IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee,

Petitioner,

v.

Pennsylvania Department of State, et al.,

Respondents.

No. 95 MD 2022

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS' PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR REVIEW

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRAÇÃ"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

					Page	
I.	INTRO	ODUCT	ION		1	
II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND					
	A.	The Co	ommitte	ee's "Investigation" and Subpoena	2	
	B.	The Committee's Inactivity				
III.	ARGUMENT					
	A.	THE PETITION FOR REVIEW FAILS AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE THE COMMITTEE HAS NOT AUTHORIZED THIS LITIGATION				
	В.	COUNT I FAILS AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE PETITIONER NOT ENTITLED TO A WRIT OF MANDAMUS				
		1.	Petitioner Does Not Have a Clear Right to the Records			
			a.	The Statutes the Petitioner Relies Upon Do Not Clearly Entitle It to the Requested Records	10	
			b.	The Request for Records Is Subject to Constitutional Limitations and Other Laws Governing Disclosure of Sensitive Information	13	
		2. Responding to a Records Request is Not a Ministerial Act				
CONC	CLUSIC	N	•••••	20 ¹	20	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Annenberg v. Roberts, 2 A.2d 612 (Pa. 1938)	5
Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm'n, 576 U.S. 787 (2015)	8
Camiel v. Select Comm. On State Contract Pracs. of House of Representatives, 324 A.2d 862 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1974)	12
Chadwick ex rel. Chadwick v. Dauphin Cnty. Office of Coroner, 905 A.2d 600 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2006)	9
Comm. on Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives v. Miers, 558 F. Supp. 2d 53 (D.D.C. 2008)	
Comm on Indiagram of U.S. House of Danuagantatives v. McCahn	
Commonwealth v. Vartan, 733 A.2d 1258 (Pa. 1999)	17
Commonwealth ex rel. Carcaci v. Brandamore, 327 A.2d 1 (Pa. 1974)	
Donahue v. State Civ. Serv. Comm'n, No. 84 MD 2020, 2020 WL 6155681 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Oct. 21, 2020)	19, 20
Fagan v. Smith, 41 A.3d 816 (Pa. 2012)	18
Greidinger v. Davis, 988 F.2d 1344 (4th Cir. 1993)	16
Jackson v. Vaughn, 777 A.2d 436 (Pa. 2001)	9
League of Women Voters v. Commonwealth, 178 A.3d 737 (Pa. 2018)	16

Lore v. Sobolevitch, 675 A.2d 805 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996)	6, 7
Maute v. Frank, 670 A.2d 737 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996)	14, 15
Pa. State Educ. Ass'n v. Commonwealth, Dep't of Cmty. & Econ. Dev., 148 A.3d 142 (Pa. 2016)	15
Phila. Firefighters' Union, Local 22 v. City of Phila., 119 A.3d 296 (Pa. 2015)	18
Project Vote/Voting for Am., Inc. v. Long, 752 F. Supp. 2d 697 (E.D. Va. 2010)	16
Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811 (1997)	8
Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811 (1997) Reese v. Pennsylvanians for Union Reform, 173 A.3d 1143 (Pa. 2017) Seeton v. Adams, 50 A.3d 268 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012) Tindell v. Dep't of Corr., 87 A.3d 1029 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014) True the Vote v. Hosemann, 43 F. Supp. 3d 693 (S.D. Miss 2014)	14, 15
Seeton v. Adams, 50 A.3d 268 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012)	18
Tindell v. Dep't of Corr., 87 A.3d 1029 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014)	10
True the Vote v. Hosemann, 43 F. Supp. 3d 693 (S.D. Miss 2014)	16
Statutes and Rules	
2 U.S.C. § 288b(b)	7
6 U.S.C. §§ 671-674	16
42 U.S.C. § 5195c	16
42 U.S.C. § 5195c(e)	17
25 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 1222(a)	19
25 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 1222(f)	19
25 Pa. Stat. § 2621	19
46 P.S. § 61	5
71 P.S. 8 272(a)	11

71 P.S. § 801	11
Pa. S. Rule 14	5
Pa. S. Rule 15	5
Pa. R.C.P. 1028(5)	4
Pa. R.C.P. 2002(a)	6
Other Authorities	
Pa. Const. art. I, § 5	16
Pa. Const. art. II, § 1	5
Pa. Const. art. II, § 11	5
Pa. Const. art. II, § 11 REFIREMENT PROMITEMOCRACITOCOM REFI	

The Pennsylvania Department of State and Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth Leigh Chapman (collectively, "Respondents") file this Brief in support of their Preliminary Objections to the Petition for Review ("Petition") filed by the Pennsylvania Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee ("Petitioner").

I. INTRODUCTION

This case is ostensibly an action by the Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee ("Committee") to enforce a September 15, 2021, subpoena to the Department of State ("Department") demanding, among other items, records containing driver's license numbers, partial Social Security numbers, addresses, and dates of birth for all nine million registered Pennsylvania voters (the "Subpoena"). Although the Petition was filed in the Committee's name, neither the Committee nor the Senate ever authorized it. Instead, it appears that Committee Chair Senator Cris Dush has taken it upon himself to unilaterally bring this suit in the Committee's name. But he has no authority to do so. Because neither the Committee nor the Senate has authorized this suit, and because Senator Dush has no authority to unilaterally act for the Committee, the Committee lacks capacity to sue. This suit therefore must be dismissed in its entirety.

Furthermore, Count I of the Petition must be dismissed for additional reasons. The Petitioner cannot establish a right to a writ of mandamus under Count

I because it does not have a clear right to relief under 71 P.S. § 272 or § 801, the statutes it seeks to enforce. First, the Committee has not actually sought records pursuant to those statutes. Second, even if the Committee's Subpoena is reconceived as an administrative request for records, the Department does not have a ministerial duty to respond. On its face, the demand for information implicates several constitutional rights and a federal law that limits what information the Department may produce. Just the need to consider the import of those constitutional provisions and federal law means the Secretary's duty to respond is not ministerial. Finally, mandamus is not appropriate where the Department's response to the Subpoena is not a mere ministerial duty.

Accordingly, the Petition must be dismissed in its entirety.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. The Committee's "Investigation" and Subpoena

On September 9, 2021, the Committee held its first ever election-related hearing. *See generally* Hr'g Tr. (Sept. 9, 2021) (Ex. 1). The sole topic was the Department's election related guidance during the 2020 election. *Id.* Only one official, Fulton County Commissioner Stuart Ulsh, testified at the September 9 hearing. *Id.* Former Acting Secretary Veronica Degraffenreid provided written testimony but did not personally attend the September 9 hearing in light of pending

litigation, including litigation that Commissioner Ulsh and Fulton County officials brought against her concerning election matters. *Id*.

The following week, the Committee held a short meeting at which it voted along party lines to issue a subpoena duces tecum to the Department, demanding it produce seventeen separate categories of documents. Hr'g Tr. (Sept. 15, 2021) at 4:14-16 (Ex. 2). The Subpoena seeks detailed information about every registered Pennsylvania voter, including names, addresses, dates of birth, detailed voting histories, driver's license numbers, and partial Social Security numbers. Petition, Ex. A. The Subpoena also seeks reports of audits and/or reviews of the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors ("SURE") system from 2018 to the present. *Id.* ¶ 16. That request encompasses sensitive information about Pennsylvania's election systems that, if disclosed, could make those systems vulnerable to attack. Marks Decl., ¶ 39 (Ex. 3). And the Subpoena demands the Department's communications with county election officials between May 1, 2020, and May 31, 2021, Subpoena ¶ 1; election procedures and policies in effect between August 1, 2020, and June 30, 2021, id. ¶ 2; materials used to train election workers between August 1, 2020, and June 30, 2021, id. \P 3; a copy of the certified results of the November 2020 general election and 2021 primary election, id. ¶ 15; and 2021

¹ This declaration was attached as Exhibit G to the Memorandum in Support of the Commonwealth Petitioners' Application for Summary Relief in *Costa v. Corman*, No. 310 MD 2021.

voter registration reports submitted to the Department, id. ¶ 17. The Committee has never explained why it needs all the information requested in the Subpoena or what exactly it plans to do with the information.

B. The Committee's Inactivity

The Committee went more than six months—from September 15, 2021, to March 31, 2022—without holding a single public hearing or meeting on anything, much less on its election "investigation." Pet'r's Answer to Prelim. Obj. ¶ 32. On March 31, 2022, the Committee convened for the first time since voting to issue the Subpoena to hold a hearing about ballot drop boxes. *Id.* ¶ 33. The Committee has never met to discuss the Subpoena or the related supposed "investigation," and it has never voted to enforce the Subpoena. *Id.* ¶ 34. Nor has the full Senate voted to enforce the Subpoena or authorized the Committee to do so. *Id.* ¶ 35. Senator Cris Dush, the Chair of the Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs, verified the Petition in this matter. *Id.* ¶ 40.

III. ARGUMENT

A. THE PETITION FOR REVIEW FAILS AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE THE COMMITTEE HAS NOT AUTHORIZED THIS LITIGATION

This Court should dismiss the Petition for Review because neither the Senate nor Committee has authorized a suit to enforce the Subpoena, and Senator Dush alone cannot act on behalf of either without such authorization. This suit must therefore be dismissed in its entirety. Pa. R.C.P. 1028(5).

The Commonwealth's legislative power is vested in its General Assembly.

Pa. Const. art. II, § 1. Article II, Section 11 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides that "*[e]ach House* shall have power to determine the rules of its proceedings and . . . *to enforce obedience* to its process[.]" Pa. Const. art. II, § 11 (emphasis added). And 46 P.S. § 61 states, "*[e]ach branch of the legislature* shall have the power to issue their subpoena, as heretofore practiced, into any part of the commonwealth" (emphasis added). The General Assembly may authorize other entities—such as a committee—to exercise its legislative power, but the exercise of legislative power must fit within the scope of delegated authority. *Annenberg v. Roberts*, 2 A.2d 612, 616 (Pa. 1938).

The Pennsylvania Senate has authorized the Committee to exercise certain aspects of legislative power and delegated to the Committee Chair a narrow set of powers. *See generally* Pa. S. Rule 14 (providing for Senate standing committees and designating their responsibilities and powers); Pa. S. Rule 15 (providing Committee Officers with specified powers and responsibilities). There is no delegation of authority, in the rules or elsewhere, that allows any single Senator—whether a committee chair or otherwise—to unilaterally bring suit in a committee's name. The Senate has not even authorized committees to authorize lawsuits. Until it does, that power remains with the full body.

In Pennsylvania "all actions shall be prosecuted by and in the name of the

real party in interest." Pa. R.C.P. 2002(a). The "real party in interest" in an action is "a person who has the power to discharge the duties created and to control a cause of action and the proceedings brought to enforce it." *Lore v. Sobolevitch*, 675 A.2d 805, 808 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996). "To be the real party in interest, then, one must not merely have an interest in the result of the action, but must be in such command of the action as to be legally entitled to give a complete acquittal or discharge to the other party upon performance." *Id*.

Here, as Petitioner admits, the Committee has neither met nor held any vote about whether to enforce the Subpoena. Pet'r's Answer to Prelim. Obj. ¶ 34. Without such a vote, at a minimum, the Committee itself—the real party in interest—has not authorized this suit.

Based on his verification of the Petition, it appears instead that Senator Dush brought this action and intends to pursue it in the Committee's name. Id. ¶ 40. But nothing in Pennsylvania law, and no act of the Pennsylvania Senate, authorizes a single senator to unilaterally initiate litigation in the name of a committee.

Moreover, Senator Dush cannot be the real party in interest in this action.

Senator Dush is the Chair of the Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee,
but he is not the Committee. Senator Dush has no authority to unilaterally bring
suit on behalf of the Committee without, at a minimum, the Committee's
authorization. So too, Senator Dush is not "legally entitled to give a complete

acquittal or discharge" upon performance. See Lore, 675 A.2d at 808.

In fact, it is doubtful that the Committee itself could initiate litigation to enforce the subpoena unilaterally without authorization from the Senate. In addressing the authority of congressional committees or other legislative to pursue litigation to enforce subpoenas, courts have consistently looked to the existence of express authorization from the full body, often in the form of a resolution. See Comm. on Judiciary of U.S. House of Representatives v. McGahn, 968 F.3d 755, 762 (D.C. Cir. 2020) (en banc) (allowing committee to proceed with lawsuit to enforce subpoena where the full House had expressly authorized the litigation by resolution); Comm. on Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives v. Miers, 558 F. Supp. 2d 53, 63 (D.D.C. 2008) (permitting lawsuit brought by committee to proceed where full House of Representatives had passed resolution authorizing its filing); see also 2 U.S.C. § 288b(b) ("The [Senate Legal] Counsel shall bring a civil action to enforce a subp[o]ena of the Senate or a committee or subcommittee of the Senate under section 288d of this title only when directed to do so by the adoption of a resolution by the Senate."). For instance, in *Miers*, the court concluded that "the fact that the House has issued a subpoena *and explicitly* authorized this suit . . . is the key factor that moves this case from the impermissible category of an individual plaintiff asserting an institutional injury . . . to the permissible category of an institutional plaintiff asserting an institutional

injury." 558 F. Supp. 2d at 71 (emphasis added) (citations omitted).²

The implications of permitting Senator Dush to act unilaterally for the Committee would be absurd. Consider, for example, a hypothetical situation in which Senator Jay Costa, another Committee member, voluntarily dismissed this action on behalf of the Committee. That act would have no more or less authority than Senator Dush's independent decision to initiate this action. Or imagine a situation in which Senator Dush purported to settle with the Department, but then a week later the Committee as a whole voted to continue the action. In that situation, the will of the Committee as the named Petitioner necessarily would control, underscoring that Senator Dush does not have the power to "give a complete acquittal or discharge" to the Committee, and thus had no authority to initiate this suit.

References by Petitioner to the scope of powers that each house of the General Assembly possesses fail to grapple with the fundamental problem here.

² These principles apply outside of the subpoena context as well. For instance, in *Raines v. Byrd*, the Court held that individual legislators could not bring an action asserting an "institutional injury" to their houses where they were not expressly authorized to do so. *See* 521 U.S. 811, 829 (1997) ("We attach some importance to the fact that appellees have not been authorized to represent their respective Houses of Congress in this action, and indeed both Houses actively oppose their suit."); *see also Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm'n*, 576 U.S. 787, 802 (2015) (upholding standing of legislature to bring litigation where both house had voted to authorize suit).

The issue here is not what the Senate *may* do (either itself or by delegation to Committee or even a single senator). The issue is that neither the Senate nor the Committee has *in fact* authorized this action, and neither has *in fact* authorized a single senator to initiate litigation in the name of the Committee.

It is undisputed that neither the Senate nor the Committee has voted to enforce the Subpoena. Senator Dush has taken unilateral action as an individual legislator and attempted to exercise legislative power without the authority to do so. Because an action to enforce the Subpoena has never been validly authorized, this Court should dismiss the Petition for Review for lack of capacity to sue.

B. COUNT I FAILS AS A MATTER OF LAW BECAUSE PETITIONER IS NOT ENTITLED TO A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner is not entitled to a writ of mandamus ordering Respondents to produce critical election security information and the personal information of more than nine million Pennsylvanians. A writ of mandamus "is an extraordinary writ that will only lie to compel official performance of a ministerial act or mandatory duty where there is a clear legal right in the plaintiff, a corresponding duty in the defendant, and want of any other appropriate and adequate remedy." *Jackson v. Vaughn*, 777 A.2d 436, 438 (Pa. 2001). "As a high prerogative writ, mandamus writs are rarely issued and never where the plaintiff seeks to interfere with a public official's exercise of discretion." *Chadwick ex rel. Chadwick v. Dauphin Cnty*.

Office of Coroner, 905 A.2d 600, 603 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2006). A writ of mandamus is available only to "enforce rights that have been clearly established." *Tindell v. Dep't of Corr.*, 87 A.3d 1029, 1034 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014).

Here, mandamus relief is unavailable for two reasons. First, Petitioner has no clear right to relief under 71 P.S. § 272 or § 801, and the requests are subject to constitutional and other legal limitations. Second, mandamus is inappropriate where, as here, the Department's duty is not ministerial. Accordingly, Count I is legally insufficient and must be dismissed.

1. Petitioner Does Not Have a Clear Right to the Records

Senator Dush does not have a clear right to the requested records. Neither of the statutes on which Petitioner purports to rely give it a clear right to the requested records, and in any case, Respondents have raised significant privacy, privilege, and security concerns that preclude mandamus relief.

a. The Statutes the Petitioner Relies Upon Do Not Clearly Entitle It to the Requested Records

Petitioner points to two scarcely used statutes in the Administrative Code for the bold proposition it is "clearly" entitled to the millions of requested records. To the extent Petitioner has properly invoked those statutes—and it has not—there is nothing "clear" about them.

First, neither the Committee (nor Senator Dush) has ever actually asked the Department to produce records pursuant to 71 P.S. § 272 or § 801. Instead, the

Committee issued a Subpoena. Nothing in the Committee's Subpoena references § 272 or § 801, and it has never been clearly established that those provisions provide the basis either for a legislative committee or an individual senator to enforce a subpoena or for a writ of mandamus to lie. The applicability of Sections 272 and 801 to a legislative subpoena would be an issue of first impression. That alone shows that Petitioner's right to relief is not clearly established.

Second, even if Petitioner had properly invoked § 272 or § 801, those statutes do not "clearly" entitle it to mandamus relief. Both statutes concern the circumstances under which the legislature may review Department records. Section 272 empowers the Acting Secretary "Flo permit any committee of either branch of the General Assembly to inspect and examine the books, papers, records, and accounts, filed in the department, and to furnish such copies or abstracts therefrom, as may from time to time be required." 71 P.S. § 272(a). Section 801 describes various duties of the Acting Secretary, including that "[t]he books, papers and accounts of the secretary shall be open to the inspection and examination of committees of each branch of the legislature, and secretary shall furnish such copies, or abstracts, therefrom, as may from time to time be required." 71 P.S. § 801. Neither statute defines the circumstance in which the provision of such materials is "required." No case has ever examined the statutes at issue, much less analyzed under what circumstances inspection of Department records

may "be required." In addition, this Court noted in an earlier order regarding this same Subpoena that legislatures do not have an unlimited right to require information: "Broad as it is, however, the legislature's investigative role, like any other governmental activity, is subject to the limitations placed by the Constitution on governmental encroachments on individual freedom and privacy."

Memorandum & Order ("Costa Mem. & Order") at 3, Costa v. Corman ("Costa" or "Costa, No. 310 MD 2021"), Nos. 310 MD 2021, 322 MD 2021, 323 MD 2021

(Pa. Commw. Ct. Jan. 10, 2022) (per curium) (quoting Commonwealth ex rel. Carcaci v. Brandamore, 327 A.2d 1, 4 (Pa. 1974)). Where this Court has already indicated that "material issues of fact" precluded enforcement of the Subpoena, see Costa Mem. & Order at 6, Petitioner cannot possibly show that the statutory language clearly entitles it to mandamus relief.

Third, any request for materials under § 272 or § 801 must necessarily be made for a proper legislative purpose, and the Committee has no such purpose. The Senate's investigative power is subject to important limits, including that any action be taken in furtherance of a proper legislative purpose. *Brandamore*, 327 A.2d at 3-4; *Camiel v. Select Comm. On State Contract Pracs. of House of Representatives*, 324 A.2d 862, 869 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1974). As Respondents have previously argued in detail, the Committee has repeatedly shifted its justifications for the Subpoena, and the purported justifications are either

illegitimate, pretextual, or have no connection to the material sought. *See, e.g.*, Oct. 14, 2021 Mem. in Supp. of Commonwealth Pet'rs' App. for Summ. Relief at 27-33 ("Pa. Br."), *Costa*, No. 310 MD 2021; Nov. 8, 2021 Pa. Reply at 7-10, 21-32, *Costa*, No. 310 MD 2021. Because the Subpoena has not been issued for a legitimate legislative purpose, Petitioner has no clear right to relief.

Fourth, § 272 and § 801 do not clearly authorize a legislative committee to require an agency to provide materials when the committee intends to distribute those materials to a third party, private entity. The statutes mention "inspection" and "examination" of certain documents by a legislative committee but do not clearly apply when a legislative committee intends to turn over Department documents to a third party. And concerns about third party access to Department documents are especially acute where, as here, there are factual questions about the private party's capacity to safeguard the documents. *See Costa* Mem. & Order at 5 (ruling there is "a substantial factual question surrounding the federal protection requirements and the capability of the Senate Committee's contracted vendor, Envoy Sage, LLC, to protect the infrastructure information.").

b. The Request for Records Is Subject to Constitutional Limitations and Other Laws Governing Disclosure of Sensitive Information

Even if the Committee had properly invoked § 272 and § 801, a writ of mandamus cannot issue because those statutes do not provide a clear right to

access documents that are protected by constitutional and other legal limitations.

Statutory requests for information are subject to external limitations, including constitutional and federal law at issue here. *See Reese v. Pennsylvanians for Union Reform*, 173 A.3d 1143, 1159 (Pa. 2017) (finding every government disclosure of personal information must be balanced against the right to informational privacy); *Brandamore*, 327 A.2d at 4. By itself, the need to consider if the request for records implicates these limitations defeats mandamus relief. *See Maute v. Frank*, 670 A.2d 737, 739 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996) (finding mandamus inappropriate where a balancing test must be applied pursuant to the Pennsylvania Constitution and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act).

Here, production of the requested documents under either § 272 and § 801 or via Subpoena implicates (1) millions of Pennsylvanians' constitutional right to privacy; (2) Pennsylvanians' right to fair elections and the free exercise of the right to vote as provided for in the Pennsylvania and U.S. Constitutions; (3) federal law protecting the disclosure of Protected Critical Infrastructure Information ("PCII"); and (4) common law protections associated with privileged information. Because this Court must balance the requests for documents with these constitutional and legal principles, it cannot be said that Petitioner has any "clear" right to relief.³

³ Respondents intend to explain why production of these records will lead to violations of the Pennsylvania and U.S. Constitution and federal law in their

First, Article I, Section 1 of the Pennsylvania Constitution protects the right of Pennsylvanians to informational privacy, which is the "right of the individual to control access to, or the dissemination of, personal information about himself or herself." *Pa. State Educ. Ass'n v. Commonwealth, Dep't of Cmty. & Econ. Dev.*, 148 A.3d 142, 150 (Pa. 2016).

The right to informational privacy can be infringed only if a compelling interest in disclosure outweighs individuals' privacy interests. *Id.* at 158. And, because the constitutional right to privacy applies anytime a third-party exercises control over an individual's personal information, the individual's interests must be balanced before any personally identifying information is disclosed, whether pursuant to a statute or subpoena. *See Reese*, 173 A.3d at 1159. The need to balance interests *before* producing voters' personal information defeats any assertion that Petitioner has a clear right to that information. *Maute*, 670 A.2d at 739.4

Second, requiring disclosure of every voter's personal information,

response to the Committee's Application for Summary Relief (as Respondents did in *Pennsylvania v. Dush*, 322 MD 2021 (Pa. Commw. Ct.)). Here, Respondents must only show that such a weighing of rights defeats mandamus relief.

⁴ Indeed, based on these (and other) arguments regarding the privacy interests at stake, this Court previously determined no party "established a clear right to relief" given the "outstanding issues of material fact." *See Costa* Mem. & Order at 6. The Court's holding on this point requires dismissal of the Committee's mandamus claim.

Pennsylvanians' right to free elections and to freely exercise the right to vote as protected by the Pennsylvania and U.S. Constitutions. Article 1, Section 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution commands that "Elections shall be free and equal" and that "no power, civil or military, shall at any time interfere to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage." Pa. Const. art. I, § 5. Article I, Section 5 also prohibits acts that "discourag[e] voters from participating in the electoral process." *League of Women Voters v. Commonwealth*, 178 A.3d 73, 814 (Pa. 2018).

The U.S. Constitution likewise carefully protects against acts that might discourage an individual from exercising the right to vote. Multiple courts have held that the unwanted sharing of voters personal information has such an effect. *See, e.g., Greidinger v. Davis*, 988 F.2d 1344, 1353-54 (4th Cir. 1993); *True the Vote v. Hosemann*, 43 F. Supp. 3d 693, 739 (S.D. Miss 2014); *Project Vote/Voting for Am., Inc. v. Long*, 752 F. Supp. 2d 697, 711-12 (E.D. Va. 2010). Because the requests for records must be balanced against the right to vote as protected by the U.S. Constitution and the Pennsylvania Constitution, Petitioner cannot demonstrate a clear right to relief, and mandamus cannot lie.

Third, some of the information sought by the Committee implicates PCII, which is barred from disclosure under federal law. 6 U.S.C. §§ 671-74; 42 U.S.C. § 5195c. "Critical infrastructure" are "systems and assets" that are "so vital to the

United States" that their incapacity or destruction "would have a debilitating impact on security, national economic security, national public health[,] or safety," 42 U.S.C. § 5195c(e), and election systems are one type of critical infrastructure. The Committee is not authorized to access PCII under federal law. Because the Court must evaluate whether the requested documents would constitute such protected information, Petitioner has no clear right to relief.⁵

Fourth, the Committee and Senator Dush appear to demand production of material that may be protected by the deliberative process privilege. In particular, paragraph 16 of the Subpoena requests draft documents and discussions about those drafts that are protected. *See* Pa. Br. at 69, *Costa*. Under the deliberative process privilege, the government may withhold documents containing 'confidential deliberations of law or policymaking, reflecting opinions, recommendations or advice. *Commonwealth v. Vartan*, 733 A.2d 1258, 1263 (Pa. 1999) (plurality) (citation omitted). Because this Court must determine whether production of the requested records would violate this privilege, Petitioner has no clear right to relief.

⁵ After extensive briefing on this issue, this Court determined that, as with the constitutional privacy issues, summary relief on the issue of PCII was inappropriate. The Court found there was "a substantial factual question surrounding the federal protection requirements and the capability of the Senate Committee's contracted vendor, Envoy Sage, LLC, to protect the infrastructure information." *See Costa* Mem. & Order at 5. Again, this Court's previous finding is dispositive as to whether mandamus here is appropriate.

2. Responding to a Records Request is Not a Ministerial Act

A writ of mandamus is inappropriate to "compel performance of a discretionary act or to govern the manner of performing [the] required act." *Phila*. *Firefighters' Union, Local 22 v. City of Phila*., 119 A.3d 296, 304 (Pa. 2015) (alteration in original) (quoting *Fagan v. Smith*, 41 A.3d 816, 817 (Pa. 2012)). Nor can it be used "to revise a public official's decision that results from the exercise of discretion." *Seeton v. Adams*, 50 A.3d 268, 273 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012).

Responding to a request for sensitive records is not a ministerial act the Acting Secretary could be "required to perform upon a given state of facts and in a prescribed manner in obedience to the mandate of legal authority." Phila. Firefighters' Union, 119 A.3d at 303 (citation omitted). As noted, the Subpoena seeks, among other things, voters' sensitive personal identifying information, PCII, and privileged material. Respondents must object to a records request where they believe that it is without a proper legal basis or where compliance with the request could conflict with other provisions of the Pennsylvania Election Code, federal law, or the Pennsylvania and U.S. Constitutions. The Department must review all potentially responsive documents to determine whether they are responsive, whether they are privileged—and if so, what privilege applies—and whether production of the requested records would conflict with federal or state laws protecting the right to privacy or expose sensitive election infrastructure

information.

An executive official's judgment and discretion is necessarily implicated by a request for sensitive departmental records. As the Commonwealth's chief election officer, the Acting Secretary is charged with "exercis[ing] in the manner provided by this act all powers granted" to her in the election code. 25 Pa. Stat. § 2621. Among other things, she is charged with developing and establishing the SURE system and promulgating regulations necessary to administer the system which stores the private information of all Pennsylvania electors. 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. §§ 1222(a), (f). While performing her role as chief elections officer she must act in compliance with the Pennsylvania and federal Constitution as well as an array of complex Commonwealth and federal election laws.

In short, Respondents have ample bases to exercise their judgment and discretion in determining the proper response to the Committee's request—regardless of whether it was made pursuant to the Subpoena⁶ or by statute—as the

⁶ Petitioner seemingly asserts that it is entitled to mandamus relief ordering Respondents to comply with the Subpoena. *See* Petition, ¶ 41. But Petitioner cannot seek a writ of mandamus ordering Respondents to comply with the Subpoena. "Simply because [Petitioner] was dissatisfied with [Respondents'] exercise of [their] judgment in responding to the Subpoena does not entitle [it] to mandamus relief." *Donahue v. State Civ. Serv. Comm'n*, No. 84 MD 2020, 2020 WL 6155681, at *4 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Oct. 21, 2020).

The *Donahue* decision is on point. There, petitioner subpoenaed the Department of Human Services ("DHS") and sought to enforce the subpoena by seeking a writ of mandamus in Commonwealth Court. *Id.* at *1. The court found

Respondents would with any sensitive records request.

Petitioner, however, asserts that a writ of mandamus is an appropriate vehicle to obtain the requested materials because the provision of such materials is a "ministerial" or "mandatory, non-discretionary obligation." Petition, ¶¶ 43, 55. According to Petitioner, Respondents must robotically respond to a broad and intrusive records request that would turn over the personal identifying information of millions of Pennsylvania voters to a private, third-party entity retained by the Committee. That is incorrect. Petitioner may disagree with how Respondents exercised their discretion, but it cannot credibly dispute the seriousness of the constitutional and federal legal issues that are implicated by its request or that the Acting Secretary has a duty to exercise careful judgment and discretion before handing over PCII and the sensitive, private information of millions of Pennsylvania electors. Nothing about the Committee's request could be characterized as triggering a merely "ministerial" response from Respondents. Mandamus relief should be denied on that basis alone.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents respectfully request that this Court

that DHS had already met its obligations where it "reviewed the Subpoena requests, determined that the requested documents could not be produced, and timely notified [petitioner] of the reasons why." *Id.* at *4. Here, just as in *Donahue*, Petitioner cannot force Respondents to rubber stamp a subpoena by seeking mandamus relief.

sustain their Preliminary Objections and enter an order dismissing the Petition for Review.

REFRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET, COM

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 27, 2022

Josh Shapiro
Attorney General
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Michael J. Fischer (Bar No. 322311)
Chief Counsel and Executive Deputy
Attorney General
Jacob B. Boyer (Bar No. 324396)
Deputy Attorneys General
PENNSYLVANIA OFFICE OF
ATTORNEY GENERAL
1600 Arch Street, Suite 300
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(267) 768-3968
mfischer@attorneygeneral.gov
jboyer@attorneygeneral.gov

/s/ *Bradie R. Williams*

John C. Dodds (Bar No. 44423)
Braide R. Williams (Bar No. 327334)
Susan Baker Manning
(admitted pro hac vice)
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
john.dodds@morganlewis.com
bradie.williams@morganlewis.com
susan.manning@morganlewis.com
(215) 963-5000

Christine P. Sun (admitted pro hac vice)
Marina Eisner (admitted pro hac vice)
STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY
CENTER
1101 17th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
christine@statesuniteddemocracy.org
(615) 574-9108
marina@statesuniteddemocracy.org
(240) 600-1316

Attorneys for Respondents

EXHIBITE TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE

Page 1

Page 3

TRANSCRIPTION OF

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE 2020

GENERAL ELECTION AND THE 2021 PRIMARY ELECTION

SEPTEMBER 9, 2021

REPORTED BY: MARICOPA REPORTING,INC.

SOMMER E. GREENE, RMR 8686 E. SAN ALBERTO, #300

CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85258

CERTIFICATE NO. 50622 480.597.4744

for everyone.

It's particularly important that we perform these reviews as an aid in determining -- determining if legislative changes are necessary now because the 2020 general election and '21 primary represent some of the first elections under Act 77 of 2020 and Act 12 of 2021. I don't believe anyone would argue that Act 77 significantly changed how Pennsylvania conducts its elections at the municipal, county, and state levels of government.

Consequently, the impacts and execution of our election code must be looked in -- looked at to determine if further legislation is needed to correct any ambiguous sections, confusing sections, and/or sections that our sister branch of government deemed unconstitutional. That is our job as the legislative branch.

However, some of our fellow Pennsylvanians may not clearly understand why this is our job as the legislative branch and, more specifically, why this committee was selected to conduct this investigation. Those are appropriate questions.

In fact, the first question, which must

Page

SEPTEMBER 9, 2021

SENATOR DUSH: I now call this public hearing of the Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee to order.

Today, we will be hearing testimony regarding the Pennsylvania Department of State's last-minute guidance before the 2020 general election. Today's hearing and the investigation we are conducting in this committee are not about President Trump as some have -- as some reports in the news have implied.

This investigation is 1not about overturning the results of any election, as some would suggest. That horse is out of the barn as far as this investigation is concerned.

Rather, this investigation is about looking intensely into the general election held November 2020 and the primary election held in May of 2021, to evaluate our election code is working and to confirm whether or not these things and their worth — if there were things that need to be changed in the law to make our elections run better

Page 4

be asked and answered in the affirmative by any
governmental authority is, do we have the authority
to take this action?

The initial part of this hearing will lay out that authority to the people of the Commonwealth so that if someone asked that question in the future, all one has to do is refer the questioner to the video of this hearing.

The Pennsylvania senate's authority, responsibility, and organization are primarily governed by four documents; three of which are specific to Pennsylvania.

These are the US Constitution, the Pennsylvania Constitution, the Rules of the Senate and Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure.

For this investigation, we really start with the Pennsylvania Constitution. And that's appropriate. It is -- it is comprised of 11 articles or sections. The 11 articles are often considered to be in order of importance, especially the first several.

For instance, Article I is our written
Declaration of Rights as Pennsylvanians. We, the
people of Pennsylvania, wanted to make sure the
government we created could never overstep its

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Page 5

given authority and never infringe upon this list of 29 precious rights. Unfortunately, most people don't realize that in Pennsylvania, we actually do have 29 enumerated rights listed clearly in our Constitution. I recommend everyone actually look up and see what your 29 rights as Pennsylvanians actually are.

Before we go further, let me quickly describe where the concept of our constitutional government come -- came from. You see, people have always had a dis- -- a distrust, rightly so, of those who have influence and authority over their daily lives. There is something within each and every American and Pennsylvanian that understands that those who have such power can possibly have motivations to abuse it to their own ends.

In the United States, the people understood this at our founding. They understood the inherent propensity in this fallen world for those who have power to seek even greater power, especially through government.

The system of checks and balances that this Republican form of government was set up in a manner in which acknowledges that inherent propensity, while also recognizing the need of Page 7

government systems. Sovereigns make the rules. The people of America recognize that they were in the position of making the rules in America.

Second, they also realize that they could not all be making their own rules about how to -- they and their neighbors should interact with one another on a one-by-one basis, but needed some form of governance by which they could come to -- to agreement on rules to solve this. They chose a Republican form of governance under covenants called constitutions.

Again, quoting from Commentaries, the definition of the term "constitution." Quote, Whatever may be the definition of constitution in its broad sense, in America, it is understood to mean a written instrument enacted by the people acting directly in their sovereign capacity.

Again, the people are the sovereigns.

The sovereigns acting collectively make the rules.

The sovereigns have chosen to use a covenant called the Constitution to set those rules in place.

Now, let's go back to the -- how the Senate is governed and how it derives its authority, responsibilities, and organizations.

After declaring our rights in the first

Page

having a civil government capable of protecting the rights of the individual.

The quote from Commentaries on the Constitution of Pennsylvania by Thomas Raeburn White, a book that I think everybody in the Commonwealth should get as part of their seventh grade civics course or Peonsylvania government course, the book most often cited by the Pennsylvania courts on constitutional principles under the law.

I quote, When the Declaration of Independence severed the bonds which joined the American colonies to the government of Great Britain, the sovereignty, formally exercised by the King and Parliament, descended upon the American people. As the ordinary governmental functions could not be exercised by the people acting directly, it became necessary for them to establish governments to which they could delegate certain of their powers, end quote.

Let me reemphasize two points in that comment.

One, sovereignty. One usually uses the term in regard to kings, emperors, Caesar, and other -- other monarchal governments -- monarchal

Page 8

article, the most important articles, our ancestors in Pennsylvania set up the next most important thing in forming a government, the legislature. The legislature is the rules committee. The legislature is set up in Article II and the process of legislation is set up in Article III.

You see, the legislature makes all the laws or rules necessary for the government to function through being the cont- -- continual and most direct voice of Pennsylvanians within government.

Without the legislation making -without the legislature making the laws, there
wouldn't be much of an organized functioning
society able to sys- -- systematically function,
economically settle disputes, and provide a safe
place to live.

Immediately, in Article II and III, the Senate, along with the House of Representatives, is established and given the job of legislating, passing laws. It clearly states this is our job.

Now, forgetting for a moment all the serious concerns and some unfortunate jokes
Pennsylvanians have about how good our lawmaking is, we do try our best to pass good laws. But as

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

Page 9

we all know from our everyday lives, in everything we do as humans, there is room for improvement; nothing is perfect.

Sometimes, although we try to anticipate the effects of our laws and how they will work in as many different situations as possible, sometimes circumstances arise that we just can't anticipate. And in those situations, the law we've written may not be sufficiently developed to adapt to and accommodate those circumstances in a way that comports to our original -- original intent.

Unfortunately, I think many
Pennsylvanians will agree with this last point. We
don't always see the impacts of the laws we create
beforehand. We don't always see the second and
third order impacts of what will happen before we
make that vote.

In those cases, we need to go back and investigate those impacts to improve the law. This is what we are doing here.

The legislature did not fully see the impacts of 77 -- Act 77 and what they would do to our electoral system, particularly when combined with a pandemic and how the people of Pennsylvania

Page 11

specifically states that each house of the General Assembly has the power to make their own rules and no other branch has the authority to dispute our rules and how the Senate operates, these rules are vitally important.

The last document I mentioned that governs how the Senate operates really is an extension of the Senate rules and is also something the majority of America's state legislatures use to guide how they operate. It's Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure.

In fact, Senate Rule No. 26 states in summary that, whatever is not covered by our specific Pennsylvania Senate rules, Mason's Manual is the authority and our rule book.

In fact, it is so well recognized to both the United States and the Pennsylvania Supreme Courts quote it as an authoritative voice or source in their decisions.

So why are we here in the Intergovernmental Operations Committee?

Well, Senate Rule 14 establishes what all of our committees will be for the session. Committees are smaller groups of senators that focus on specific areas of law or legislation.

Page

would feel about it before it was passed. Now we're going back to take a look and see if anything needs to change.

Some people will say that what I just explained is not enough to justify why our committee is doing what it's doing. So let me explain a little more about how the Senate operates and why the Intergovernmental Operations Committee is the lead — is leading the Senate election investigation.

In Article II, Section 11, entitled,
Powers of Each House, in addition to what the
Pennsylvania Constitution says about how the Senate
should operate, it states that the Senate will also
determine the rules of our proceedings. This is
where the third document that govern -- governs the
Senate comes into play, the Senate rules.

Every session, the Senate votes to approve the rules, ru- -- rules which these days only change slightly from session to session. The current -- current 38 Senate rules are necessary to govern how day-to-day operations occur. Things that are important, but not so much that they need to be part of the Constitution.

But since the consti- -- Constitution

Page 12

Currently, we have 22 committees. There is nothing specifically establishing a committee's

jurisdiction, but we try to use commonsense names of committees to indicate what they are typically responsible for handling.

For example, the Banking Insurance Committee regularly focuses on and is -- has responsibility for any legislation or legal matter regarding banking and insurance.

It is the same concept for the Aging and Youth Committee and the Education Committee. We can guess, looking at their names, what top---what topics are likely to come before them.

The concept is no different for this committee. The Intergovernmental Operations Committee, although we can certainly understand if the general public might not immediately associate the committee's name with elections. However, the meaning of the Intergovernmental -- of intergovernmental is multiple levels of government and how they interact.

So while our local government committee focuses just on municipal and county government issues, and our state government committee focuses on state government issues, an appropriate focus

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 13

for the Intergovernmental Operations Committee is legislation and laws that involve multiple levels of government.

I already mentioned how elections are a multilevel enterprise that runs the entire gamut of levels of government. Election law and execution of all federal, state, county, and municipal governments, which fits right into the definition of intergovernmental, multiple lever -- levels of government.

Now, we know why we're here in the Intergovernmental Operations Committee. But still, some people still might say we don't have the power to investigate elections.

Well, according to our rules, whose power and authority comes directly from the Pennsylvania Constitution, we do.

Senate Rule 14 governs committee actions. While there may be details contained in it, Rule 14 specifically states, the standing committee is authorized to require public officials -- "A standing committee is authorized to require public officials and employees and private individuals to appear before the standing committee for the purpose of submitting information to it."

Page 15

earliest times in the history of the US legislation, both federal and state, and from even earlier -- earlier epochs in the development of British jurisprudence.

Mason's Manual Section 795, paragraph 2, "The legislature has the power to investigate any subject regarding which it may desire information in connection with the proper discharge of its function to enact, amend or reveal statutes or to perform any other act delegated to it by the Constitution."

Section 795, paragraph 13, "In the exercise of its power to make investigations, a legislature may incur reasonable necessary expenses payable out of the public funds."

Section 757, paragraph 2, "Legislatures use several mechanisms to oversee the operation of the executive branch. These include program evaluation and performance auditing units, review and analysis of agency budgets, and review of administrative regulations."

It cannot be disputed that elections are subject -- are a subject on which the legislation is appropriate. Our United States Constitution provides at Article I, Section 4, that

Page 14

It goes on to say that this is necessary, as we discussed earlier, to enable us to write good and effective legislation because we need information to make the best decisions we can.

This is also referred to as an investigation. It's not a criminal investigation, but rather an investigation to gather and study evidence on a particular topic. This hearing is on the impacts of Act 77 on the Pennsylvania elections.

Going another step further, Mason's Manual, the countrywide recognized manual for legislative operations and the extension of our Senate rules, mentions legislation -- legislative investigations many times. In fact, Chapter 73 is an entire chapter dedicated to just how to conduct legislative investigations.

Critical specific passages from Mason's Manual include Section 795, paragraph 1, "The right of the legislative body to make investigations in order to assist it in the preparation of wise and timely laws must exist as an indispensable incident and auxiliary to the proper exercise of legislative power."

This has been recognized from the

Page 16

at times -- that the times, places, and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives are to be prescribed by the state legislatures.

Our Pennsylvania Constitution contains an entire article, Article VII, on elections and specifically contemplates in Section 6, the passage of laws, regulating the holding of elections, placing certain parameters on those laws, and specifying the General Assembly's role in the passage of those general laws on elections. This committee, therefore, is clearly gathering information on a subject on which the legislature is permitted to enact laws.

So with all that being said, this is why we find ourselves here today. To -- continuing to investigate if our election laws are correct as written or if they need to be modified.

Our big evidence that we need to be modified is the very fact that so many court cases were filed and litigated over the November 2020 election. Most of these cases were filed because the parties alleged an ambiguity in the law that related to the -- that needed to be clarified and resolved for the operation of whatever -- whatever upcoming election existed.

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

Page 17

Our sister branch of government ultimately decided there were ambiguous -- ambiguous sections, confusing sections and/or unconstitutional sections.

Therefore, we're going to gather as much evidence as necessary to figure out what our election laws need to be and to restore the faith of Pennsylvanians in that election system.

One last thing before I end my remarks.

Subpoenas. There's been news, speculations and public arguments about subpoenas. As the chairman of this committee, it is my firm position with respect to subpoenas that we will follow the advice of counsel and longstanding Senate precedent in determining whether and when subpoenas are necessary. The power to issue a subpoena isn't unlimited and we must ensure sound legal footing before we proceed down that path.

In addition, we must be ready, willing, and able to actually review and utilize meaningfully any information that we receive in response to our subpoenas. Having a hearing like this one that we're having today allows us the room to satisfy -- satisfy those consi- -- considerations.

Page 19

types of human beings.

Our family in particular admitted itself to this country generations ago. It's noted through its military service, its sacrifice in public service, and a variety of other means.

I personally, through my childhood, experienced some of the greatest moments in the transition and evolution of this country during the civil rights movement. But not only people of color, but women, disabled, and veterans benefitted by extraordinary legislation and public policy which advanced this nation to truly include all Americans in the American dream.

This is expressed singly and most importantly through one's right to vote. Democrats since the '60s have been very committed to the process of opening up the opportunity to express itself -- express one's self through the right to vote. Certainly, the historic legislation that allowed every individual, and particularly African-Americans, the right to vote in the '60s, up until currently advancing mail-in voting. Today, I'm almost in disbelief. I sit here mostly in frustration.

I've been a member of the General

Page 18

Keep in mind, also, that the power to issue a subpoena is not held by one person. The issuance of a subpoena is a committee action.

In conclusion, this committee appreciates the foundational work conducted by the bipartisan Senate Special Committee on Election Integrity and Reform chaired by Senators Langerholc and Street. We -- we will build on their excellent work, not repeat it.

This committee also appreciates the foundational work of Representative Gross, House State Government Committee, and the report they produced summarizing their efforts.

I now defer to Sen- -- Senator Williams, the Democratic Chair of the Intergovernmental Operations Committee to offer introductory remarks.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you all for gathering here today.

I'll say a majority of my life, my family and I have been involved in what we would consider the advancement of this country. That's not a perfect union. It, nonetheless, is a construct of perspectives' opinions in different Page 20

Assembly for over 30 years. Two-thirds of that time has been in this body. In all my time here, through all the great victories and upsetting defeats, bipartisan breakthroughs and partisan obstructions, my resolve to work with whomever and however to help the people of this Commonwealth, the constituents in my district, as well as yours,

achieve a better life has never wavered.

What is occurring today is the exact opposite of that objective. What is happening here today is a travesty, plain and simple. This isn't about gathering information to help improve the election process and it certainly isn't about seeking truth on behalf of the citizens of Pennsylvania. This isn't even a real investigation. This exercise is one part of the ongoing nationally orchestrated attack on our electoral system.

This is an attack on one of our greatest freedoms. It's an attack on our right to vote. This entire tragic charade has been going on for ten months now. Although, in actuality, the first seeds were planted even before the election took place last year. But here we sit, in September 2021, still giving oxygen to the big lie.

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

Page 21

Because as long as that lie exists, it will remain a rallying cry in the deceptive attempts to sow doubt in the minds of electorate and help promote changes to our electoral system that are partisan and create a system to overturn election results that are unfavorable -- unfavorable to one party.

This sham review is not the pursuit of transparency. The goal is simply to stoke distrust and division with not just in our political families, but across this country. And the most exasperating part of it all is that everyone on this panel knows that, we know this, and you know this. And yet here we sit, witnessing the exploitation of the people out there who honestly believe that the lies they've been told about so-called irregularities and rigging is the basis of which is not founded in fact. Because they trust what they are told and by whom they are told. This is sad and it's wrong. Notwithstanding the sheer ruthlessness and cruelty of which I just described, let's go through the other reasons why this is such an appalling situation.

While the rules of the Senate may seem tenuous -- tedious and sometimes admittedly archaic, they are rules. The rules are grounded in

purview, and it's acting recklessly in that -- in that process, with only political motive in mind.

We are fearful. This sets a dangerous precedent in which it becomes a super committee. And with self-appointed authority that has no checks and no balances and no limits.

Another reminder I have for everyone is that Act 77, which includes the most significant updates to the Pennsylvania election code in decades, included provisions that allow for vote by mail. It was passed with overwhelming bipartisan votes in both chambers of the General Assembly.

But now that they didn't get the result they wanted in only one race on the ballot, mind you, they're calling for an investigation that could potentially be used as an exercise to get rid of mail-in voting and other means that make voting more accessible to all citizens of Pennsylvania.

There are legislators who filed suit just last week to have the law ruled unconstitutional and overturned. The very law, that of the 13, 11 voted for. I was involved as a Democratic chair of the state government committee. People fought tooth and nail to get that legislation passed as swiftly as possible so that

Page 22

the ideals of openness and fairness and they aren't rules that we're just supposed to follow. They are rules that we as a body vote on and approve at the beginning of each legislative session. Underscore collectively vote upon these rules, including the committee structure and its purposes.

Within these rules is the outline of our committee structure and what each specific committee struc- --- functions and jurisdiction is within the confines of our branch's role in the system of checks and balances.

That leads me to here. Where I can tell you, as both the current ranking member of this committee and as a part of the ranking member of the state government committee, we have no authority to over- -- or oversight or subpoena power over -- over any election-related matters.

We all know, at least those of us who know how to do our jobs and our obligation to our -- to our oath of office know, the state government committee oversees matters of elections and matters of election code.

While it is our job to protect the people's right to vote and ensure the ballot access for all, this committee is operating out of its

Page 24

Page 23

provisions would be in place in time for the 2020 election.

The last time I checked, we support the freedom to vote. So why are senate republicans looking to disrupt that freedom with an anti-voter investigation? Voters pick the leaders. Our leaders do not pick which voters to hear and which voters to silence. This is making a mockery of that sacred right.

The 2020 election has been litigated many times and each claim of any impropriety has been proven false. Multiple legitimate audits have been conducted and the election has been certified since late last year. The call for additional reviews of election results that have been audited multiple times and certified for over nine months only serves to challenge our values as Pennsylvanians.

Audits at the -- at the -- the county level and state levels have already been conducted pursuant to state law. We do not need further evidence that our elections were properly administered and free of fraud, particularly through audits lacking any legal authority.

All the facts clearly show that the

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 25

election results were fair and valid. Over 50 courts across the country, independently of one

another, have examined these claims and found them

to be completely baseless. And speaking of the

5 2020 election results, half of the Senate was on

6 that same ballot. Let me repeat. And in speaking

7 of 2020 election results, half of the Senate.

8 Republican and Democrat, was on the same ballot.

9 Including a dozen Republican state senators who

10 won -- who won reelection and other winning

elections to the Senate for the first time and some

who are on this committee. Yet one of them questions the integrity of these results.

questions the integrity of these results.
 And least we not forget, for the

And least we not forget, for the first time in 60 years, Pennsylvanians elected Republicans to the post of state treasurer, defeating an incumbent Democrat, an auditor general, and came within reach of out-sitting a sitting Democratic Attorney General.

This is not a sign of a stolen election. This is a betrayal of a sacred trust. This is about the big lie that may have been begun by feeding into the whims of a former president that has quickly spread like wildfire throughout this country and it's corrupting our discourse and

Page 27

too turned off about the process to participate or
 worse. You fall into the category of those who are
 trying to disenfranchise under the ruse of election
 security reforms.
 Instead of a sham investigation being

Instead of a sham investigation being conducted on the big lie, we encourage our colleagues to focus on real election improvements. And our counties are pleading for -- to -- are pleading for us to assist them in carrying our elections more efficiently and inclusively. Both Democratic and Republican counties are asking for precanvasing of mail-in ballots. Democrat and Republican counties are asking for drop-box security. Democrat and Republican counties are asking for sufficient resources to support poll workers. Democrat and Republican counties are asking for new technology requirements. These calls are not new. Counties have been asking for our help since 2020 primary in June.

We had the entire summer and fall to pass a measure that would relieve some of these bordens in time for the November election. They warned us of the challenges they face and beg---begged us for help in upgrading the process.

And yet, the majority in charge of

Page

retribution is sought at all levels of elected office.

But if you don't want to believe me, because my candidate was on the winning side of the election, take it from the reputable Republicans, reputable Republicans who stand firmly with this truth.

This ill-conceived investigation is also a gross misuse of taxpayers' money for political purposes. Wasteful spending by counties being forced to chase a basic conspiracy -- basis conspiracy theory is no way to use taxpayers' money.

Further unnecessary investigations are going to be expensive and a waste.

And speaking of counties who may be strapped with this burden, just a few days ago, Senate Republicans could not even cite which counties their investigations would focus upon.

Again, no one is looking for the answers to made-up problems that are dangling in front of the people. Those answers don't exist because this is a sham. It's all just perpetuating a lie to get as many people upset and as confused to the point where they are too turned against --

Page 28

setting the agenda won't act to implement those needed improvements.

In a time where we have real issues to tackle in Pennsylvania, why would Senate Republicans waste valuable time and resources in pursuit of the big lie?

Anyone who is making the sham review a priority is not showing concern for our collective constituents. How will this review benefit constituents?

Will it keep people in their homes?

Will it create new jobs?
Will it help individuals it

Will it help individuals making a fair living wage?

Will it help businesses recover from the economic hardships of the pandemic which has been caused?

Will it provide our students with educational opportunities?

Will it provide broadband infrastructure so people in rural Pennsylvania and urban communities can have access to today's technology?

Will it eradicate toxic schools? Address the gun violence that is

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

Page 29

devastating so many areas across Pennsylvania?
Will it keep our elderly nursing home

residents residing safe and healthy?

Will it help clean up those victims from climate change and the floods which are occurring almost every month?

The 2020 presidential election results reflect votes made by Americans, making key decisions that impact their lives, like pandemic relief, health care and economic well-being. This anti-voter investigation disregards those decisions and the values that guided voting across the commonwealth. We see through those people who spread lies, refuse to govern in our interests, and pass laws -- laws to silence our votes and our voices.

Pennsylvanians deserve leadership that deliver for our families and implement standards that protect our rights, not those that stifle them. Doing the right thing is difficult and shouldn't be deemed courageous. It's what we were sent here to do. That's what I was sent here to do over 30 years ago. It's our sworn duty and our moral obligation.

Living with the fact of knowing, lying

Page 31

At this time, we'll move to testimony
and we are blessed to have Stuart Ulsh,
Commissioner of the Fulton County, with us to
testify. And Mr. Ulsh, you're recognized for your
testimony.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: All right. Thank you, Chairman.

Good afternoon, Senators. My name is
 Stuart Ulsh. I am a chairman of the Fulton County
 Board of Commissioners, county commissioners, and
 the board of elections. I want to thank you all
 for the opportunity for testifying before your
 committee.

Prior to the 2020 general election, the board of elections received numerous guidance and other directives from the Secretary of the Commonwealth, Kathy Boockvar, including the night before the election.

Our board, along with all of our election employees, worked very hard to understand and follow with the information and guidance received from Secretary Boockvar. I personally had numerous conversations with her before, during, and after the November general election. Our board of election has the power under the Pennsylvania law

Page

at the expense of those who put their trust in us, is a real burden to carry. Let us move past further review of the fair and credible election results of 2020 and get down to doing the people's business.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Chairman.

Before we continue, I'd like to run through some quick housekeeping items for the members and panelists.

First, everyone is muted until their -it's their turn to speak. Members, you will be
unmuted when asking a question and will remain
unmuted through the duration of the answer. In an
effort to get as many questions as possible, with
the exception of the chairs, members are limited to
one question at a time and we will allow as many
questions as possible to stay within our timeframe.

Members, please continue to contact committee staff to participate in each round.

As a reminder to all members and testifiers, this hearing is being recorded and live-streamed. Testimony and the hearing's recording will be available on our committee's website.

Page 32

to inspect, investigate, and safeguard our own elections in Fulton County.

In December of last year, we decided to authorize Wake TSI to review our handling of the elections --

SENATOR DUSH: Commissioner, can I -- I apologize. I forgot, I neglected something. I need you to -- if you'd please rise and raise your right hand.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Oh.

SENATOR DUSH: I've got to get you sworn in. And that's my fault.

Do you swear the statements that you've already made and that you are going to proceed to make, and the answers to questions will be truthful, honest and complete to the best of your knowledge, so help you God?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I do.
SENATOR DUSH: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ULSH: And thank you,

21 Chairman.

Okay. Our election board has the power under Pennsylvania law to inspect, investigate and safeguard our own elections of Fulton County. In December of last year, we decided to authorize Wake

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

Page 33

TSI to review our handling of the elections and to provide us with a report.

After Wake TSI conducted its investigation of the elections, Fulton County posted a copy of the Wake's report on the county's website. At that point, we were asked to provide the acting Secretary of the Commonwealth, Veronica Dagraffenreid, a letter explaining, excuse me, what was done during our investigation. We provided a

was done during our investigation. We provided a
letter as requested by the acting Secretary.
Shortly thereafter, we were notified by the acting
Secretary by -- that both Fulton County Dominion
machines were decertified.

With no other options available, Fulton County has been forced to initiate litigation against the acting Secretary, challenging her decision to decertify Fulton County election machines.

Our case against the acting Secretary is currently pending in the Commonwealth courts. I have been asked by my legal counsel to refrain from answering questions regarding the litigation at this time, so I will -- I will not be answering such questions. But I am here today to speak in the effects of guidance, often confusing and some

Page 35

COMMISSIONER ULSH: This was the first I've talked to the Secretary of the Commonwealth. I haven't -- I haven't had any conversations with her in any other elections, no.

SENATOR WARD: What sort of questions did she ask?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: The one -- the one conversation was calling to see -- this was on election day -- was calling to see if we had any counts of how many absentee and mail-in ballots we've received.

And then on another call, she called and asked how things was going and if we needed any help with anything, that they was there to help us if we was having problems with anything.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman? I'm a need -- I -- I need to interrupt.

I heard the witness testify to the fact that he was not able to answer questions based upon litigation. I'm listening to my colleague ask questions, which, in fact, can be parts of evidence introduced into trial. So I need to understand what the standard's going to be, because if the gentleman's going to answer questions, we're going to ask questions and we're not going to be

Page 3

time contradictory in the elections of 2020.

Thank you, sir.

SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Commissioner. And we do have some questions. I'm going to start

with Senator Ward.

SENATOR WARD: Thank you so much, Chairman. Thank you, Commissioner Ulsh, for being here today.

First of all, how long have you been a commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Five and a half years.

SENATOR WARD: Okay. And in that time, you have overseen quite a few elections. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes.

SENATOR WARD: You mentioned in your testimony that previous Secretary of State, Kathy Boockvar, contacted you before, during, and after the November 2020 election. Is that correct?

21 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes. She's 22 contacted me quite a few times.

SENATOR WARD: Was that customary for the Department of State to reach out and especially the Secretary herself? Page 36

constrained by the questions that we're going to ask. But we are going to be respectful of the gentleman as he relates to being controlled by his litigation.

So I understand that the gentleman wants to cooperate, but he's already set a standard by which we need to -- to operate in, and I just need to have clarity -- we, as members of this committee, need to have clarity about what that line's going to be and how far we're allowed to go.

SENATOR DUSH: Commissioner, your litigation does not include -- is not directed at the -- the plethora of guidances that came out from the Secretary and the -- the meetings and the conversations that happened as a result of that.

Am I correct?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: No, our litigation doesn't have anything to do with what went on on election day.

SENATOR DUSH: Thank you.
Senator Ward, go ahead.
SENATOR WARD: Thank you.
I just -- had you -- had you completed your thought about what sorts of questions

Secretary Boockvar, then-Secretary Boockvar, asked

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

Page 37

1 of you?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: In the one -- one occasion she called back and asked me, on election day, this had been in the afternoon, if we had any counts of ballots received. And then she went on to another phone call and called and asked me if I had any counts between Trump and Biden. And that's -- and there was other calls, but I didn't answer anything after that.

SENATOR WARD: Okay. I -- I -- just hearing that, I find that very, very unusual. Especially the Secretary of State calling you herself. She must have, I'm assuming, felt concerned about what was happening in Fulton County.

I find this just another example of activities that created confusion and concerns about the election process. And this is why I believe that this committee needs to strongly pursue answers to these and other questions.

And I have a great deal of respect for the Minority Chair, greatly respect him, but I have constituents that are asking questions. They want answers. And if you believe that these results of the election were accurate, it should be no problem Page 39

that's part of the litigation and we're making
 comments to that, we're setting a record. We are
 estab- -- we're -- we're estab- -- we are
 establishing a profile on behalf of the Secretary.
 She's not able to be here because of the
 litigation. It's inappropriate - SENATOR DUSH: Chairman -- Chairman

SENATOR DUSH: Chairman -- Chairman, one -- one point of content. Individuals have the right against self-incrimination.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: They do.

SENATOR DUSH: The department does not.
SENATOR WILLIAMS: But -- well -SENATOR DUSH: And we're -- when it
comes to the litigation, the litigation, my
understanding, is against the Department. Is that
not correct? Is it the Secretary? Is she included
individually?

All right. When it comes to this testimony, those actions before that -- the Secretary had taken, as comes before this committee, it is -- I know what I want to say and I in having -- I'm having a difficult time with it.

These committee hearings are necessary to get to the bottom of the questions and the actions that the Department took. These -- these

Page

to go over the process and to investigate these questions. I think it speaks to the very foundation of our Democratic society.

I want to thank Commissioner Ulsh for being here today and for his steadfast commitment to voter integrity.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I'm still not clear. Well, let me -- for the record,

I -- I want all my colleagues, Democrat and
 Republican, to understand that the manner in which

we do our work today hopefully will be civil andthat's my intent. And I appreciate the comments by

my colleague and I respect her as well. And I
 understand our constituents are asking us questions

because they've been presented facts that frankly

18 aren't accurate.19 Nonethe

Nonetheless, the comments about the Secretary will be a part of a -- a hear- -- of a case, potential litigation.

2 2 Is that your attorney sitting to your

23 left?

24 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes.

25 SENATOR WILLIAMS: All right. If

Page 40

actions, these last-minute directives, again, those are not part of the litigation. However, I don't know if there's any intent to use those actions as part of that case.

