, Mr. Wynne, but at what point in time are vou asking the Court to consider these matters, this judicial notice?

MR. NKWONTA: We11, we are prepared to submit a motion or we are prepared to submit them to the Court right now. We wanted to get the Court's preference as to how we present that.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Wynne.
MR. WYNNE: Your Honor, I got an e-mail last night.
And we were in the middle, obviously, preparing for today. And so I'd ask that -- you know, I didn't see, first of all, a
foundation. And I'd ask -- give me the weekend to read them and then be properly informed to address them. I stand by my objections for now, but they don't seem to be essential for the witness who's coming up.

THE COURT: What do you have to say about that?
MR. NKWONTA: First -- we're willing to give opposing counsel until Monday and address it then and we can address any objections then.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what we're going to do. First thing Monday morning at 9 o'clock, counsel will tell me whether he objects or not. If he objects, then you will have a right to say, well, didge, this is why you still should let them in. And I'll yo ahead and rule after you make all your -- if he doesn't ©bject, we'll take them all at one time. The ones he object on, I'll give you the right to say, well, here's why you should still do it, Judge, and I'll rule right here from the bench.

MR. NKWONTA: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
If not, Mr. Turner, come back and take the stand.
And, Mr. Evans, you resume your cross-examination. Good morning. How are you doing, sir? Mr. Turner, I just want to remind you, you're still under oath so you don't have to take another oath. You can be seated. And once you're seated and ready, then Mr. Evans can start his

13 CROSS-EXAMINATION (continued)
14 BY MR. EVANS:
15 Q. Mr. Turner, I hope you had a good evening yesterday. And 16 we're going to try to zip along here and I'm going to kind of 17 jump right into it. didn't have any other discomfort about voting in the 2020

21 Senate runoff, did you?
22 A. To answer your question directly, no.
23 Q. No one screamed at you when you voted in the 2020 Senate
examination on you again.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. EVANS: Judge Jones, thank you. And I'm going to be efficient, quick. I can sense the Court's desire to move things along. I'm going to do exactly that.

THE COURT: Smart man.
MR. EVANS: We11, thank you.

GAMALIEL WARREN TURNER, SRO having been previously duly sworn, resumes the stand and testified as follows:

Based upon what you told me yesterday, other than you having to make some calls about getting your ballot, you runoff, did they?
A. No.

1 Q. No one terrorized you when you voted in the 2020 Senate 2 runoff, did they?

3 A. Not a person, no.
4 Q. No one threatened you when you voted in the 2020 Senate 5 runoff, did they?

6 A. Not a person, no.
7 Q. No one coerced you when you voted in the 2020 Senate 8 runoff, did they?

9 A. Not a person, no.
10 Q. And other than voting - other than having to make a
11 couple calls to get your ballot, you had no other discomfort 12 or inconvenience in voting in the 2020 Senate runoff, did you?

13 A. I have to answer yes to that.
14 Q. And what else?
15 A. The acceptance that the process is not working; the 16 acceptance that $I$ am going through things that other people do 17 not go through; the acceptance that this is not the first 18 time, it's a continued problem. So in that case, I can't -- I 19 can't give you that -- I can't give you that in a positive. Q. And the process you're referring to is what we discussed 21 yesterday, which is the not forwarding of an absentee ballot

23 A. Yes, that's a flawed process, as you have stated so clearly.
Q. In 2020 you lived in California, right?

1 A. Yes, I did.
2 Q. You didn't live in Georgia, did you?
3 A. I was physically working and living -- living in
4 California, but it was not my residence.
5 Q. And because you're in California, you didn't know what
6 the environment was like in Georgia, did you?
7 A. I did.
8 Q. Were you in Georgia?
9 A. Not physically.
10 Q. So how would you have known what the environment was like
11 in Georgia when you were living all the way across the country
12 in California?
13 A. I stay very connected with everything that's going on in 14 my state and in my city.

15 Q. But you didn't have any personal knowledge because you 16 weren't in Georgia were you?

17 A. I had personal knowledge.
18 Q. How did you have personal knowledge when you were not in the state of Georgia?

THE COURT: Let me say this before he answers that questions. If he starts repeating hearsay this time, you know --

MR. EVANS: I'11 object, Judge.
THE COURT: Yeah. All right. MR. EVANS: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: In terms of actual language, to stay away from the hearsay, I am connected in terms of conversation on a daily basis with my insurance agent, that also happens to be my state representative. My classmate, who also happens to be a state representative. My church mate that also happens to be city council representative.

So, therefore, in that language, and I've been before you, before the Court, I am older than they are. They come to me to speak to me and my thought process in terms of what is going on in the past and which moves the should make. So without the hearsay, yes, sir, I'm very connected to what's going on in my city and my state

MR. EVANS: And I'17 object, Judge, just to put it on the record, to the extent that Mr . Turner alludes to any conversations that took place outside of this courtroom.

THE COURT Say that again? Any conversation that took place outs de of this courtroom.

MR. EVANS: To the extent that he's offering the truth of the statement that he knew about the environment. He offered no specific statements, but I want to put that on the record to preserve that.

THE COURT: Well, you can, but I haven't heard anything he said wrong. I've listened to him very closely. He never said what anybody said. You asked him how he knew, and he told you he knew from phone conversation. But he
didn't say what the conversations were.
MR. EVANS: Yep. That's fair, Judge. And I'11
follow up on that.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. EVANS: Thank you.
BY MR. EVANS:
Q. So, Mr. Turner, no one told you what the environment was like in Georgia in the 2020 Senate runoff, did they?
A. You're talking about before, leading upto or after?
Q. Let me strike that question. I'm going to take that one off and throw another one that might be a bit better.

Other than what people told you about what Georgia was like in the 2020 Senate runoft, you have no personal knowledge of what Georgia was like for the 2020 Senate runoff, do you? A. Yes, I do.
Q. How?
A. Once again, to make it clear, I am a pillar of that community in my own sort. I advise other church people, children, youth. I speak on voting. I have spoke on voting all my life. I have been a part of the civil rights movement as a child and as an adult with a unique concern about the problems associated with voting especially in my community.

So, yes, sir, I don't have to physically be there to know what's going on. I don't have to physically be there when I have stood in line prior to October runoff to try to vote and the difficulties associated with the absentee ballot.

Yes, sir, I was very, very aware. I stated earlier, yesterday, that we were tracking the receipt of those absentee ballots in Atlanta; Albany, Georgia; Columbus, Georgia, with my personal friends. So, yes, there is a unique understanding, a concern about the climate, not only that climate but the climate of the nation.
Q. So let me -- I'm going to try to limit this down. If you can answer this question, this'll go quick.
A. Yes.
Q. You have no personal knowledge because you weren't in Georgia in the 2020 Senate runoffabout what the environment was like at that point, do you?
A. I agree that I was not in Georgia. I disagree that I have no personal knowledge.
Q. How did you have personal knowledge of what was going on in Georgia when you --

THE COURT: Hold on. I have an objection.
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: This has been asked and answered multiple times.

THE COURT: He's right. He's answered this question, Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Okay. That's fair, Judge.
BY MR. EVANS:
Q. Are you represented by counsel in the trial today?

1 A. No, I'm not. Not directly or indirectly, to my
2 knowledge. I'm just a witness.
3 Q. Have you communicated with any attorneys about testifying 4 today?

5 A. No, I have not.
Q. So you have never communicated with any of these lawyers here?
A. You said testifying today. I am a witness --

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on, hold on, sir.
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Your Honor, relevance.
MR. EVANS: This -- if I could, Judge. This goes directly to intent. Our case is going to show that this was a case brought about by Fair Fight to prove a narrative that no facts existed and each of these witnesses are mere pawns to pursue that. So we aro entitled to determine how he got brought in, what his intent is, and it also sheds lights on what Fair Fights intent is in bringing this case.

THE COURT: I'll allow him to answer the question whether he talked to any lawyers, not what the conversation was, but the question is did he talk to any lawyers.

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: And I would -- yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. EVANS: Well, and, Judge, just for the record, he said he's not represented by any of the lawyers here.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. EVANS: Or lawyers at all, so it --
THE COURT: -- he's a plaintiff in this case. These are the lawyers presenting the case, so they've got to be his lawyers.

MR. EVANS: No, I don't -- he's not a plaintiff, Judge.

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: He's not a plaintiff in this case? That's you.

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: -- let me Elarify.
Same locus of facts. We represented Mr. Turner in the Muscogee County case and he was our client and we did have an attorney/client privilege. And that is the same set -that is the same issue. Afid because that is the same issue, the privilege is maint ${ }^{\text {an }}$ ned.

MR. EVANS Judge, I would disagree with that. Attorney/client privilege is limited to the scope of the underlying representation. I just asked Mr. Turner, is anyone representing you and testifying today, he answered no. There is no attorney/client privilege. Any of his communications with anyone --

THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to do. I'll listen very carefully, Mr. McQueen, on what question Mr. Evans asks him. There's a fine line between the representation on both of these cases, because you-all did represent him, as you say,

1 in the other case, because you're not representing him in this case, but these cases intertwine, so I might just listen very closely to the questions Mr. Evans says. You can object. Even if you don't object, but I think it's crossing the line, I'll stop it, but you are not his lawyers in this case, but you are lawyers in the other case, but the question is for this case did you talk to any lawyers.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Judge, that's fair.
BY MR. EVANS:
Q. So, Mr. Turner, did you talk to any lawyers about testifying today?
A. I was approached because of the last case about my desire or opportunity to participate in this case, yes, sir.
Q. And how were you approached?
A. Actually, if you want to know the truth, I was approached in that I approached them and asked them what was my follow up. What was going to happen on the other side of the last case that allowed me --

THE COURT: Sir, would you do me a favor? I'm trying to determine what you said to your lawyers in the other case and what you said in this case. So when you said "them," can you be specific like who is them? Because it's going to help me be able to say, if "them" is talking about Mr. McQueen now --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: -- but if you're talking about "them" in another set of lawyers, that's not something you can talk about.

THE WITNESS: The lawyers that I am talking to are the same lawyers from the previous case.

THE COURT: And who are those lawyers?
THE WITNESS: Fair Fight.
THE COURT: These exact same three lawyers sitting at the table right now?

THE WITNESS: Not all of them, jút, yes, representative, yes.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Bryan is kind of like Bishop Jackson. She's been in just aijout all of these cases. Was Mr. Bryan one of the lawyer's in the other case?

THE WITNESS: I was not physically there. I was teleconferenced in to listen to the case. So this is the first time I have seen them. I have talked to two of them that are sitting here at the table now.

THE COURT: Which two?
THE WITNESS: Ms. Summer and Marcos.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. Again, we're going to have to just kind of crawl through it.

MR. EVANS: I'11 be efficient, Judge. I'm not going to belabor this issue.

BY MR. EVANS:

1 Q. So just -- I'm going to ask this again, just for the
2 record and I can get my train of thought going again.
Have you talked to any lawyers about appearing today to
4 testify?
5 A. At what point are you talking to? What point in time are
6 you talking to so I can answer it correctly?
7 Q. At any point have you talked to any lawyers about
8 testifying today at the trial?
9 A. Yes, I did.
10 Q. And what was said about you testifyíng today at the
11 trial?
12 A. The question is would I be available to be able to
13 support the ongoing efforts for the voter registration
14 improprieties.
15 Q. And let me clarify. Today or yesterday did you talk to 16 any lawyers about Restifying today or yesterday?

17 A. No.
18 Q. Did anyone tell you how to testify today or yesterday at
19 this trial?
A. No one has ever told me how to testify.

21 Q. Is anyone paying for you to be here to testify today or

23 A. Yes.
Q. How much are you being paid to testify today and yesterday?

1 A. I'm only providing lodging. There is no money associated 2 with it. The rental car is out of my pocket.

3 Q. Is Fair Fight paying for your hotel?
4 A. I would surmise, yes.
5 Q. Is Fair Fight paying for your plane ticket to get here
6 from California?
7 A. No.
8 Q. You're paying for your own plane ticket to get here from
9 California?
10 A. I paid for my plane ticket to get hére. I will ask for 11 reimbursement. I'm in the middle of travel to check on my 12 home. And further on from there if will leave directly from 13 here to go to a Caterpillar demonstration in Peoria, Illinois.

14 Q. I get it. I have to do --
15 A. If that is doabl $\Leftrightarrow$ yes. But on the other side of that, 16 no.

17 Q. I have to do reimbursements all the time. They're the 18 bane of my existence. I understand.
A. Yes.

So Fair Fight is reimbursing you for your plane ticket
from California to get here, right?
Q. Are they paying for your expenses while you're here testifying; is that right?

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Hold on.

14 Q. I, too, will try to do quick. I do have a few follow-up
15 questions for you, Mr. Turner.
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. Mr. Turner, did you apply for an absentee ballot soon 18 after arriving in California?