But I can tell you right now that we have just cause to ask these questions as it relates to those last-minute guidances and how they impacted the operations of the county elections offices, as well as even down to the precinct level.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest this. That certainly those questions will be asked and they'll probably be asked in the court of law. And for those who will give guidance, establishing a profile of the Secretary who heads a department in which the litiga--- litigation is being engaged is a challenge to not step beyond a line.

If we choose to do that, then, again, I will -- I will remind the gentleman, we will ask questions and we'll ask questions that will be balanced.

The portrayal of the Secretary asking questions clearly implied that there was a purpose beyond her given sworn responsibilities as the

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Page 41

Secretary. I think the term was used "odd," which will lead to a further investigation. That certainly implies something. Implication is a part of a process of building a case. That's all I'm saying.

If you choose to ask the questions, that's your right. If you choose to incriminate himself, that's his right. I'm not sure he would do it in front of a responsible attorney, but that's what they choose to do. If you choose to do that, we are going to ask questions. We're prepared to cooperate with the committee in any manner and format that it lays out, but some of the questions are making all of us very uncomfortable in the manner in which we're approaching it.

SENATOR DUSH: Chairman, I appreciate that and we're not going to stop questions. If the commissioner's attorney deems this that we tread in -- that we're treading into that area, then he has a responsibility to ensure that his client does not so tread. And we will proceed along those

> Are there any other questions? Commissioner, I have a couple. What do you feel were the most

Page 43

COMMISSIONER ULSH: It was overwhelming for a small county and a small staff.

3 SENATOR DUSH: What -- what kind of 4 impacts did that have on you and your staff?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Everybody was -- we double-checked everything that we was doing as we was working along with it to make sure we was following protocol. Went back, researched and everything that we received. So, basically, it was -- it -- it cost a lot more work for everybody.

SENATOR DUSH: Did it interfere with any of your other duties as it relates to the election, you or your election staff?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: It -- it was a burden, it was actually -- it worked everybody extra. Everybody put more hours in. We had to actually -- the people that does it have other jobs, too. We had to put everything completely off and their only thing was -- was sat in that room and take care of everything that was coming in.

SENATOR DUSH: Was this election conducted any differently than previous elections due to the last-minute guidances?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: We just had a lot more time in it. And we -- of course there was --

Page 42

significant pieces of last-minute guidance, whether officially as a guidance document or less formally in e-mail communications generally? As it relates to what was given to the county election officials by the Department of State.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't know. There was a lot coming up to it and we're a small county and, of course, we have a small staff. It -- there -- it was all pretty much put together at a last minute.

I guess the biggest -- the hard- -- our hardest thing was, is to make sure we kept things straight with the mail-ins and the absentees, as far as what we dealt with in our office.

SENATOR DUSH: The -- so there was a -was this amount of guidance, was that unusual for an election?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: This is the first I've seen any of this. And I -- I don't remember of anything coming up to an election of the prior elections.

SENATOR DUSH: Would -- would you say it's a small amount, a significant amount, or was it overwhelming to you? How -- your own words, how would you characterize it?

Page 44

there -- there was a lot of different -- like in the protocols, things you had to do different.

So, basically, just the storage and the -- everything. I mean, just keeping other containers to keep ballots in and all that, everything that led up to it.

SENATOR DUSH: What would you suggest to correct or mitigate those kinds of impacts in future elections?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Don't change election laws up to six months before an election.

SENATOR DUSH: Thank you.

Would -- did any of the instructions, suggestions or recommendations from the Department leading up to the election, in your mind, diverge from what you believed the election code required?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Now repeat that. Sorry.

SENATOR DUSH: Title 25, under which the election -- which is the election code, were there any of the instructions or suggestions from the Department that you're aware of that diverge from Title 25?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I -- I can't tell you it didn't. I -- I would have to read across it

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

25

Page 45

1 all to see. I mean, I -- I can't -- nothing comes 2 out to me without reading it.

3 SENATOR DUSH: All right.

4 Are there any other questions, any 5 other -- who want to offer questions?

Senator Costa.

SENATOR COSTA: Thank you very much,

Mr. Chairman, and thank you for testifying.

Just a couple of a detailed questions.

10 You serve as the chairman of the commission, board of commissioners?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I do.

SENATOR COSTA: Are you also on the

14 board of elections as well?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm a chairman of

16 the board of elections also.

> SENATOR COSTA: Is there an election director in your department -- in your county or do you serve in that capacity as well?

> COMMISSIONER ULSH: No, we have an election director.

22 SENATOR COSTA: And that election 23 director is the one I presume who was also very 24 active in this con- -- in things you described,

25 many of the changes that took place. Is that Page 47

Page 48

you went back and checked to make sure you did things you were supposed to do and you did them in accordance with the guidelines. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: We -- we went back and reviewed as things was going just to -- before we -- like even before election day, we looked at things over, looked -- just re- -- re- -get it familiar with us.

SENATOR COSTA: And through that review, did you determine that there were any irregularities that occurred that you had done that needed to be significantly modified, or were any fraudulent activities taking place in your review? Did you determine that at all?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: There was stuff as it went on that looked like -- there was things that went on as we was reading across it. It was like changing the one was put in right before, like contradicting what was already in. So which made things a little confusing.

21 SENATOR COSTA: Okay. It was 22 confusing, but not fraudulent?

> COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't know if it was fraudulent or not. It was confusing to us.

SENATOR COSTA: That's all the

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes.

SENATOR COSTA: He's not here today.

4 Is that correct?

correct?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: it's a lady, but, no, she's not here.

SENATOR COSTA: She's not here, excuse

me.

As it relates to -- as I understand your testimony, you're stating that there were some changes that were implemented during the course of the election via the Secretary's guidance that were burdensome and caused folks to work a little extra and sort of missed the opportunity to do other things they should have been doing. And I can

16 understand that. 17

Would you agree that this is one of the highest vote totals we've ever had in your county?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: It's the highest we had in -- since I was commissioner, yes.

21 SENATOR COSTA: And --

22 COMMISSIONER ULSH: But not -- not

23 major major, but it was higher. 24 SENATOR COSTA: Okay. And do you know

whether or not, based upon -- my understanding was

questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DUSH: Thank you. The Chair recognizes Senator Gephardt.

SENATOR GEPHARDT: Commissioner Ulsh, good afternoon. Thank you for taking the time to appear before our committee today. I'd really just like to ask you a few questions about the mail-in

ballots and specifically the ones that arrived without a secrecy envelope with them.

10 When -- If a -- if a ballot did arrive 11 and it wasn't in the secrecy envelope, did you 12 count those ballots once they were received?

> COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes, Senator, thank you.

We -- as we got them, we didn't have a lot of that in Fulton County. But there was -- it was changed back and forwards.

I mean, as we was reading their directives, what to do. And if -- if there was one that wasn't in the secret envelope, it was followed, you know, with what was said to do with

But then we had some -- we had some that wasn't returned and, of course, they provisional voted and then we had to go through all

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Joseph?

Page 49 Page 51 1 1 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't know his that procedure. 2 So I mean, I can't tell you how many it 2 last name. 3 was, but anything that -- anything that did 3 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. 4 receive, it was followed to protocol with what the 4 SENATOR DUSH: My chief of staff. 5 5 directive said. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Okay. 6 6 SENATOR GEPHARDT: Right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 7 7 And have you had any discussions, do You didn't have any other conversation 8 8 you know or have you heard of any counties that about any other topic? 9 might have handled it differently than that? 9 COMMISSIONER ULSH: No. Just other 10 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I haven't talked to 10 than with my attorney. 11 no other counties. No. 11 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. So in a 12 SENATOR GEPHARDT: Okay. And did the 12 May 4, 2001, letter -- 2021 letter to the 13 Department of State's guidance to count and then 13 Department of State, Ms. Hess, who's the elections 14 the Supreme Court's decision not to count ballots 14 director. Correct? 15 15 without secrecy envelopes, did that cause any COMMISSIONER ULSH: Hess? Yes. 16 confusion or any lack of confidence in how you were 16 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: She said. "In 17 processing them? 17 December 2020, various members of the Pennsylvania 18 COMMISSIONER ULSH: It -- it was -- it 18 legislature contacted the Fulton County election 19 19 office and asked if we would allow Wake TSI to do was definitely confusing. 20 Actually, we have a -- a contact number 20 an audit to prove to the voters that the 2020 21 21 that we'd call if there was something going on, you general election was run appropriately." 22 22 need a quick answer. There was calls made from our Who were the members of the General 23 director to them just to get a quick answer on what 23 Assembly who contacted the elections office? 24 to do in the cases that was coming up. And it 24 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Well, I'd -- I was 25 was -- it basically was dealt with at that time, 25 in conversation with Senator Ward. Page 50 Page 52 what they told her on the answer, whenever she was 1 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Senator Ward? 1 2 2 on the call with them. COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes. 3 SENATOR GEPHARDT: That -- that was my 3 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Did you 4 final question. Thank you for your time 4 have a conversation with any other senator? 5 COMMISSIONER ULSH: All right. Thanks. 5 COMMISSIONER ULSH: No. 6 SENATOR DUSH: Cheirman Santarsiero --6 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Did anyone 7 I mean Senator Santarsiero 7 else on the board of commissioners or in the 8 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Thank you. Thank 8 elections office have conversations at that time 9 9 you, Mr. Chairman. with any other senator or representative? 10 Commissioner Ulsh, I want to first make 10 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Not that I'm aware 11 sure I'm pronouncing that correctly. With my last 11 of. 12 name, I'm sensitive to that. 12 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And what 13 Let me -- let me ask you first, 13 was -- what did Senator Ward say to you? 14 Commissioner, if I may, prior to the start of the 14 COMMISSIONER ULSH: She just asked me 15 hearing this afternoon, did any member of the 15 if I would -- if I had -- would be interested or if 16 16 General Assembly or any staff person talk to you I had any thoughts of doing an investigation of our 17 17 about this hearing today? elections. 18 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Not about the 18 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. What was 19 hearing, other than just if I was available to come 19 your response? 2.0 down to testify. 20 COMMISSIONER ULSH: What was my 21 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. So the 21 response? 22 extent of the -- and who did you speak to about 22 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Correct. 23 23 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I -- I actually, that? 24 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I talked to Joseph. 24 with all the -- the changes and everything that was

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

going on, it was already on my mind, wondering what

25

Page 53

to do to double-check ourselves. And when the question was asked to me, I -- I wanted to know myself if everything was done properly.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And did you share that conversation, the substance of your conversation, with your other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: We talked -- I -- I made the remark that I wouldn't make any decisions without having it brought up in our meeting, in our commissioners' meeting.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: That you had that conversation with both of the other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And who proposed this company, Wake TSI?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: The name was brung up from the senators, but I -- it wasn't guaranteed that that was who was doing it. I actually Googled them and checked them out to see what credentials they had.

And after looking at that, I had no reason not to think that they couldn't do the job that we was wanting them to do. So then I actually, at that point, was in contact with them.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. You -- you

Page 55

would cost came up, did it not?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I -- I talked - talked to them and asked them what extent they
 would do in the investigation.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: And what all it would consist of.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: And basically when they would be available to do it.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And did they tell you what the cost would be? I'm assuming, as a commissioner, you were concerned about that, were you not?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: There wasn't no cost involved with us.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: It was --

18 COMMISSIONER ULSH: We have a report -19 their report's on our -- the County of Fulton's
20 website 1 put it there for transparency reasons.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yeah --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I want everybody to

know what it says. You're more than welcome to go in there and pull it off. It tells you everything

about that.

Page .

just said that was brought up by the senators. Who were the senators who brought up that name?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Well, it was just -- the name was just brung up. It was whenever me and Judy was talking, the name was brought up that -- that this would be somebody that you could contact.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Did -- did she suggest that it was someone -- the company that you should contact or one of others that you could consider?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: It was just the name that I could -- that I could talk to, if I was interested.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. So she wanted you to contact them, if you were interested?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: She -- she referred to the name and said if I -- if I wanted to contact them, I was welcome to.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: What -- and did you, at that point, contact Wake TSI?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I did.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And what -- and what -- then when you talked to them, I

assume the -- the issue of what the investigation

Page 56

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: I'm going to get

to that in a moment, but --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Okay.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: - but first I want to try and understand.

So they -- they told you that this was going to be -- they could do this at no cost to the county.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I would like for you to refer to our Wake Technology report on our website.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Oh, I --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I can't remember everything word for word it says on it. I don't want to say something and it's not exactly word for word. I'd refer to that.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: No, and I appreciate that, but I'm trying to ask you now your recollection of your conversation with Wake TSI when you contacted them about potentially using them to do this investigation.

I'd assume -- as a former township supervisor, I know cost was always an issue for our board, I'm sure for your board of commissioners it is, too. They told you that it would be no cost to

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

23

25

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

Page 57

the county. What was your understanding as to who was paying for this?

3 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Myself was, as same 4 as you, I might worry about the cost for the Fulton 5 County, too, for the taxpayers. 6

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Right.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Whenever I say it was free to you, that's all I was concerned about.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. So you -you made no inquiry as to who was -- who was paying for it?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I just wanted to make sure Fulton County taxpayers wasn't paying for it.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Did you -- did you ever wonder yourself as to who might be paying for this?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I actually made the offer that I would kick into it if I had to.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And what was the response?

22 COMMISSIONER ULSH: You don't need to 23 worry about it, it's paid for.

24 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. They 25

didn't explain who paid for it?

Page 59

are you asked questions about -- from your constituents, about people who are distrustful of the way that we conduct elections here in Pennsylvania, especially 2020, 2021?

SENATOR ULSH: It was actually talked about how do we know things was right, how do we -how do we have trust in everything? I've had multiple people say they'll never vote again because of everything that they seen on TV. Everything that they heard was going on. That was one of the things that led me to do what I done.

66 -- 67 counties in Pennsylvania. Fulton County made it 66 counties still talk about it. Fulton County doesn't.

15 SENATOR ARGALL: In -- in terms of 16 the -- the ranking, would this be in the distrust 17 of government, the conduct of elections, would this 18 be in the top 10 issues that people address you at 19 when you're at the Eagle Scout banquet or the 20 county commissioners' meeting? Would it be in the 21 top three? Is it -- is it number one? How -- how 22 does it rank in -- in all of the issues --

> COMMISSIONER ULSH: As far as government, it's -- it's probably five.

SENATOR ARGALL: Okay.

Page 58

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I honestly never 1 2 asked the question. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. So you 3

were talking a moment ago --

SENATOR DUSH: Senator, I want to go on to others and then we'll circle back to you.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

> SENATOR DUSH: Next, Senator Argall. SENATOR ARGALL: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner, in my academic work in previous years, I've spent a lot of time studying and teaching about the distrust of government. Sometimes my students would come to class and say, well, it was because of something that happened in Iraq or Afghanistan, and I would talk to them about growing up during the Vietnam era and Watergate. And some of my more astute students would take it

19 20 all the way back to the Declaration of

21 Independence. Americans, for a lot of good 22 reasons, have always had a pretty considerable

23 distrust to government. 24

I'm curious, and you've got a broad jurisdiction as a county commissioner, how often Page 60

1 COMMISSIONER ULSH: It's probably in 2 the middle.

SENATOR ARGALL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: But as far as local government, I'm really big on transparency. Anybody that knows me in Fulton County knows -knows that. They don't really talk about that in Fulton County as a local government because they know I'm an open book.

SENATOR ARGALL: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: So I guess I would put it a five.

SENATOR ARGALL: Okay. How can this Senate help you to answer those questions from people that are distrusting the process?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: My biggest thing is -- and, of course, we've -- we went through an investigation, so I -- I put that behind me. I had to sign papers that proven the results. I wanted to sleep at night knowing that they was correct to my -- best of my knowledge. I put mine behind me.

As far as anybody else that would have that question and go to sleep at night, I -- I couldn't even imagine doing that. I -- I think if there's nothing odd, you feel there's nothing odd,

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

25

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

8

9

Page 61

1 there's no reason to show it.

And there possibly could be a problem. An accident they made on their own. But without doing it, how you ever knowing that? As yourself, how do you ever know that?

So, I mean, I guess you probably should follow your heart on it, I guess. I don't know how else to put it.

SENATOR ARGALL: Okay. Now it's been suggested to us that from time to time that we should ignore the -- the -- the thousands of constituents who have contacted us, just as they've contacted you, and I, for one, simply I'm not about to ignore my constituents. I think we need to help them get the answers that they deserve. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DUSH: Thank you.

And I'll remind the members, we sunshined -- sunshined this as reference to Act 77 and how the regulatory issues of the last-minute guidances came down that impacted it, and I think we're going a little bit far afield in some of these lines of questioning and I'd appreciate members sticking to that.

Next we have Senator Hughes.

Page 63

Page 64

million votes cast for president in the 2020 election and there's about 9500 in Fulton County.

3 So in the -- in the -- your 4

investigation, was there any fraudulent voting ever found out? Found in the votes.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Our report come back -- it's in our report, but, no, nothing was found. Everything was ran in Fulton County --

SENATOR HUGHES: Everything was square, up and up, no fraudulent voting?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's -- that's what our report has, yes.

SENATOR HUGHES: That's what the report says?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Uh-huh.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. Well, that's good. That's good. That's a testimony of you, sir, and your operation.

19 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm sleeping good 20 at night

> SENATOR HUGHES: All right. And -- and all of those hard-working folks who put off everything, we -- that was observed, that is a -- a reality across the state. You know, I mean, you know, I'm from Philly, so, you know, kind of like

Mr. Chairman. Chairman Ulsh, good to see you. Good to meet you, sir.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you,

4 5 So you're chair of the -- the

6 commission. Right? 7

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes, Senator --SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. How long --COMMISSIONER ULSH: Good to meet you,

10 too, yes.

11 SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. How long have 12 you served in that position, sir?

13 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I've been there 14 like five -- five and a half years.

15 SENATOR HUGHES: Always as chair? 16 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes.

17 SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. Very good.

18 Thank you.

19 And just -- just so I can have the --20 the facts in -- in my mind, the total vote in 21 Fulton County for president was -- what was that 22 number?

23 COMMISSIONER ULSH: 9,000, 9500. 24 SENATOR HUGHES: About 9500 votes 25 total. Okay. And, of course, there were about 7.8

central conversation and -- and lots of workers, you know, lots of cameras and things like that.

So the scrutiny was -- was intense and the workers put a lot of extra time in -- into the process. But congratulations on there and not finding any fraudulent, fraudulent activity.

you -- this was Act 77, we got a lot of new -- a lot of new rules coming in. This is probably the biggest change in -- in election law in Pennsylvania for decades. Okay? You know, first time really full effect of mail-in voting, right,

Did you feel it -- as chairman, when

13 in a major way. It -- it would -- it would seem to 14 me that getting a call directly from the Secretary

15 would be a welcome thing, because in this case, 16 she's -- she was the boss, right? You know,

17 that -- you're hearing from the boss about how the 18 rules should be played out in a major change in

19 election with a record turnout. 20

What was your -- what was your take on 21 that? 22 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I -- as far as her

calling me? To me, it's just another day. That -on election day, it was just another day to me.

SENATOR HUGHES: Uh-huh.

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

Page 65 Page 67 1 COMMISSIONER ULSH: But it -- I was 1 So, Mr. Chairman, I have no further 2 there in prior elections. Actually, I called her 2 questions. But I do want to commend you, Chairman, 3 on one occasion and she never returned my phone 3 and -- and your folks who -- who had to grind it 4 4 out in a very turbulent environment. So thank you 5 SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. 5 very much. 6 6 COMMISSIONER ULSH: But that was back a COMMISSIONER ULSH: Thank you. 7 7 SENATOR HUGHES: Appreciate you. couple years earlier. 8 8 SENATOR HUGHES: Previously? SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Senator 9 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes. 9 Hughes. 10 SENATOR HUGHES: Prior to the act, 10 For the second time, Senator 11 prior to the --11 Santarsiero. 12 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yes, it was before 12 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Thank you, 13 the 2020 election. 13 Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Ulsh. 14 SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah, yeah. 14 I just want to go back to that issue of 15 15 COMMISSIONER ULSH: And I have yet to the Wake TSI report and the payment for it. 16 get that phone call back. 16 So, sitting here today, do you have an 17 SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. All right. 17 understanding as to who paid for that report? 18 Well, we had a big election since then that --18 COMMISSIONER ULSH: It's -- it's in our COMMISSIONER ULSH: Well, I mean, I'm 19 19 report. I - I believe it was -- I can't even 20 glad to hear from her. I -- I was glad she was 20 remember what it was. There's been so much stuff 21 21 there. through my head here. I can't even remember 22 22 SENATOR HUGHES: Well, we got a new honestly. 23 Secretary now, so, you know. 23 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. So you 24 So -- so record turnout, lots of staff 24 mentioned before that the report is -- is posted 25 time put in to make sure everything worked right. 25 online. My understanding is there was a draft of Page 65 Page 68 And in the end -- and it wasn't even -- it wasn't 1 1 the report issued back in February. Do you recall 2 2 even close in Fulton County, as I understand it, that? 3 all right. It was about a big, big difference 3 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Repeat that. Sorry 4 between Trump and Biden in Fulton County. Would 4 about that. 5 5 that be correct? SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Excuse me? 6 6 COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's what I read. COMMISSIONER ULSH: Repeat that. 7 SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah, that's what you 7 Sorry. 8 8 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Sure. read, okay. 9 And so -- and so, no -- in -- in -- in 9 My understanding is that there was an 10 10 your efforts, your analysis, Wake TSI, whatever, initial draft of the Wake TSI report issued back in 11 11 no -- no fraudulent voting. February. 12 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Our report says COMMISSIONER ULSH: There was an 12 13 there was no findings. 13 initial draft that actually was confidential. 14 SENATOR HUGHES: No findings. I think 14 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. 15 15 it's important for the record, all right, and COMMISSIONER ULSH: It wasn't a report, 16 it's -- I think it's a testimony to yourself, to 16 it was a draft for proofreading. 17 17 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. fellow commissioners, but especially to the -- the 18 18 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't know how staff, you know, the folks who, you know, grind it 19 19 out every day in that process, that their hard work you got that. That never should have been out. 20 has been verified, certified, if you will, that 20 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well, its -- its 21 there was no issues or no problems that they did a 21 reference to it and quotes from it are -- are 22 damn good job on that -- on that election in Fulton 22 reported in the press. I think the Washington Post 23 23 County to make sure everything ran according to did --24 24 Hoyle, even with a lot of changes happening moving COMMISSIONER ULSH: I've -- I've been 25 25 trying to find out how that got out because I would up to election day.

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

10

11

18

19

25

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

1

2

3

4 5

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

Page 69

like to know that.

2 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Well, be 3 that as it -- as it may, the -- the initial draft

4 report said in two places that the person who had

5 requested the audit in Fulton was Pennsylvania

State Senator Mariscano. Now, as an Italian
 American. I know our names are often butche

American, I know our names are often butchered. I assume that was a reference to Senator Mastriano.

Does that comport with your memory, did Senator Mastriano was he involved in asking for this -- this audit?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: We still talking about the draft report?

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't want to -don't want to make any comment about the draft
report because my e-mail was hacked. I would like
to know how you got that.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well, I'm -- I'm
 reading this from an article in the Washington
 Post. That's how I got it.

22 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Okay.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: And I can tell

you the date of that article is June 6, 2021.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Okay. Thank you.

Page 71

Page 72

1 has been asked here today as a representative of

Fulton County. This hearing is about Fulton County

and the election that happened last November. And

that seems to me to be inexplicably linked to the

5 subsequent event of the request to have this

6 outside company, Wake TSI, come in and perform an

alleged investigation. So I would think that that is relevant to our discussion here today.

Are you saying that I should not be asking any questions about Wake TSI?

SENATOR DUSH: There -- the Wake TSI investigation is -- as it relates to the specific actions that we sunshined, which are the -- the guidances which led up to this election, as well as during the election, that is what has been sunshined and I'd appreciate it if you stick to the -- the purpose that is stated in the sunshine law for this hearing.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. But -- and I -- I do want to respect that,

21 Mr. Chairman, so I'm just trying to understand what 22 the parameters are.

23 If the Wake TSI investigation dealt 24 with that topic, then I would assume that there 25 would be no objection to my asking questions about

Page 70

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. But, again, my -- my question stands --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I -- I -- I know

Doug Mastriano afterwards was involved with the conversations. But before the -- before the -- the analysis, before the investigation happened, I had

analysis, before the investigation happened, I had
 no conversation with Doug Mastriano about any of
 it. I didn't know he was even involved with it. I

it. I didn't know he was even involved with it. I had no conversation with Doug Mastriano.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Oh, so -- Okay. So just so I understand, when did you understand that he was involved? When did you first

13 understand that?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: After the investigation was done and the report come out.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay.

SENATOR DUSH: Senator, if we could stick to the -- what was actually sunshined in this

hearing, which is the actions that led up to and during the last-minute guidance from the Secretary.

That's what we were sunshined for and I would appreciate if we would stick to that.

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Well,
 Mr. Chairman, I -- I -- I appreciate that. I -- my

understanding is, though, that Commissioner Ulsh

the Wake TSI investigation.

2 SENATOR DUSH: As it relates to how

Wake TSI described what happened during that -- during those guidances, I don't have any problem

with. But, as I said, I do want to stick with what

the law requires us to sunshine and if you would
 stick to that subject matter, I'd appreciate it.

Stick to that subject matter, I'd appreciate Thank you.

8 Thank you9 SEN

SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Well -- okay. Let me -- let me -- let me try it this way

12

distinctions that were made or the differences

between the draft report that came out in Februaryand then the one that was ultimately made public in

I want to try to understand the

and then the one that was ultimately made public

May. And is that -- that's when it was posted by
the county, correct, in May, the final report from

the county, correct, in May, the final report from Wake TSI?

SENATOR DUSH: Yes.

20 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Again, my

understanding is that in the draft report, the --the report concluded, quote, That no anomalous or

unusual incidents reported during the election
process and that the election was, quote, Well run,

followed all commonwealth and federal guidelines

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

25

could not find any related information with regard

to cost. Where else can we find it and who paid?

	Page 73		Page 75
1	and was conducted in a diligent and effective	1	COMMISSIONER ULSH: You said you looked
2	manner, end quote.	2 at our website and there's nothing on it?	
3	And I want to share my colleague	3 SENATOR WILLIAMS: The website that you	
4	Senator Hughes in congratulating you on that and	4 referred us to earlier in your testimony, which you	
5	and that conclusion.	5 said	
6	But then the final version of the	6 COMMISSIONER ULSH: County of Fulton.	
7	report that was posted in May went beyond that in	7 SENATOR WILLIAMS: There's no	
8	that same notation and it it included a number	8	there's no
9	of issues and those included three related to	9	COMMISSIONER ULSH: There's no report
10	Dominion voting systems, and I wondered whether you	10 on that?	
11	could tell us why that was changed, why that was	11	SENATOR WILLIAMS: No.
12	added into the report that was not in the original	12	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I I can assure
13	draft.	13	you there is.
14	COMMISSIONER ULSH: Okay. Senator,	14	SENATOR WILLIAMS: The report's there,
15	first of all, I didn't write the report, so I had	15	but the cost is not.
16	no I I didn't write it, didn't tell them what	16	COMMISSIONER ULSH: The cost, I don't
17	to put in it. The report's what they did in the	17	know. I honestly can't tell you, but it tells you
18	investigation and they filed it.	18	in there who paid for it, is what I said. I don't
19	As far as the draft report, I won't	19	know nothing about cost. I have no idea what it
20	make any comment on that because that's not public	20	cost. I just said it says in there who paid for
21	information.	21	it.
22	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. But you	22	SENATOR WILLIAMS: Right. So where
23	did receive that draft report.	23	will we find in your public records
24	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I I'm just	24	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I
25	saying that's not public information.	24 25	SENATOR WILLIAMS: who paid for it?
		7	
	Page 74	7	Page 76
1	Page 74 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well	1	Page 76 COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that
1 2	Page 74 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My	72	
	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked.	1	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that
2	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My	1 2	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of
2	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked.	1 2 3	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it
2 3 4	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked.	1 2 3 4	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does
2 3 4 5	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft	1 2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it.
2 3 4 5 6	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked.	1 2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that
2 3 4 5 6 7	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yes. SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yes. SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a list of other things that we have to do for the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine. But you're also suggesting that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yes. SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a list of other things that we have to do for the for this.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine. But you're also suggesting that there's that you don't have knowledge of where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yes. SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a list of other things that we have to do for the for this. Are there any other members who have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine. But you're also suggesting that there's that you don't have knowledge of where to find who paid for this?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER VLSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a list of other things that we have to do for the for this. Are there any other members who have any questions before I move on to the Secretary?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine. But you're also suggesting that there's that you don't have knowledge of where to find who paid for this? COMMISSIONER ULSH: It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yes. SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a list of other things that we have to do for the for this. Are there any other members who have any questions before I move on to the Secretary? Yes, Chairman Williams.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine. But you're also suggesting that there's that you don't have knowledge of where to find who paid for this? COMMISSIONER ULSH: It SENATOR WILLIAMS: You do before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a list of other things that we have to do for the for this. Are there any other members who have any questions before I move on to the Secretary? Yes, Chairman Williams. SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine. But you're also suggesting that there's that you don't have knowledge of where to find who paid for this? COMMISSIONER ULSH: It SENATOR WILLIAMS: You do before Let me phrase this before you answer. And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well COMMISSIONER ULSH: That's not. My my e-mail was hacked. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Your e-mail so you're saying that your e-mail that had the draft report in it was hacked. COMMISSIONER ULSH: I'm just saying that shouldn't have been out because that was confidential. It wasn't a final report. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Let me SENATOR DUSH: Senator SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yes. SENATOR DUSH: We're going far afield again from the actions of the directives that were implemented. I'm going to move on. I've got a list of other things that we have to do for the for this. Are there any other members who have any questions before I move on to the Secretary? Yes, Chairman Williams.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't have that in my public records because it didn't come out of our budget. I don't know I don't know what it cost. I honestly can't tell you that. But it does report in there who paid for it. SENATOR WILLIAMS: So we're saying that there's no record in Fulton County COMMISSIONER ULSH: We keep records on our budget what we SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. COMMISSIONER ULSH: out of our budget. SENATOR WILLIAMS: I understand that, but it's a related item. It's a related expense and you said you don't have it, fine. But you're also suggesting that there's that you don't have knowledge of where to find who paid for this? COMMISSIONER ULSH: It SENATOR WILLIAMS: You do before

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

can't find it is a significant issue in the public

domain. If the public -- Let me finish.

24

25

Page 77

1 If we as public officials cannot
2 identify where that kind of cost was, who paid for
3 it, there is implicit in that there's potential
4 conflict of interest, which is part of why we're
5 here today.
6 So your answer's troubling because

So your answer's troubling because you're not giving us any guideline of where to go to find out who paid it. That to me is kind of shocking to suggest that the person who heads this area doesn't have any knowledge of where...