19 A. Yes. Immediately.
20 Q. And did you put down your California address on that 21 application?

22 A. Yes, I did.
23 Q. And did you receive an absentee ballot for the local
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: We object. This is -- it's been established that he was --

THE COURT: He's testified that he's being reimbursed for his hotel room, Mr. Evans, by Fair Fight. So I think that's established. And his airplane, he's paying for.

MR. EVANS: Judge, I've got no further questions.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Evans.
Redirect?
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Thank you, sir.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Turner.
A. Good morning. elections that took place shortly after you arrived there in November of 2019?

1 A. Yes, I did. With no problem.
2 Q. And was that -- was that absentee ballot delivered to
3 your address in California?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. And just to be clear, did you have any problems receiving 6 it at that address?

7 A. Not for the local elections, no.
8 Q. And just to be clear here, did those November 2019
9 elections occur before December of 2020?
A. Yes.

11 Q. You were talking to defense courisel earlier in your
12 testimony about trouble you had in obtaining an absentee 13 ballot for the runoff.

15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Did that occur after the 2019 local elections?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Do you recall when defense counsel said your county
19 election official sent your absentee ballot for the 2021
20 runoff to your Muscogee address?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Other than defense counsel's own statements, do you have
23 any personal knowledge of that happening?
A. None.
Q. I want to switch gears, Mr. Turner, and ask a few
questions about what you originally came here to discuss, which was the challenge to your eligibility. How did you find out that you had been challenged?
A. Trying to follow up on the missing absentee ballot that I should have received a couple of days prior.
Q. And I want to make sure I understand this. At that -what was your reaction at the point that you learned you had been challenged?
A. Serious confusion. As you had indicated earlier and as counsel had indicated earlier, I checked the box to where I should have been receiving my ballot automatically. Didn't receive it the first time. Ever subsequent election, primary, general election, to include the runoff election, I had to call in and there was no record of my forwarding address. And only now can surmise that for whatever reason it went to my -- mome based on the information provided yesterday.
Q. And, Mr. Turner, I want to make sure. I'm asking a very specific question.

How did you feel upon learning you had been challenged? THE COURT: Hold on, hold on. MR. EVANS: Objection, asked and answered. This was not brought up on my cross. I never asked him how he felt. He asked this in his direct and I object as asked and answered, Judge.

11 Q. Was that the name of the individual who challenged you?
12 A. Yes, it was.
13 Q. And when you were discussing those challenges yesterday
14 and you were trying to recall the name of the person who
THE COURT: I think I remember he indicated to the Court he felt intimidated, frustrated, upset. I think he even got emotional, because I remember that from yesterday.

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: I will move along, Your Honor. BY MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN:
Q. This is the last few questions, Mr. Turner. I'd like to revisit a topic that defense counsel raised when he was examining you yesterday.

Do you recognize the name Alton Russell?
A. Yes, I do. challenged you, was that who you were referring to during that conversation?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever met Mr. Russell?
A. I have.
Q. In what context did you meet Mr. Russell?
A. In the context of a documentary where he had agreed to sit down and talk to what happened during that challenge.
Q. And when you say talk to -- sit down and talk to whom, sir?
A. A reporter and myself.
Q. So you personally discussed -- let me rephrase that.

Did you have a discussion with Mr. Russell?
A. I did.
Q. And in that discussion, did the two of you discuss the challenges?
A. We did.

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: I think, Your Honor --
THE COURT: As a result of that conversation, did you do anything as a result of the conversation vou had with Mr. Russell?

THE WITNESS: I don't follow Your Honor.
THE COURT: Did you do ariything as a result of that conversation you had with Mr. Russell?

THE WITNESS: No Your Honor. I'm still waiting on his return phone call.

THE COURT So after you had the conversation with Mr. Russell, you did -- that conversation did not cause you to do anything else or do anything?

THE WITNESS: There was no action to be taken. Nothing for me to do other than to accept what he said to me. MR. EVANS: And, Judge, I have to object to that question. It asked about statements made out of court, the substance of the statements, and that's offered for the truth of the substance of the statements that are allegedly made. That is hearsay. That's an out-of-court statement. That
inadmissible.
THE COURT: He never said what he said.
MR. EVANS: You asked him, did the substance of the conversation. Did you discuss the challenges. That is absolutely --

THE COURT: No. He can ask him, did you talk about it. As long as you ask him what did you say, what did he say. So I'11 overrule that objection.

Next question.
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: I have no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Recross?
RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. EVANS:
Q. So just now, Mr. Turner, you said you applied for an absentee ballot for a local election and you got that ballot; is that right?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And when you said you applied, you independently filled out an absentee ballot application; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And in that absentee ballot application, did you indicate where you then lived, which was in California?
A. Absolutely.
Q. That is different from when you filled out the automatic
over 65 receipt of absentee ballot applications, isn't it?
2 A. There lies the problem. Because it was that application
3 for absentee ballot, that single application for absentee ballot, that includes check here if you're over 65 and would like to have your ballot sent to you repeatedly without having to request an additional ballot.
Q. I understand that. But if you could answer that question.

When you applied for an absentee ballot that was a different action that you took than checking the automatic receipt or sending of absentee ballots, isn't it?
A. I'm not understanding how you re trying to phrase that. It's the same ballot. It's the single -- the same ballot. You fill it out, request fior absentee ballot, and the block is on that ballot.
Q. And you don't have any evidence today to in any way connect Mr. Alton Russell to any of the defendants, do you? A. Yes.

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on, hold on, hold on.
THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not --
THE COURT: Hold on, hold on, hold on, hold on, hold on.

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Your Honor, Mr. Turner has attempted to address that and counsel has objected to that previously. This is now a sword and shield issue.

THE COURT: Let me say this to Mr. Turner. The question is, do you have any way of connecting Mr. Russell to any of the present defendants. If you can do that without telling us what he said, fine. But if you can't do it without telling us what he said, what Mr. Russell said to you, don't say that. Okay?

Now, that's all I have to say.
THE WITNESS: Mr. Russell has publicly said on the record --

THE COURT: Well, don't repeat what he said. I know you think it's on the record, but --

THE WITNESS: Do I physically have any, no.
MR. EVANS: Okay. Judige, no further questions.
Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Turner.
Is Mr. Turner excused?
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Just one moment, Your Honor, if I may?

THE COURT: Well, I usually don't give two redirects. So is he excused? What is -- why do you want to call him back again? Why do you want to call him back for another reredirect?

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: To get an understanding of why he responded that he had -- why he gave the answer that he gave to counsel.

MR. EVANS: Judge, if I may respond, they've already had two, a direct and a redirect, Judge. He's answered that exact question. We need to move forward.

THE COURT: Well, actually, no. It's up to me to decide whether he gets another one or not.

MR. EVANS: I know it is. It is, Judge.
THE COURT: But I understand your objection.
Why do you want a reredirect?
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: We just have one question, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the question?
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: WE want to know if, based on the conversation that he had has an understanding about that relationship.

THE COURT: What relationship?
MR. MOCINE MC QUEEN: The relationship that counsel asked about between True the Vote and Mr. Russell.

THE COURT: I'll allow that one question and then, of course, you get rerecross.

REREDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN:
Q. Mr. Russell -- or sorry, Mr. Turner, I apologize.

Mr. Turner, based on the conversation you had with Mr. Russell, do you have an understanding of any relationship between True the Vote and Mr. Russell?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your --

THE COURT: Well, that was the one question you said you wanted to ask.

MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Okay.
THE COURT: You asked it.
MR. EVANS: I'm going to put on the record an objection, Your Honor, hearsay. That question asked for the truth of what was asserted in that conversation. That's an out-of-court statement and we're objecting.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm overruing your objection.
Recross? Rerecross?
RERECROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. EVANS
Q. Other than what $\mathfrak{y}$ allege the conversation you and Mr. Russell had, which was outside of this court, you don't have anything eise to connect any of the defendants with Mr. Russell, do you?
A. The documentary where he stated it publicly. That's it.
Q. So nothing else?
A. Don't need anything else. Those were his words.
Q. Okay. Is that a no?
A. No.

MR. EVANS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Turner.

Can Mr. Turner be excused?
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: Yes, Judge.
MR. WYNNE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Turner.
Are you ready to go?
MR. MOCINE-MC QUEEN: I apologize for interrupting,
sir.
But just in answer to your question, we would excuse him, subject to reserving the right to seek that proffer in the future if we may?

THE COURT: So you're still under subpoena with the plaintiffs, which means you can'te back to California until they release you. You've got to be -- you don't have to stay at the courthouse, but youve got to give them a number where they can be in touch with you if they need you.

MR. WYNNE Your Honor, one question of proceeding. For these purposes, is he still considered on the stand, that is, that he may not consult with anybody else about his testimony, including counsel that's not his counsel?

THE COURT: Well --
MR. WYNNE: He's still on the stand.
THE COURT: He can't -- he's still a witness. So
more or less, yeah, in a sense, he can't discuss it. Yeah, so that's correct.

THE WITNESS: Understood.

21 K-e-n-n-e-t-h, M-a-y-e-r.
Call your next witness.
call Dr. Ken Mayer.
THE COURT: And you are?
card to the court reporter.

And Dr. Mayer? direct examination BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Good morning, Dr. Mayer.
A. Good morning.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

MR. SHELLY: Good morning, Your Honor. Plaintiffs

MR. SHELLY: I'm Jacob Shelly. I'm going to give my

THE COURT: To the court reporter.
All right. Good morning, Mr. Shelly.

MR. SHELLY: Is on his way upstairs.
THE COURT: Dr. Mayer, coine on up.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: Would you raise your right hand?

DR. KENNETH MAYER,
having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Have a seat. If you could please state and spell your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: My name is Kenneth Mayer,

1 Q. You're retained by plaintiffs as an expert in this case?
2 A. That's correct.
3 Q. I understand this is not your first time before this
4 honorable court, but I would like to give you an opportunity
5 to introduce yourself. In what profession are you employed?
6 A. I am on the faculty in the political science department
7 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
8 Q. How long have you been employed there?
9 A. Since 1989.
10
Q. And are you a full professor?

11 A. Yes.
A. My bachelor's degree is trom the University of

14 California, San Diego in Dolitical science with a minor in
Q. Can you summarize your academic work?

21 A. My academic work has been in American politics generally, with a focus on election administration, voting rights, redistricting, and also a focus on the presidency.
Q. Dr. Mayer, how many articles have you published in these fields you've just described?

1 A. Probably north of 30 .
2 Q. And do these articles include publications about voter
3 behavior?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. How many books have you edited or written in these
6 fields?
7 A. Edited and written, I think it's probably close to 20.
8 Q. Have you provided any professional consulting on behalf
9 of state or local election administrators?
10 A. Yes. I have provided services both to state election 11 authorities in Wisconsin, which have Gone through several 12 iterations in the last 15 years. Also have provided analytic 13 consulting services to countyclerks, in particular the Dane 14 County clerk in Wisconsin.

15 Q. Has your academic work won any awards?
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. Can you summarize some of the main ones?
18 A. So in 2002 I won a national award for the best book 19 published on the presidency. In 2013 a paper I wrote with some colleagues won an award for the best application of Political Science.
Q. Dr. Mayer, have you previously testified as an expert

1 witness in cases related to voting or voting rights?
2 A. Yes. Many times.
3 Q. Approximately how many?
4 A. I think I've testified in court at trial in probably 12
5 or 13 cases. And have testified in deposition probably in
6 another ten or so.
7 Q. Any of those cases include any here in the Northern
8 District of Georgia?
9 A. Yes, several.
10 Q. And what kinds of analysis do you provide in these types 11 of cases?

12 A. Generally, I'm asked to -- to provide analysis and 13 conclusions on an empirical question, given the data and

19 Q. Has the Court ever excluded any of your opinions under
20 Daubert or any other standard?
21 A. No.

MR. SHELLY: Your Honor, plaintiffs tender Dr. Mayer as an expert in political science, quantitative analysis,
election administration and voter behavior.
THE COURT: Do you wish to voir dire, Mr. Powell?
MR. POWELL: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Any objection to this person testifying as an expert in those areas?

MR. POWELL: No, not to those areas.
THE COURT: All right. Then he'll be allowed to testify as an expert in those areas.

MR. SHELLY: Thank you, Your Honor
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, did you submit an expert report in this case? A. I did.

MR. SHELLY: I would itike to hand him that report.
You have a copy iif your binder, Your Honor. Would you like -- I have a separate copy if that's easier for you to find.

THE COURT: If you've got it up here, I'11 find it. MR. SHELLY: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you-all have it, Mr. Powell?
MR. SHELLY: Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.
THE WITNESS: Is it possible to get a sip of water?
THE COURT: Yeah. Hold on.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, is this the report that you authored?
A. Yes.

1 Q. Does it accurately summarize the conclusions that you've 2 reached in this case?
A. Yes.

14 Q. And that's pages 57 it 73 ; is that correct?
15 A. That's correct.
16 Q. Now, this CV was created a couple of years ago. Can you
17 summarize any relevant updates?
18 A. There have been several additional publications, a new
19 edition of a book on the presidency, several additional peer-reviewed articles on the use of geospatial data in redistricting, and automated methods of creating literature reviews, some additional conference presentations, and some additional instances of public service to state or university entities.
Q. Thank you.

Dr. Mayer, what were you asked to do in this case?
A. I was asked to analyze the challenge files that True the Vote offered in 65 Georgia counties. And to assess the reliability of those -- of that data with respect to data in the Georgia statewide voter file.
Q. And how did you do that? What methodology did you employ?
A. I used the same methods that would typically be used and that I have used in my own work. I evaluated the reliability of the underlying data, evaluated the relfability of the record linkage process that True the vote appears to have used based on what they said, and examined or reached conclusions about the accuracy and reliabdity of those matches or claims that someone in the Georgiá file was no longer eligible to vote in Georgia.
Q. When you revieved the county list that True the Vote provided as part of its challenge file, did that include, for example, Banks County?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. And did you find plaintiff Jocelyn Heredia within that file?
A. Yes. She was in the challenge file for Banks County.
Q. Thank you.

Can you summarize your overall conclusions that you reached?

1 A. Well, my overall conclusion is that $I$ was just shocked at how sloppy and inaccurate the underlying data and linkage process was. I found tens and tens of thousands of obvious errors that were apparent based on immediate inspection. I found examples of missing data, duplicated records, records that are linked to the wrong individual or someone with a different name. People who hadn't actually moved, people who had reregistered, on and on and on. And I -- it -- it was just astounding how shoddily executed an unrei iable the whole enterprise was.

THE COURT: Dr. Mayer, you indicated sloppy, inaccurate data. Was this something obvious to a layperson or is this something that only could be seen by an expert?

THE WITNESS: Weir, some of it would be obvious to a layperson. For example, I identified over 15,000 records where the challenge files claimed that someone had moved based on a change of address file or a change of address request, but there was no -- there was no address to where the person who was alleged to have moved to.

THE COURT: 15,000?
THE WITNESS: Over 15,000.
I found examples where a zip code, which is either a five or nine-digit number -- you can't have any other -- in almost 10,000 cases, the zip code, or what should have been a zip code, was actually a city name. And I detail those in my report.

Now, some of them, you know, might be something that I know to look for because I've done this in my own work. But some of it was just completely obvious. That someone could have looked at this record or looked at this data and known that something was not right because data that should have been there was not there or was obviously wrong.

THE COURT: Thank you. BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, I want to start at the beǵnning.

What do you understand to have been the premise of True the Vote's challenge program?
A. My understanding of the premise is that True the Vote is alleging that anyone who filed a National Change of Address request with the U.S. Postal Service indicating they want their mail forwarded lost their eligibility or was challenged as ineligible to vote in Georgia based on that NCOA request. Q. Now, was ineligible voting in Georgia a serious problem in 2020?
A. No, not at all. In fact, the results in 2020 in the general election were repeatedly confirmed in multiple recounts. I note in my report that the Georgia Secretary of State audited absentee voting in Cobb County and concluded that there was not a single invalid absentee ballot that was cast in 2020.

1 Q. Does the academic literature have anything to say about
2 fraud voter claims?
3 A. Yes. The academic literature is -- has repeatedly 4 concluded over several decades of analysis that claims of 5 voter fraud are vastly exaggerated and that there are -- there 6 simply is no material level of voter fraud or ineligible 7 individuals casting ballots.

8 Q. Does permitting ineligible voters to remain on the voting 9 list materially increase the risks of ineligible voting? voting list has what's called deadwood, people who are on the lists -- on the list but they are io longer eligible to vote: They have died, they might have moved to another state and registered, they might have done something else, committed a crime or something that -- that gives up their eligibility to vote.

And the reason this exists in every voter file is that it is not possible to immediately remove someone who is ineligible. The data are not sufficient to do that immediately or even quickly. And the -- the effects of improperly removing someone from the voter rolls can be enormously significant where someone is no longer eligible to vote.

And, again, the academic literature has established quite clearly that the existence of this deadwood, which is what

1 it's called, does not increase the probability or likelihood 2 of ineligible people voting or ineligible ballots being cast.

3 Q. I want to discuss in a little more detail how True the
4 Vote generated its challenge file. Is True the Vote's
5 description of its methods consistent with professiona1
6 standards for describing record $1 i n k a g e ~ o r ~ m a t c h i n g ? ~$
7 A. No, it was woefully inadequate.
8 Q. Can you explain?
9 A. The problem in any record linkage, where we have two
10 large datasets and we're trying to deterinine if an individual all kinds of reasons that can go wiong. And in the academic realm, when someone is doing that, a scholar is doing some research, there are very explicit steps and descriptions that are typically offered: The dates the files were generated, the specific process by which the matching or record linkage was conducted, what constituted a match, the type of matching, how the data were preprocessed to make sure that the format of the matching fields was consistent, how the results were reviewed to assess the reliability of that process.

And I give an example in my report of one of the -- an influential recent article that talks about record linkage between administrative files and the voting files. And there was a 2,000-word explanation over multiple pages that allows someone to go through and -- and replicate, so it's possible

1 to recreate and repeat that process, which is an essential 2 part of the social scientific process.

3 Q. Based on the description that was provided, can you give 4 us just a high level understanding of what True the Vote's 5 process was?

6 A. So, again, I'm off -- I'm operating off the descriptions that they provided in the records that $I$ reviewed. And there are actually two different descriptions that are -- that are different. My understanding is that what True the Vote did is matched an individual's first name, last rame, and address to the Georgia voter file. And that anybody who had the same first name, last name, and address of an individual in the voter file was identified as a challenged voter.
Q. Dr. Mayer, did you cciate a demonstrative --

THE COURT: hold on, hold on.
MR. POWEL,: I'd like to object to the lack of foundation. I'm not sure what descriptions he's referring to. We haven't seen them and I'm not sure what he's referring to at all.

THE COURT: Mr. Shelly?
MR. SHELLY: Dr. -- again, I asked him to provide the --

THE COURT: A11 right. At this point in time, I'11 sustain the objection. You lay a foundation, we'11 go from there.

BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, can you tell us the materials that you reviewed when reaching these conclusions?
A. So it's in my report. Let me have a moment here. So I describe the -- the descriptions that I worked with are on page 19 and 20 of my report. One of them is a document that the OPSEC group gave in one of their amended responses, it's footnote 4 in my report.

The second is an e-mail from Catherine Engelbrecht to multiple recipients, which provided an actual -- actually somewhat different description of the process. So that's -that's all I am aware of the descriptions that they have given. I haven't seen, I'm not aware of any more detailed descriptions that have beeti offered.

THE COURT: Mr. Powell, are you still objecting? MR. POWEL, $:$ Not at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then you can proceed, Mr. Shelly.

MR. SHELLY: Thank you.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, did you create a demonstrative to help illustrate this process?
A. I did.
Q. I'd like to show that.

Does this -- is this said demonstrative you're referring

1 to? Do you see it on your screen?
2 A. I do not. MR. SHELLY: Your Honor, is it on yours?

THE WITNESS: I see it now.
THE COURT: It's on mine.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Is this the demonstrative you're referring to?
A. Yes.
Q. Does this accurately illustrate and summarize the conclusions in your report?
A. Yes.
Q. I'd like to walk -- I'd like you to walk the Court through each piece of this.
A. So I have a question. Touching the screen, this is a touch screen. Can I glear this so that the -- the --

THE COURT The right bottom corner.
THE WITNESS: Right bottom corner?
THE COURT: I think Ms. Wright has already cleared it for you.

THE WITNESS: Now I just turned it off.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: It is off. Wait a minute.
THE COURT: I'11 tell you what. Mr. Powe11, with your permission, I'm going to allow Dr. Mayer to step up here and look at my screen and I will step down there, okay?

MR. POWELL: Al1 right.

THE COURT: Record this for history. The judge gave up his position. Come on up.

Are you okay? Mr. Powe11, okay?
MR. POWELL: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Is that okay?
MR. SHELLY: I just want to make sure you're able to see the screen as well.

THE COURT: I'm going to -- I'11 come over here and look at this one. I can look at that one. well, he could look at that one. I'll look at Madison's

THE DEPUTY CLERK: It's backon.
THE COURT: There you go?
THE DEPUTY CLERK: I think you turned it off.
THE COURT: Just dion't touch it.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: I cleared it.
THE COURT Thank you.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Okay. So, Dr. Mayer, you were describing a matching process between the NCOA file --

MR. SHELLY: Did we all just lose it?
THE COURT: Are the ones over there working?
THE SECURITY DEPUTY: They were.
THE COURT: Dr. Mayer --
THE SECURITY DEPUTY: They're off now.
THE WITNESS: $I$ didn't touch it.

THE COURT: They're all off now. Just hold it a

MR. SHELLY: All right. Third time's a charm. second.
R. BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, you were describing a matching effort between the NCOA file and the voter file. And I want to break down the different pieces here. So starting with the NCOA file, what are the four fields within that file?
A. The fields from the NCOA file are an individual's first name, their last name, their previous address, and the address where they have asked their mail to be forwarded.
Q. And to help us understand theis third column on the right, can you explain what a unique identifier is?
A. A unique identifier is some data field or combination of data fields that uniquely identifies an individual, such that when we see those values in those fields, that we can be certain or very confident that any other time you see those fields we're talking about the same person. So someone with the first name, last name, address.

I note in this description -- that's not a unique identifier -- that there are -- just, as an example, there are over 85,000 individuals in the Georgia voter file who have the same first name, last name, and street address, reflecting multiple generations that are living -- living in one household.

5 A. No, neither on their own nor in combination.
So the unique notation here is an indicator of whether that field or whether any combination of those fields is actually able to identify a unique individual.
Q. And are any of these fields unique identifiers?
Q. Let me show you the next piece. What fields are in the voter file?
A. So the voter file includes much more detailed information. The voter ID -- the voter registration number is actually a unique identifier. It's a number that is assigned to everyone who is registered or, incised, has been registered. And that number does not change, that number is never given to another person. It is unique.

The voter file includes the voter's first name and last name, their address, it includes their middle name -- which the NCOA file does not or did not. It also includes their suffix, junior, senior, third. The voter file includes the registrant's birth year -- not the complete birthday, but the birth year. It includes the registrant's self-reported race, the registrant's self-reported gender, the date on which the registrant registered to vote, and the date of the last election in which the registrant voted.
Q. You mentioned that the voter ID number is a unique identifier. Are any of these other fields unique identifiers? A. No. If you were using them in combination and using all

1 of them, you would be able to get close. But none of these
2 fields on their own, other than the voter registration number,
3 is a unique identifier.
4 Q. Was the one unique identifier, the voter ID, was that
5 used in the matching process?
6 A. No. It does not exist in the NCOA file. It is in the 7 challenge file, but the only way that that number can be put 8 there is after that matching process had been conducted based 9 on the name and address.

10 Q. And what would you expect to happen matching does not 11 include unique identifiers?

12 A. The -- the risk is that you Gire going to be matching or
13 linking to the wrong person. That there's some -- an
14 individual you identified with the first name, last name, and 15 address in the NCOA file that is being linked to a different 16 individual in the voter file.

17 Q. Of these other non-unique identifiers, were they all used 18 in the matching process?

19 A. No. Again, based on the files and descriptions that I
A. It by definition increases the probability that you're

1 linking to a different individual in the voter file.
2 Q. Did you find any evidence of these mistakes in True the
3 Vote's challenge file?
4 A. I did.
5 Q. Can you tell us about some of those duplicates?
6 A. So the starting point is that in the voter file, which is
7 in Georgia is pretty large, I found, which I noted, over
885,000 records that are actually duplicated on name and
9 address -- first name, last name, and address triplets. Which

1 give a specific example in my report.
2 Q. Do you want to explain that example?
3 A. So in the challenge file for Gwinnett County, there are 4 two individuals named Eric Jones at the same address. And they are both in the challenge file. In the voter file, there are actually three Eric Jones at that address who are registered to vote. They all have voter different registration numbers. They all have different birth years. They have different middle names or suffixes So there are three distinct different Eric Jones at thát address.

True the Vote challenged two of them. I don't know how they could tell which Eric Jones they were talking about. It's not possible to determine, based on that challenge file, whether -- you know, whictoric Jones they are challenging, which one is actually the right Eric Jones, if any of them. That's just -- thed just one of the examples. And there were close to 1400 other instances like that.
Q. What do professional companies that are licensed to conduct NCOA matching say about the risk of false positives?