If you don't know who paid for it, I'll accept that. It's hard for me to accept that you don't know where to go to find it. That's what I'm confused about.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: You're saying you want to know who paid for it?

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: And I told you it's on our report on our website. It says that in there who paid for it.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Did we just not look

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Did we just not look for that? We've had three people look for it and they've not found it.

24 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Could you give me a 25 minute?

Page 79

question.

SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Commissioner.

Go ahead.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: The comment about the Secretary calling you, does that suggest that that affected any operation, other than time and guidance? Did it affect your directives to people or did it affect any portion of the election or -- or any outcome?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: If anything I did, I talked to my office personnel, wanted to know if things was going okay, if there was a problem because it made me feel like there was a flag going up in Harrisburg, that we was doing something wrong.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. But that's your personal interpretation.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yeah. No as far as -- as far as what everybody was doing, everybody did their job.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: And she did not say—you said you were concerned by her call, that a yellow flag went up because of her call. I guess because she didn't call you two years ago or call you back, I could understand that. What I'm

Page 78

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER ULSH: We don't have the report. There anything else you could talk about while I'm looking for this or -- this thing is 80-some pages long?

SENATOR WILLIAMS: It's how many pages? Is there anybody else who could get that for you that you could ask them to forward to us?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't mind. I don't rely on people to get things done.

SENATOR DUSH: Commissioner, did you
 say it's 80-some pages long?
 THE WITNESS: It's like 80-some pages

long. 70-some pages.
 SENATOR DUSH: All right. We're not

going to -- we're not going to wait for that --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't know -- I don't know where it's at in it, though. I couldn't tell you.

20 SENATOR DUSH: If you can get the information to us --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I can do that. SENATOR DUSH: We will forward that.

24 We have --25 SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have one last

Page 80

saying to you, though, there's nothing she actually said that suggested or implied or inferred that there was a problem in Fulton County from her department's perspective?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: And I didn't say yellow flag, I said red flag.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. Let's say -- let's say fire flag, whatever.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Okay. But -- but I'm just letting you know that whenever she called me, this was the first time I've ever got a call from the Department of State.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: I got it, but you're not answering.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: So, the first thing about they're seeing something on the computer that we're doing that's making a question.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: That's your interpretation.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: Because -- that's my interpretation. And all I did was called my people and say, what's going on? Are you'uns okay? And everything was fine.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: I noticed you have a ring on your finger. Are you a married guy?

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1

2

3

15

16

17

18

19

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 81

1 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Say again. 2 SENATOR WILLIAMS: I noticed you have a 3 ring on your finger. Are you a married guy? 4 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Yeah.

5 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I don't know what

7 it has to do with this. 8

SENATOR WILLIAMS: I'm going to tell you what it has to do with it. I'll tell you directly what it has to do with it. I'm a married guy, too. You said your interpretation. You're a married guy, I'm a married guy. When my wife says something, and I start interpreting, I get in trouble. Okay?

testifying here today for a reason. Your interpretation -- and I asked you a very specific question. I said did she say anything specifically, you didn't give me an answer. You went to your interpretation. I'm asking you for her words, out of her mouth, without your interpretation, without you editing it, without you providing other colorization to it. I'm asking

you: Did she say anything in her comments to you

that suggested or said directly, there's a problem

So I'm suggesting to you that you're

Page 83

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Well, let me -apologies, Mr. --

One, I would hope that from this brief exchange that those who are watching across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would understand that those of us who are on the Democratic side of the aisle are not in opposition to any investigation, any review, or, in fact, any audit that would be required by facts, evidence, information, that would suggest that something was done improperly during the course of this past election cycle that's under review today. Be very clear that members on this side of the aisle in the past have actually asked for those review and investigations of individuals, as well as organizations that are involved in areas that we have found to be of

And, in fact, we've asked that of a member of the Senate who was involved in activity that we mought undergirded this actual election cycle. And to date we've gotten no response.

question as it relates to this past election cycle.

To the gentleman who testified, we thank him for his service. We thank him for his 24 information and we look forward to the details that we've asked of the committee and we ask that all of

Page 82

in Fulton County?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I -- I told what you she asked me. I didn't say anything else other than that.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: So the answer to my question is?

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I -- I told you the questions that she asked me and I took that for what it was. She just asked me the questions and I answered her.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: So there's nothing she said --

COMMISSIONER ULSH: I never -- I never said she made me worried. I just asked my people if everything was fine.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: All right. Fine. Thank you.

SENATOR DUSH: All right. Chairman Williams -- Well, no, all right.

You have closing remarks? I'm going to be doing my closing remarks and I'm going to be listing a few questions that we would have been asking the Department of State should they be there.

Please, go ahead.

Page 84

us receive that information because we do believe it may shed some light on questions that have been

raised and, Mr. Chairman, we thank you for

4 organizing the process. Thank you. 5 SENATOR HUGHES: Mr. Chairman.

6 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Hughes.

7 SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah. If -- if I may, 8 I'm -- I'm reading from a Pennsylvania Spotlight

9 article, dated August 11th, that refers to

10 communication -- e-mail communication from Fulton 11 County commissioner -- Fulton County commissioners.

12 It says -- and I can share this with the committee 13 if you would like, Mr. Chairman.

14 SENATOR DUSH: You may.

> SENATOR HUGHES: Commissioner Ulsh e-mailed Commissioner Bunch, Senator Ward and Representative Topper from his private e-mail account on November 9th stating, quote, The people are asking who all is in this fight with Senator Mastriano, end quote. He continued --

20 21 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Hughes, this --22 again, we sunshined this for a specific reason.

23 SENATOR HUGHES: Well, this relates to 24 the -- this relates to the validity of -- of -- of 25 the election and validity of everything that

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

25

20

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 85

1 occurred leading up to it, Mr. Chairman. 2 If you -- if you read the rest of 3 what's been reported here as a quote, "It couldn't 4 hurt the Trump campaign if our state 5 representatives all got involved. If we don't stop 6 this election problems, next will be worse. If 7 there were 109 House and 27 Senate with Senator 8 Mastriano, it would all -- it would be a big help. 9 The people need this. Respect their vote." 10 SENATOR DUSH: Okay. Senator Hughes, 11 I've listened --12 SENATOR HUGHES: I'm -- I'm reading 13 from -- from August 11th --

14 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Hughes.

15 SENATOR HUGHES: -- article written 16 in --

17 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Hughes, you're 18 out of order. This was specifically sunshined --19

SENATOR HUGHES: I'm not out of order. I'm very much in order, sir. Okay?

21 SENATOR DUSH: This was specific 22 sunshined for the last-minute guidance. We're on a 23 very divergent track right now. And --

SENATOR HUGHES: All of this relates, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DUSH: This -- again --

Page 87

It's -- the training that goes into it ahead of time is pretty arduous. Some of the changes that came down last minute were very stressful, I know, to you and other counties that I've talked with. And I do appreciate, again, all of those people because without all of you, the wheels come off the bus. None of us would be sitting up here. There wouldn't be anybody in a sworn elective position.

voting election offices. I've seen it myself.

So my thanks to you very much and to your staff, as well as those throughout the Commonwealth in all 67 counties. Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER ULSH: Thank you,

14 Chairman. Thanks, all you senators. 15

SENATOR DUSH: And before we close, since the Department of State declined to attend today's hearing to testify, I would like to read some of the questions for the Department into the record.

And we received a declination notice last week, and then we received another one half an hour before the hearing. And again they had stated that the purpose -- the reason for their not attending was that they had pending litigation -litigation and I will reiterate that government

Page 85

SENATOR HUGHES: All of this relates. SENATOR DUSH: It's not --SENATOR HUGHES: But I guess in the end, since the report indicated there was no fraudulent voting that occurred in Fulton County, I guess it's not an issue, which is really what we're trying to get at. But we need to be real careful how we conduct this proceeding if there's communications talking that kind of lean to a slight or a slant one per -- one candidate versus the other. And how this process works.

SENATOR DUSH: Senator Hughes, we have invited the Secretary of State to be here to answer to these questions and others. The Department of State has refused to now participate in this and this line of questioning, as relates to Commissioner Ulsh, is over. We're going to move on to the next session.

Commissioner, and I do appreciate your time and your attendance here, as well as your testimony. And on behalf I'm sure of members on both sides of the aisle here, the -- our heartfelt thanks go out to the precincts, the people who worked the precincts and who worked in the county Page 88

agencies do not have the right against self-incrimination and that the actions that were taken -- if actions were taken, then we have the right to proceed as a legislature because we have an upcoming election here in November. We have another one -- another primary coming -- coming in the spring.

And just as we did several times over the last year and a half with COVID-19, we've shown that we can respond with alacrity. That we can get out there and get things done and pass bills and get them done with speed and with a purpose. So there is no time to sit on the sidelines with this.

And, for the record, some of the questions: One, would you please define the guidance -- define guidance for the committee and what guidance is legally binding.

Under what statutory authority is the guidance binding?

Under what statutory authority is it issued?

Is official guidance the only way that counties are provided with feedback, instructions, or recommendations in administering elections or interpreting the code?

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 89

What are other ways -- what other ways are counties provided with explanations from the department regarding how to administer the election?

Who typically sends those e-mail questions to the county?

Before a guidance is issued or an informal e-mail is sent, is there an internal process that the guidance or e-mail goes through in terms of review before it's issued to the counties?

Who's typically involved in that process?

Is the process the same regardless of whether it's a guidance or an e-mail?

Are guidances in e-mails to be given legal standing?

Under what statutory authority do they have any legal standing?

How often on average are e-mails typically sent to the counties providing feedback, recommendations, and instructions on administering elections?

In the 2020 general election, were there more or less e-mails than usual sent to the counties? If more, why?

Page 91

naked ballots, ballots that have been placed directly in a return envelope and are missing the secrecy envelope, but the -- the Pennsylvania Supreme Court ruled against that guidance? When Secretary Boockvar testified

before Representative Grove's committee in the House, she stated that guidance was issued because counties did not know what to do about the signatures. The signature verification has been part of our election security for a very long time. What was it about the November 2020 election that suddenly made this a significant issue?

Isn't signature verification part of the in-person voting process?

How was signature verification supposed to occur for in-person voting?

Prior to the election, the Pennsylvania courts heard a suit over whether voters could or should be given the ability to correct defects in their mail-in ballots or cure them.

Are you aware that Secretary Boockvar, in the PA Supreme Court case on curing ballots in 24 25 November 2020, stated that "Logistical policy decisions like the ones implicated herein are more properly addressed by the legislature and not the

Page 90

What about during the '21 primary, the 2021 primary, were there more or less e-mails than average that were sent to the counties? Again, why do you think that might be?

I understand the Deputy Secretary Jonathan Marks sent an e-mail giving guidance regarding ballots received after 8 p.m. of election night and before 5 p.m. Friday, November 5th. What was the major need to send this guidance so close to the election?

Who decided to send the guidance so close to the election?

What other kinds of issues were addressed in e-mails sent by the Department leading up to the 2020 general election?

How many examples of e-mails sent to -sent leading up to 20- -- we would like to have examples of the e-mails sent leading up to the 2020

Could you please provide copies of all the e-mails that were transmitted to county election officials regard- -- regarding guidance from August 1st until November 30th?

Is it true that the Department of State issued guidance that the counties should count Page 92

courts"?

Is it evident through Secretary Boockvar's statement that it was not the purview of the Executive Branch to construct electoral -- or election logistical policy? Therefore, would you agree with Secretary Boockvar and the PA Department of State that the Pennsylvania General Assembly legislation -- the Pennsylvania General Assembly legislate election logistical policy?

Are you aware that in the same court case mentioned previously that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision specifically stated that these logistical issues should be decided through legislation stating that in light of the open policy questions, attendant to that decision relating to curing ballots, including what the precise contours of the proced- -- procedure would be, how the con- -- concomitant burdens would be addressed and how the procedure would impact the confidentiality and counting of ballots, all of which are best left to the legislative branch of the Pennsylvania government?

Is it true that Secretary Boockvar, when she petitioned the PA Supreme Court concerning signature verification in October of 2020, stated

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

2

3

7

16

17

18

21

22

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 93

that she could -- was concerned that counties might improvise ad hoc procedures which would vary from county to county creating a significant risk of error and uncertainty in the review of ballots.

Despite the Secretary and the Court stating that the matter of curing ballots should proceed through the legislative process, did the Department issue guidance or recommendations on curing ballots?

To your knowledge, were the -- were there counties who permitted voters to, in any way, cure their ballots?

What's your understanding of how counties permitted such cure?

How many counties permitted these cure processes?

Did they all use the same processes, to your understanding?

We have heard that both the executive and judicial branches specifically stated that creating the logistical process of curing ballots is the purview of the legislature. However, prior to writing such logistical election policy, would you agree that it would be incumbent on the General Assembly -- Assembly to thoroughly study the matter Page 95

Department be prepared to testify on that audit report and to have answers to the findings that were in that report.

4 I now recess this Senate

5 Intergovernmental --6

SENATOR HUGHES: Mr. Chairman --

Mr. Chairman --

8 SENATOR DUSH: -- Operations Committee 9 until the --

10 SENATOR HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, before 11 vou recess --

12 SENATOR DUSH: -- call of the chair.

13 SENATOR HUGHES: -- I wanted to do 14 something for the record. Before you recess the

15 meeting. It's a re- -- it's a request --

SENATOR DUSH: We're at ease. We're at ease.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you.

SENATOR DUSH: The letter is submitted 19 20

> SENATOR HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, I now --SENATOR DUSH: I now recess this Senate

23 Intergovernmental Operations Committee. The letter

will be posted on the Senate's web page.

Is it true that Secretary Boockvar, when she petitioned the PA Supreme Court concerning signature verification in October 2020, stated that she was concerned that there are no standards or guidelines contained within the code governing how an election official should perform such a

8 comparison? 9

of curing ballots?

Would it follow, then, that if the legislature desired to legislate signature verification back into the election code, the General Assembly would need to provide standards and guidelines for counties to follow specifically and to uniformly conduct such signature verification?

Would it also follow that the General Assembly, before legislating such standards and guidelines, study the matter in depth to ensure the best signature verification standards and procedures are contained in our election code?

I will add that the auditor general -the Democratic auditor general -- in 2019 issued a scathing examination of what our next hearing is going to cover. The SURE system. And I would request that the Secretary be prepared and the

Page 96

CERTIFICATE

I, Sommer E. Greene, Certified Court Reporter for the State of Arizona, certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were transcribed by me, that the audio transcription was taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print by computer-aided transcription under my direction; that the foregoing pages are a full, true, and accurate transcript of all proceedings, all to the best of my skill and ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to nor employed by any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.

DATED this 16th day of September, 2021.

Sommer E. Greene

Certified Court Reporter No. 50622 For the State of Arizona

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

EXHIBIT 2

	Page 1
1	PENNSYLVANIA SENATE INTERGOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
2	OTERATIONS COMMITTEE
3	+ + + + +
	VOTING MEETING -
4	CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS
5	
6	+ + + + +
7	Wednesday, September 15, 2021
	+ + + + +
8	
9	A public hearing of the Pennsylvania Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee convened,
10	pursuant to notice, at 9:30 EDT; Senator Cris Dush, Chairman, presiding.
11	SENATE COMMITTEE MEETING MEMBERS PRESENT:
12	OFFICERS:
	CRIS DUSH, Chairperson
13	ANTHONY H. WILLTAMS, Minority Chair
14	MAJORITY: SCOTT E. HUTCHINSON, Vice Chair
15	JAKE CORMAN, Ex-Officio
1 (DAVID G ARGALL
16	CHRIS GEBHARD DOUG MASTRIANO
17	JUDY WARD
18	MINORITY:
	JAY COSTA
19	VINCENT J. HUGHES STEVEN J. SANTARSIERO
20	SIEVEN J. SANIARSIERO
	STAFF:
21	NATHANIEL R. SANKO, Legislative
22	Assistant/Clerk
	The transcript constitutes the minutes from
23	the Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee held on September 15, 2021.
24	
25	

	Page 2	Page 4	
1	T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S	1 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Here.	
2	TABLEOT CONTENTS	THE CLERK: Judy Ward?	
	PAGE	3 SENATOR WARD: Here.	
3			
4	Meeting called to order 3	,	
5	Motion by Chairman Dush for consideration to	5 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Present. 6 THE CLERK: Dush?	
6	authorize the issuance of subpoenas 4		
7	Committee discussion re motion 8	7 SENATOR DUSH: Present. 8 THE CLERK: Corman?	
8			
	Ruling 59		
9	A 1'	10 SENATOR DUSH: A quorum having been	
10	Adjournment 59	11 established, good morning everyone. It has been made	
11 12	Reporter's Certificate 60	12 plain that the Department of State and Acting Secretary	
13		3 Degraffenreid are not willing to participate in this	
14		14 body's investigation into the 2020 general election and	
15		15 2021 primary election and how the election code is	
16		16 working after the sweeping changes of Act 77 of 2020.	
17		In order to determine the necessity and	
18		18 scope, in terms of legislative action, it is essential 19 that the Legislature have access to the relevant	
19			
20		20 information in regarding in regard to the 21 aforementioned elections.	
21			
22		As such, pursuant to the powers granted to	
23		23 the Senate Committees via Senate Rule 14D and Article	
24 25		24 II, Section 11 of the Pennsylvania Constitution as well 25 as Pennsylvania Statue 46 subsection 61, I make the	
23		23 as Pennsylvania Statue 40 subsection 61, 1 make the	
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S	Page 5	
2	(0.20 a.m.)	1 motion to authorize and direct the senate secretary to 2 prepare a subpoena directed to the Acting Secretary of	
3	(9:30 a.m.) SENATOR DUSH: We will now call this meeting	3 State, Veronica Degraffenreid, requesting the following	
_	the Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee to	4 information:	
5 ord		5 (1) any and all communications; emails,	
6	In order to establish a quorum, Nate, please	6 letters, notes of calls and/or meetings or otherwise	
	If the role.	7 from the Department of State to any county election	
8	THE CLERK: Argall?	8 director or member of a county election board between	
9	SENATOR ARGALL: Here.	9 May 1st, 2020 and May 31st, 2021;	
10	THE CLERK: Costa?	10 (2) a copy of each and every version of all	
11			
12	THE CLERK: Gebhard?	12 effect at any time between August 1st, 2020 and June	
13	SENATOR GEBHARD: Here.	13 30th, 2021 relating to elections, election systems,	
14	THE CLERK: Hughes?	14 mail-in ballot applications, ballots, voting,	
15	UNIDENTIFIED: Proxy.	15 compliance with state or federal election laws, polling	
16	SENATOR HUGHES: Here.	16 places and/or poll watchers;	
17	UNIDENTIFIED: He was here. I don't know		
18 wh	nere he went.	18 county election workers, poll workers, poll watchers,	
19	UNIDENTIFIED: He went to the restroom.	19 judges of elections, inspectors, clerks and all persons	
20	UNIDENTIFIED: Restroom. Okay.	20 who staffed voting offices between August 1st, 2020 and	
21	THE CLERK: Hutchinson?	21 May 31st, 2021;	
22	SENATOR HUTCHINSON: Here.	22 (4) a complete list containing the name, date	
23	THE CLERK: Mastriano?	23 of birth, driver's license number, last four digits of	
24	SENATOR MASTRIANO: Proxy here.	24 Social Security number, address and date of last voting	
	THE CLERK: Santarsiero?	25 activity of all registered voters within the	
25	THE CEETAL SUMMISSION	<u> </u>	

Page 6 Page 8

- 1 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as of May 1st, 2021 by
- 2 county;
- 3 (5) A complete list containing the name, date
- 4 of birth, driver's license number, last four digits of
- 5 Social Security number, address and date of last voting
- 6 activity of all registered voters within the
- 7 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as of November 1st, 2020
- 8 by county;
- 9 (6) a complete list containing the name, date
- 10 of birth, driver's license number, last four digits of
- 11 Social Security number and address of all individuals
- 12 who voted in person in the November 2020 General
- 13 election by county;
- 14 (7) a complete list containing the name, date
- 15 of birth, driver's license number, last four digits of
- 16 Social Security number and addresses of all individuals
- 17 who voted by mail-in ballot in the November 2020
- 18 General election by county;
- 19 (8) a complete list containing the name, date
- 20 of birth, driver's license number, last four digits of
- 21 Social Security number and address of all individuals
- 22 who voted by absentee ballot in the November 2020
- 23 General election by county;
- 24 (9) a complete list containing the name, date
- 25 of birth, driver's license number, last four digits of

- 1 (15) a copy of the certified results for each
- 2 and every race and or ballot question on the May 2020
- 3 general and the May 2021 primary elections;
- 4 (16) a copy of all reports of audits and/or
- 5 reviews of the Sure System conducted by or for the
- 6 Department of State between 2018 and the present,
- 7 including but not limited to any audits conducted under
- 8 25 Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes 1803(a);
- 9 (17) a copy of the annual reports submitted
- 10 to the Department in 2021 pursuant to Title 4,
- 11 Pennsylvania Code 183.7; 4 PA Code 183.7.
- 12 These subpoenas shall direct the production
- 13 of requested records be made to the Office of General
- 14 Counsel for the Senate Republican Caucus by no later
- 15 tan 4:00 p.m. on Friday, October 1st, 2021.
- 16 The senate secretary shall further be
- 17 authorized to, in turn, direct senate security to
- 18 appropriately serve these subpoenas as required by law.
- 19 Is there a second to the motion?
- 20 SENATOR CORMAN: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?
- 21 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Ward seconds the
- 22 motion. Are there any questions or discussion
- 23 regarding the motion? The Chair recognizes the
- 24 minority chair, Senator Williams.
- 25 SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have attempted to

Page 7

- 1 Social Security number and address of all individuals
- 2 who voted by provisional ballot in the November 2020
- 3 General election by county;
- 4 (10) a complete list containing the name,
- 5 date of birth, driver's license number, last four
- 6 digits of Social Security number and address of all
- 7 individuals who voted in person in the May 2021 primary
- 8 election by county;
- 9 (11) a complete list containing the name,
- 10 date of birth, driver's license number, last four
- 11 digits of Social Security number and address of all
- 12 individuals who voted in person in the May 2021 primary
- 13 election by county;
- 14 (12) a complete list containing the name,
- 15 date of birth, driver's license number, last four
- 16 digits of Social Security number and address of all
- 17 individuals who voted by absentee ballot in the May
- 18 2021 primary election by county;
- 19 (13) a complete list containing the name,
- 20 date of birth, driver's license number, last four
- 21 digits of Social Security number and address of all
- 22 individuals who voted by provisional ballot in the May
- 23 2021 primary election by county;
- 24 (14) a complete list of all changes to voter
- 25 records made between May 31st, 2020 and May 31st, 2021;

- 1 accommodate the process, even though I differ with the
- 2 process. I came here prepared to follow what was
- 3 outlined in terms of what was going to happen. There
- 4 was an opening statement, which I feel and felt was
- 5 important to provide with regard to perspective about
- 6 what the proceedings are today.
- 7 I did interrupt and ask for acknowledgement
- 8 on the seconding of the motion, which was not
- 9 recognized. I want to ask that I have latitude in
- 10 responding to these subpoenas, in terms of the comments
- 11 I may make. I'm asking on behalf of myself solely, not
- 12 the other members, so that I can get as a part of the
- 13 record a reaction on the side of the minority portion.
- 14 SENATOR DUSH: Senator, you're recognized for
- 15 the comments.
- 16 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 17 In January, Senator Pro Tem, Jake Corman, created and
- 18 appointed, along with recommendations from Senator Jay
- 19 Costa, members to the Special Commission on Election
- 20 Integrity. From this bipartisan committee, there were
- 21 recommendations on how to improve, protect, and support
- 22 voter participation.
- 23 During those proceedings, the County
- 24 Commissioner's Association of Pennsylvania, an non-
- 25 profit and non-partisan association, representing 67

Page 10 Page 12

- 1 counties, provided specific insight and guidance of
- 2 needed resources for counties across the Commonwealth
- 3 of Pennsylvania. To date, none of those
- 4 recommendations have been enacted.
- Nonetheless, here we sit prepared to vote on
- 6 subpoenas that may or may not be a violation of federal
- 7 law, that may or may not be jurisdictionally
- 8 appropriate based upon this committee and based upon
- 9 the non-participation in our last hearing at the
- 10 Department of State.
 - Regardless of the fact that the Department
- 12 has before the election and since the election provided
- 13 specific comment reported before committees regarding
- 14 their activities. Regardless of the fact that this
- 15 committee and the republicans are quite aware that they
- 16 have taken the Department to court and, therefore,
- 17 limit what the Department can say in public
- 18 proceedings.
- We're also here based upon the testimony of
- 20 the Fulton County Commissioner, Stuart Ulsh, which,
- 21 frankly, raises more questions than provided answers or
- 22 insight. What was stated on the record, there was no
- 23 evidence of fraud in his county nor consequence of
- 24 election manipulation.
- 25 Further, he provided what many of us see as
- Page 11 1 an alarming line of information, information that a
- 2 private vendor potentially without sunshine or public
- 3 knowledge, has access to their voter file information.
- 4 The entirety of our proceedings today,
- 5 issuing subpoenas, is based upon such a non-credible
- 6 foundation, going well beyond and is very troubling,
- 7 and, in fact, leads us to darker days in this country,
- 8 such as when hearings like these during the McCarthy
- 9 era were held, where voices were silenced and liberties
- 10 were denied, being bullied by the power of the
- 11 government.
- 12 It is no exaggeration to say to protect one's
- 13 right to vote, is parallel to those dark days and space
- 14 in this country. This equates to a pure, unadulterated
- 15 power grab, unfounded in fact, widely unpopular and
- 16 aimed to suppress voters' rights targeted to stack the
- 17 deck, aimed at gross misuse of taxpayers' dollars.
- 18 This is an attack on our country's greatest freedom.
- 19 It's an attack on our right to vote.
- 20 Today the republicans are taking a giant leap
- 21 from fanning the flames of voter obstruction to a
- 22 blowtorch on democracy. Not only are the subpoenas
- 23 that you are set to authorize being carelessly rushed
- 24 without evidence to warrant them, there's also no
- 25 ground to stand on. This action is clearly a violation

- 1 of the separation of powers. This investigation is
- 2 either a untimely election contest or an election
- 3 audit, probably both. The senate does not have the
- 4 authority to perform either.
- 5 And in the substance of these subpoenas, the
- 6 public should be forewarned of the overreaching,
- 7 overarching nature contained in these subpoenas,
- 8 specifically for the government to have access to your
- 9 Social Security numbers should be scary to all of us.
- This information that will be provided will
- 11 be forwarded to a private vendor. For those who come
- 12 from counties that are truly concerned about the
- 13 government, its overreaching and desire your privacy,
- 14 this should be seen as a betrayal of those who are here
- 15 to represent you.
- 16 Further, the information that we now see
- 17 based upon the activity going on in Arizona, and make
- 18 no mistake, this is an attempt, and an Arizona type
- 19 forensic audit is being investigated by the federal
- 20 Department of Justice and may well be, in fact, a
- 21 violation of federal law.
- 22 As my friend, Senator Costa and others last
- 23 week and others before him have stated, we're at a
- 24 crossroads. For those of us who want to preserve the
- 25 constitution, it is our sworn responsibility to follow
 - Page 13
- 1 it in this commonwealth, this is a clear, clear pattern
- 2 that troubles all of us.
- 3 Senator Corman suggested today, in a
- 4 published newspaper article, that there should be an
- 5 investigation. We agree. We agree with him. We
- 6 believe that what has been revealed by testimony in
- 7 careless newspaper reports, there seems to be potential
- 8 for a legal activity conspiring to change the results
- 9 of this election, information being --
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: Mr. Chairman, you're
- 11 questioning the integrity of the integrity of the chair
- 12 and going to motives. Under Rule 10(b), I've clearly
- 13 laid out where the purpose of this investigation and
- 14 what it's to be used for. It is not for several of the
- 14 what it's to be used for. It is not for several of the
- 15 points that you've made. I've given, you know, some 16 latitude, but at this point, you have to stop making
- 17 false accusations about the intent of this
- 18 investigation and of the chair. You're going to the
- 19 motives of the chair, which under senate rules is not
- 20 authorized. You may proceed.
- 21 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you. For the
- 22 record, I am not questioning the motives of the chair.
- 23 There's nothing in my statement that suggests it's the
- 24 motives of the chair. It doesn't even personalize it
- 25 to the extent that the member is involved.

Page 14 Page 16

- SENATOR DUSH: Senator --1
- 2 SENATOR WILLIAMS: But it does --
- 3 SENATOR DUSH: -- when you say that the
- 4 motive of this is for some purpose other than the
- 5 stated motives and the intent of this committee and
- 6 this investigation, you are questioning the motive of
- 7 the chair.
- 8 SENATOR WILLIAMS: I'm reacting to what has
- 9 been publicly documented in a newspaper article --
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: Not on this chairman's
- 11 directives and my statements. You're using other
- 12 people's comments. You are not using the statements of
- 13 this chairman. And I'm the one who determines the
- 14 direction of this investigation.
- 15 SENATOR WILLIAMS: This committee is
- 16 sanctioned by the body as a total. No committee
- 17 operates independent of the senate. It only operates
- 18 from the permission of those who are in leadership. So
- 19 with all due respect, there's nothing that any
- 20 committee chair, including you, can certainly suggest
- 21 operates independently of that process.
- 22 So, therefore, with all due respect, Mr.
- 23 Chairman, this is a response to a statement made by the
- 24 member that sanctions the committee, that appoints the

1 this committee and directed the work of this committee.

2 and stated publicly in many and numerous newspaper

- 25 chairman of this committee, and allows for the work of
- 1 why it is that the proposed subpoena would be
- 2 requesting Social Security and driver's license
- 3 numbers?

Page 15

So to suggest that the chairman is solely

3 reports, including today.