MR. POWELL: Your Honor, I'm going to object. We've laid no foundation for his expertise in NCOA link matching. We heard a long resume, but that wasn't among the items.

MR. SHELLY: This is a regular part of the election administration. And, yeah, I would say it was squarely within election administration.

MR. POWELL: It's not. It's not, Your Honor. This is about mass mailing. It's not election administration. We have no foundation for this.

MR. SHELLY: Well, as defendants have frequently offered, election administrators do rely on NCOA matching in some contexts.

THE COURT: Well, he's testifying as an expert. Would he not have knowledge on this as an expert?

MR. POWELL: He could have some knowiedge.
THE COURT: And using that some knowledge, can he not use some of that knowledge to formulate his opinion that he's testifying about here today?

MR. POWELL: Well, as a layperson, yes.
THE COURT: Wello ne's not a layperson. He's an expert.

MR. POWEL, $:$ I think on this issue he's a layperson.
THE COURT: I disagree. I'm going to allow him to testify. BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, can you tell the Court what professional companies that are licensed to conduct NCOA matching say about the risk of false positives?
A. They note that false positives, where someone is in the NCOA file when they shouldn't be or it's the wrong person to match into another database, that that happens regularly.

1 Q. Indeed, have you ever tried to undertake a matching 2 process like this yourself?

3 A. I have in my own research.
4 Q. Can you explain that experience to the court?
5 A. So in 2016 I conducted -- and it's listed in my vita -- I 6 did a survey of non-voters, of non-voting registrants in Wisconsin's two largest counties. And so we mailed a survey to individuals, we received responses. And in order to accurately calculate population estimates from that sample, we needed to remove individuals who were no longer eligible to vote at that address.

So I worked with an entity of campus called the UW Survey Center, a survey research center which has been around for decades, and we actually went through a process relying on commercial databases, in this case it was LexisNexis, but one of the things that they rely on is the NCOA process.

So I received a list of voters -- registrants who, according to this process, were no longer eligible to vote at that address where they were registered in the Wisconsin voter file.

And the key thing about this process is every one of those records where the result was some evidence that they were no longer registered at that address, it came with a probability estimate. It came with an expression of the confidence of that match. And they weren't all 100 percent.

1 They ranged from high confidence to medium confidence to low 2 confidence. So I've done this process, and I know what the resulting data looked like.

It's not all or nothing. Even if someone shows up in the database, in the NCOA database, that by itself does not mean that you have matched to the right person in a voter file. Q. To the extent defendants say they supplemented the NCOA matching with other tools like SmartyStreets or fuzzy logic, would that change any of your conclusions?
A. No. Because the -- as I noted, those processes were not adequately described. No idea of what they mean or what types of fuzzy matching they relied on. They don't indicate what they used SmartyStreets for. it's basically a -- it's a website that you can use to complete an incomplete address. There are all kinds of different things that True the Vote says they did, but 1 can look at the data itself and conclude that whatever they did, it was not sufficient because there are still errors in the actual files that they created. Q. Did you read an explanation from defendants that the challenge file was screened through the Social Security Death Index to remove deceased voters?
A. That's in the description.
Q. Did you find any evidence that was done?
A. Well, I'm not sure how you would do that, because the -neither the NCOA, nor the voter file has information that

1 would allow you to reliably match to the Social Security Death 2 Index because it doesn't have dates of birth.

But I didn't find evidence that they had improperly challenged someone who had died. I didn't have access to that data. But it doesn't change my overall conclusion.

And even setting that aside, even if they reliably got 100 percent of people who they said had died, I don't think they did, but that does not change my conclusion about the tens of thousands of other areas -- of other areas, I'm sorry, that are in the files that they created.
Q. Is there any publicly accessiblenational database of an individual's citizenship status?
A. Not that is not mass avariable to the public.
Q. Dr. Mayer, did you idisntify any racial disparities in your analysis?
A. I did. I identified several.
Q. Can you summarize those for us?
A. The first is that True the Vote produced challenge files in 65 of Georgia's 159 counties. Again, I don't know why they selected those counties. All I observed is that a challenge list was produced in those counties. Those counties were disproportionately African American. Al1 three of the counties with the highest percentage of African American registrants were challenged.

Of the 20 counties with the highest percentage of African

1 American registrants, ten of them were challenged, as opposed
2 to only four of the 20 counties with the lowest percentage. I found counties in the Atlanta metropolitan statistical area were overrepresented with, I think, 17 of the 29 counties in the Atlanta metropolitan statistical area challenge.

And I also found that using a -- a regression analysis that I describe in my report, that the likelihood that a county was selected for or the likelihood that a challenge file was produced or was created, went up as the share of African American registrants went up.

That's only one of them. There were others.
Q. Did you find any disparities in the -- the name and address --
A. Yes.
Q. -- false positivधs?
A. So of the 1,375 duplicated records, where there's either more than one person with the same name and address in the NCOA file or more than one person that has been challenged with the same name or address in the voter file, the challenge file was about 27 percent African American. The duplicated records that were challenged were 40 percent African American.

And I also found a disparity where challenged registrants who are alleged to have moved within the state were disproportionately African American. The voter file is about just shy of 30 percent African American. But challenged

1 registrants who True the Vote says moved within Georgia, I
2 think the number was over 38 percent African American.
3 Q. Okay. So you've shared some of the limitations with the 4 kinds of data that was used. Now I want to ask you about some 5 of the other categories that you described.

Did you find any missing values in key fields --
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. -- whatever that means?
9 A. There were missing values in blank fields and records where the information should have been there.
Q. Is this what you were explaining to the Court in response to his question?
A. Yes, in terms of the 15,000 challenged records where there is no address that stiows where the registrant is alleged to have moved to.
Q. And what does this error convey to you about the kinds of quality control that was used in the process?
A. Well, what it tells you is that something went seriously wrong, because any time you're dealing with large datasets like this, and every time I have done this in the context of my own work, you go through and you look at the results and you see if the results make sense. You see if the data that's supposed to be there is there. You see -- you determine if the fields that are supposed to have values of a certain type, whether they have values of that type. And so the missing
street addresses is just one indication that something went wrong, something doesn't make sense in how that process was conducted.
Q. And what do you understand what happened if an elections official tried to contact one of these voters on the list?
A. Well, it increases the likelihood that an election official wouldn't be able to contact them. Because if someone has actually moved, there's no -- in the challenge file there's no address where a clerk can send --Can send mail. So it increases the likelihood that a voter whose eligibility has been challenge, they might not even know that their eligibility has been challenged $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{fitil}}$ they show up to vote or until they request an absentee ballot.
Q. Did you identify any erroneous zip code data?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe that?
A. So in the challenge file for Henry County, there were about -- there were over 9,000 challenges in Henry County. Every one of those records in the zip code of the address where the voter was alleged to have been registered, instead of a zip code, there's the name of the municipality in Henry County where the voter is registered.

And, again, that's something that -- you can look at that and immediately know something went seriously wrong with this process, because that's supposed to be a zip code. It's not
supposed to be a city name or a municipality name.
Q. Did you identify any anomalies with how city names were 3 listed in the challenge file?

4 A. Yes. I found numerous examples where records in the NCOA not abbreviated, sometimes they were just misspelled. And, file had -- had misspellings or spelling variations of city names. Sometimes they were abbreviated, sometimes they were again, that indicates that there was a problem or a lack of quality control.
Q. Did you identify any instances where the name of the registrant in the challenge file did not match the corresponding name in the voter fife?
A. I did. I found, I think it was -- I have to look, but it was several hundred, 240 maybe, instances where the voter registration number inthe challenge file -- which is, again, that's the voter registration number of the person that True the Vote is saying is no longer eligible to vote because they've moved -- that individual in the voter file has a different name than the person in the NCOA file.
Q. Did you identify any instances where --

THE COURT: Hold on.
Explain that again. I didn't quite understand. The name changes? Explain.

THE WITNESS: The name -- it's not the same. And I don't know why. It could be it's just the wrong individual.

1 It could be that someone has -- you know, has legally changed 2 their name because they got married, got divorced or

3 something. But I -- I looked at -- I have the challenge file 4 and it has the voter registration number, which True the Vote extracted from the voter file. If I go look for that number in the voter file, the name of the person under that record is not the same name as the person in the NCOA challenge file.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Shelly.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, did you identify instances in the challenge file where the registration addresses and the alleged move-to address were the exact same?
A. I did. There were five records in the challenge file where the address of the voter was registered and the address that they are alleged to have moved to were identical.
Q. How could that happen?
A. It shouldn t. It either means that there was -- it means there was an error somewhere along the way. It means that that person never moved or it means that something went wrong with the matching process in the process of trying to link the change of address file or the change of address registry to the voter file.

But that -- that -- that shouldn't happen. If someone is alleged -- if I'm asserting that someone has moved and the address that I'm saying they moved to is the same address to

1 where they are, that tells you something -- something has gone 2 wrong.

3 Q. Did you identify any instances in the challenge file 4 where the registration address and the alleged move-to address 5 were in the same county?

6 A. Yes. I identified, I think it was 343 cases where the 7 address where the voter is alleged to have moved to was in the

23 A. Yes. I found almost 6,400 cases where the challenged alleged to have moved to.

4 A. Yes. Again, I would have to look at my report to get the
Q. Did you identify any instances where True the Vote challenged individuals who are not registered to vote in Georgia? specific number, but my recollection is there were over 300 cases where True the Vote was challenging the registration of someone who actually wasn't registered in Georgia.
Q. Your report mentions a lack of adequate data preparation. What do you mean by that?
A. So, again, when you're matching across large scale data files, particularly when you're using what I would call nonstandard fields, like an address, people will write down their address in different ways. Sometimes they would use street or they would write a suffix, but there are all kinds of ways we can write down our address.

Notably in the challenge file, the entire street address, the house number, the street, the street type, is one field. 141 Elm Lane would be the field. In the voter file, all of those are broken out separately. The house number is one field, the street name is one field, the street type is another field.

And so you have to be very careful when you are creating a -- a concatenated field, or a combined field, using multiple records to make sure that that's going to match the data in the other -- the other file. And, again, I don't know how

1 True the Vote did that preprocessing. I know that -- if I had 2 done that in my own work, I would have carefully described how

3 I preprocessed and ensured that those fields were comparable.
4 Q. Roughly speaking, of all these types of errors that we've
5 just discussed, how many did you find in total?
6 A. So just these errors of missing data, reregistration,
7 city or city names and the zip code, I think it's going to be 8 well in excess of 30,000 cases.

9 Q. How does that inform your conclusions about the quality
10 of the challenge file?
11 A. Well, it tells me that the chalienge file is just rife
12 with errors. And, I mean, I -- as I was going through and 13 doing the analysis, it just took my breath away how sloppy it 14 was.

15 Q. If you submitted something like this in your academic 16 work, what would be the result?

17 A. I would be laughed out of the room.
18 Q. Are you familiar with the difference between what the 19 USPS refers to as a temporary versus a permanent change of 20 address request?

## 21 A. Yes.

Q. Can you summarize that difference for us?
A. My understanding is the way the U.S. Postal Service describes this is, a temporary change of address is filed by someone who is going to be away from their address and wants

1 their mail forwarded for a period of greater than 15 days but
2 less than six months. And so they -- in that case, they would
3 file what the USPS calls a temporary National Change of
4 Address.
5 Q. And what would a permanent change refer to?
6 A. A permanent change would be anything over six months.
7 Q. Okay.
8 A. Even if someone hadn't moved permanently, that's just
9 what the Postal Service calls it.
10 Q. So if you were fortunate enough to offered a visiting 11 position at the University of Georgia and you were here for 12 the academic year, from September through May, would you file 13 what the Postal Service calls a temporary change of address or 14 a permanent change of addcess?

15 A. In that circumstance, since I would be here for nine or 16 ten months, I would file a permanent change of address.

17 Q. Even if you intended to return to Wisconsin?
18 A. That's correct.
19 Q. Are you familiar with other reasons a voter might file a so-called permanent NCOA request while still intending to 21 return to their registration address?

22 A. Yes. There are any number of reasons why someone might 23 do that.

24 Q. Would you share some of those reasons with the Court?
A. So two of the obvious ones would be someone who is in the

1 military and is temporarily deployed or stationed at -- on or 2 near a military base out of state. I mean, that's a classic kind of absentee voter, which would also include someone who was in a family of an individual who fell into that category.

THE COURT: How would someone -- looking at that note -- let's go back to your example. You leave the University of Wisconsin, come to the University of Georgia for ten months, you file a permanent change of address. If I'm looking at that, how would I know, well, he's obviously moved there for good, he said it's permanent. How would I know it's not meant to be permanent?

THE WITNESS: Well, I'lletll you, Your Honor, there are two ways: One is that I found, I think, 400 cases where the address where a voter is alleged to have moved to is literally on a military base.