- 5 responsible and solely under attack, is not consistent
- 6 with the facts, nor is it consistent with any pattern
- 7 that has occurred within the senate prior to his
- 8 arrival as a chairman or will go forward. That's the
- 9 reality. That's not an exaggeration. That's a
- 10 statement of the fact. So I would like to continue
- 11 with regard to how the senate is proceeding, not the
- 12 chairman.
- 13 SENATOR DUSH: Proceed.
- 14 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you. We believe now
- 15 that has been revealed by testimony in countless
- 16 newspaper reports, that there seems to be the potential
- 17 for activity, which may be considered to be illegal.
- 18 Information being given to a private vendor without a
- 19 public notification and a continuing drumbeat to avoid
- 20 any kind of rescission of that potentially illegal
- 21 activity is of great concern.
- While this reminds us, again, of another era.
- 23 When the Watergate Committee began its investigation,
- 24 it headed in one direction, and quickly discovered by
- 25 the statement of facts and details that indeed there

- 1 were unscrupulous and illegal activities in a pointedly
- 2 different direction. We suggest that Senator Corman
- 3 and the like indeed investigate those significant
- 4 findings and those proceedings.
- Lastly, we sit in the shadow of 911 where we
- 6 as a collective nation weep and mourn and remember the
- 7 tragedy which occurred. And I'm drawn to the comments
- 8 made by former President Bush, "We're greater as a
- 9 collective as opposed to divided."
- 10 So while we sit here in the minority, we will
- 11 continue the battle and the fight for those of us who
- 12 believe in what President Bush believes in and every
- 13 good and godly given American in Pennsylvania believes
- 14 in, their God-given right to be considered equal. And
- 15 that's expressed through their franchise and their
- 16 right to vote. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 17 SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Chairman. Are
- 18 there any other questions or discussion on the motion?
- THE CLERK: Senator Santarsiero, Mr.
- 20 Chairman.
- 21 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Santarsiero.
- 22 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Thank you, Mr.
- 23 Chairman. I just have a few questions, if I may.
- 24 First, I'm trying to understand the breadth of the
- 25 subpoena and what is being requested. Can you explain
 - Page 17

- SENATOR DUSH: Those documents are part of
- 5 any audit that the auditor general would conduct or
- 6 anybody who is looking to verify the identity of
- 7 individuals and their place of residence and their
- 8 eligibility to vote.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Well, why are we
- 10 trying to verify the identity of these individuals?
- 11 There are almost seven million people, for example, who
- 12 voted in the November 2020 elections, both in person
- 13 and by mail-in and absentee ballot. Why are we trying
- 14 to verify their identities?
- 15 SENATOR DUSH: Because there have been
- 16 questions regarding the validity of people who have
- 17 voted, whether or not they exist. Again, we are not
- 18 responding to proven allegations. We are investigating
- 19 the allegations to determine whether or not they are
- 20 factual.
- 21 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Toward what end?
- 22 Toward what end would you?
- 23 SENATOR DUSH: If we have some errors within
- 24 the voter registration system which allow for such
- 25 activity, then we have a responsibility as a

Page 18 Page 20

- 1 Legislature to create legislation, which will prevent
- 2 that from happening in future elections.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well, we have
- 4 legislation right now that requires certain threshold
- 5 requirements for someone to be able to vote. Why
- 6 specifically would we need this information for the
- 7 nearly seven million people who voted. We've heard
- 8 through our special committee earlier this year from a
- 9 number of county elections officials across
- 10 Pennsylvania and we heard as recently as last week from
- 11 a county election official in Fulton County that there
- 12 were no issues. Why do we need this information?
- 13 SENATOR DUSH: The commissioner from Fulton
- 14 County was commenting on the counts. He was not
- 15 commenting on the veracity of the individual voters and
- 16 whether or not they were authorized. And to the first
- 17 part of your question, if all those protections that
- 18 you described are in place and we still discover that
- 19 there were issues, then we do have a responsibility to
- 20 clarify or improve on the legislation that you've
- 21 described.
- 22 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Beyond understanding 22 counsel?
- 23 that someone may or may not have voted properly, what
- 24 are you going to use this information for? I'm still
- 25 trying to struggling with the information. You're

- 1 need to verify those voters from 2020?
- 2 SENATOR DUSH: That question again has been
- 3 asked and answered. This is an investigation to
- 4 determine if there are failures with regard to ensuring
- 5 the integrity of the voter registration system.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: All right. Let me go
- 7 on to another topic that I would like to try to get
- 8 some understanding of. If this information, if the
- 9 subpoenas are voted out today, and the information is
- 10 provided, who is going to have access to the
- 11 information?
- 12 SENATOR DUSH: We are still working on
- 13 getting the contracts finalized on a vendor who is
- 14 capable of conducting such an investigation.
- 15 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Who is we in that
- 16 sentence, if I could?
- SENATOR DUSH: Myself and my team. 17
- 18 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: And who is your team?
- 19 SENATOR DUSH: My staff as well as the legal
- 20 counsel whe will be assisting.
- 21 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: And who is that legal

Page 19

- 231 SENATOR DUSH: The senate republican legal
- 24 counsel right now. There's a possibility of hiring
- 25 outside counsel too. We haven't finalized that.

- 1 asking for a lot of information. You're asking for the
- 2 identification, the Social Security numbers and
- 3 driver's license numbers for nearly seven million
- 4 people. What do you hope to do with that information?
- SENATOR DUSH: That's aheady been asked and 6 answered.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well, I don't know that
- 8 you've really answered the question, because there have
- 9 been allegations about last year's election. I
- 10 understand that. They've been proven to be without
- 11 merit. Why do we now need this information?
- 12 SENATOR DUSH: Again, it is to verify the
- 13 individuals. I will -- and as to your comments on the
- 14 outside vendors for this purpose, we have the Secretary
- 15 of State authorized that distribution of that exact
- 16 same information to a number of third-party vendors up
- 17 to the election.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Mr. Chairman, I don't
- 19 think I've asked any questions about outside vendors
- 20 yet. I --
- 21 SENATOR DUSH: Actually, you did.
- 2.2. SENATOR SANTARSIERO: You may be anticipate, 22 vetting those candidates.
- 23 but you said so we could verify the voter, but why do
- 24 we need to verify -- I'm trying to understand why we
- 25 need to verify -- why does this committee -- this body

- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: All right. So the
- 2 senate republican caucus is going to determine who is
- 3 going to be hired to review this information? Am I
- 4 understanding that correctly?
- SENATOR DUSH: I have been tasked with
- 6 running this committee. I will be making a choice
- 7 after conferring with legal counsel, and then we will
- 8 proceed from there. But that has not been finalized
- 9 yet.
- 10 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: All right. In any
- 11 event, it's legal counsel that you are going to choose.
- 12 SENATOR DUSH: That is correct.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And do you have
- 14 a list of vendors right now that you're considering
- 15 that you can share with the committee?
- 16 SENATOR DUSH: I don't have anybody that I'm
- 17 willing to share at this point.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: That you're willing to 18
- 19 share at this point. And why is that? Why would you
- 20 not be willing to share that information right now?
- 21 SENATOR DUSH: Because I have not completed
- 23 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Are they vendors
- 24 that are located inside the Commonwealth of
- 25 Pennsylvania?

Page 22 Page 24

- 1 SENATOR DUSH: Both inside and outside.
- 2 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Are they vendors
- 3 located within the United States of America?
- 4 SENATOR DUSH: Absolutely.
- 5 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And are these
- 6 vendors, do they -- who's funding these vendors.
- 7 SENATOR DUSH: It will come out of senate
- 8 funds.
- 9 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: It will come out of
- 10 senate funds. The vendors themselves, do we know who
- 11 their clients are outside of potentially this
- 12 committee?
- 13 SENATOR DUSH: As I said, I'm in the process
- 14 of vetting those possible vendors.
- 15 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And when you've
- 16 completed your what you describe as your vetting, are
- 17 you going to be sharing that publicly?
- 18 SENATOR DUSH: I'm sorry. Could you repeat
- 19 the question?
- 20 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Well, so my question,
- 21 what I'm trying to get to, Mr. Chairman, is, obviously,
- 22 I think it should be the goal of this committee,
- 23 certainly the goal of the state senate to operate in as
- 24 open and transparent a manner as possible. I'm a bit
- 25 concerned about what you're describing now, because it
 - Page 23
- 1 seems contrary to that goal. But my question is with
- 2 respect to this vetting that you're doing, are you
- 3 ultimately going to make that information available to
- 4 the public?
- 5 SENATOR DUSH: That information will be made
- 6 available, but at this point, we're off the topic of
- 7 the subpoenas in particular. And as to the
- 8 understanding --
- 9 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Mr. Chairman?
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: I would ask the member if you
- 11 have questions regarding the subpoenas and we will
- 12 proceed from there.
- 13 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Mr. Chairman, I
- 14 strongly, with all due respect, disagree with that.
- 15 You are proposing that this committee vote on the issue
- 16 of subpoenas that potentially would result in the
- 17 production of a voluminous amount of information about
- 18 individual Pennsylvania citizens.
- 19 The question is about what happens to that
- 20 information when it comes in? Who has access to that
- 21 information? Who are those people? And how are they
- 22 chosen? I think are direct -- those are questions that
- 23 are directly relevant to the question before this
- 24 committee, which is whether or not we should issue
- 25 these subpoenas.

- 1 How can we vote on whether we should issue
- 2 these subpoenas if we don't know, ultimately, what's
- 3 going to happen to this information and who's going to
- 4 have access to it? So I would respectfully disagree.
- 5 Now, my question is whoever --
- 6 SENATOR DUSH: Well, to answer your question,
- 7 the sensate secretary is going to prepare the subpoena,
- 8 directing the Secretary of State to produce the
- 9 documents and these will come to the senate, and they
- 10 will be held in the legal counsel's office until such
- 11 time as we have a finalized agreement and a contract
- 12 for the investigator.
- And, again, I go back we need to be pursuing
- 14 questions on the substance of this subpoena. We have
- 15 the authority to do this, and we are working to ensure
- 16 that everything is in proper place. The storage of
- 17 that information will be held in a secure location and
- 18 capable under the counsel's office, just like any other
- 19 legal documents are secured within the senate legal
- 20 offices, and we will take proper care of it.
- 21 Are there any other questions --
- 22 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: I have several others,
- 23 if I may, Mr. Chairman. So will this whatever vendor
- 24 is ultimately chosen, will this vendor have complete
- 25 access to all the information that is produced as a

- 1 consequence of these subpoenas?
- 2 SENATOR DUSH: Could you repeat the question?
- 3 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Will the vendor who is
- 4 ultimately chosen have complete access to all the
- 5 information that may be produced as a consequence of
- 6 the issuance of these subpoenas?
- 7 SENATOR DUSH: Potentially yes. That will be
- 8 part of the discussion that I will be having with our
- 9 legal team as to what specifically will be given.
- 10 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: So to understand your
- 11 answer the scope of the access that the vendor will
- 12 have will be decided by you and your legal team?
- 13 SENATOR DUSH: That is correct.
- 14 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. And in going
- 15 through this vetting process, is one of the factors
- 16 you're discussing what kind of experience these vendors
- 17 have with reviewing election results?
- 18 SENATOR DUSH: Absolutely. And as well any
- 19 similar investigative capabilities that may be
- 20 required.
- 21 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. Getting back to
- 22 the issue of the vendors, do we know whether any of
- 23 these vendors have any relationship with the lawyer,
- 24 Sydney Powell?
- 25 SENATOR DUSH: You're off topic on this.

Page 26 Page 28

- 1 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: No, I don't think so,
- 2 Mr. Chairman, with all due respect. You're talking
- 3 about vetting vendors who potentially, we don't know,
- 4 because you haven't really answered.
- 5 SENATOR DUSH: Actually, the answer to that
- 6 is I really don't know, because it is not something
- 7 that is relevant to my determination as to whether
- 8 these people have qualities. You're going --
- 9 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: So it's possible then.
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: It's absolutely possible.
- 11 Putting a man on the moon was found to be possible.
- 12 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Is it possible that
- 13 these vendors are in any way receive funding from the
- 14 Lydon Harry Bradley Foundation?
- 15 SENATOR DUSH: Again, I don't know.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Okay. But it's
- 17 possible.
- 18 SENATOR DUSH: Do you have a point?
- 19 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Yeah. I would have
- 20 thought that the point was self-evident.
- 21 SENATOR DUSH: Have a point that is relevant
- 22 to this.
- 23 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: It's absolutely
- 24 relevant. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, you are
- 25 asking this committee to consider the issuance of a
 - Page 27
- 1 subpoena that is requesting personal information about
- 2 nearly seven million Pennsylvanians. You have yet to
- 3 explain who exactly is going to have access to that
- 4 information.
- 5 You have not indicated that there would be
- 6 anyone making decisions regarding the access to that
- 7 information other than yourself and some undefined
- $8 \hspace{0.1cm}$ legal team that may or may not yet have been chosen.
- 9 And you're asking this committee to vote on whether
- 10 these subpoenas should be issued without having any of
- 11 that information.
- 12 And I would argue that each one of us, as
- 13 elected representatives of nearly 260,000 people in
- 14 each of our districts, that we have duty to those
- 15 people, many of whom voted in last November's election
- 16 to know exactly where their information is going and
- 17 who's going to have access to it. They cast votes
- 18 under the law, under their freedom as Americans to cast
- 19 votes in an election, with no expectation, no
- 20 reasonable expectation that some private company not
- 21 chosen by them, not chosen in a democratic fashion,
- 22 because this committee doesn't seem to have any ability
- 23 to make that decision.
- 24 SENATOR DUSH: I think that --
- 25 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Allow me to finish,

- 1 please, if I may.
- 2 SENATOR DUSH: Well, I want to make a point
- 3 here. The Secretary of State issued authorization for
- 4 people to have access to all of that to one
- 5 subcontractor, a political activist organization, which
- 6 then was given the ability to, without any kind of
- 7 vetting, push that out to others. I think there was
- 8 somewhere around forty of them that had access to all
- 9 of that information. So I have a hard time
- 10 understanding your line of questioning on this.
- 11 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Mr. Chairman, when -
- 12 SENATOR DUSH: You're --
- 13 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Mr. Chairman, the
- 14 Secretary --
- 15 SENATOR DUSH: The governor's own
- 16 department --
- 17 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: The Secretary of the
- 18 Commonwealth has legal authority to conduct
- 19 investigations into the conduct of elections. Now --
- 20 SENATOR DUSH: That was not an investigation.
- 21 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Now, Mr. --
- 22 SENATOR DUSH: That was authorization to Sure
- 23 system.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Mr. Chairman? Mr.
- 25 Chairman, what you are proposing today, which is the

- 1 issue in front of us, not what any secretary of state
- 2 may or may not have done at any time in the past, is
- 3 whether this committee should issue subpoenas that
- 4 include personal information for nearly seven million
- 5 Pennsylvanians. And you are incapable right now today,
- 6 while we are considering this vote, to tell the members
- 7 of this committee and the public who exactly is going
- 7 of this committee and the public who exactly is goin
- 8 to have access to that information, how that
- 9 information is going to be used, and whether or not
- 10 that information is going to be made public.
- 11 You can't even tell us today who is going to
- 12 be part of your team making those decisions. You're
- 13 not willing to let us know what vendors are being
- 14 considered. You're not describing what you term as
- 15 vetting process is, and yet you're asking us to vote on
- 16 the issuance of a subpoena that will collect that
- 17 information.
- 18 And, Mr. Chairman, I think, you know, we come
- 19 here today asked to vote on something as substantial as
- 20 this, that we should have that information in front of
- 21 us, and, frankly, the public should have that
- 22 information in front of us. I'm very concerned, very
- 23 concerned that this committee, and ultimately this body
- 24 is not being transparent. Moreover, I'm concerned that
- 25 everything you're describing, in terms of the decisions

Page 30 Page 32

- 1 in this process, the decisions as who should be hired
- 2 as a vendor to review this information, the decisions
- 3 about how that investigation, that review should take
- 4 place is a partisan one. You've said it yourself.
- 5 It's the republican caucus that will be
- 6 making these decisions. Now, it may well be, and I
- 7 think we all know, that this chamber has a majority of
- 8 republicans, but the state senate, democrats and
- 9 republicans alike, were elected to represent the people
- 10 of this commonwealth in the state senate of
- 11 Pennsylvania.
- 12 And what you're now describing sounds very
- 13 much to me like a partisan investigation, so much so
- 14 that you're not even willing to share the details of
- 15 that --
- 16 SENATOR DUSH: All right. I'm done. Again,
- 17 you're going to Rule 10(b), questioning the motives of
- 18 the chair. The chair now recognizes Senator Corman.
- 19 SENATOR CORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 20 Just a couple comments. You know when my friends over
- 21 here, you know, pose something, which is certainly
- 22 within their right. That's allowed. But when people
- 23 are many times opposed to things, the best way to get
- 24 other people to oppose to things is to make them
- 25 scared. They should be scared of something. I guess
- Page 31 1 my question for all of us is what are we scared of?
- 2 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman Mr.
- 3 Chairman, if I could just briefly interrupt. The
- 4 chairman just criticized my colleague for impugning the
- 5 motives --
- 6 SENATOR CORMAN: That's a fair point. Fair 7 point.
- 8 SENATOR WILLIAMS: -- impugning the motives
- 9 and -- thank you, sir.
- 10 SENATOR CORMAN: Fair point.
- 11 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Please recognize that.
- 12 Thank you.
- 13 SENATOR CORMAN: Fair point.
- 14 SENATOR DUSH: The chair recognizes that
- 15 and --
- 16 SENATOR CORMAN: Fair point.
- 17 SENATOR DUSH: Thank you.
- 18 SENATOR CORMAN: But the question, in
- 19 general, is, you know, what would any of us,
- 20 republican, democrat, people of Pennsylvania, be afraid
- 21 of, of this investigation? You know, all we're doing
- 22 is seeking facts, seeking information, so that we can
- 23 make better public policy.
- 24 My good friend, Senator Williams, made
- 25 mention of some public comments of my own, talking

- 1 about we're looking to undermine an election. That's
- 2 far from the truth. The Legislature, let me be very
- 3 clear, Legislature has not authority to overturn an
- 4 election. When there was a lot of human cry back in
- 5 December about reappointing electors under the federal
- 6 constitution, we said no. We can't do that.
- 7 The state statute is very clear, that the
- 8 winner of the popular vote certified by the Department
- 9 of State, appoints the electors of that party. And we
- 10 made no move in this general assembly or this senate to
- 11 change that. That is the law.
- 12 Any contest of any election, whether it be
- 13 for the President of the United States, whether it be
- 14 or governor, whether it be for Legislature, whether it
- 15 be for county commissioner, whatever, are done through
- 16 the courts. All contests are done through the courts.
- 17 And the courts will ultimately have the say as they did
- 18 in this particular last election on numerous races.
- 19 And they made a decision. So there's no movement or
- 20 discussion of that point.21 The point is we have public that is c
- The point is we have public that is concerned
- 22 about how the last election was conducted. And just as
- 23 there was many concerns in 2016 from my friends, and
- 24 particularly in Washington, D.C. on the other side of
- 25 the aisle, there was a great debate about Russian

- 1 collusion for two years why the democrats in D.C. were
- 2 in the minority and then when they came into the
- 3 majority, conducted investigations into Russian
- 4 collusion. And even though there was, you know, very
- 5 little facts behind that, they continued and continued
- 6 and continued until, ultimately, an independent council
- 7 was appointed, and then the final --
- 8 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman? Mr.
- 9 Chairman, I have no problem with the gentleman speaking
- 10 extemporaneously about Russian or China or whatever he
- 11 wants to talk about, but I do know for the record, that
- 12 when my colleague was attempting to question specific
- 13 items he was constrained. Also, for the record, to my
- 14 friend, I didn't suggest, and I didn't say in my
- 15 comments anything about undermining what I said was
- 16 comments in the paper talked about an investigation, of
- 17 which we will follow up and support him in that effort
- 18 to follow the details and the facts.
- 19 So all I'm suggesting is that whatever we're
- 20 going to do, the pattern be the same for every member
- 21 of the committee. And certainly I respect my
- 22 colleague, and I always have for a long time, and if he
- 23 has full reign to talk about things such as that on the
- 24 national stage, I only think it's appropriate that we
- 25 have the same consideration.

Page 36 Page 34

- SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Chairman. And I do 1
- 2 agree. Let's try and keep this on topic.
- SENATOR CORMAN: So the point is I think that
- 4 someone who I believe who has served with my colleagues
- 5 for 20 years plus that, whether we agree to disagree
- 6 credibility is important for all of us. And,
- 7 obviously, this investigation, which gets a lot of
- 8 attention, will be judged by its results. And what is
- 9 most important to me, is the credibility of it. And I
- 10 understand some of the questions by the gentleman from
- 11 Bucks County and his concerns about the credibility.
- 12 I could tell you this from my perspective,
- 13 and I'm not speaking for the chair. The chair will
- 14 make these decisions, you know, we didn't went outside
- 15 sources when we talked about this paying for this,
- 16 because, you know, republicans wouldn't like it if
- 17 George Soros was funding investigations, right, nor
- 18 should democrats like it if people with partisan
- 19 leanings are paying for this on the outside. We felt
- 20 very uncomfortable and didn't believe -- this is
- 21 something the senate believes in. This is something
- 22 that needs to be done. Then, you know, this is a
- 23 public event, and the public, you know, should do that.
- 24 And individuals who, ultimately are hired by the chair
- 25 in this committee, should have that same type of
 - Page 35
- 1 credibility.
- People that have a track record of doing
- 3 whatever investigations in their past that have that
- 4 credibility. I think that is the most important, so
- 5 that when we look at the results of this, when we look
- 6 at the results of this at the end of the day, that
- 7 whether it's your eyes or my eyes or independent eyes,
- 8 we can look at what we found is credible and then
- 9 hopefully, it'll accomplish one of two things; either
- 10 will give us action items to better our laws moving
- 11 forward for the next election, or we can dispel a lot
- 12 of the concerns about the last election.
- One of those two things will happen at the
- 14 end of the day. And I think both of those are good. I
- 15 think both of those are productive for our
- 16 commonwealth. Either we better our laws or we dispel a
- 17 lot of the concerns that the people of Pennsylvania
- 18 have. And you may not agree with those concerns, but I
- 19 can tell you in my years in the senate, I have not had
- 20 any issue and I've received more phone calls, more
- 21 voter contacts, more people walking up to me in the
- 22 street, and, look perception is reality.
- 23 Not to get too far off topic, but I'm sure
- 24 many people thought about the Russian collusion. That
- 25 was their perception, that was their reality. And so,

- 1 that investigation found out there was nothing. So
- 2 people were more comfortable with the fact that Russia
- 3 didn't get involved in our elections in 2016. Maybe
- 4 that'll be the same here. I don't know. But, again,
- 5 one of two things will happen, either we will fins
- 6 things where we can improve our laws, or we will find
- 7 nothing that will then dispel a lot of people's
- 8 concerns, and we call can be more confident in our
- 9 system moving forward.
- 10 So, you know, I'd say well, we can do this
- 11 together. We can do it with credibility. That is our
- 12 goal, and I think that's the goal of the chair. That's
- 13 the goal of myself as the pro tem. I know that's a
- 14 goal. And we've had these discussions at caucus. If
- 15 we're going to do this, let's do it right, so that the
- 16 people of Pennsylvania will have confidence in whatever
- 17 result we obtain. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- 18 SENATOR COSTA: Mr. Chairman, may I --
- 19 SENATOR DUSH: I'm going to, as I'm looking
- 20 at the clock, we're getting it to the point where if
- 21 we're going to have the vote on this motion, we're
- 22 going to have to limit further comments to about five
- 23 minutes per member. And I will go to -- are there any
- 24 members who have yet to speak that have comments?
- 25 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman --
- Page 37
- SENATOR DUSH: One moment. I'd like to have
- 2 an answer to that question first, Mr. Chairman. Are
- 3 there others?
- SENATOR COSTA: I just have one follow up
- 5 question.
- SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman? Wait. Wait
- 7 a minute. Mr. Chairman, you made a comment, and if
- 8 we're going to follow a process, then you make a
- 9 comment, we get to react.
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: And I'm going to recognize --
- 11 SENATOR WILLIAMS: And --
- 12 SENATOR DUSH: -- Senator Costa.
- 13 SENATOR WILLIAMS: -- before you do that, you
- 14 put parameters on my members of five minutes prior to
- 15 after another gentleman on committee spoke for ten.
- 16 SENATOR DUSH: Senator --
 - SENATOR WILLIAMS: And so Mr. Chair --
- 18 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Santarsiero had more
- 19 than time.

17

- 20 SENATOR WILLIAMS: I'm not discussing any
- 21 particular member. I'm talking about going forward.
- 22 SENATOR DUSH: We've --
- 23 SENATOR WILLIAMS: I'm suggesting to you that
- 24 you put a time limit on the members, and to my
- 25 knowledge, there's no other business other than this

Page 38 Page 40

- 1 today. So if it takes the entire day, so be it. This
- 2 is a significant moment. This is a significant asking
- 3 of the general public. And there are several items to
- 4 be discussed as we proceed.
- Now, I have no idea as to whether members
- 6 want to talk for two minutes, ten seconds or 20
- 7 minutes. I don't know. But I do find it a bit
- 8 disingenuous to make an announcement that we are now
- 9 confined to five minutes after my friend, colleague and
- 10 leader of the senate speaks at length about a variety
- 11 of items. That doesn't -- that's not consistent with
- 12 what we should do as a body.
- 13 SENATOR DUSH: Chairman, the individual who
- 14 spoke prior to that and took even longer, and that was
- 15 member of your side. So, and there were a number of
- 16 topics discussed by him as well. From this point
- 17 forward, given the time constraints that we have, I am
- 18 going to limit until five minutes. And then if we've
- 19 got time, we'll come back for a second round. Senator
- 20 Costa, you're recognized.
- 21 SENATOR COSTA: Mr. Chairman, I would ask
- 22 that you recognize Senator Santarsiero, then Senator
- 23 Hughes and then myself. That was what we'd hoped to be
- 24 able to achieve at this point.

3

- 25 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: And I will not take
- Page 39 1 anywhere near five minutes, Mr. Chairman. You have my 1 driver's licenses, voting records, Social Security
- 2 word on that. SENATOR DUSH: Thank you.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: If I may? Thank you.
- 5 Mr. chairman, I just want to say, first, I
- 6 wholeheartedly agree with Senator Corman that
- 7 credibility is a critical issue here. So I guess I
- 8 have another question for you, if I may. Leaving aside
- 9 the payment information, as to where the founding comes
- 10 from the vendor, can you say to us today that no vendor
- 11 will be chosen who has at any time had any connection
- 12 with any of the candidates, particularly the
- 13 presidential candidates, but, frankly, any of the
- 14 candidates who ran in last November's election?
- 15 SENATOR DUSH: That would be a very difficult
- 16 task given that there is going to be a need to have
- 17 multiple investigators, multiple areas of expertise,
- 18 and the relationships that one has with how narrowly
- 19 defined are we going to be going with these
- 20 relationships? We live in a world where people are
- 21 getting more and more actively involved with the
- 22 political sphere. So am I going to be examining this
- 23 in a way that will try and engender confidence on the
- 24 part of the people of the commonwealth as to the
- 25 outcomes.

- So the vetting process will be rigorous. We
- 2 will be making sure that we're applying some
- 3 significant measure of ensuring that the people will
- 4 have faith in that. I'm not going to be hiring
- 5 political activists to become investigators.
- SENATOR SANTARSIERO: But it is possible,
- 7 based on what you just said, that the vendor or vendors
- 8 hired may have worked for one or more campaigns in last
- 9 year's elections.
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: Again, anything is possible,
- 11 but it's not where I'm going with this.
- 12 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Thank you, Mr.
- 13 Chairman. I have no further questions.
- 14 SENATOR DUSH: The chair recognizes Senator
- 15 Hughes.
- SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16
- 17 And I'll try to get -- be as succinct as I possibly
- 18 can, although there is a tremendous amount of
- 19 information and conversation that needs to be had with
- 20 this; obviously, I'll be voting no on the motion to
- 21 subpoena documents and records with the Department of
- 22 State.
- 23 We have every reason, every right to be
- 24 candor about what happens with these documents, with
- 25 this information. It's profuse public information --

- 2 information -- when Republican members of the Senate
- 3 will obviously have access to this information and
- 4 those Republican members of the Senate were involved in
- 5 the insurrection and, in fact -- excuse me --
- SENATOR DUSH: The Senator is out of line.
- SENATOR HUGHES: I am not out of line; I am
- 8 very much in line.
- 9 You are asking for prolific information --
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: The hearing will be at ease.
- 11 The hearsay is at ease.
- 12 Cut the feed.
- 13 (Pause)
- 14 SENATOR DUSH: The committee is back in
- 15 session.
- 16 SENATOR HUGHES: May I continue, Mr.
- 17 Chairman?
- 18 SENATOR DUSH: You may.
- 19 SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Mr. Chairman, the
- 20 information that you're requesting is going to be made
- 21 available to, at least, we can only infer, to at least
- 22 Republican members of this committee. Don't know if
- 23 it's going to be available to Democratic members. 24 We do know that Republican members of the
- 25 Senate were in Washington, D.C. on January 6th, which

Page 42 Page 44

- 1 was Insurrection Day. We do know that Republican
- 2 members of this committee were in communication with
- 3 last week's testifier about, within a week after the
- 4 November 3rd election about how to impact the results
- 5 of the election.
- 6 So, we do not have a full --
- 7 SENATOR DUSH: Senator --
- 8 SENATOR HUGHES: -- understanding --
- 9 SENATOR DUSH: -- we're at ease.
- 10 (Pause)
- 11 SENATOR DUSH: If we could wrap this up?
- 12 SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- Mr. Chairman, I've been a member of the
- 14 Pennsylvania Legislature for 34 years. I have
- 15 introduced thousands of bills, worked with hundreds of
- 16 staffers who assisted me in drafting legislation and
- 17 advised me on the information that we needed to draft
- 18 those bills.
- I can honestly say that never in my 34 years
- 20 has someone told me I needed the names, addresses,
- 21 driver's license numbers, and Social Security numbers
- 22 of my fellow Pennsylvanians to draft a bill. Never.
- 23 If that's the reason the majority gives us
- 24 for needing this information and for issuing the
- 25 subpoena to help draft legislation, Mr. Chairman,
- Page 43
- 1 that's absurd and the majority knows it; however, the
- 2 majority also knows it needs to create a legislative
- 3 purpose to justify their fishing expedition for voters'
- 4 personal information or their subpoenas will likely
- 5 with declared invalid by the courts.
- 6 So here we are. Be clear: We don't need any
- 7 voters' name, address, driver's license number, or
- 8 Social Security number to draft legislation on any
- 9 subject. We don't need the name, address, driver's
- 10 license number, or Social Security number of every
- 11 person who voted in person in 2020 to draft voting
- 12 legislation. We certainly don't need that information
- 13 from 6.9 million Pennsylvania voters, which is what the
- 14 subpoena seeks. We don't need the personal information
- 15 from 6.9 million Pennsylvania voters to draft
- 16 legislation on in-person voting, or absentee voting, or
- 17 mail-in voting, or voting by provisional ballot. We
- 18 don't need subpoena records about when a voter last
- 19 exercised his or her right to vote to draft
- 20 legislation.
- 21 A person's constitutional right to vote and
- 22 First Amendment rights includes the right not to vote
- 23 if he or she does not want to. And whether a person
- 24 exercises that right consistently or occasionally, is
- 25 none of this committee's business.