THE COURT Okay.
THE WITNESS: So their address says United States Air Force Academy. Their address says Dyess Air Force Base or Joint Base Lewis-McChord. So there's no ambiguity.

Another way that you would draw that inference, which I did in my report, is I would look at a municipality that is adjacent to or on or adjacent to or nearby a military facility. So not everyone who is deployed to Joint Base Lewis-McChord actually lives on base. They might live in an adjacent municipality.

And so working with a dataset of large military installations, where I go -- and I can see where Edwards Air Force Base is or Fort Irwin or Warner Robins Air Force Base. I can see on a map where the base is, and I can see the municipalities that are around there.

THE COURT: Two questions.
Question one: If it's not on a military base -- you know, again, come back to you. If you go to the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia, and you put downopermanent, how do they know it's not permanent?

THE WITNESS: Well, you wouicn't be able to tell just by looking at that. That -- you would not have sufficient information to know whether someone had moved permanently or -- I mean, permanently- not in how the postal service describes it, but permanently how you or I would describe that.

THE COURT: Yeah.
THE WITNESS: So you would not -- you could not tell that from the National Change of Address file.

THE COURT: Did you find any number of people that were challenged to show a military base location?

THE WITNESS: Yes. As I noted, there -- if we -- and if you have my report, there's an appendix to my report that shows I found -- I mean, this is literally the correct use of the term "literally." I'm not talking about metaphorically.

1 I'm talking about someone whose address lists as the city a military installation. I found -- I think it was 397 people who were on 59 different military installations.

And one example. There are nine people in the challenge file who list as their moved address, it says where they have moved is the United States Air Force Academy. And so that sort of fits. That's someone who is both in the military and a student almost certainly.

THE COURT: Mr. Shelly, I think this is a good point to take a break.

This demonstrative you have, make sure you give a copy of that to Ms. Conkel.

We're going to take a 15 -minute break and start back at 10:50. Thank you.
(A break was taken from 10:35 a.m. until 10:50 a.m.)
THE COURT Mr. Shelly, you may proceed.
MR. SHELLY: Thank you.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Dr. Mayer, right before we took a break the Court was asking you about examples of challenged voters who live on or near military installations. You mentioned you had a table of that in your chart -- a chart of that in your report. Were you referring to Appendix A on page 49?
A. That's correct.
Q. Thank you.

In addition to military voters, can you give a
2 non-exhaustive list of other reasons that a person might file
3 a change of address request to the Postal Service and still
4 intend to return to their registration address?
5 A. So another example would be the archetype of an absentee 6 voter, a college student who lives in Georgia, graduated high

7 school in Georgia, but is attending college or university away
8 from home.
9 Q. I want to ask you more about that in a second, but just eligibility to vote in Georgia.
Q. So let's take the students example that you give. Did you analyze the challenge file for potential students?

23 A. I did.
Q. How did you do that?
A. I created a decision rule. I was looking for a specific
set of universities or colleges that -- actually, it's not exhaustive. I identified municipalities where every public university in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas were located. I identified every school in the SEC, every school in the ACC, every school in the Big 12, Big 10, the Ivy league. And the Georgia governor's office produces a dataset of the top destinations for graduating high school seniors in Georgia. And I included colleges or universities that are on that list.

Again, so this is a fairly extensive iist, but it's not exhaustive. I didn't include the UC system, I didn't include the State University of New York, Sut I had a set of colleges and universities. And I looked for instances of someone in a challenged file -- in the challenge file who had moved to an address, either on or near one of those universities.
Q. What did you ind?
A. I found over 33,000 cases where a student -- or not a student -- someone had -- someone in the challenge file had moved to an address that was in the same or adjacent municipality as one of the colleges or universities in my set that I examined.
Q. Would removing students in college dorms be sufficient to exclude all the students from the challenge file?
A. No. The first instance, I'm not aware of an easily accessible database of all of the college or university

1 dormitory addresses. But even if you were able to eliminate 2 everyone who was not living on campus, data from 2018 from the 3 American Association of Colleges and Universities shows that 4 only about 13 percent of even first-year students live on campus. And that number will actually go down as someone moves through their college years. So a very small percentage of college students are actually living on campus.
Q. You've discussed now challenged individuals who are likely students, challenged individuals you are likely in the military. Did I hear you answer the Court's question that you even found individuals who are likelystudents in the military?
A. Yes. As I noted, there were nine challenges issued to registrants whose move-to address was literally the United States Air Force Acadœmy. And then there were others. There were people who were -- had an address in Annapolis where the Naval Academy is. There are people who listed an address in West Point, New York, where the U.S. military academy is. So in addition to the Air Force -- I mean, there are other instances where someone was likely both a student and in the military.
Q. Did you create another demonstrative summarizing all the errors that we've been discussing this morning?
A. I did.
Q. Is this that demonstrative on your screen?

## A. It is. <br> A. It is.

MR. SHELLY: And, Your Honor, do you have that on your screen as well?

THE COURT: Yes, thank you.
MR. SHELLY: Thank you.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. Does this accurately illustrate and summarize the conclusions that you've reached in your report?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you've done an impressive job reciting many of these figures from memory as we've gone through it, but I want to make sure that the record is clear. So can you tell the Court once again how many instances you found where the challenged individual's registrationaddress and the alleged move-to address are identical?
A. There were five instances.
Q. And, again, how could that happen?
A. I don't know. It should not have. And it is such an obviously identifiable error that I am just flabbergasted that this was not screened and caught.
Q. How many instances did you find where there was kind of -- some kind of syntax error in the street address field? A. So there were seven cases. And this means that the information in an address field was not blank, but it was obviously wrong. It was listed as null or missing, or in one
case it looked like a spreadsheet reference. It had an equal sign G16. So there was something in that field that was obviously not supposed to be there or obviously reflecting a problem.

THE COURT: Yeah, but the registration address and the move-to address are identical. So how do you miss that?

THE WITNESS: I don't know. It was -- again, there is a process that I go -- or that anybody, any reputable academic that's going through and reviewing this, these are things that you look for. What is the quálity of the underlying data?

And, again, these things tell me that there was something fundamentally wrong with the process that was used to generate these files, bicause that should not happen. BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. How many instances did you find where the registrant was alleged to have moved to an undefined street address?
A. There were 27. And most of these were cases where the move-to address was listed as general delivery or something that was not actually a street address.
Q. How many instances where the challenged file name did not match -- sorry -- I skipped this one.

How many instances where the registration address and the move-to address are in the same county?
A. There were 145. I think earlier I said there were in the

1 300s, but this is the correct number. There were 145 cases
2 where a registrant is alleged to have moved to another address 3 in the same county.

4 Q. How many examples where the challenge file name and the 5 voter file name did not match?

6 A. 263.
7 Q. How many instances where the challenged individuals were 8 not registered in Georgia?

9 A. 336 .
10 Q. How many instances where the challenged individual
11 resided literally on a military installation?
12 A. 397.
13 Q. How many instances where you found the duplicate in the 14 challenged file entries ot the first name, last name, address, 15 triplet?

16 A. 1375.
17 Q. How many instances where the challenged individuals had been registered at the move-to address?
A. 6,377 .
Q. And, again, do you have any explanation for how that result could appear in the file?
A. So that reflects almost certainly that True the Vote was relying on outdated information, maybe an older version of the voter file. But, again, this is something that -- you're creating a file where you are alleging that someone is not

1 eligible to vote. And you can immediately see that if someone 2 who has moved to an address where they are registered, I mean, how do you question whether they're eligible to vote at that 4 address? That -- that -- I mean, I'm using "shouldn't" as a 5 conditional, but there's no responsible process that would 6 have produced that result. And, again, it was something that 7 was trivial to check. It was one line of code. And its 8 something that you -- that should have been done.

9 Q. How many instances of erroneous zip code data?

12 Q. How many instances where the street address and the

15 Q. How many total instances where the challenged individual 16 resided on or veryclosely adjacent to a military 17 installation?

18 A. 22,956 cases.
19 Q. And similarly how many instances where challenged individuals were alleged to reside on or adjacent to a college or a university campus where you would expect Georgia high school seniors to enroll?
A. I found 35,056 cases.
Q. Now, are you suggesting that nobody in a challenge file could have been wrongly registered?

1 A. No. I'm not suggesting that there was nobody in the 2 challenge file who was no longer eligible to vote. What I am saying is that there are so many glaring examples of errors in that process that even if there were some cases where someone was properly identified as someone ineligible to vote -- the way that I think about it is that you don't get to throw a quarter million pieces of garbage at the wall and pat yourself on the back that some of them actually stuck.
Q. I want to conclude by talking some about how voters are likely to be affected by voter challenges. In your report you discuss a voter turnout model. Can you explain this concept for the Court?
A. So I describe in my report something called the cost of voting model. And it's a ramework that people who study voting turnout use to evaluate the effects of different practices, different election administration practices. And the emphasis is on things that raise or lower the costs of voting, the time costs, the informational costs, the psychological costs of voting. And the literature finds generally that as the costs of voting go up, there are additional barriers, additional burdens that are imposed on individuals, the likelihood that an individual votes goes down.
Q. Is this model generally accepted among political
scientists?

1 A. I would describe it as essentially almost universally 2 accepted. There may be voting scholars who might sort of costs to the voter challenge process. You mentioned time. How could time be a cost?
A. Well, the time could be a cost that under Georgia law, the provisions I cite in my report, somen whose eligibility is challenged can be required to appear or respond to prove that they are eligible to vote, even if they've actually already voted in an election all the way up to responding to a mailing, even being required to appear at a hearing in front of a county board or çunty election officials where they would -- they may have to prove -- they might have to be in a position where ney have to prove their eligibility to vote. And just the administrative and time and opportunity costs of doing that are enormously high.

THE COURT: Is it decided by the local Board of Elections whether they want to go through that cost?

THE WITNESS: Well, the Board of Elections is not the only entity that pays the costs. It could be the voter that pays.

THE COURT: Yeah. But the one that makes that
determination whether or not the person is going to have to get up this information to prove that they can vote somewhere in Georgia is the local Board of Elections.

THE WITNESS: That would be true. But they are the ones that make a determination of whether -- I guess the term would be whether they accept the challenge.

THE COURT: Of course, they could look at it and say, ah, we're not going to accept this challenge and not even contact the people. It's possible, or is itcnot?

THE WITNESS: It's possible, but there's an
additional issue is that not every election board or entity around the state will do it in the same way. So a challenge that is filed on the same basas in one county might be immediately rejected; that same challenge might be accepted in another county.

THE COURT That's my point, is that the costs you're talking about, ine individuals that decide whether or not we want to create this cost, is the local board?

THE WITNESS: That is my understanding.
BY MR. SHELLY:
Q. For the counties that do require voters to appear in person, would there be other costs to having to appear before a government board in addition to the time?
A. Yes. A voter might be required to assemble documentation and worry that they are not doing -- they need to do something

1 they're not doing. A voter could perceive a risk that -- if their eligibility is challenged. A voter might worry that
Q. Could getting pulled out of line while someone is trying

11 to vote in person be a cost?
A. Yes. A voter might worry thitit they were being singled out and they may worry to the point that they don't even try to vote.
Q. You just touched on this. Could the perceived legal risk of voting when youve been accused of an unlawful registration be a cost?
A. Yes.
Q. Are these types of costs recognized in academic 1iterature?
A. In this case they are universally recognized.
Q. What is the expected foreseeable result of imposing these costs on eligible voters?
A. Well, we can identify an individual cost, the effect on any individual voter, but it's important to keep in mind that
this is not an individual-level decision. This was a mass challenge of a quarter million people. And the almost certain effect, or certainly the likely effect, as there were, there were voters whose eligibility was challenged and it made it much more difficult for them to vote.

And my expectation is that what they were there -certainly would be individuals whose registrations were improperly challenged that resulted in them not voting. MR. SHELLY: Thank you, Dr. Mayer. ${ }^{\text {ONo }}$ further questions for you at this time.

THE COURT: Mr. Shelly, make sure you give Ms. Conkel a copy of this.

MR. SHELLY: I did during break.
THE COURT: All cight. Thanks.
MR. SHELLY: And I would now like to move those into evidence as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Powell, any objection?
MR. POWELL: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: They're admitted without objection. He's your witness now, Mr. Powell. What exhibit numbers are these? MR. SHELLY: We're going to mark this one as 91 . (Plaintiff's Exhibit 91 was received and marked into evidence.)

CROSS-EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. POWELL:
2 Q. Good morning, Dr. Mayer.
3 A. Good morning.
4 Q. I apologize if I break into Dr. Meyer at some point,
5 because I didn't have the pleasure of deposing you and there's
6 some neuro pathways ingrained with Meyer, I'm sure.
7 So you -- congratulations on your book award, by the way.
8 A. Thank you.
9 Q. Since your report, have you reviewed anv further
10 information about the case?
11 A. I have not.
12 Q. Okay. Have you communicated with anybody about your
13 testimony?
14 A. I had met with counsei, but I hadn't communicated with
15 anybody e1se.
16 Q. Did you discuss your testimony?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Okay. What was the nature of that discussion?
19 A. Just what the questions would be, I'm under oath, answer

23 A. No. here today? the questions, tell the truth.
Q. Were you asked to perform any analysis of the defects or disparate impact in the Davis Somerville challenge file?
Q. Do you have the True the Vote challenge files with you

1 A. No.
2 Q. Is there any way we could look at them and verify what 3 you're saying?

4 A. They would be on my home office computer. I don't have
5 them -- I don't have my computer in my possession.
6 Q. So if you said there were no middle names in the file and
7 we thought there were 61,000 , is there any way we could
8 resolve that?
9 A. I don't know. have any affect on my conclusions about the problems that I've 12 talked about.

13 Q. Why is that?
14 A. Because those problems with the missing information and 15 the duplicate records and the military and students, that that 16 happens whether or $n$ ot voter's middle name or middle initial 17 had been included.

18 Q. You do discuss the errors of no middle names being in
19 your report, though; right?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Okay. And you're aware that the NCOA does do matching on middle names?
A. When it is available. But, again, I was operating off of the descriptions that True the Vote gave, so --
Q. What did -- I'm sorry.

1 A. No, that's -- I'm done.
2 Q. What did you understand those descriptions -- did you
3 understand there was a particular audience for those
4 descriptions or what was the context of them?
5 A. Well, these were -- one of them was a description that
6 was offered -- again, my understanding, I'm not a lawyer --
7 was offered in evidence as a response to questions. The other
8 was, as I noted, an e-mail that was sent to multiple
9 recipients to describe the matching process

11 complete and comprehensive description of the methods used?
12 A. I was operating off the descriptions I had, the two
13 descriptions. And, again, I there were references in those
14 descriptions to vague and ambiguous things.

16 Did you get 65 different Excel spreadsheets?
17 A. I did.
18 Q. Did you get just 65 or did you get 159 ?
19 A. I received just 65.
Q. Okay. So there are 65 separate spreadsheets. And how

21 did you put those -- did you put them together somehow?
A. I did. I used a statistical package called Stata, which allows you to input the files and to -- there are commands where you're allowed to combine files into a single database with -- so that essentially you're stacking the data. So I

1 was able to combine all 65 county files into a single file.
2 Q. And does your -- the software used, does it extract that
3 information from the files or are you having to cut and paste
4 or how does that work?
5 A. It's automatic. It just imports the fields in the 6 spreadsheet. Or in this case, I think they were comma --

7 well, no, they were a spreadsheet. So it would just import
8 the data in spreadsheets directly from what was in the file.
9 Q. Are you aware of an error rate of that importation?
10 A. Not in Stata. I'm not aware of what the error rate might 11 be.

12 Q. Is there any way we could know that no errors were made 13 during that importation as you combined 65 files into one?

14 A. Well, again, I did adata validation process. But, no, I 15 can't -- I don't know what the error rate might have been. In 16 my experience, having done that in multiple states with large 17 numbers of counties, that error rate I would expect to be 18 somewhere between zero and very, very small.

19 Q. Did someone study your error rates?
20 A. No. This is from my experience in working with this 21 process.
Q. But you have to have at least studied your error rate to know what it might be.
A. In this instance?

25
Q. That 0 to 1 percent. I'm just --

1 A. Well, I'm not -- no, I'm not saying it's 0 to 1 percent.
2 I imported the files, and my expectation is that there would
3 not be a material number of errors resulting from that
4 process. It's very straightforward.
5 Q. Is it possible that the middle names that were in the 6 original files got left out in the combined file?

7 A. I don't think so.
8 Q. Did you inspect the 65 spreadsheets individually before 9 you combined them?

## A. Yes.

Q. What did you look at?

12 A. It's been two and a half years since I did this. I
13 looked at them and I -- my recollection is that most, if not
A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
Q. Well, did they target people as -- individually for any particular demographics?
A. Well, I can tell you that my analysis found that the counties -- in that set of 65 -- that I reviewed, were more likely to have higher African American populations in terms of

1 registrants than the counties where there were no challenges.
2 So I don't know whether True the Vote had a particular name,
3 that we're going to challenge this person. My understanding
4 is that it was a mass challenge based off of the NCOA
5 registry.
6 Q. And did you say in your report that the impact on African
7 Americans was not statistically significant?
selection, it doesn't meet conventional thresholds of statistical significance. But, again, it's increasingly recognized in political science that that's not a binary. It doesn't -- you don't look at a cocificient and the errors and then it doesn't mean anything it doesn't mean anything, and suddenly it does when you ditit that .05 threshold. I make that very clear in my report.
Q. What measure do we have to make decisions about whether something matters?
A. It's based on the data and experience and judgment.
Q. Would you publish a peer-reviewed article announcing a conclusion about the disparate impact in this case based on your findings of not any statistical significance?
A. I would.
Q. And what would you say about it?
A. I would say the same thing I said in my report, that reflects the three counties with the highest percentage of

1 African American registrants. Knowing those differences, that 2 table would go in. And I would reach the same conclusion that 3 this doesn't meet the . 05 level of statistical significance, 4 but we can be confident that the coefficient is positive. And

5 I would -- I would use the same language and same techniques 6 in peer-reviewed research.

7 Q. So in your report, there's quite a bit of reliance on the 8 idea that counties were selected or chosen or targeted; is 9 that right?
A. I wouldn't say "quite a bit." It was' -- that was one step in the analysis, but the bulk of the analysis is on the actual files that were produced. And, again, there were other instances where there was a dasproportionate impact on African Americans, the -- the dupiticate records, for example, or the fact that African Americans are overrepresented among the challenged voters vino are alleged to have moved within Georgia.

18 Q. Would you have any reason to doubt that your report close to a dozen times?

21 A. My understanding is that -- what that means is these were mentions the idea of counties being selected by True the Vote the counties where the voter challenges were -- were at issue.
Q. How do you think that happened? Walk me through the process of how True the Vote selects a county for challenge.
A. I don't know. The -- as I note, the decision process for

1 the purposes of my report is unobserved. But in terms of the 2 effects, I don't think it matters.

3 Q. Are you familiar with Section 230 that allows for the 4 challenges?

5 A. In general, yes.
6 Q. Okay. So do you know how a petition gets from a
7 challenger or from someone like True the Vote to an actual
8 voter?
9 A. So my understanding is that under Georgia law, someone registration of other people in the oounty. And, again, this is based on -- my understanding of the data that I reviewed, is that these were files that ivere provided or challenge files that were issued under the name of True the Vote. And I don't doesn't really affect my empirical conclusions.

1 Q. So would your analysis change if TTV, True the Vote, had 2 not selected counties for submission but rather was forced to 3 submit only in counties where they had challengers come 4 forward to volunteer to petition?

5 A. That doesn't at all change my analysis about the 6 sloppiness with which --

7 Q. I'm not talking about the sloppiness. I'm talking about 8 the targeting of counties.

9 A. We11, again, as $I$ note in the report, for my purposes that process is unobserved. A11 I see is whether a county file has been created.
Q. So I'm asking you a hypothetical then. If the only reason that a challenger -- it the only reason a challenge was submitted in county $A$ but fiot county $B$ was solely because a resident of county $A$ had contacted True the Vote and said I'd like to volunteer to file a challenge and no resident of county B had come forward to do so, would that not affect your assessment that True the Vote was selecting its counties? A. No. Because I'm not making an argument about how True the Vote selected its counties. I'm making an empirical argument about the nature of the counties that were selected, in terms of the demographics. So how True the Vote selected them is not relevant to my determination of the empirical effects --
Q. What I'm asking is --

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on. Let him finish his answer. Let him finish his answer.

MR. POWELL: Sorry.
THE WITNESS: So I don't know where I cut off.
BY MR. POWELL:
Q. Well, I -- you know, on your report, page 3, there's two mentions of True the Vote selecting counties. On page 7 there is a mention. On page 8 , page 18. On page 34 there are seven mentions using the word "selected." So it seems fairly relevant that you think True the Vote went through a process of selecting 65 counties in which to submit challenges. So I'm asking, would that not change if True the Vote wasn't making those decisions?
A. Well, in terms of the empirical conclusions, not at all. Because I don't know what the process that True the Vote used once it -- I mean, as I note in my report, there were indications that there were other counties where they had engaged in that process. But I don't see that because the challenge files were not produced.

But this was an effort that -- my understanding is that it involved True the Vote. And my empirical conclusions, whether it was True the Vote or an individual in accounting or -- we have the results in front of us. I can see the files that were produced or created. I can evaluate those files and the accuracy of those files. Who actually is responsible for

1 creating those or what role the different groups were -- and 2 that's something that's opaque, because the descriptions that were given by representatives or people in True the Vote about how that process worked, were -- were not complete.
Q. So you said your empirical conclusion of some kind of impact wouldn't change, but your conclusion that True the Vote was selecting counties would have to change, wouldn't it? THE COURT: Hold on. BY MR. POWELL:
Q. Under my hypothetical?

THE COURT: What's your objection?
MR. SHELLY: Respectfulde, I think this question's been asked three times and ansivered three times by now.

THE COURT: I thitik it has, Mr. Powell. He's given the answer. I think ぬou can continue to proceed from it. MR. POWELA: We11, all right, Your Honor.

BY MR. POWELL:
Q. But you calculated the percentage of African Americans in the True the Vote challenge file; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Yeah. So that's 27.3 percent?
A. That's correct.
Q. So that's less than the percentage of African Americans in the Georgia voter file; right?
A. That's correct.

1 Q. Which is 29.9 percent?
2 A. That's correct.
3 Q. So that's almost a 3 percent difference between the two.
4 One's about 10 percent bigger or smaller than the other. Is
5 that significant?
6 A. Well, the problem with that argument is that their
7 selection as someone who is being challenged is conditional on removes African Americans at a higher rate than non-Hispanic white voters.
Q. You understand that's what was happening here, an effort
Q. Removing? From what?
A. From voter files. to remove?

1 A. I understand that these were challenge files that were 2 issued that were calling into question the eligibility of 3 registrants in Georgia.

4 Q. The eligibility to do what?
5 A. To vote.
6 Q. When?
7 A. The files that I evaluated, in my understanding, is that
8 they were created around or in December of 2020.
9 Q. So there -- it was eligibility to vote in an election,

11 A. I think that's right.
12 Q. So not to remove someone fron the voter file?

1 that's a distinction without a difference, because it's 2 calling into question the eligibility of someone to vote.

3 Q. So you focused in your report on the counties around 4 Atlanta.

5 A. No. Hold on a second. You're putting words in my mouth.
6 I didn't focus on my report on these counties. I noted in my
7 report that of the 29 counties in the Atlanta Metro

1 counties around the MSA, which are the most populous counties 2 in Georgia, and which I think you would agree have the highest percentage of African American voters.

4 A. Well, we know that of the 20 counties with the highest percentage of African American registrants, ten of them were challenged.
Q. So there were more potential challengers in those populous ten counties than in the least populous ten counties in Georgia?
A. I don't know who the actual challengers were.
Q. I'm asking you a hypothetical. © 11 things being equal, wouldn't it be easier for challergers to come forth in a county like Fulton, which has million people, than in the other -- than to find 84 cilallengers in the other 84 smallest counties, which also £qual about a million people?
A. You're saying easier to come forward -- I mean, it could be possible that that -- that there -- would be more people willing to serve as challengers. But, again, that doesn't matter for my conclusions.
Q. I'm just talking about the odds of being able to find a challenger in a county with a million people versus a county with a thousand people. You're treating counties as if they're the same. You don't account for population in your analysis, do you? You counted the population --
A. Well, yes, I do. In my analysis, I do include -- I do

1 assess the likelihood of a county being -- having a challenge
2 file using population.
3 Q. Where is that in your report?
4 A. Table 2 on page 35.
5 Q. And how does that take into account the varying
6 populations of the counties?
7 A. Because it measures the likelihood that a county has been

9 the number of registrants in a county. So even after you have controlled for population, you still see an effect in which counties with larger proportions of Atrican American voters are more likely to be selected, Even after taking population into account.

14 Q. But, again, if it proved to be the case that it was the 15 petitioners who selected True the Vote and not the other way 16 around, would that change your conception that True the Vote
Q. Why not?

21 A. Because the impact is there. And, I mean, True the effect exists.
Q. Is it not true that whites make up a larger percentage of

1 challenged voters in 60 of the 65 counties?
2 A. I don't know. I did not look at a county-by-county 3 breakdown of the demographics. And, again, that would -4 wel1, I'11 stop there.