- 1 That is the information that the subpoena
- 2 seeks and it is just wrong. But these are not the only
- 3 reasons that aisle be voting no.
- 4 It struck me driving here today that for all
- 5 of our differences about the 2020 election and this
- 6 process, Republicans and Democrats claim to agree on
- 7 two things: we want this process to be transparent and
- 8 we want the results to be credible.
- Democrats thought we took a small step
- 10 forward in that regard with Senator Dush, yourself, Mr.
- 11 Chairman, replaced Mr. Mastriano as chairman, amid
- 12 accusations that Mr. Mastriano retreated from
- 13 conducting an investigation and that he was only ever
- 14 interested in politics and showmanship and not actually
- 15 getting things done.
- 16 SENATOR DUSH: All right. The member is
- 17 suspended from further comment, because he is, again,
- 18 violating Rule 10 --
- 19 SENATOR HUGHES: I'm just quoting -- I'm
- 20 quoting the comments.
- 21 SENATOR DUSH: It's not a quote --
- 22 SENATOR HUGHES: These are public comments
- 23 that were made public, Mr. Chairman.
- SENATOR DUSH: Senator, you're out of order.
- 25 The chairman recognizes Senator Costa.
- Page 45
- SENATOR COSTA: Thank you very much, Mr.
- 2 Chairman.
- 3 As it relates to --
- 4 SENATOR HUGHES: So, I'm done speaking; is
- 5 that what the deal is?
- 6 SENATOR COSTA: That's exactly what the
- 7 chairman has ruled.
- 8 SENATOR HUGHES: So, I'm done speaking by
- 9 quoting the public record by yourself and the president
- 10 pro tem?
- 11 SENATOR DUSH: We're at ease.
- 12 SENATOR HUGHES: These are comments about why
- 13 the change was made.
- 14 SENATOR COSTA: We are extremely disappointed
- 15 that the nature of our comments and the length of our
- 16 comments are being cut off by you. I think this was
- 17 mentioned by Senator Williams. This is a significant
- 18 conversation and as we mentioned earlier, we're at the
- 19 crossroads here in terms of who we are and what we're
- 20 going to do as a Commonwealth and as a committee and as
- 21 a body -- a section of our Senate.
- We strongly believe that and continue to
- 23 believe that we have a lot of issues here. My
- 24 colleague has eloquently talked about the concerns that
- 25 have been raised with respect to the release of all of

Page 46 Page 48 1 information. 1 this information. Nearly seven million individuals' 2 Social Security numbers, addresses, other information 2 Mr. Chairman, to that end, I move that we 3 that's being requested here; again, not known who's 3 table these subpoena motions to such a time that we 4 going to have access to them, not known what their ties 4 have more information about who's going to be involved, 5 or relationships with or other organizations. 5 what members of this committee who participated in 6 various activities outside of this place and outside of None of that vetting process is being done in 7 this Commonwealth, and in other ways, until we know 7 a bipartisan way; it's strictly being done by you and 8 your small team that you've indicated. 8 who's going to be involved in your discussions about And the question that I have, and one I'd who's going to be selected along those lines. 10 like to have answered, will the individuals who are on 10 So, I move that we table these subpoenas 11 until such time as we have more information about the 11 this committee who participated in the full county 12 election issue that took place when they audited that 12 scope of the subpoenas and the nature of what's going 13 election -- where they found no fraud, by the way --13 to be done with this information, nearly seven million 14 will those individuals be directly involved in your 14 records. 15 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: I second that. 15 discussions, with respect to your vetting and making a THE CLERK: So, moved and seconded, that we 16 16 determination of who's going to be involved and what 17 entity or third-party contractor will be selected? 17 table the motion; Senator Santarsiero seconded. 18 SENATOR DUSH: We have not made that 18 SENATOR DUSH: The chair recognizes the 19 determination yet. We are in the process of working 19 motion and the second by Senator Santarsiero on the 20 move to table this vote. 20 with the legal team on how that is going to occur. 21 Nate, will you take a roll. SENATOR COSTA: When you say, "Working with 22 the legal team," would a legal team determine for you 22 THE CLERK: Argall? 23 SENATOR ARGALL: No. 23 whether or not the senators who were referenced in the 24 24 previous testimony from the gentleman from Fulton THE CLERK: Argall, no. 25 25 County, who will make that determination to what Costa? Page 47 Page 49 1 degree? 1 SENATOR COSTA: Aye. 2 Because, as was indicated by Senator 2 THE CLERK: Costa, aye. 3 Williams, there are a lot of concerns about what took 3 Gebhard? 4 place there, which is another path that we may need to SENATOR GEBHARD: No. 5 be looking at, collectively, and quite frankly, given 5 THE CLERK: Gebhard, no. 6 what the Department of Justice has issued to, and the 6 7 7 courts have issued, with respect to the Arizona SENATOR HUGHES: Aye. 8 8 situation, which is analogous to what is being done THE CLERK: Hughes, aye. 9 here, in our view, we believe that there are a lot of 9 Hutchison? 10 concerns about folks who were involved in that 10 SENATOR HUTCHINSON: No. 11 conversation that we need to look at, as well. 11 THE CLERK: Hutchison, no. 12 So, my question is, will you not have members 12 Mastriano? 13 who participated in the Fulton County conversation 13 SENATOR MASTRIANO: Proxy, no. 14 regarding that audit, not participate in your decision-14 THE CLERK: Mastriano, proxy, no. 15 making process? 15 Santarsiero? SENATOR DUSH: I will be making that 16 16 SENATOR SANTARSIERO: Aye. 17 determination. I have not made that determination as 17 THE CLERK: Santarsiero, aye. 18 of yet. 18 Judy Ward? SENATOR COSTA: Mr. Chairman, again, we 19 SENATOR WARD: No. 20 THE CLERK: Judy Ward, nay. 20 reiterate our concern about a lot of decisions that 21 have not been head at this point. And you're asking us 21 Anthony Williams? 22 to cast votes on a significant matter, as was described 22 SENATOR WILLIAMS: No -- I mean, aye. Sorry. 23 23 multiple times by my colleagues. THE CLERK: Williams, aye. 24 It's wholly inappropriate to us to go down Dush? 25 this path without having the ample knowledge and 25 SENATOR DUSH: Nay.

Page 50 Page 52

- 1 THE CLERK: Dush, nay.
- 2 Corman?
- 3 SENATOR CORMAN: No.
- 4 THE CLERK: No.
- 5 SENATOR DUSH: The vote is 7:4. The motion 6 fails.
- 7 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, as a matter
- 8 of record, did the gentleman provide a proxy to the
- 9 committee?
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: He has.
- 11 SENATOR COSTA: Mr. Chairman, may I
- 12 continual?
- 13 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Costa is recognized.
- 14 SENATOR COSTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 15 Mr. Chairman, I guess to summarize our
- 16 position in this matter is that we believe that despite
- 17 how it is being labeled by our colleagues on the other
- 18 side of the aisle as, say, an investigation, a review,
- 19 whatever you want to call it, we believe that it is
- 20 clearly, clearly -- all sides indicate that it an
- 21 election contest; something that this committee simply
- 22 has no jurisdiction over or no ability to do.
- This is clearly a "separation of powers"
- 24 issue. This is a Legislature trying to engage itself
- 25 into a process by which our statutes clearly define
 - Page 51
- 1 when election contests take place: immediately after
- 2 the election, 20-some-days or so before they have to be
- 3 filed, and the courts determine whether there's any
- 4 validity to those allegations that were made in that
- 5 election contest.
- 6 We cannot, some 10, 11 months later come back
- 7 and try to do another election contest. That is what
- 8 the crux of this is about.
- 9 Secondly, there is another issue that we
- 10 continue to raise with respect to the authority of this
- 11 particular intergovernmental affairs committee that we
- 12 talked about in the past and what's been raised in the
- 13 past. We continue to believe that the purview of this
- 14 subject matter belongs in the Secretary of State and
- 15 our State Government Committee, chaired by Senator --
- 16 Member, Senator Williams, a longtime standing member
- 17 and chairperson of that committee. We believe that
- 18 that's where this conversation should be taking place.
- This committee, as the chairman knows, and my
- 20 colleague, Senator Corman knows, was created about 10
- 21 years ago, not for the purpose of doing what we're
- 22 doing today; but simply, quite frankly, to add another
- 23 committee so we had enough members serving committee
- 24 assignments as chairpersons -- let's be frank -- and
- 25 that's why it was created. And it has never had the

- 1 authority to deal with these types of matters.
- 2 Historically, for generations and decades and
- 3 decades and decades, the State Government Committee had
- 4 jurisdiction over election matters, not this committee;
- 5 in fact, this committee, even in a published record in
- 6 the "Pennsylvania Bulletin," signed by the President
- 7 Pro Tem Corman, states unequivocally, as it relates to
- 8 regulatory activities, which is what we're looking at
- 9 here, and guidelines and the like, that that
- 10 jurisdiction for elections in the Department of State
- 11 falls within the Department of State.
- 12 In fact, the only place, the only thing cited
- 13 for this committee, and that document that was
- 14 published in the "Pennsylvania Bulletin," was
- 15 independent regulatory review commission matters.
- 16 That's the only identify -- the opportunity for this
- 17 committee to examine those types of things.
- And, historically, if you go back and look at
- 19 every single piece of legislation that's been
- 20 introduced into this committee since its creation,
- 21 none, if any, have dealt with election law, at any
- 22 point in time, other than this conversation that's
- 23 taking place.
- So, to summarize our position, there is --
- 25 this is a situation where it's a "separation of powers"

- 1 issue and that no matter you want to call it, however
- 2 you want to color it, it is an election contest. It's
- 3 not permitted by the statutes. It's not permitted by
- 4 this committee to exercise.
- 5 And the second issue, as it relates to this
- 6 authority, this committee, we continue to hold that,
- 7 and those are going to be the issues that we're going
- 8 to continue to rise through this process.
- o to continue to rise unrough this process.
- 9 We are elected to vote -- to make sure that
- 10 we protect the people's privacy, with respect to their
- 11 ballot, with respect to their vote. And we believe in
- 12 looking to do the things that are taking place here,
- 13 with respect to Social Security numbers, with respect
- 14 to addresses, driver's licenses, you name it, clearly
- 15 violates that authority for us to be able to do that
- 16 and protect people's ability to vote and the sanctity
- 17 Od
- 17 of their vote, and that's really what's at issue here,
- 18 and that's what we're going to continue to take
- 19 exception to.
- Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 21 SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Senator.
- 22 And just one quick --
- 23 THE CLERK: Mr. Chairman?
- 24 SENATOR DUSH: -- response.
- THE CLERK: You need to recognize Jake.

Page 54 Page 56

- 1 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Corman?
- 2 SENATOR CORMAN: I will be very brief, and I
- 3 appreciate the second time.
- 4 First of all, we, as the Senate, determine
- 5 jurisdiction. Clearly, intergovernmental affairs,
- 6 elections are held by both, local and state government.
- 7 So, clearly if we determined that intergovernmental
- 8 affairs is the proper place to review something like
- 9 this, it is our decision and we have made it.
- 10 Secondly, and most importantly, something
- 11 that I have always tried to be, and I think my
- 12 colleagues on the other side would agree, I like to
- 13 stand up for the institution of the Senate. It is
- 14 something that I something that I have been a part of
- 15 almost all of my life and it's something that is very,
- 16 very important to me, the institution, itself.
- 17 And I believe in the institution, that part
- 18 of our process is to gather sensitive information, and
- 19 so we will be responsible and make sure that that
- 20 ' C d' ' 1 4 1 4 ' 1 4
- 20 information is kept secure and there is no process that
- 21 it gets leaked out in and used for other purposes.
- 22 You know, hopefully -- not hopefully -- we
- 23 will do a much better job than what we've seen in this
- 24 administration, who has had significant data breaches
- 25 over their time here; more than any administration I've
 - Page 55
- 1 ever dealt with. So, the institution, the Senate will
- 2 do its job; we will gather sensitive information, we 3 will review sensitive information, and then we will
- will review beliefelve information, and then we will
- 4 secure that information. That is my pledge. That is
- 5 something that is paramount.
- 6 Again, the institution of the Senate has the
- 7 right, and should, perform oversight over State
- 8 Government Executive Branch. That is our role and we
- 9 will continue to provide that role.
- 10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 11 SENATOR COSTA: Mr. Chairman, can I just
- 12 briefly respond to a couple of things?
- 13 SENATOR DUSH: No.
- 14 SENATOR COSTA: Very briefly, please.
- 15 SENATOR DUSH: One second.
- 16 SENATOR COSTA: Thank you.
- 17 SENATOR DUSH: I went, specifically, on the
- 18 hearing last week over the elements of the
- 19 Constitution, the statute, the Senate Rules, and
- 20 Mason's Manual that clearly identify the authority of
- 21 this body in the Senate and this committee, in
- 22 particular, to conduct these investigations.
- 23 I invite anyone, anyone who has questions
- 24 about that authority to go and watch that hearing --
- 25 it's available online -- then to examine for yourself

- 1 where we have it. And if you want to go in and examine
- 2 the Constitution, the statute, the Senate Rules, or the
- 3 Mason's Manual, in which the Senate has delegated some
- 4 of that guidance, then I invite you to take a look at
- 5 it.
- 6 The Chair recognizes Senator Ward.
- 7 SENATOR WARD: Thank you, Chairman.
- 8 I sit here and I listen to my colleagues on
- 9 the other side of the aisle and like Pro Tempore
- 10 Corman, and, you know, we had a data breach in the
- 11 Department of Health that released personal health
- 12 information on our Pennsylvanians and I have not heard
- 13 any comments from my colleagues on the other side of
- 14 the aisle.
- 15 This investigation is a process and we have
- 16 to get it right. There are many steps in this process
- 17 and they have to have integrity.
- My constituents, I say this all the time,
- 19 have been outraged by -- their questions have gone on
- 20 answered. They want us to look at the process.
- 21 It is paramount to our democratic process.
- 22 We must restore their trust and the trust of all
- 23 Pennsylvanians.

1

- 24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 25 SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Senator Ward.

- And for a second time, Senator Costa.
- 2 SENATOR COSTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 3 And just very briefly, in response to the
- 4 president pro tem's comments about the institution, we
- 5 all share the concerns and respect for this
- 6 institution; that's precisely why we raise the issue
- 7 with respect to the jurisdiction of this committee.
- 8 The gentleman indicated that we decide what
- 9 committees, what jurisdiction they have. My
- 10 recollection was we had no vote. I don't remember this
- 11 committee deciding whether or not we would accept
- 12 subject matter jurisdiction over this matter.
- So, while that may have been a unilateral
- 14 decision that was made, it's one that we continue to
- 15 disagree with.
- With respect to the concern about the
- 17 information that's going to be shared with these third-
- 18 party vendors, I, too, believe that we have an
- 19 obligation to ensure that not only our members do not
- 20 disseminate this information, but more importantly,
- 21 that the third-party vendors do not disseminate it.
- And while we take great steps in terms of
- 23 confidentiality, and more importantly, both, for
- 24 members, staff, attorneys, outside counsel, and these 25 third-party folks, there needs to be significant

Page 58 Page 60

- 1 consequences to any breach of that duty. And we need
- 2 to lay out -- and any agreement that you're preparing
- 3 needs to include things where there are significant
- 4 impacts to those folks who are doing that.
- If it's a member of this committee or the
- 6 members of our body that does something, they need to
- 7 be sanctioned in a significant way, because this is
- 8 extremely important, relevant data information that
- 9 people have. It is not -- again, we continue to
- 10 believe that it is not our authority or duty to this,
- 11 to issue these subpoenas, but it is the Secretary of
- 12 State's and her responsibility to do those types of
- 13 things that were done; it was mentioned earlier.
- But, clearly, we have an obligation to
- 15 protect this vital information of folks and we need to
- 16 make certain that those sanctions are significant along
- 17 those lines.
- 18 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 19 SENATOR ARGALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may?
- 20 SENATOR DUSH: Senator Argall?
- 21 SENATOR ARGALL: The question of which
- 22 committee should move forward with this has been
- 23 discussed at great length.
- 24 As the Chairman of the State Government

1 considerable workload with State Committee

- 25 Committee, I suggested several months ago, because of a
- SENATOR WILLIAMS: To the question at hand,
- 2 congressional redirecting, lobbying reform, election
- 3 reform legislation that I'm moving ahead with the
- 4 minority chairman, Senator Sharif Street, and a host of
- 5 other issues, that it would be helpful to balance the
- 6 labor and, in my mind, this committee makes perfect
- 7 sense to move forward on this issue.
- The subject of separation of powers has also
- 9 been discussed. I spent most of my academic career in
- 10 reviewing those kinds of issues and I think we would
- 11 all agree on this committee that the Senate of
- 12 Pennsylvania should not act as the governor's lap dog.
- 13 We should not act as the lap dog for the Secretary of
- 14 the Commonwealth.
- 15 We should provide oversight and I believe
- 16 that is exactly what we should do beginning today with
- 17 the issuing of these subpoenas.
- 18 SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Senator.
- 19 Senator Williams, for final comments before
- 20 the vote.
- 21 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 2.2. I actually have questions. So, to that end,
- 23 does the chair or the body acknowledge that the
- 24 Department of State is the agency that has the
- 25 responsibility to oversee election procedures, review

- 1 them, update them, and maintain the integrity of the
- 2 process of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?
- SENATOR DUSH: The chair recognizes that.
- 4 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Does the chair acknowledge
- 5 the fact that audits were, in fact, done and, in fact,
- 6 Pennsylvania was, I guess, the first of a few states to
- 7 actually do these types of audits.
- 8 Does the chair acknowledge that those audits
- 9 were done properly and accurately?
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: Having seen the reports, but
- 11 not having access to the actual investigators, I
- 12 believe that they are, but I do not know for certain.
- SENATOR WILLIAMS: Does the chair acknowledge
- 14 the fact that the manner in which those audits were
- 15 done included a bipartisan process; meaning that the
- 16 commissioners on the ground, whether they were
- 17 Democrats or Republicans, were involved?
- 18 SENATOR DUSH: The chair so recognizes.
- 19 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Does the chair recognize
- 20 that, in fact, many areas that would be deemed as
- 21 "Republican areas" that those commissioners, in fact,
- 22 acknowledge that audits were done and done accurately
- 23 and effectively?
- 24) SENATOR DUSH: Within the scope of the
- 25 audits, it does.

Page 59

- Page 61
- 2 which the public will, I guess, at some point in time,
- 3 catch up with what we're doing -- I'm sure they will
- 4 ask why we're doing it -- the question I have is, of
- 5 the committee, who will pay?
- I don't necessarily mean what vendor, because
- 7 I understand that not to be deemed yet, but will this
- 8 be a taxpayer-paid activity or a "funded by a non-
- 9 outside entity" activity?
- 10 SENATOR DUSH: The chair has been asked and
- 11 answered that question before, and, again, our intent
- 12 right now, and as far as I know, we're going to be able
- 13 to do it, it will be funded within the Senate.
- 14 SENATOR WILLIAMS: So, it will be a
- 15 taxpayers-paid audit?
- 16 SENATOR DUSH: Correct -- well, no. It will
- 17 be a taxpayer-funded investigation, to verify.
- 18 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Okay. Taxpayer-funded
- 19 event -- investigation -- whatever way we're describing
- 20 it -- I'm not caught up in that -- but the taxpayers
- 21 will be paying for this? 22
 - SENATOR DUSH: That is correct.
- 23 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Does the gentleman know
- 24 what the limitations are of what that expense might be?
 - SENATOR DUSH: They're going to have to fall

25

Page 62 Page 64 1 within our budget. 1 trust. That means the public needs to be engaged. SENATOR WILLIAMS: Well, I got that, but do 2 That means all parties of the public, Democratic and 3 we know what the magnitude of costs of this activity 3 Republican, need to be involved. 4 may be? Have you gotten estimates about what this may 4 So, if there's any expectation that out of 5 cost? 5 this investigation, this particular investigation, will 6 come some elevated confidence of what was done, that 6 SENATOR DUSH: We're getting estimates on 7 specific elements and then if evidence leads to further 7 can't be done without full inclusion of all the 8 inquiry, then that has the potential to grow. 8 decisions which are being made. And to date, the So, as it relates right now, we're working on 9 vendors who are being selected, the lawyers who are 10 a limited scope and a limited investigation within the 10 involved are not Democrat and Republican; they're 11 simply Republican. I'm not admonishing. I'm not 11 questions that have been raised about what has gone on 12 so far, and then we'll see where it goes from there. 12 suggesting ill-intent, but I am being very, very clear; 13 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Is it hundreds of 13 that only underscores that which divides us and is 14 thousands of dollars or millions of dollars? 14 consistently pushing us towards extremes in this 15 SENATOR DUSH: Again, I don't have the full 15 endeavor and the manner in which we operate in our 16 -- I don't have that yet. 16 political events to date. 17 SENATOR WILLIAMS: Before that determination 17 I would suggest to the chair that if they're 18 of how the taxpayers will pay this or how much they 18 going to proceed in this investigation, that all 19 will pay, will that be made available to the public or 19 parties should be involved, including vetting who those 20 at least to all bodies involved in this committee? 20 vendors may be. 21 21 SENATOR DUSH: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 SENATOR WILLIAMS: And, lastly, to the point 22 SENATOR DUSH: Thank you, Chairman. 23 SENATOR ARGALL: Mr. Chairman, a question? 23 of this has to be done with credibility, just for those 24 24 who need to know, our early audits were done in a SENATOR DUSH: We're going to --25 SENATOR ARGALL: Question, Mr. Chairman. 25 bipartisan manner. Page 63 Page 65 I reflect upon my friend and colleague who 1 SENATOR DUSH: Nate, please call the roll on 1 2 talked about the State Government activity. While I 2 the motion. 3 appreciate his recommendation, there's a phrase: The 3 SENATOR ARGALL: A question, Mr. Chairman? 4 tyranny of the majority. 4 One more question; it's a yes-or-no answer. I'm not to say that he's a part of the 5 THE CLERK: Argall? 6 tyranny but be very clear. An arbitrary decision made 6 SENATOR ARGALL: Aye. 7 7 by an individual member of this process has never been THE CLERK: Costa? 8 the process that we have followed. That's why we are 8 SENATOR COSTA: No. 9 conflicted with whether this committee actually should 9 THE CLERK: Costa, no. 10 10 have the jurisdiction. Gebhard? So, my decision to say it shouldn't and his 11 SENATOR GEBHARD: Aye. 12 decision to say it should, is not the manner in which 12 THE CLERK: Gebhard, aye. 13 we should be proceeding. We should be proceeding in a 13 Hughes? 14 public manner that the public is engaged and 14 SENATOR HUGHES: No. 15 15 acknowledges such recommendations and shift in powers THE CLERK: Hughes, no. 16 or responsibilities. 16 Hutchison? 17 We've not done that. The rules of the Senate 17 SENATOR HUTCHINSON: Aye. 18 laid out what our committee responsibilities are at the 18 THE CLERK: Hutchison, aye. 19 beginning of our session. There's not ever been a 19 Mastriano? 20 discussion about how we change that, and to that end, 20 SENATOR MASTRIANO: Proxy, aye. 21 again, remains the question about whether this 21 THE CLERK: Santarsiero?

22

23

24

25

senator SANTARSIERO: No.

THE CLERK: Santarsiero, no.

SENATOR WARD: Yes.

Ward, Judy?

22 committee is allowed to do what it's doing today.

24 credibility, both my friends' comments about

25 credibility, credibility is borne out of the public

And, lastly, to my friend's comment about

Page 66	
1 THE CLERK: Ward, Judy, yes.	
2 Williams, Anthony?	
3 SENATOR WILLIAMS: No.	
4 THE CLERK: Anthony Williams, no.	
5 Dush?	
6 SENATOR DUSH: Aye.	
7 THE CLERK: Dush, aye.	
8 Corman?	
9 SENATOR CORMAN: Aye.	
10 THE CLERK: Corman, aye.	
11 SENATOR DUSH: By a vote of 7:4, the majority	
12 having voted in the affirmative, the motion carries.	
The Senate Intergovernmental Operations	
14 Committee now stands in recess until call of the chair.	
15 (Whereupon, at 10:48 a.m., the committee	
hearing concluded.)	
17	
18	
19	M.
20	ac to cket com
21	
22	CL
23	700
24	Ç,
25	3
Page 67 1 CERTIFICATE 2 This is to certify that the foregoing transcript	
1 CERTIFICATE	
2 This is to certify that the foregoing transcript	
3 In the matter of: Voting Meeting -	
4 Consideration of a motion	
5 to authorize the issuance of subpoenas	
6 Before: Pennsylvania Senate	
7 Intergovernmental Operations	
8 Committee	
9 Date: September 15, 2021	
10 Place: 172 Main Capitol, Room 8 EB East	
11 Wing, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 17120	
12 was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my	
13 direction; further, that said transcript is a true and	
14 accurate record of the proceedings.	
14 accurate record of the proceedings.	
16	
17	
18	
19 /s/ CHRIS HOFER	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

[1 - amount] Page 1

1	31st 5:9,21 7:25,25	absurd 43:1	addresses 6:16
1	34 42:14,19	academic 59:9	42:20 46:2 53:14
1 5:5	3rd 42:4	accept 57:11	adjournment 2:10
10 7:4 13:12 30:17	4	access 4:19 11:3	administration
44:18 51:6,20	-	12:8 20:10 23:20	54:24,25
10:48 66:15	4 2:6 5:22 8:10,11	24:4,25 25:4,11	admonishing
11 4:24 7:9 51:6	46 4:25	27:3,6,17 28:4,8	64:11
12 7:14	4:00 8:15	29:8 41:3 46:4	advised 42:17
13 7:19	5	60:11	affairs 51:11 54:5
14 7:24	5 6:3	accommodate 9:1	54:8
14d 4:23	59 2:8,10	accomplish 35:9	affirmative 66:12
15 1:6,23 8:1 67:9	6	accurate 67:14	aforementioned
16 8:4		accurately 60:9,22	4:21
17 8:9	6 6:9	67:12	afraid 31:20
17120 67:11	6.9 43:13,15 60 2:11	accusations 13:17	agency 59:24
172 67:10	61 4:25	44:12	ago 51:21 58:25
1803 8:8	67 9:25	achieve 38:24	agree 13:5,5 34:2
183.7 8:11	6th 41:25	acknowledge	34:5 35:18 39:6
183.7. 8:11		59:23 60:4,8,13,22	44:6 54:12 59:11
1st 5:9,12,20 6:1,7	7	acknowledgement	agreement 24:11
8:15	7 6:14	9:7	58:2
2	77 4:16	acknowledges	ahead 59:3
2 5:10	7:4 50:5 66:11	63:15	aimed 11:16,17
20 34:5 38:6 51:2	8	act 4:16 59:12,13	aisle 32:25 44:3
2016 32:23 36:3	8 2:7 6:19 67:10	acting 4:12 5:2	50:18 56:9,14
2018 8:6	9	action 4:18 11:25	alarming 11:1
2020 4:14,16 5:9		35:10	alike 30:9
5:12,20 6:7,12,17	9 6:24	actively 39:21	allegations 17:18
6:22 7:2,25 8:2	911 16:5	activist 28:5	17:19 19:9 51:4
17:12 20:1 43:11	9:30 1:9 3:2	activists 40:5	allow 17:24 27:25
44:5	a	activities 10:14	allowed 30:22
2021 1:6,23 4:15	a.m. 3:2 66:15	16:1 48:6 52:8	63:22
5:9,13,21 6:1 7:7	ability 27:22 28:6	activity 5:25 6:6	allows 14:25
7:12,18,23,25 8:3	50:22 53:16	12:17 13:8 15:17	amendment 43:22
8:10,15 67:9	able 18:5 38:24	15:21 17:25 61:8	america 22:3
25 8:8	53:15 61:12	61:9 62:3 63:2	american 16:13
260,000 27:13	absentee 6:22 7:17	actual 60:11	americans 27:18
3	17:13 43:16	add 51:22	amid 44:11
3 2:4 5:17	absolutely 22:4	address 5:24 6:5	amount 23:17
30th 5:13	25:18 26:10,23	6:11,21 7:1,6,11	40:18
		7:16,21 43:7,9	

[ample - candor] Page 2

ample 47:25	aside 39:8	62:19	bipartisan 9:20
analogous 47:8	asked 19:5,19 20:3	avoid 15:19	46:7 60:15 62:25
announcement	29:19 61:10	aware 10:15	birth 5:23 6:4,10
38:8	asking 9:11 19:1,1	aye 49:1,2,7,8,16	6:15,20,25 7:5,10
annual 8:9	26:25 27:9 29:15	•	
		49:17,22,23 65:6	7:15,20
answer 24:6 25:11	38:2 41:9 47:21	65:11,12,17,18,20	bit 22:24 38:7
26:5 37:2 65:4	assembly 32:10	66:6,7,9,10	blowtorch 11:22
answered 19:6,8	assignments 51:24	b	board 5:8
20:3 26:4 46:10	assistant 1:21	b 2:1 13:12 30:17	bodies 62:20
56:20 61:11	assisted 42:16	back 24:13 25:21	body 14:16 19:25
answers 10:21	assisting 20:20	32:4 38:19 41:14	29:23 38:12 45:21
anthony 1:13 4:4	association 9:24	51:6 52:18	55:21 58:6 59:23
49:21 66:2,4	9:25	balance 59:5	body's 4:14
anticipate 19:22	attack 11:18,19	ballot 5:14 6:17,22	borne 63:25
anybody 17:6	15:5	7:2,17,22 8:2	bradley 26:14
21:16	attempt 12:18	17:13 43:17 53:11	branch 55:8
applications 5:14	attempted 8:25	ballots 5:14	breach 56:10 58:1
applying 40:2	attempting 33:12	based 10:8,8,19	breaches 54:24
appointed 9:18	attention 34:8	11:5 12:17 40:7	breadth 16:24
33:7	attorneys 57:24	battle 16:11	brief 54:2
appoints 14:24	audit 12:3,19 17.5	began 15:23	briefly 31:3 55:12
32:9	47:14 61:15	beginning 59:16	55:14 57:3
appreciate 54:3	audited 46:12	63:19	bucks 34:11
63:3	auditor 17:5	behalf 9:11	budget 62:1
appropriate 10:8	audits 8:4,7 60:5,7	believe 13:6 15:14	bulletin 52:6,14
33:24	60:8,14,22,25	16:12 34:4,20	bullied 11:10
appropriately	62:24	45:22,23 47:9	bush 16:8,12
8:18	august 5:12,20	50:16,19 51:13,17	business 37:25
arbitrary 63:6	authority 12:4	53:11 54:17 57:18	43:25
areas 39:17 60:20	24:15 28:18 32:3	58:10 59:15 60:12	c
60:21	51:10 52:1 53:6	believes 16:12,13	c 2:1 3:1 67:1,1
argall 1:15 3:8,9	53:15 55:20,24	34:21	call 3:3,7 36:8
48:22,23,24 58:19	58:10	belongs 51:14	50:19 53:1 65:1
58:20,21 64:23,25	authorization 28:3	best 30:23	66:14
65:3,5,6	28:22	betrayal 12:14	called 2:4
argue 27:12	authorize 1:4 2:6	better 31:23 35:10	called 2.4 calls 5:6 35:20
arizona 12:17,18	5:1 11:23 67:5	35:16 54:23	
47:7	authorized 8:17		campaigns 40:8 candidates 21:22
arrival 15:8	13:20 18:16 19:15	beyond 11:6 18:22 bill 42:22	
article 4:23 13:4	available 23:3,6		39:12,13,14
14:9	41:21,23 55:25	bills 42:15,18	candor 40:24
	,		

capabilities 25:19	29:18 30:19 31:2	clerk 1:21 3:8,10	59:19 63:24
capable 20:14	31:3,4 33:8,9 34:1	3:12,14,21,23,25	commission 9:19
24:18	36:18,25 37:2,6,7	4:2,4,6,8 16:19	52:15
capitol 67:10	38:13,21 39:1,5	48:16,22,24 49:2,5	commissioner
care 24:20	40:13,16 41:17,19	49:8,11,14,17,20	10:20 18:13 32:15
career 59:9	42:12,13,25 44:11	49:23 50:1,4	commissioner's
careless 13:7	44:11,23,25 45:2,7	53:23,25 65:5,7,9	9:24
carelessly 11:23	47:19 48:2 50:7	65:12,15,18,21,23	commissioners
carries 66:12	50:11,14,15 51:19	66:1,4,7,10	60:16,21
cast 27:17,18	53:20,23 55:10,11	clerks 5:19	committee 1:1,9
47:22	56:7,24 57:2	clients 22:11	1:11,23 2:7 3:4
catch 61:3	58:18,19,24 59:4	clock 36:20	9:20 10:8,15 14:5
caucus 8:14 21:2	59:21 64:21,22,23	code 4:15 8:11,11	14:15,16,20,24,25
30:5 36:14	64:25 65:3	colleague 31:4	15:1,1,23 18:8
caught 61:20	chairman's 14:10	33:12,22 38:9	19:25 21:6,15
certain 18:4 58:16	chairperson 1:12	45:24 51:20 63:1	22:12,22 23:15,24
60:12	51:17	colleagues 34:4	26:25 27:9,22
certainly 14:20	chairpersons	47:23 50:17 54:12	29:3,7,23 33:21
22:23 30:21 33:21	51:24	56:8,13	34:25 37:15 41:14
43:12	chamber 30:7	collect 29:16	41:22 42:2 45:20
certificate 2:11	change 13:8 32:11	collective 16:6,9	46:11 48:5 50:9
certified 8:1 32:8	45:13 63:20	collectively 47:5	50:21 51:11,15,17
certify 67:2	changes 4:16 7:24	collusion 33:1,4	51:19,23,23 52:3,4
chair 1:13,14 8:23	china 33:10	35:24	52:5,13,17,20 53:4
8:24 13:11,18,19	choice 21:6	color 53:2	53:6 55:21 57:7
13:22,24 14:7,20	choose 21:11	come 12:11 22:7,9	57:11 58:5,22,25
30:18,18 31:14	chosen 23:22	24:9 29:18 38:19	59:1,6,11 61:5
34:13,13,24 36:12	24:24 25:4 27:8	51:6 64:6	62:20 63:9,18,22
36:17 37:17 40:14	27:21,21 39:11	comes 23:20 39:9	66:14,15 67:8
48:18 56:6 59:23	chris 1:16 67:19	comfortable 36:2	committee's 43:25
60:3,4,8,13,18,19	cited 52:12	comment 10:13	committees 4:23
61:10 64:17 66:14	citizens 23:18	37:7,9 44:17	10:13 57:9
chaired 51:15	claim 44:6	63:23	commonwealth
chairman 1:10 2:5	clarify 18:20	commenting 18:14	6:1,7 10:2 13:1
8:20,20 9:16	clear 13:1,1 32:3,7	18:15	21:24 28:18 30:10
13:10 14:13,23,25	43:6 63:6 64:12	comments 9:10,15	35:16 39:24 45:20
15:4,8,12 16:16,17	clearly 11:25	14:12 16:7 19:13	48:7 59:14 60:2
16:20,23 19:18	13:12 50:20,20,23	30:20 31:25 33:15	communication
22:21 23:9,13	50:25 53:14 54:5	33:16 36:22,24	42:2
24:23 26:2,24	54:7 55:20 58:14	44:20,22 45:12,15	communications
28:11,13,24,25		45:16 56:13 57:4	5:5

[company - days] Page 4

company 27:20	considered 15:17	conversation	47:13
complete 5:22 6:3	16:14 29:14	40:19 45:18 47:11	couple 30:20
6:9,14,19,24 7:4,9	considering 21:14	47:13 51:18 52:22	55:12
7:14,19,24 24:24	29:6	copy 5:10 8:1,4,9	court 10:16
25:4	consistent 15:5,6	corman 1:15 4:8,9	courts 32:16,16,17
completed 21:21	38:11	8:20 9:17 13:3	43:5 47:7 51:3
22:16	consistently 43:24	16:2 30:18,19	create 18:1 43:2
compliance 5:15	64:14	31:6,10,13,16,18	created 9:17 51:20
concern 15:21	consolidated 8:8	34:3 39:6 50:2,3	51:25
47:20 57:16	conspiring 13:8	51:20 52:7 54:1,2	creation 52:20
concerned 12:12	constituents 56:18	56:10 66:8,9,10	credibility 34:6,9
22:25 29:22,23,24	constitutes 1:22	correct 21:12	34:11 35:1,4
32:21	constitutes 1.22	25:13 61:16,22	36:11 39:7 62:23
concerns 32:23	12:25 32:6 55:19	correctly 21:4	63:24,25,25
34:11 35:12,17,18	56:2	cost 62:5	credible 11:5 35:8
36:8 45:24 47:3	constitutional	costa 1:18 3:10,11	44:8
47:10 57:5	43:21	9:19 12:22 36:18	cris 1:9,12
concluded 66:16	constrained 33:13	37:4,12 38:20,21	critical 39:7
conduct 17:5	constraints 38:17	44:25 45:1,6,14	criticized 31:4
28:18,19 55:22	contacts 35:21	46:21 47:19 48:25	crossroads 12:24
conducted 8:5,7	contained 12:7	49:1,2 50:11,13,14	45:19
32:22 33:3	containing 5:22	55:11,14,16 57:1,2	crux 51:8
conducting 20:14	6:3,9,14,19,24 7:4	65:7,8,9	cry 32:4
44:13	7:9,14,19	costs 62:3	cut 41:12 45:16
conferring 21:7	contest 12:2 32:12	council 33:6	
confidence 36:16	50:21 51:5,7 53:2	counsel 8:14 20:20	d
39:23 64:6	contests 32:16	20:22,24,25 21:7	d 3:1
confident 36:8	51:1	21:11 57:24	d.c. 32:24 33:1
confidentiality	continual 50:12	counsel's 24:10,18	41:25
57:23	continue 15:10	counties 10:1,2	dark 11:13
confined 38:9	16:11 41:16 45:22	12:12	darker 11:7
conflicted 63:9	51:10,13 53:6,8,18	countless 15:15	data 54:24 56:10
congressional 59:2	55:9 57:14 58:9	country 11:7,14	58:8
connection 39:11	continued 33:5,5,6	country's 11:18	date 5:22,24 6:3,5
consequence	continuing 15:19	counts 18:14	6:9,14,19,24 7:5
10:23 25:1,5	contract 24:11	county 5:7,8,18	7:10,15,20 10:3
consequences 58:1	contractor 46:17	6:2,8,13,18,23 7:3	64:8,16 67:9
consider 26:25	contracts 20:13	7:8,13,18,23 9:23	david 1:15
considerable 59:1	contrary 23:1	10:20,23 18:9,11	day 35:6,14 38:1
consideration 1:4	convened 1:9	18:11,14 32:15	42:1
2:5 33:25 67:4		34:11 46:11,25	days 11:7,13 51:2

[deal - earlier] Page 5

deal 45:5 52:1	described 18:18	discovered 15:24	drumbeat 15:19
dealt 52:21 55:1	18:21 47:22	discussed 38:4,16	due 14:19,22
debate 32:25	describing 22:25	58:23 59:9	23:14 26:2,24
decades 52:2,3,3	29:14,25 30:12	discussing 25:16	duly 67:12
december 32:5	61:19	37:20	dush 1:9,12 2:5
decide 57:8	desire 12:13	discussion 2:7	3:3 4:6,7,10 8:21
decided 25:12	despite 50:16	8:22 16:18 25:8	9:14 13:10 14:1,3
deciding 57:11	details 15:25	32:20 63:20	14:10 15:13 16:17
decision 27:23	30:14 33:18	discussions 36:14	16:21 17:4,15,23
32:19 47:14 54:9	determination	46:15 48:8	18:13 19:5,12,21
57:14 63:6,11,12	26:7 46:16,19,25	disingenuous 38:8	20:2,12,17,19,23
decisions 27:6	47:17,17 62:17	dispel 35:11,16	21:5,12,16,21 22:1
29:12,25 30:1,2,6	determine 4:17	36:7	22:4,7,13,18 23:5
34:14 47:20 64:8	17:19 20:4 21:2	disseminate 57:20	23:10 24:6 25:2,7
deck 11:17	46:22 51:3 54:4	57:21	25:13,18,25 26:5
declared 43:5	determined 54:7	distribution 19:15	26:10,15,18,21
deemed 60:20	determines 14:13	districts 27:14	27:24 28:2,12,15
61:7	differ 9:1	divided 16:9	28:20,22 30:16
define 50:25	differences 44:5	divides 64:13	31:14,17 34:1
defined 39:19	different 16:2	document 52:13	36:19 37:1,10,12
degraffenreid	difficult 39:15	documented 14:9	37:16,18,22 38:13
4:13 5:3	digits 5:23 6.4,10	documents 17:4	39:3,15 40:10,14
degree 47:1	6:15,20,25 7:6,11	24:9,19 40:21,24	41:6,10,14,18 42:7
delegated 56:3	7:16,21	dog 59:12,13	42:9,11 44:10,16
democracy 11:22	direct 5:1 8:12,17	doing 23:2 31:21	44:21,24 45:11
democrat 31:20	23:22	35:2 51:21,22	46:18 47:16 48:18
64:10	directed 5:2 15:1	58:4 61:3,4 63:22	49:24,25 50:1,5,10
democratic 27:21	directing 24:8	dollars 11:17	50:13 53:21,24
41:23 56:21 64:2	direction 14:14	62:14,14	54:1 55:13,15,17
democrats 30:8	15:24 16:2 67:13	doug 1:16	56:25 58:20 59:18
33:1 34:18 44:6,9	directives 5:11	draft 42:17,22,25	60:3,10,18,24
60:17	14:11	43:8,11,15,19	61:10,16,22,25
denied 11:10	directly 23:23	drafting 42:16	62:6,15,21 64:22
department 4:12	46:14	drawn 16:7	64:24 65:1 66:5,6
5:7 8:6,10 10:10	director 5:8	driver's 5:23 6:4	66:7,11
10:11,16,17 12:20	disagree 23:14	6:10,15,20,25 7:5	duty 27:14 58:1,10
28:16 32:8 40:21	24:4 34:5 57:15	7:10,15,20 17:2	e
47:6 52:10,11	disappointed	19:3 41:1 42:21	e 1:14 2:1,1 3:1,1
56:11 59:24	45:14	43:7,9 53:14	67:1,1
describe 22:16	discover 18:18	driving 44:4	earlier 18:8 45:18
			58:13
			30.13

(2.24		27.10	f 1 0.4
early 62:24	engaged 63:14	expectation 27:19	feel 9:4
ease 41:10,11 42:9	64:1	27:20 64:4	fellow 42:22
45:11	engender 39:23	expedition 43:3	felt 9:4 34:19
east 67:10	ensure 24:15	expense 61:24	fight 16:11
eb 67:10	57:19	experience 25:16	file 11:3
edt 1:9	ensuring 20:4 40:3	expertise 39:17	filed 51:3
effect 5:12	entire 38:1	explain 16:25 27:3	final 33:7 59:19
effectively 60:23	entirety 11:4	expressed 16:15	finalized 20:13,25
effort 33:17	entity 46:17 61:9	extemporaneously	21:8 24:11
either 12:2,4 35:9	equal 16:14	33:10	find 36:6 38:7
35:16 36:5	equates 11:14	extent 13:25	findings 16:4
elected 27:13 30:9	era 11:9 15:22	extremely 45:14	finish 27:25
53:9	errors 17:23	58:8	fins 36:5
election 4:14,15,15	essential 4:18	extremes 64:14	first 16:24 18:16
5:7,8,13,15,18	establish 3:6	eyes 35:7,7,7	37:2 39:5 43:22
6:13,18,23 7:3,8	established 4:11	△ 4	54:4 60:6
7:13,18,23 9:19	estimates 62:4,6	1	fishing 43:3
10:12,12,24 12:2,2	event 21:11 34:23	f 2.1 67:1	five 36:22 37:14
13:9 18:11 19:9	61:19	fact 10:11,14 11:7	38:9,18 39:1
19:17 25:17 27:15	events 64:16	11:15 12:20 15:10	flames 11:21
27:19 32:1,4,12,18	evidence 10:23	36:2 41:5 52:5,12	folks 47:10 57:25
32:22 35:11,12	11:24 62:7	60:5,5,5,14,20,21	58:4,15
39:14 42:4,5 44:5	evident 26:20	factors 25:15	follow 9:2 12:25
46:12,13 50:21	evident 20.20 ex 1:15	facts 15:6,25 31:22	33:17,18 37:4,8
*	ex 1.75 exact 19:15	33:5,18	· · ·
51:1,2,5,7 52:4,21		factual 17:20	followed 63:8
53:2 59:2,25	exactly 27:3,16	fails 50:6	following 5:3
elections 4:21 5:13	29:7 45:6 59:16	failures 20:4	foregoing 67:2
5:19 8:3 17:12	exaggeration	fair 31:6,6,10,13	forensic 12:19
18:2,9 28:19 36:3	11:12 15:9	31:16	forewarned 12:6
40:9 52:10 54:6	examine 52:17	faith 40:4	former 16:8
electors 32:5,9	55:25 56:1	fall 61:25	forty 28:8
elements 55:18	examining 39:22	falls 52:11	forward 15:8
62:7	example 17:11	false 13:17	35:11 36:9 37:21
elevated 64:6	exception 53:19	fanning 11:21	38:17 44:10 58:22
eligibility 17:8	excuse 41:5	far 32:2 35:23	59:7
eloquently 45:24	executive 55:8	61:12 62:12	forwarded 12:11
emails 5:5	exercise 53:4	fashion 27:21	found 26:11 35:8
enacted 10:4	exercised 43:19	federal 5:15 10:6	36:1 46:13
endeavor 64:15	exercises 43:24	12:19,21 32:5	foundation 11:6
engage 50:24	exist 17:17	feed 41:12	26:14
		11.12	

founding 39:9	38:3	good 4:11 16:13	heard 18:7,10
four 5:23 6:4,10	generations 52:2	31:24 35:14	56:12
6:15,20,25 7:5,10	gentleman 33:9	gotten 62:4	hearing 1:8 10:9
7:15,20	34:10 37:15 46:24	government 11:11	41:10 55:18,24
franchise 16:15	50:8 57:8 61:23	12:8,13 51:15	66:16
frank 51:24	george 34:17	52:3 54:6 55:8	hearings 11:8
frankly 10:21	getting 20:13	58:24 63:2	hearsay 41:11
29:21 39:13 47:5	25:21 36:20 39:21	governor 32:14	held 1:23 11:9
51:22	44:15 62:6	governor's 28:15	24:10,17 54:6
fraud 10:23 46:13	giant 11:20	59:12	help 42:25
freedom 11:18	give 35:10	grab 11:15	helpful 59:5
27:18	given 13:15 15:18	granted 4:22	hired 21:3 30:1
friday 8:15	16:13,14 25:9	great 15:21 32:25	34:24 40:8
friend 12:22 31:24	28:6 38:17 39:16	57:22 58:23	hiring 20:24 40:4
33:14 38:9 63:1	47:5	greater 16.8	historically 52:2
friend's 63:23	gives 42:23	greatest 11:18	52:18
friends 30:20	go 15:8 20:6 24:13	gross 11:17	hofer 67:19
32:23 63:24	36:23 47:24 52:18	ground 11:25	hold 53:6
front 29:1,20,22	55:24 56:1	60:16	honestly 42:19
full 33:23 42:6	goal 22:22,23 23:1	grow 62:8	hope 19:4
46:11 62:15 64:7	36:12,12,13,14	guess 30:25 39:7	hoped 38:23
fulton 10:20 18:11	god 16:14	50:15 60:6 61:2	hopefully 35:9
18:13 46:24 47:13	godly 16.43	guidance 10:1	54:22,22
funded 61:8,13,17	goes 62.12	56:4	host 59:4
61:18	going 9:3 11:6	guidances 5:11	hughes 1:19 3:14
funding 22:6	12:17 13:12,18	guidelines 52:9	3:16 38:23 40:15
26:13 34:17	18:24 20:10 21:2	h	40:16 41:7,16,19
funds 22:8,10	21:3,11 22:17	h 1:13	42:8,12 44:19,22
further 8:16 10:25	23:3 24:3,3,7	hand 61:1	45:4,8,12 49:6,7,8
12:16 36:22 40:13	25:14 26:8 27:3	happen 9:3 24:3	65:13,14,15
44:17 62:7 67:13	27:16,17 29:7,9,10	35:13 36:5	human 32:4
future 18:2	29:11 30:17 33:20	happening 18:2	hundreds 42:15
g	36:15,19,21,22	happens 23:19	62:13
g 1:15 3:1	37:8,10,21 38:18	40:24	hutchinson 1:14
gather 54:18 55:2	39:16,19,19,22	hard 28:9	3:21,22 49:10
gebhard 1:16 3:12	40:4,11 41:20,23	harrisburg 67:11	65:17
3:13 49:3,4,5	45:20 46:4,16,20	harry 26:14	hutchison 49:9,11
65:10,11,12	48:4,8,9,12 53:7,7	head 47:21	65:16,18
general 4:14 6:12	53:18 57:17 61:12	headed 15:24	
6:18,23 7:3 8:3,13	61:25 64:18,24	health 56:11,11	
17:5 31:19 32:10		ĺ	

[idea - know] Page 8

i	7:17,22 17:7,10	interrupt 9:7 31:3	issued 27:10 28:3
idea 38:5	19:13 34:24 46:1	introduced 42:15	47:6,7
identification 19:2	46:10,14	52:20	issues 18:12,19
	infer 41:21	invalid 43:5	45:23 53:7 59:5
identify 52:16 55:20	information 4:20	investigate 16:3	59:10
identities 17:14	5:4 11:1,1,3 12:10	investigated 12:19	issuing 11:5 42:24
	12:16 13:9 15:18	investigating	59:17
identity 17:6,10	18:6,12,24,25 19:1	17:18	it'll 35:9
illegal 15:17,20	19:4,11,16 20:8,9	investigation 4:14	items 33:13 35:10
16:1	20:11 21:3,20	12:1 13:5,13,18	38:3,11
	23:3,5,17,20,21	14:6,14 15:23	itis 40:6
immediately 51:1 impact 42:4	24:3,17,25 25:5	20:3,14 28:20	i
impact 42.4 impacts 58:4	27:1,4,7,11,16	30:3,13 31:21	j 1:19,19
impacts 38.4 important 9:5	28:9 29:4,8,9,10	33:16 34:7 36:1	j 1:19,19 jake 1:15 9:17
34:6,9 35:4 54:16	29:17,20,22 30:2	44:13 50:18 56:15	53:25
58:8	31:22 39:9 40:19	61:17,19 62:10	january 9:17
importantly 54:10	40:25,25 41:2,3,9	64:5,5,18	41:25
57:20,23	41:20 42:17,24	investigations	jay 1:18 9:18
improve 9:21	43:4,12,14 44:1	28:19 33:3 34:17	job 54:23 55:2
18:20 36:6	46:1,2 48:1,4,11	35:3 55:22	judged 34:8
impugning 31:4,8	48:13 54:18,20	investigative	judges 5:19
inappropriate	55:2,3,4 56:12	25:19	judy 1:17 4:2
47:24	57:17,20 58:8,15	investigator 24:12	49:18,20 65:24
incapable 29:5	inquiry 62:8	investigators	66:1
include 29:4 58:3	inside 21:24 22:1	39:17 40:5 60:11	june 5:12
included 60:15	insight 10:1,22	invite 55:23 56:4	jurisdiction 50:22
includes 43:22	inspectors 5:19	involved 13:25	52:4,10 54:5 57:7
including 8:7	institution 54:13	36:3 39:21 41:4	57:9,12 63:10
14:20 15:3 64:19	54:16,17 55:1,6	46:14,16 47:10	jurisdictionally
inclusion 64:7	57:4,6	48:4,8 60:17	10:7
independent 14:17	insurrection 41:5	62:20 64:3,10,19	justice 12:20 47:6
33:6 35:7 52:15	42:1	issuance 1:4 2:6	justify 43:3
independently	integrity 9:20	25:6 26:25 29:16 67:5	k
14:21	13:11,11 20:5 56:17 60:1	issue 23:15,24	keep 34:2
indicate 50:20	intent 13:17 14:5	24:1 25:22 29:1,3	kept 54:20
indicated 27:5	61:11 64:12	35:20 39:7 46:12	kind 15:20 25:16
46:8 47:2 57:8	interested 44:14	50:24 51:9 53:1,5	28:6
individual 18:15	intergovernmental	53:17 57:6 58:11	kinds 59:10
23:18 38:13 63:7	1:1,9,23 3:4 51:11	59:7	know 3:17 13:15
individuals 6:11	54:5,7 66:13 67:7		19:7 22:10 24:2
6:16,21 7:1,7,12	2 1.2,7 00.13 07.7		

[know - minutes] Page 9

25:22 26:3,6,15	24:10,19,19 25:9	long 33:22	matter 47:22 50:7
27:16 29:13,18	25:12 27:8 28:18	longer 38:14	50:16 51:14 53:1
30:7,20,21 31:19	46:20,22,22	longtime 51:16	57:12,12 67:3
31:21 33:4,11	legislation 18:1,4	look 35:5,5,8,22	matters 52:1,4,15
34:14,16,22,23	18:20 42:16,25	47:11 52:18 56:4	mccarthy 11:8
36:4,10,13 38:7	43:8,12,16,20	56:20	mean 49:22 61:6
41:22,24 42:1	52:19 59:3	looking 17:6 32:1	meaning 60:15
48:7 54:22 56:10	legislative 1:21	36:19 47:5 52:8	means 64:1,2
60:12 61:12,23	4:18 43:2	53:12	measure 40:3
62:3,24	legislature 4:19	lot 19:1 32:4 34:7	meeting 1:3,11 2:4
knowledge 11:3	18:1 32:2,3,14	35:11,17 36:7	3:3 67:3
37:25 47:25	42:14 50:24	45:23 47:3,9,20	meetings 5:6
known 46:3,4	length 38:10 45:15	lydon 26:14	member 5:8 13:25
knows 43:1,2	58:23	m ,	14:24 23:10 33:20
51:19,20	letters 5:6	magnitude 62:3	36:23 37:21 38:15
l	liberties 11:9	mail 5:14 6:17	42:13 44:16 51:16
1 2:1	license 5:23 6:4,10	17.13 43:17	51:16 58:5 63:7
labeled 50:17	6:15,20,25 7:5,10	main 67:10	members 1:11
labor 59:6	7:15,20 17:2 19:3	maintain 60:1	9:12,19 29:6
laid 13:13 63:18	42:21 43:7,10	majority 1:14 30:7	36:24 37:14,24
lap 59:12,13	licenses 41:1 53:14	33:3 42:23 43:1,2	38:5 41:2,4,22,23
lastly 16:5 62:22	life 54:15	63:4 66:11	41:24 42:2 47:12
63:23	limit 10:17 36:22	making 13:16 21:6	48:5 51:23 57:19
latitude 9:9 13:16	37:24 38:18	27:6 29:12 30:6	57:24 58:6
law 8:18 10:7	limitations 61:24	40:2 46:15 47:15	mention 31:25
12:21 27:18 32:11	limited 8:7 62:10	47:16	mentioned 45:17
52:21	62:10	man 26:11	45:18 58:13
laws 5:15 35:10,16	line 11:1 28:10	manipulation	merit 19:11
36:6	41:6,7,8	10:24	million 17:11 18:7
lawyer 25:23	lines 48:9 58:17	manner 22:24	19:3 27:2 29:4
lawyers 64:9	list 5:22 6:3,9,14	60:14 62:25 63:12	43:13,15 46:1
lay 58:2	6:19,24 7:4,9,14	63:14 64:15	48:13
leader 38:10	7:19,24 21:14 listen 56:8	manual 55:20 56:3	millions 62:14 mind 59:6
leadership 14:18	little 33:5	mason's 55:20	
leads 11:7 62:7	live 39:20	56:3	minority 1:13,18 8:24 9:13 16:10
leaked 54:21	lobbying 59:2	mastriano 1:16	33:2 59:4
leanings 34:19	local 54:6	3:23,24 44:11,12	33.2 39.4 minute 37:7
leap 11:20	located 21:24 22:3	49:12,13,14 65:19	minute 37.7 minutes 1:22
leaving 39:8	location 24:17	65:20	36:23 37:14 38:6
legal 13:8 20:19,21	Iocation 27.17	materials 5:17	38:7,9,18 39:1
20:23 21:7,11			30.1,7,10 37.1

mistake 12:18	nay 49:20,25 50:1	numbers 12:9	opportunity 52:16
misuse 11:17	near 39:1	17:3 19:2,3 42:21	oppose 30:24
moment 37:1 38:2	nearly 18:7 19:3	42:21 46:2 53:13	opposed 16:9
months 51:6 58:25	27:2,13 29:4 46:1	numerous 15:2	30:23
moon 26:11	48:13	32:18	order 2:4 3:5,6
morning 4:11	necessarily 61:6		4:17 44:24
motion 1:4 2:5,7	necessity 4:17	0	organization 28:5
5:1 8:19,22,23 9:8	need 18:6,12 19:11	o 2:1,1 3:1	organization 26:5
16:18 36:21 40:20	19:24,25 20:1	obligation 57:19	outcomes 39:25
48:17,19 50:5	24:13 39:16 43:6	58:14	outlined 9:3
65:2 66:12 67:4	43:9,12,14,18 47:4	obstruction 11:21	outraged 56:19
motions 48:3	47:11 53:25 58:1	obtain 36:17	outside 19:14,19
motive 14:4,6	58:6,15 62:24	obviously 22:21	20:25 22:1,11
motives 13:12,19	64:3	34:7 40:20 41:3	34:14,19 48:6,6
13:22,24 14:5	needed 10:2 42:17	occasionally 43:24	57:24 61:9
30:17 31:5,8	42:20	occur 46:20	overarching 12:7
mourn 16:6	needing 42:24	occurred 15:7	overreaching 12:6
move 32:10 48:2	needs 34:22 40:19	16:7	12:13
48:10,20 58:22	43:2 57:25 58:3	october 8:15	oversee 59:25
59:7	64.1	office 8:13 24:10	
moved 48:16	never 42:19,22	24:18	oversight 55:7 59:15
movement 32:19	51:25 63:7	officers 1:12	
	newspaper 13:4,7	offices 5:20 24:20	overturn 32:3
moving 35:10 36:9 59:3		official 18:11	p
	14:9 15:2,16	officials 18:9	p 3:1
multiple 39:17,17 47:23	non 9:24,25 10:9	officio 1:15	p.m. 8:15
	notes 5:6	okay 3:20 17:9	pa 8:11
n.	notice 1:9	21:13,23 22:2,5,15	page 2:2
n 2:1,1 3:1	notification 15:19	25:14,21 26:16	paid 61:8,15
name 5:22 6:3,9	november 6:7,12	61:18	paper 33:16
6:14,19,24 7:4,9	6:17,22 7:2 17:12	one's 11:12	parallel 11:13
7:14,19 43:7,9	42:4	online 55:25	parameters 37:14
53:14	november's 27:15	open 22:24	paramount 55:5
names 42:20	39:14	opening 9:4	56:21
narrowly 39:18		operate 22:23	part 9:12 17:4
nate 3:6 48:21	number 5:23,24	64:15	18:17 25:8 29:12
65:1	6:4,5,10,11,15,16	operates 14:17,17	39:24 54:14,17
nathaniel 1:21	6:20,21,25 7:1,5,6	14:21	63:5
	7.10 11 15 16 20		
nation 16:6	7:10,11,15,16,20	operations 1:1,9	participate 4:13
	7:21 18:9 19:16	operations 1:1,9 1:23 3:4 66:13	participate 4:13 47:14
nation 16:6		-	
nation 16:6 national 33:24	7:21 18:9 19:16	1:23 3:4 66:13	47:14

participation 9:22	people's 14:12	pointedly 16:1	presiding 1:10
10:9	36:7 53:10,16	points 13:15	prevent 18:1
particular 23:7	perception 35:22	policies 5:11	previous 46:24
32:18 37:21 51:11	35:25	policy 31:23	primary 4:15 7:7
55:22 64:5	perfect 59:6	political 28:5	7:12,18,23 8:3
particularly 32:24	perform 12:4 55:7	39:22 40:5 64:16	prior 15:7 37:14
39:12	permission 14:18	politics 44:14	38:14
parties 64:2,19	permitted 53:3,3	poll 5:16,18,18	privacy 12:13
partisan 9:25 30:4	person 6:12 7:7,12	polling 5:15	53:10
30:13 34:18	17:12 43:11,11,16	popular 32:8	private 11:2 12:11
party 19:16 32:9	43:23	portion 9:13	15:18 27:20
46:17 57:18,21,25	person's 43:21	pose 30:21	pro 9:17 36:13
path 47:4,25	personal 27:1 29:4	position 50:16	45:10 52:7 56:9
pattern 13:1 15:6	43:4,14 56:11	52:24	57:4
33:20	personalize 13:24	possibility 20:24	probably 12:3
pause 41:13 42:10	persons 5:19	possible 22:14,24	problem 33:9
pay 61:5 62:18,19	perspective 9:5	26:9,10,11,12,17	procedures 5:11
paying 34:15,19	34:12	40:6,10	59:25
61:21	phone 35:20	possibly 40:17	proceed 13:20
payment 39:9	phrase 63:3	potential 13:7	15:13 21:8 23:12
pennsylvania 1:1	piece 52:19	15:16 62:8	38:4 64:18
1:8 4:24,25 6:1,7	place 17:7 18:18	potentially 11:2	proceeding 15:11
8:8,11 9:24 10:3	24:16 30:4 46:12	15:20 22:11 23:16	63:13,13
16:13 18:10 21:25	47:4 48:6 51:1,18	25:7 26:3	proceedings 9:6
23:18 30:11 31:20	52.12,23 53:12	powell 25:24	9:23 10:18 11:4
35:17 36:16 42:14	54:8 67:10	power 11:10,15	16:4 67:14
43:13,15 52:6,14	places 5:16	powers 4:22 12:1	process 9:1,2
59:12 60:2,6 67:6	plain 4:12	50:23 52:25 59:8	14:21 22:13 25:15
67:11	please 3:6 28:1	63:15	29:15 30:1 37:8
pennsylvanians	31:11 55:14 65:1	precisely 57:6	40:1 44:6,7 46:6
27:2 29:5 42:22	pledge 55:4	prepare 5:2 24:7	46:19 47:15 50:25
56:12,23	plus 34:5	prepared 9:2 10:5	53:8 54:18,20
people 17:11,16	point 13:16 21:17	preparing 58:2	56:15,16,20,21
18:7 19:4 23:21	21:19 23:6 26:18	present 1:11 4:5,7	60:2,15 63:7,8
26:8 27:13,15	26:20,21 28:2	8:6	produce 24:8
28:4 30:9,22,24	31:6,7,10,13,16	preserve 12:24	produced 24:25
31:20 34:18 35:2	32:20,21 34:3	president 16:8,12	25:5
35:17,21,24 36:2	36:20 38:16,24	32:13 45:9 52:6	production 8:12
36:16 39:20,24	47:21 52:22 61:2	57:4	23:17
40:3 58:9	62:22	presidential 39:13	productive 35:15