5 Q. So you didn't notice, for example, that the percentage of 6 challenge voters in Banks County who were white was 81 and a 7 half percent?

8 A. No.
9 Q. A11 right. Now, we looked at a demonstrative earlier. part because of the NCOA and the known problem of false positives. But, again, the issue is that these are records

1 that are purporting to identify ineligible voters. And we can 2 see that there are all kinds of missing data, incomplete data. 3 Whether that was in the NCOA or whether that was the result of whatever process True the Vote used to generate these files, I don't know.
Q. How do we know they're purporting to identify -- you mention in your report I think -- determine ineligible voters? How does the spreadsheet determine that by itself?
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. Well, you're telling me that this is -- these spreadsheets are purporting to identify ineligible voters. How do they purport that?
A. Well, the spreadsheets dori't do anything. The spreadsheets don't have ady agency. The spreadsheets have records that include d'ata. And my understanding of how these -- the reascn these spreadsheets were created -- the reason these data were created was a process of challenging the -- or challenging the eligibility of registrants based on whether or not someone with that name and address had filed an NCOA.
Q. So they're challenging the eligibility; not determining it?
A. That's correct.
Q. Who determines the eligibility?
A. That would be the county election entities, the boards or

1 officials.
2 Q. So you mentioned earlier that a number of the errors in 3 the challenge file were obvious, like the syntax error, for 4 example?

5 A. That's correct.
6 Q. Any others that you would consider obvious to an
7 observer?
8 A. Well, I noted those in reports. The records that don't
9 have an address, the records that have a city name where the 10 zip code is, someone who is already reregistered. I mean, 11 these are errors that any responsibleentity that was 12 producing this purporting to show- or purporting to 13 challenge these -- the eligibdity of these registrants, this 14 is a process that should have happened. Someone should have 15 looked at this and found these errors and determined what

17 of the underlying process.
A. I'm not offering a conclusion about that. I'm offering a conclusion about the files.
Q. So if these errors were obvious, in your experience with election administration, would you expect a Board of Elections would be able to look at them and see those errors?
A. It's possible.

1 Q. Because they're obvious?
2 A. It's possible. I don't know how the process that was
3 used in the -- these 65 counties, what the boards did with
4 these files once they got them.
5 Q. Would you expect that a - - any of the members of the
6 Boards of Elections, or their lawyers who were examining these
7 files for probable cause to issue a challenge, would look at
8 these errors and say we're not going to find probable cause?
9 A. They could. But that -- I mean, that just begs the prior question of why these challenges are issued in the first place

11 and why these errors weren't caught before dumping this
12 quarter million records on county election officials across
13 the state.
14 Q. Well, that's a different question.
15 A. Well, it's one that they -- it's one that should have
16 been answered. These errors should have been caught.
17 Q. Do you know how many of these errors made their way to a 18 voter?
A. No.
Q. So you've identified a bunch of errors in spreadsheets and you don't have any information about their impact on actual voters?
A. My analysis was limited to an evaluation of the reliability of the underlying data.
Q. I'd like a yes or no.

1 A. So I did not do an analysis of what happened to
2 individual voters following the submission of the files.
3 Q. So you don't actually know whether the firewall of the
4 Board of Election allowed any of these erroneous challenges to go through?

6 A. That's correct.
7 Q. Do you have any understanding of the connection between
8 any of the defendants and any of the challenges that reached
9 any of the plaintiffs?
A. I'm aware that at least one of the testifying witnesses or the plaintiffs was in a challenge file, but beyond that, I have not done that kind of review
Q. So let's talk a little bat about your selection of instate movers for one of your conclusions. You mention on page 35 -- and I'11 read it and then you can find it in the document.
"Overall, the 2021 voter registration file shows that 29.9 percent of the registrants are African American," which I believe you testified to earlier.

Starting up again with your quote, "But among the alleged in-state movers in True the Vote's challenge file, 38.4 percent are African American."

Why focus on in-state movers? Why exclude the relevant cohort of out-of-state movers?
A. Because that was a characteristic of the file.

1 Q. What do you mean?
2 A. That existed in the file. And that was a pattern that I 3 found in the data as part of my analysis about a 4 disproportionate effect on, in particular, African American 5 voters.

6 Q. So could that effect be because African American voters 7 are more likely than other voters to move in state rather than 8 out of state?

9 A. It could.
10 Q. Could it be that they're less likelv file NCOA than 11 other voters?

12 A. It could.
13 Q. Okay. So do you know the percentage of African Americans
14 in the out-of-state mover ile?
15 A. Based on the over 911 percentages, the out-of-state movers 16 would be less likely to be African American than the

17 representation in the voter file.
18 Q. Do you know how many of the 250,000 or so records in the
19 True the Vote file were in state versus out of state, just
20 hard numbers?
21 A. Not off the top of my head.
22 Q. Let me see if this sounds familiar. About $88,000,89,000$
23 for in state and the rest out of state?
A. Again, I don't know -- I don't recall off the top of my head what those numbers look like.

1 Q. Are you aware of any county Board of Elections that
2 received a True the Vote list that only had in-state movers on 3 it?

4 A. Am I aware of any? No.
5 Q. Did you calculate that white voters make up 53 percent of 6 all True the Vote challenges but only 48 percent of all

7 registered voters?

9 that -- the percentage of the challenge file that was African American.
Q. Do you know the racial makeup of the people who actually carried the challenges forward intheir respective counties? A. No.
Q. All right. So you mention on page 30 -- and this is just about the military bases, and I'm sure you have it partly memorized -- but that about 22,956 -- I shouldn't even say "about," that's exact. It appears registrants in the challenge file moved to an address on or near a military installation.

Are military addresses obvious?
A. They can be.
Q. Like an APO or any other type of military designation?
A. Yes, there were some addresses that were APOs. And others were -- the municipality was the name of a military installation.

1 Q. So a Board of Election could have seen that and excluded 2 them right away from any challenge?

3 A. They could have.
4 Q. Now, you mention that of that 22,956 that are on or near,
5397 of those were on; is that right?
6 A. That's correct. That was based either on an APO address 7 or the name of -- of installation in the address. And I --

8 that's 1 isted in Appendix $A$ of my report.
9 Q. So about just a little under 2 percent appeared to 1 ive
10 on a base?
11 A. 2 percent of what?
12 Q. Wel1, 397 as a percentage of 22,956 ?
13 A. So that's about $2-400$ is a little under 2 percent of 14 the 22,956 --
A. No.

21 Q. Do you know how many of those 397 people found out that
Q. I believe it's 1.73 percent, but I didn't know if you could do all that in your head like A Beautiful Mind or something.

So do you know how many civilian employees of the military branches live on bases? there was a challenge made against them?
A. No.
Q. Now, you mentioned that -- I guess it's -- the difference is 22,459 had moved near a base. So they're in a city that

1 contains a military base?
2 A. Well, as I describe in the report, it was a -- the -- a nearby city that was either adjacent to or a municipality that 4 was the closest to a military base.

5 Q. How near is near?
6 A. I don't recall the precise rule that I used, but my 7 recollection is that, in most of the cases, they were either
are in large cities.
A. Well, that's a different matter. Because if you look at most of the installations that I've identified, you're actually not likely to see a huge military installation next to a large city. It can happen, but most -- you know, Fort Irwin, Fort Rucker, these are not near large cities. Some are. Warner Robins is in the Atlanta area, but it's not -these are municipalities that are so close to a military installation that it's certainly reasonable to think that that would be a reason for someone to file an $\cos$ to an address -Q. Would you say that in the dozens of states that allow citizen challenges, they should simply avoid any areas that are near a military base?
A. I'm not offering a coriclusion about how this process should work. I'm offering a conclusion about the characteristics of the files that were created in this case. Q. Well, you said there is a likelihood that someone who's with the military could be near the base. But you don't have that figure. So how do we decide whether it would be negligent or reasonable to use an NCOA to predict that that move was permanent?
A. Well, again, I'm not offering an opinion about negligence. I'm offering an opinion about the characteristics of the data, and the -- the -- the errors and problems in presenting this data as reflecting ineligible registrants.

1 I'm not offering an opinion about what an ideal system looked 2 like or looks like.

3 Q. So you also mention that there are 34,578 records listing
4 a registrant who had moved to a city with a college or
5 university. Is "with" broader than "near"? What is the --
6 what does that entail?
7 A. So "with" includes municipalities where the university is
A. I'm not offering an opinion about what the system should

1 look like. I'm offering an opinion that someone who files an 2 NCOA to 29 Palms, in the case of Fort Irwin or to Angusta or 3 Athens, Georgia, that there is a reasonable reason why someone 4 might do that.

14 A. It's the Boards of Elisction that make that determination.
15 Q. Is there anything in the Georgia voter file that 16 definitively identifies a registrant as a student?

17 A. No.
18 Q. How does the Secretary of State do that when it
19 identifies voters who might have moved?
A. I don't believe they do. I think they -- someone who has filed an NCOA or someone who requests an absentee ballot to be sent to a mailing address that might be different than their residential address. I'm not aware that the Secretary of State has a process to identify students in the voter file. Q. So what tools should the average citizen use to try to

1 identify students?
2 A. I mean, I'm not offering an opinion about what people 3 should do. I'm offering an opinion about, first of all, 4 claims of voter fraud, and ineligible registrants voting is 5 vanishingly rare, and that there were enough errors in the 6 files that were produced that they were not created or 7 reviewed according to standards that would be used in my line 8 of work.
Q. Is your line of work the standard for acitizen petitioner, scholarly, peer reviewed, that sort of thing?

11 A. No.
12 Q. Okay. Did you analyze any of the voters' dates of birth
13 for how likely they might have been students?
14 A. I did not.
15 Q. Do you know of a way someone like True the Vote might 16 have done that?

17 A. They could nave identified someone based on their birth 18 year.

19 Q. So you can't eliminate all students from your challenge 20 list because you can't identify them.

21 A. Well, but a student doesn't lose their eligibility to vote because they're attending university out of state.
Q. I'd like you to answer my question, though, which is you can't remove all the students because you can't identify them; is that right?

1 A. That would be correct. You would not be able to identify 2 and remove all students from the challenge file.

3 Q. Did you review any evidence that suggested that True the
4 Vote's challenges had made false statements?
5 A. So --
6 Q. Are we talking about error or false statements?
7 A. My analysis is about errors.
8 Q. Did you see any indication of outright falsehoods in the
9 challenge files?
10 A. I did not have any information that fould allow me to 11 assess that. My conclusions were based on the files as 12 produced.
Q. I want to talk a little bit about your experience in 14 election administration adid other expertise.

17 A. Yes, one of the areas.
18 Q. And you have publications in election administration.
19 Are there any other areas of publication you consider relevant to this case?

21 A. I would say my experience handling large datasets. But

1 A. So I don't mean to quibble, but what do you mean by voter 2 role analysis?

3 Q. We11, have you analyzed voter rolls for, you know, things 4 like residency issues?

5 A. Yes.
6 Q. Okay. Have you had any hand in administering elections?
7 A. Not as a poll worker.
8 Q. Does your -- I know your resume as it is in your report
9 is, what, a year or two old. Since -- since the time that --
10 that you provided that, have you gained any additiona1
11 experience with the NCOA registry?
12 A. No, that -- that direct experience would be reflected in
13 an article that is in that CV.
14 Q. Do you have any expecience with the NCOA's matching
15 algorithms that the Postal Service has embedded?
16 A. Not specifically with the NCOA.
17 Q. What about with CASS?
18 A. Not.
19 Q. Do you know what CASS is and how it's used?
20 A. No.
21 Q. What about with DPV?
22 A. I'm not familiar with what that means.
Q. Delivery point validation.
A. Again, I'm working with the NCOA and the files as produced. I don't know what DPV is.

1 Q. Do you have experience in mass mailing systems?
2 A. I would say no. I have done some large scale mailings,
3 but I don't know that I would characterize them as mass.
4 Q. Okay. Have you published any articles on NCOA or Postal
5 Service or mass mailing in any of the scholarly journals?
6 A. No.
7 Q. What about the trade publications?
8 A. What trade -- are you asking have I published in trade
9 publications?
10 Q. Yeah. MAIL Magazine for example.
11 A. No.
12 Q. Okay. Do you attend any of the typical postal industry 13 conferences?

14 A. No.
15 Q. Have you published any online postal or mailing
16 communities on the internet?
17 A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
18 Q. We11, have you published in any of the less formal
19 forums, like online newsletters and things like that that are related to postal services?

21 A. No.
22
23 A. No.
Q. Do you subscribe to any of the scholarly journals in the postal industry?

1 A. No.
2 Q. Do you follow any of the experts in that industry?
3 A. It's possible that I could have come across their work 4 and reviewed it. But follow, not that I regularly update 5 that.

6 Q. Do you know how many states allow voters to make
7 residency-based challenges?
8 A. No.
9 Q. So you wouldn't know the key difference in how the
10 statutes work?
11 A. No.
12 Q. Do you know what the time fraine to submit challenges was
13 in Georgia under the challenge law?
14 A. Not off the top of miy nead.
15 Q. Earlier you were talking about the cost of voting. And 16 you, I think, referred to some -- some academic scholarship. 17 Does the cost of model tell us anything about voters' 18 willingness to endure greater cost when an election is very 19 close?

20 A. There are things that are associated with proximity that 21 increase voter attentiveness. So it could be that a voter might pay more attention as an election gets close.
Q. Is that not reflected in the actual articles that you cite, though?
A. Well, it's -- it's reflected in my own work for things

1 like states that have a 30 -day or 28 -day cutoff for
2 registration will have lower turnout than states that allow 3 same day, early voting or same day registration or Election 4 Day registration.

5 Q. Do you know what the U.S. Postal Service's licensees of 6 NCOALink do with that database once they get access to it?

7 A. My understanding is that that is most commonly used for 8 mass mailings and marketing, but it depends -- again, I note 9 in the report that based on data that the post office people pay them to use the registry.

13 Q. Do you know if any of those licensees do any contextual 14 or probabilistic matching with the changes of address they get 15 from the Postal Service?

16 A. I would expect that they would.
17 Q. That's going to be more accurate than trying to do exact 18 match?

19 A. It should be. And it will -- well, when you -- I'll
20 leave it at that.
21 Q. Do you have a general idea of the number of records that 22 are submitted by customers of NCOALink that return a match in 23 forwarding address information?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if the NCOA link licensees make any attempt

1 to predict for their mass mailer clients whether a permanent 2 change of address is indeed permanent?

3 A. No.
4 Q. How are temporary changes of address reflected in the 5 NCOA?

6 A. So my understanding is that the nature of the form would 7 be reflected in the underlying NCOA data. That it should show

9 Q. Did you identify any temporary filings in -- in True the
10 Vote's challenge file?
11 A. No. Because the only data that had were the actual 12 challenge files. And I am not awiie if there was information 13 in there reflecting whether it was a temporary or permanent. 14 Q. So it's your understariding that whether someone marks 15 permanent or temporary on their form, which sometimes is 16 online, it's going to go in the National Change of Address 17 registry?
A. Well, I note in my report that the publications show that they can return different types of statuses to note the types of match and which fields match and which didn't, but, again, the information that $I$ had was the challenge files, which I'm not aware that it included that information.

1 Q. Um-hum. Now, you mention at page 33 of your report that 2 states do not use an NCOA match alone as a reason for removing 3 a voter from the list of registered voters. Why is it 4 relevant what states are trying to do to remove a voter?

5 A. Well, because that reflects the inherent problems of relying on the NCOA because of the issue of false positives. So it's simply to note that the underlying data has some known issues with its reliability.
Q. What is the rate of false positives?
A. I do he know.
Q. Now, what is the source of your statement that states don't use an NCOA match alone?
A. It's based on my experience in studying elections, but I don't know off the top of hiy head what the precise practices are in every state as they do their list maintenance processes.
Q. So you don t know what other tools states use to make that determination?
A. Well, it's most commonly -- it's a combination of an NCOA match, whether a voter responds to a card. There are some states that would rely or would have relied on something called the electronic registration information center, which would provide information about whether an individual had actually registered in another state. And it is typically engaged when a voter has not voted over at least two general

1 elections. So it's a combination of things.
2 Q. Who has access to that? I believe you referred to ERIC?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. Who has access to that?
5 A. So it's -- ERIC is a private organization that state 6 agencies can contract with. The number of states that rely on

7 ERIC has gone down. But I -- I -- I don't know if Georgia

9 experience and understanding, that there are- that states do not conduct list maintenance practices solely on an NCOA.

11 Q. How does someone who's not a state agency get access to 12 ERIC?

13 A. I don't believe they car
14 Q. Are you aware of whether, before the NCOA gets to Postal
15 Service licensees, like the ones used by True the Vote, the 16 Postal Service has evaluated the likelihood that a permanent

1 understanding, it's reflected on with the applicant or with 2 the individual files. I don't know what their process is.

3 Q. Are you aware of the measures the Postal Service takes in 4 evaluating whether someone who filed a change of address is 5 actually the person they represent themselves to be?

6 A. So the online form does have some validation. It
7 requires someone to upload some identifying information. So 8 there is a validation process.

9 Q. Will they hit your credit card as well?
10 A. I don't know. The form that I saw equires a driver's
11 license or other form of ID.
12 Q. All right. So you're not fagifiliar with a $\$ 1.10$ credit 13 card charge?

15 Q. And what about the -- well, okay.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Postal Services

21 algorithms around the NCOA and its ability to predict whether
A. No.

So you wouldn't -- you wouldn't know about the requirement that either the old or the new address has to be on the credit card bill?
A. No. changes of address that are marked permanent might actually be permanent?
A. No.
Q. Okay. When was the last time you personally ran an NCOA

2 A. That would have been 2017 or 2018. And it wasn't me, 3 personally. I was involved in that process that used a

4 commercial variant of the NCOA.
5 Q. Was it just that one time?
6 A. That's correct.
7 Q. Do you recall which vendor they used?
8 A. It was LexisNexis.
9 Q. Did you develop any opinions on which yendors were the
10 best to use?
11 A. No. That was the one that the survey center relied on.
12 Q. Are you familiar with the various tiers of vendors of the
13 NCOALink?
14 A. No.
15 Q. The 18 month versus 48 month?
16 A. No.
17 Q. When you were involved in running NCOA, how many records 18 were associated with that effort?

19 A. We ran it on several thousand.
20 Q. 2000?
21 A. I think it was more than 2000, but I don't know what the 22 exact number was.

23 Q. So you mentioned earlier that you're not familiar with
24 CASS; is that right?
25
A. That's correct.

1 Q. Do you believe the person running NCOA has any control
2 over the process?
3 A. I don't know. I mean, I don't know that there is a
4 single person who's responsible for the NCOA.
5 Q. Are you familiar with the Postal Service's requirements 6 of its NCOA vendors?

7 A. I have seen documents where the Postal Service describes
8 what that -- what vendors do, but I don't -- can't tell you
9 off the top of my head what their process is for evaluating applications to become a licensed vendor

11 Q. So you don't know whether they have requirements for
12 accuracy in matching?
13 A. No.
14 Q. Whether they're auditisd?
15 A. No.
16 Q. Now, let's tadk a little bit about false positives. On
17 page 33 of your report, you say the NCOA data are not error 18 free and the companies that conduct NCOA matching note that 19 false positives occur on a regular basis.
A. I mean, I wrote this report two and a half years ago, so

1 I don't know off the top of my head what that web page looks 2 like.

3 Q. You don't recall that it is basically a mom-and-pop 4 organization?

5 A. I don't know.
6 Q. So they -- they say in that source, "You may receive a 7 new address when the addressee has not moved at all. As

9 to be in a sma11 number, but do happen on a regular basis."
Is that what you were quoting from?
THE COURT: Hold on one second.
MR. SHELLY: Objection, Your Honor. I'm not sure what this is quoting from. W'e have no way to verify its accuracy.

MR. POWELL: Jt's in his report, Your Honor. It's in his footnote, what he cites. If you look at the web page that he cites, that's the quote.

MR. SHELLY: I don't know if you're quoting that website that appears now or when he wrote this report two and a half or three years ago.

THE COURT: Do you have that page, Mr. Powel1?
MR. POWELL: We may come back to that.
THE COURT: A11 right.
MR. POWELL: Just to keep it --
BY MR. POWELL:

1 Q. Do you have any other sources of false positives?
2 A. Yes. The academic literature on NCOA processes has found
3 that there are errors in people who are improperly flagged and 4 improperly removed based on NCOA data. And, again, I cite 5 that in the report, that the academic literature discusses 6 some of the inherent issues and the fact that minority voters 7 are more likely to be improperly flagged than white voters. 8 Q. So do you have a percent rate of the false positives? Is 9 it five? Is it 12?
A. I don't know what that false positive would be. I mean, we can go back to the academic literature, which I cite, which would have estimates of improper removals. But I don't know what those are off the top of my head.
Q. Well, let's say it's percent, that the person who filed a permanent change of address form saying they intended to move away permanently, for more than a year, actually comes back to their home or don't actually go to that address, but it's 10 percent. So we've got about a 90 percent rate of predictive power that someone who's in the NCOA registry actually did move permanently; would you agree?
A. If that's what the data show. But I don't know what the data show. And, again, my conclusions are not based simply on the status of temporary or permanent NCOA. It's based on what we can directly see in the data, and where voters who are -registrants who are filing NCOAs are actually moving to.

1 Q. So a petitioner who is trying to file a number of
2 challenges is, in a sense, able to rely on the accuracy of the
3 NCOA in saying, there may be probable cause to look into this 4 and conclude this person is ineligible.

What false positive error rate would make it unreasonable for someone to say some considerable percentage of the people in this file have probably moved away permanently and, Board of Elections, we'd like you to look into it a little further which tools that only you have?
A. Well, again, I'm not offering a conelusion about whether those beliefs are reasonable, except in regards to the fact that there is no evidence that ingiigible people are voting and that this process is more ikely to result in an eligible person being improperly faagged than it is for -- to prevent an ineligible voter from casting a ballot.
Q. You think it's more likely to, but you don't have any evidence that it did in reality.
A. Well, I know what the election administration literature says. But I can't give you a percentage based on the data that I analyzed because the information was not in those files.
Q. Now, in your demonstrative on page 17 you mention that the additional key identifying information in the voter file, such as a registrant's middle name, name, suffix, birth year, race, and gender, are not used to match, do you mean the NCOA

1 doesn't use middle names and gender?
2 A. I'm going off the description in the two places where I 3 noted how True the Vote -- or representatives of True the Vote 4 describe their process and the information that was in the -5 in the challenge files. But even if they did use middle 6 names, for example, that clearly didn't solve the problem of 7 eliminating duplicates. So, I mean, I suppose it's -- it's possible that the NCOA does use middle names, but that was not reflected in the descriptions of what True the Vote says they did.
Q. So you're saying that you -- ear ier I think you said that you didn't see any middle nanies in True the Vote's challenge file.
A. That's my recollectiof of how they did it. I don't know, again, going back and Jooking at the specific county files, whether there were any middle names in there. But, again, that doesn't affect my overall conclusion about the -- about the flaws in that process and the accuracy and reliability issues that we can directly see in the data, of which apparently not matching on middle names is one of them, but it's not the only one.
Q. So when you searched for duplicates, did you use first, middle, last, and address?
A. So when I searched for duplicates, I used first, middle -- sorry, first, last, and address, or in cases where

1 True the Vote had the voter registration number in the
2 challenge file actually linked to multiple individuals with
3 that name and address.
4 Q. Are you familiar with the different ways that people can
5 select an identifier for their permanent change of address,
6 like $F, I$, and $B$ and what those mean?
7 A. No.
8 Q. So you don't know if someone filed a change of address
9 and they marked F, that that stands for famiTy and it could
10 include anyone in the home?
11 A. It could. I don't know.
12 Q. A11 right. So if you had s€iiched for duplicates using
13 first, middle, last and address, and you can confirm this
14 during a break, and therecare over 61,000 middle names in True

17 A. Not in every case, because there were some instances
A. Well, it's not incomplete data. It was based on the descriptions that I -- that I had. There may have been other

1 elements of that that were not reflected in the descriptions. But when True the Vote says they used queries and algorithms,

3 I don't know what that means. And it doesn't -- I don't know 4 why there would be a challenged voter who doesn't have an address where they moved to or why there would be a name change or why it would be someone who moved to a military installation.

I mean, if I had a complete and accurate and reliable explanation of what True the Vote actually did and what that process looked like, I would have used thát information in my analysis. But that didn't exist.
Q. Did you look at their deposifion transcripts?
A. I don't believe I had those -- or I don't believe those had occurred at the time is wrote my report.
Q. They're not listed in your report; is that right?
A. That's correct.

MR. POWELL: Your Honor, would you like to break for lunch at some point? I probably don't have a lot more I need to do, but --

THE COURT: I'11 let you know. I'11 let you know.
MR. POWELL: All right. Hold on just one moment.
THE COURT: We need to move on.
MR. POWELL: Your Honor, I think that's all I have for now.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Any redirect?
MR. SHELLY: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. Can this witness be excused?
MR. SHELLY: Yes.
THE COURT: Mr. Powell, can this witness be excused? MR. POWELL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You're excused, sir. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: We'11 break for 1 unch, start back at
1:30. Thank you.
(The trial concluded at 12:25 p.m.)
(Change of reporters.)
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