[profit - reported] Page 12

profit 9:25	purposes 54:21	race 8:2	recorded 67:12
profuse 40:25	pursuant 1:9 4:22	races 32:18	records 7:25 8:13
prolific 41:9	8:10	raise 51:10 57:6	40:21 41:1 43:18
proper 24:16,20	pursuing 24:13	raised 45:25 51:12	48:14
54:8	purview 51:13	62:11	redirecting 59:2
properly 18:23	push 28:7	raises 10:21	referenced 46:23
60:9	pushing 64:14	ran 39:14	reflect 63:1
proposed 17:1	put 37:14,24	react 37:9	reform 59:2,3
proposing 23:15	putting 26:11	reacting 14:8	regard 4:20 9:5
28:25	q	reaction 9:13	15:11 20:4 44:10
protect 9:21 11:12	qualities 26:8	reality 15:9 35:22	regarding 4:20
53:10,16 58:15	quanties 20.8 question 8:2 18:17	35:25	8:23 10:13 17:16
protections 18:17	19:8 20:2 22:19	really 19:8 26:4,6	23:11 27:6 47:14
proven 17:18	22:20 23:1,19,23	53:17	regardless 10:11
19:10	24:5,6 25:2 31:1	reappointing 32:5	10:14
provide 9:5 50:8	31:18 33:12 37:2	reason 40:23	registered 5:25
55:9 59:15	37:5 39:8 46:9	42:23	6:6
provided 10:1,12	47:12 58:21 61:1	reasonable 27:20	registration 17:24
10:21,25 12:10	61:4,11 63:21	reasons 44:3	20:5
20:10	64:23,25 65:3,4	receive 26:13	regulatory 52:8,15
provisional 7:2,22	questioning 13:11	received 35:20	reign 33:23
43:17	13:22 14:6 28:10	recess 66:14	reiterate 47:20
proxy 3:15,24	30:17	recognize 31:11	relates 45:3 52:7
49:13,14 50:8	questions 8:22	37:10 38:22 53:25	53:5 62:9
65:20	10:21 16:18,23	60:19	relating 5:13
public 1:8 10:17	17:16 19:19 23:11	recognized 9:9,14	relationship 25:23
11:2 12:6 15:19	23:22 24:14,21	38:20 50:13	relationships
23:4 29:7,10,21	34:10 40:13 55:23	recognizes 8:23	39:18,20 46:5
31:23,25 32:21	56:19 59:22 62:11	30:18 31:14 40:14	release 45:25
34:23,23 38:3	quick 53:22	44:25 48:18 56:6	released 56:11
40:25 44:22,23	quickly 15:24	60:3,18	relevant 4:19
45:9 61:2 62:19	quite 10:15 47:5	recollection 57:10	23:23 26:7,21,24
63:14,14,25 64:1,2	51:22	recommendation	58:8
publicly 14:9 15:2	quorum 3:6 4:10	63:3	remains 63:21
22:17	quote 44:21	recommendations	remember 16:6
published 13:4	quoting 44:19,20	9:18,21 10:4	57:10
52:5,14	45:9	63:15	reminds 15:22
pure 11:14		record 9:13 10:22	repeat 22:18 25:2
purpose 13:13	r	13:22 33:11,13	replaced 44:11
14:4 19:14 43:3	r 1:21 3:1 67:1	35:2 45:9 50:8	reported 10:13
51:21		52:5 67:14	

		. 1 2.0	
reporter's 2:11	responsibility	ruling 2:8	seconding 9:8
reports 8:4,9 13:7	12:25 17:25 18:19	running 21:6	secondly 51:9
15:3,16 60:10	58:12 59:25	rushed 11:23	54:10
represent 12:15	responsible 15:5	russia 36:2	seconds 8:21 38:6
30:9	54:19	russian 32:25 33:3	secretary 4:12 5:1
representatives	restore 56:22	33:10 35:24	5:2 8:16 19:14
27:13	restroom 3:19,20	S	24:7,8 28:3,14,17
representing 9:25	result 23:16 36:17	s 2:1 3:1 67:19	29:1 51:14 58:11
republican 8:14	results 8:1 13:8	sanctioned 14:16	59:13
20:23 21:2 30:5	25:17 34:8 35:5,6	58:7	section 4:24 45:21
31:20 41:2,4,22,24	42:4 44:8	sanctions 14:24	secure 24:17 54:20
42:1 60:21 64:3	retreated 44:12	58:16	55:4
64:10,11	revealed 13:6	sanctity 53:16	secured 24:19
republicans 10:15	15:15	sanko 1:21	security 5:24 6:5
11:20 30:8,9	review 21:3 30:2,3	santarsiero 1:19	6:11,16,21 7:1,6
34:16 44:6 60:17	50:18 52:15 54:8	3:25 4:1 16:19,21	7:11,16,21 8:17
requested 8:13	55:3 59:25	16:22 17:9,21	12:9 17:2 19:2
16:25 46:3	reviewing 25:17	18:3,22 19:7,18,22	41:1 42:21 43:8
requesting 5:3	59:10	20:6,15,18,21 21:1	43:10 46:2 53:13
17:2 27:1 41:20	reviews 8:5	1	see 10:25 12:16
required 8:18	right 11:13,19	21:10,13,18,23	62:12
25:20	16:14,16 18:4	22:2,5,9,15,20	seeking 31:22,22
requirements 18:5	20:6,24 21:1,10,14	23:9,13 24:22	seeks 43:14 44:2
requires 18:4	21:20 29:5 30:16	25:3,10,14,21 26:1	seen 12:14 54:23
rescission 15:20	30.22 34:17 36:15	26:9,12,16,19,23	60:10
residence 17:7	40:23 41:19 43:19	27:25 28:11,13,17	selected 46:17
resources 10:2	43:21,22,24 44:16	28:21,24 37:18	48:9 64:9
respect 14:19,22	55:7 56:16 61:12	38:22,25 39:4	self 26:20
23:2,14 26:2,24	62:9	40:6,12 48:15,17	senate 1:1,8,11,23
33:21 45:25 46:15	rights 11:16 43:22	48:19 49:15,16,17	3:4 4:23,23 5:1
47:7 51:10 53:10	rigorous 40:1	65:21,22,23	8:14,16,17 12:3
53:11,13,13 57:5,7	rise 53:8	scared 30:25,25	13:19 14:17 15:7
57:16	role 3:7 55:8,9	31:1	15:11 20:23 21:2
respectfully 24:4	roll 48:21 65:1	scary 12:9	22:7,10,23 24:9,19
respond 55:12	room 67:10	scope 4:18 25:11	30:8,10 32:10
responding 9:10	round 38:19	48:12 60:24 62:10	34:21 35:19 38:10
17:18	rule 4:23 13:12	scott 1:14	41:2,4,25 45:21
response 14:23	30:17 44:18	second 8:19 38:19	54:4,13 55:1,6,19
53:24 57:3	ruled 45:7	48:15,19 53:5	55:21 56:2,3
responsibilities	rules 13:19 55:19	54:3 55:15 57:1	59:11 61:13 63:17
63:16,18	56:2 63:17	seconded 48:16,17	66:13 67:6
03.13,10	00.2 03.17		00.12 07.0

[senator - states] Page 14

senator 1:9 3:3,9	45:8,11,12,14,17	shadow 16:5	space 11:13
3:11,13,16,22,24	46:18,21 47:2,16	share 21:15,17,19	speak 36:24
4:1,3,5,7,9,10 8:20	47:19 48:15,17,18	21:20 30:14 57:5	speaking 33:9
8:21,21,24,25 9:14	48:19,23 49:1,4,7	shared 57:17	34:13 45:4,8
9:14,16,17,18	49:10,13,16,19,22	sharif 59:4	speaks 38:10
12:22 13:3,10,21	49:10,13,10,13,22	sharing 22:17	special 9:19 18:8
14:1,1,2,3,8,10,15	50:11,13,13,14	shift 63:15	specific 10:1,13
15:13,14 16:2,17	51:15,16,20 53:21	showmanship	33:12 62:7
16:19,21,21,22	53:21,24 54:1,1,2	44:14	specifically 12:8
17:4,9,15,21,23	55:11,13,14,15,16	side 9:13 32:24	18:6 25:9 55:17
	55:17 56:6,7,25,25	38:15 50:18 54:12	
18:3,13,22 19:5,7 19:12,18,21,22	57:1,2 58:19,20,20	56:9,13	spent 59:9
, , , ,	58:21 59:4,18,18	sides 50:20	sphere 39:22 spoke 37:15 38:14
20:2,6,12,15,17,18	1		stack 11:16
20:19,21,23 21:1,5	59:19,21 60:3,4,10	signed 52:6	
21:10,12,13,16,18	60:13,18,19,24	significant 16:3	staff 1:20 20:19
21:21,23 22:1,2,4	61:1,10,14,16,18	38:2,2 40:3 45:17	57:24
22:5,7,9,13,15,18	61:22,23,25 62:2,6	47:22 54:24 57:25	staffed 5:20
22:20 23:5,9,10,13	62:13,15,17,21,22	58:3,7,16	staffers 42:16
24:6,22 25:2,3,7	64:22,23,24,25	silenced 11:9	stage 33:24
25:10,13,14,18,21	65:1,3,6,8,11,14	similar 25:19	stand 11:25 54:13
25:25 26:1,5,9,10	65:17,20,22,25	simply 50:21	standing 51:16
26:12,15,16,18,19	66:3,6,9,11	51:22 64:11	stands 66:14
26:21,23 27:24,25	senators 46:23	single 52:19	state 4:12 5:3,7,15
28:2,11,12,13,15	sensate 24:7	sir 31:9	8:6 10:10 19:15
28:17,20,21,22,24	sense 59:7	sit 10:5 16:5,10	22:23 24:8 28:3
30:16,18,19 31:2,6	sensitive 54:18	56:8	29:1 30:8,10 32:7
31:8,10,11,13,14	55:2,3	situation 47:8	32:9 40:22 51:14
31:16,17,18,24	sentence 20:16	52:25	51:15 52:3,10,11
33:8 34:1,3 36:18	separation 12:1	small 44:9 46:8	54:6 55:7 58:24
36:19,25 37:1,4,6	50:23 52:25 59:8	social 5:24 6:5,11	59:1,24 63:2
37:10,11,12,12,13	september 1:6,23	6:16,21 7:1,6,11	state's 58:12
37:16,16,17,18,18	67:9	7:16,21 12:9 17:2	stated 10:22 12:23
37:20,22,23 38:13	serve 8:18	19:2 41:1 42:21	14:5 15:2
38:19,21,22,22,25	served 34:4	43:8,10 46:2	statement 9:4
39:3,4,6,15 40:6	serving 51:23	53:13	13:23 14:23 15:10
40:10,12,14,14,16	session 41:15	solely 9:11 15:4,5	15:25
41:6,6,7,10,14,16	63:19	soros 34:17	statements 14:11
41:18,19 42:7,7,8	set 11:23	sorry 22:18 49:22	14:12
42:9,11,12 44:10	seven 17:11 18:7	sounds 30:12	states 22:3 32:13
44:16,19,21,22,24	19:3 27:2 29:4	sources 34:15	52:7 60:6
44:24,25 45:1,4,6	46:1 48:13		

[statue - tried] Page 15

statue 4:25	suggest 14:20 15:4	tasked 21:5	33:24 34:3 35:4
statute 32:7 55:19	16:2 33:14 64:17	taxpayer 61:8,17	35:14,15 36:12
56:2	suggested 13:3	61:18	45:16 54:11 59:10
statutes 8:8 50:25	58:25	taxpayers 11:17	third 19:16 46:17
53:3	suggesting 33:19	61:15,20 62:18	57:17,21,25
step 44:9	37:23 64:12	team 20:17,18	thought 26:20
steps 56:16 57:22	suggests 13:23	25:9,12 27:8	35:24 44:9
steven 1:19	summarize 50:15	29:12 46:8,20,22	thousands 42:15
stop 13:16	52:24	46:22	62:14
storage 24:16	sunshine 11:2	tell 29:6,11 34:12	threshold 18:4
street 35:22 59:4	support 9:21	35:19	ties 46:4
strictly 46:7	33:17	tem 9:17 36:13	time 5:12 24:11
strongly 23:14	suppress 11:16	45:10 52:7	28:9 29:2 33:22
45:22	sure 8:5 28:22	tem's 57:4	37:19,24 38:17,19
struck 44:4	35:23 40:2 53:9	tempore 56.9	39:11 48:3,11
struggling 18:25	54:19 61:3	ten 37:45 38:6	52:22 54:3,25
stuart 10:20	suspended 44:17	term 29:14	56:18 57:1 61:2
subcontractor	sweeping 4:16	terms 4:18 9:3,10	times 30:23 47:23
28:5	sworn 12:25	29:25 45:19 57:22	title 8:10
subject 43:9 51:14	sydney 25:24	testifier 42:3	today 9:6 11:4,20
57:12 59:8	system 8:5 17:24	testimony 10:19	13:3 15:3 20:9
submitted 8:9	20:5 28:23 36:9	13:6 15:15 46:24	28:25 29:5,11,19
subpoena 5:2	systems 5.13	thank 9:16 13:21	38:1 39:10 44:4
16:25 17:1 24:7	i ko	15:14 16:16,17,22	51:22 59:16 63:22
24:14 27:1 29:16	t 2:1,1,1 67:1,1	30:19 31:9,12,17	told 42:20
40:21 42:25 43:14	table 48:3,10,17	34:1 36:17 39:3,4	topic 20:7 23:6
43:18 44:1 48:3	48:20	40:12,16 42:12	25:25 34:2 35:23
subpoenas 1:4 2:6	take 24:20 30:3	45:1 50:14 53:20	topics 38:16
8:12,18 9:10 10:6	38:25 48:21 51:1	53:21 55:10,16	total 14:16
11:5,22 12:5,7	53:18 56:4 57:22	56:7,24,25 57:2	track 35:2
20:9 23:7,11,16,25	taken 10:16	58:18 59:18,21	tragedy 16:7
24:2 25:1,6 27:10	takes 38:1	64:21,22	train 5:17
29:3 43:4 48:10	talk 33:11,23 38:6	thing 52:12	training 5:17
48:12 58:11 59:17	talked 33:16 34:15	things 30:23,24	transcribed 67:12
67:5	45:24 51:12 63:2	33:23 35:9,13	transcript 1:22
subsection 4:25	talking 26:2 31:25	36:5,6 44:7,15	67:2,13
substance 12:5	37:21	52:17 53:12 55:12	transparent 22:24
24:14	tan 8:15	58:3,13	29:24 44:7
substantial 29:19	targeted 11:16	think 19:19 22:22	tremendous 40:18
succinct 40:17	task 39:16	23:22 26:1 27:24	tried 54:11
	J.10	28:7 29:18 30:7	

4 1.1 12.2		• 4 1 10	50 10 52 1 2 56 1
troubles 13:2	unequivocally	vincent 1:19	50:19 53:1,2 56:1
troubling 11:6	52:7	violates 53:15	56:20
true 67:13	unfounded 11:15	violating 44:18	wants 33:11
truly 12:12	unidentified 3:15	violation 10:6	ward 1:17 4:2,3
trust 56:22,22	3:17,19,20	11:25 12:21	8:21 49:18,19,20
64:1	unilateral 57:13	vital 58:15	56:6,7,25 65:24,25
truth 32:2	united 22:3 32:13	voices 11:9	66:1
try 20:7 34:2	unpopular 11:15	voluminous 23:17	warrant 11:24
39:23 40:17 51:7	unscrupulous 16:1	vote 10:5 11:13,19	washington 32:24
trying 16:24 17:10	untimely 12:2	16:16 17:8 18:5	41:25
17:13 18:25 19:24	update 60:1	23:15 24:1 27:9	watch 55:24
22:21 50:24	use 18:24	29:6,15,19 32:8	watchers 5:16,18
turn 8:17	V	36:21 43:19,21,22	watergate 15:23
two 33:1 35:9,13	validity 17:16 51:4	48:20 50:5 53:9	way 26:13 30:23
36:5 38:6 44:7	variety 38:10	53:11,16,17 57:10	39:23 46:7,13
type 12:18 34:25	various 48:6	59:20 66:11	58:7 61:19
types 52:1,17	various 48.6 vendor 11:2 12:11	voted 6:12,17,22	ways 48:7
58:12 60:7	15:18 20:13 24:23	7:2,7,12,17,22	we've 18:7 36:14
tyranny 63:4,6	24:24 25:3,11	17:12,17 18:7,23	37:22 38:18 54:23
u	30:2 39:10,10	20:9 27:15 43:11	63:17
ulsh 10:20	40:7 61:6	66:12	wednesday 1:6
	vendors 19:14,16	voter 7:24 9:22	week 12:23 18:10
ultimately 23:3 24:2,24 25:4	19:19 21:14,23	11:3,21 17:24	42:3 55:18
29:23 32:17 33:6	22:2,6,6,10,14	19:23 20:5 35:21	week's 42:3
34:24	25:16,22,23 26:3	43:18	weep 16:6
unadulterated	26:13 29:13 40:7	voters 5:25 6:6	went 3:18,19
11:14	57:18,21 64:9,20	11:16 18:15 20:1	34:14 55:17
	, ,	43:3,7,13,15	wholeheartedly
uncomfortable 34:20	veracity 18:15 verify 17:6,10,14	votes 27:17,19	39:6
undefined 27:7		47:22	wholly 47:24
undermine 32:1	19:12,23,24,25 20:1 61:17	voting 1:3 5:14,20	widely 11:15
	veronica 5:3	5:24 6:5 40:20	williams 1:13 4:4
undermining 33:15	version 5:10	41:1 43:11,16,16	4:5 8:24,25 9:16
underscores 64:13		43:17,17 44:3	13:21 14:2,8,15
understand 16:24	vetting 21:22	67:3	15:14 31:2,8,11,24
	22:14,16 23:2 25:15 26:3 28:7	W	33:8 36:25 37:6
19:10,24 25:10 34:10 61:7	29:15 40:1 46:6		37:11,13,17,20,23
	46:15 64:19	wait 37:6,6	45:17 47:3 49:21
understanding 18:22 20:8 21:4	vice 1:14	walking 35:21 want 9:9 12:24	49:22,23 50:7
		28:2 38:6 39:5	51:16 59:19,21
23:8 28:10 42:8	view 47:9		60:4,13,19 61:1,14
		43:23 44:7,8	, , , , ,

[williams - years] Page 17

61:18,23 62:2,13 62:17,22 66:2,3,4 willing 4:13 21:17 21:18,20 29:13 30:14 wing 67:11 winner 32:8 word 39:2 work 14:25 15:1 worked 40:8 42:15 workers 5:18,18 working 4:16 20:12 24:15 46:19 46:21 62:9 workload 59:1 world 39:20 wrap 42:11 **wrong** 44:2

y

yeah 26:19 year 18:8 year's 19:9 40:9 years 33:1 34:5 35:19 42:14,19 51:21 RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET, COM

EXHIBIT 3

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senator Jay Costa, Senator Anthony H. Williams, Senator Vincent J. Hughes, Senator Steven J. Santarsiero, and Senate Democratic Caucus, Petitioners

v.

Senator Jacob Corman III, Senate Pro Tempore, Senator Cris Dush, and Senate Secretary-Parliamentarian Megan Martin,

Respondents
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania
Department of State, and Veronica
Degraffenreid, Acting Secretary of the
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,

Petitioners

v.

Senator Cris Dush, Senator Jake Corman, and the Pennsylvania State Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee,

Respondents

Arthur Harwood, Julie Haywood

Petitioners.

v.

Veronica Degraffenreid, Acting Secretary of State Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Respondents

CASES CONSOLIDATED

No. 310 MD 2021

No. 322 MD 2021

No. 323 MD 2021

DECLARATION OF JONATHAN M. MARKS

- I, Jonathan M. Marks, declare and affirm under the penalties of 18 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 4904 that:
- 1. I am the Deputy Secretary for Elections and Commissions at the Pennsylvania Department of State (the Department). I have been employed as Deputy Secretary since February 2019. Prior to serving as Deputy Secretary, I

served as Commissioner for the Bureau of Commissions, Elections and Legislation, and before that, the Division Chief for the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors (SURE). I have worked at the Department since 1993 and been involved with the Department's election-related responsibilities since 2002.

- 2. My duties as Deputy Secretary for Elections and Commissions include overseeing the Bureau of Election Security and Technology, the Bureau of Campaign Finance and Civic Engagement and the Bureau of Elections and Notaries. The Bureau of Election Security and Technology is responsible for overseeing election technology, ensuring data integrity, and developing secure administrative procedures related to election administration in Pennsylvania, including administration of the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors database (SURE).
- 3. I submit this Declaration in support of Petitioners' application for relief. Given my role and years of experience at the Department, I am personally knowledgeable about the matters referenced in this Declaration and the business records of the Department of State. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the matters set forth below.

I. The Pennsylvania Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors (SURE)

4. The SURE system is Pennsylvania's centralized voter registration and election management system. 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1222. The Department

developed the SURE system to comply with the Help America Vote Act, 52 U.S.C. § 21083, and with Act 3 of 2002. The Department manages and oversees the SURE system, which ensures the accuracy and integrity of voter registration records maintained by the election authorities in each county. The SURE system also facilitates determinations of voter eligibility, maintains precinct data, and produces poll books.

- 5. The SURE system is not a single database; instead, it is a suite of databases, portals, and applications.
- 6. The Department and counties use three components of the SURE system to administer elections: SURE Voter Registration, the SURE Agency Portal, and the SURE County Portal. Because these components can access to personal voter information, including driver's license and Social Security numbers, only officials authorized by the Department and by counties can access them.
- 7. SURE Voter Registration (SURE VR) is an application used by counties to process and maintain voter registration records and to perform a number of election-related tasks, including the management of vote history, absentee and mail-in ballots, poll books, election-related reports, and voter registration correspondence to voters. Special equipment and user credentials are required to access and use SURE VR. The Department has access to SURE VR as part of its management and oversight responsibilities.

- 8. The SURE Agency Portal is used by Department personnel to maintain elections and campaign finance data. The Department uses the portal to maintain and retrieve the archive of historic election results by precinct and county, manage nomination petitions, and manage campaign finance records.
- 9. The SURE County Portal provides counties with voter search, provisional ballot processing/certification, and other basic capabilities through a secure web service rather than the specialized equipment required to access SURE VR. Counties can use the portal for seasonal and temporary staff who may need to access basic SURE functionality during an election or other busy period of time. Additionally, counties use the portal to upload election results, certify election results, and certify voter registration statistics.
- 10. The SURE system also includes additional portals and interfaces accessible by Pennsylvania residents and voters: the SURE Public Portal, SURE Kiosks, and the SURE Online Voter Registration Web Application Programming Interface (OVR Web API). These portals and interfaces cannot access driver's license or Social Security numbers and do not provide direct or indirect access to SURE VR, the SURE County Portal, or the SURE Agency Portal.
- 11. The SURE Public Portal is accessible through the Department's website, where the public can register to vote online, check their voter registration

status, locate their polling place, and check the status of their absentee or mail-in ballot.

- 12. SURE Kiosks are located in county election offices, in courts, and at the Department and allow the public to search public countywide or statewide voter registration rolls, as necessary. To search public statewide voter registration rolls, the user of the kiosk must first attest under penalty of perjury that the information will only be used for purposes related to elections, political activities, or law enforcement. The kiosk can only display a limited number of voter records.
- 13. In 2016, the Department developed and faunched the OVR Web API¹ to increase access to voter registration. OVR Web API allows Pennsylvania agencies, organizations, and political campaigns to develop electronic applications (i.e., "apps") to help residents register to vote. The Pennsylvania agency, organization, or political campaign must sign an agreement with the Department and undergo testing to ensure that the app properly displays all the fields that a voter must fill out under Pennsylvania law (e.g., name, address, citizenship status, etc.).

¹ Pa. Dep't of State, *Pennsylvania's Online Voter Registration Web application Programming Interface (PA OVR WebAPI)* (Apr. 2021), https://www.dos.pa.gov/VotingElections/OtherServicesEvents/Pages/PA-Online-Voter-Registration-Web-API---RFC.aspx.

- 14. Pennsylvania agencies such as the Department of Health, the Department of Human Services, and the Department of Labor and Industry have built apps using OVR Web API to enable a resident to register to vote while also applying for other benefits, such as public assistance.
- 15. An app built with OVR Web API functions similarly to the Department's online voter registration website: the app allows a qualified resident to submit a voter registration application to the Department, which forwards the application to the respective county boards of elections.
- 16. Any app built with OVR Web API does not connect to, or have any access to, SURE VR, the SURE Agency Portal, or the SURE County Portal.
- 17. Likewise, the Pennsylvania agency, organization, or political campaign that built the app does not connect to, or have any access to, SURE VR, the SURE Agency Portal, or the SURE County Portal.

II. Voter Registration in Pennsylvania

18. To register to vote in Pennsylvania, a qualified resident must provide the county in which they reside with certain personal information, including their name, address, date of birth, and either their driver's license or last four digits of their Social Security number. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(5)(A); 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1327.

- 19. In Pennsylvania, voter registration is entrusted by statute to the counties. 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1203. All voter registration applications are reviewed, verified, approved, and retained by the respective county. 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1328. Once a voter registration application is approved by the county, the voter's personal information is stored in SURE VR.
- 20. Pennsylvania provides numerous ways for its residents to register to vote. Qualified residents can submit or mail paper applications to a county. They can submit electronic applications through the SURE Public Portal, which hosts the Department's online voter registration website. They can register through certain Pennsylvania agencies, including the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, as part of an application for other benefits, such as a driver's license. *See* 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1201(1)-(2). And they can submit electronic voter registration applications using apps built with OVR Web API.
- 21. The Department forwards voter registration applications submitted via its online voter registration website, submitted electronically via other agencies, and submitted via apps built with OVR Web API to the respective county for review, verification, and approval.

III. Pennsylvania Law and Department Practice Limit Access to Voter Information

22. Pennsylvania law and the Department carefully control access to voter's personal information.

- 23. Only persons authorized by the Department or by a county can access SURE VR, the SURE Agency Portal, or the SURE County Portal and view driver's license and partial Social Security numbers.
- 24. If the Department provides persons outside the Department with access to SURE VR, the SURE Agency Portal, or personal voter information, it does so only under contractual agreements that limit access to the SURE system, restrict how personal voter information can be used, and prohibit retention or dissemination of personal voter information. The Department conducts background checks, including criminal background checks, on any person the Department hires or retains who will have access to the SURE system.
- 25. The Department does not make the driver's license or partial Social Security numbers of voters accessible by the public.
- 26. Pennsylvania law requires the Department to release certain voter information on "public information lists" and "street lists." 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 1404, 1403; 4 Pa. Code §§ 183.14, 183.13. But the Department does not release driver's license or partial Social Security numbers on these lists. *See* 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 1404(a)(1), 1403(a); 4 Pa. Code §§ 183.14(c)(3), 183.13(a), (c)(5)(iii).
- 27. The Department must allow public inspection of certain election and voter records, 25 Pa. Stat. § 2622; 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1207. When complying with

these requests, the Department does not allow public inspection of driver's license or partial Social Security numbers.

- 28. Occasionally, a court will need access to SURE data as part of a nomination challenge or other election matter. To protect voter privacy and security, the county official will use the default County Portal voter search page, which does not display partial Social Security or driver's license numbers. This avoids displaying partial Social Security and driver's license numbers in open court. If the court asks to see a part of the County Portal that does display partial Social Security or driver's license numbers, the Department has instructed county officials to ask that the projector be turned off.
- 29. Pennsylvania law and Department regulations further protect the privacy and security of voters' other personal information.
- 30. State law provides that voter lists can be used only for purposes related to elections, political activities, or law enforcement, and a person obtaining either the public information list or street list must confirm compliance in writing under penalty of perjury. 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 1404(b)(3), (c)(2); 4 Pa. Code §§ 183.14(b)(4)-(5), 183.13(c)(2).
- 31. Pursuant to state law, the Address Confidentiality Program (ACP) protects the addresses of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and their families by requiring the Department and counties to use substitute personal

information in the SURE database and in election materials. 23 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 6701-13. When an ACP participant registers to vote, the county enters in the SURE system the participant's ACP number as their first name, "ACP" as their last name, "ACP [precinct number]" as the street address, a P.O. Box in Harrisburg as the mailing address, and 01/01/1900 as the date of birth. The county does not enter the ACP participant's driver's license or Social Security number into the SURE VR. ACP participants appear in poll books and on public information lists under the substitute information.

32. By regulation, the Department allows state and federal judges, state and federal law enforcement officers, state prosecutors, parole officers, correctional employees, individuals with a Protection from Abuse order, individuals granted a protection order due to stalking, and other individuals who can demonstrate a threat to personal safety to request that their home addresses not appear on public information lists. 4 Pa. Code § 183.14(c)(4)-(5).

IV. The Subpoena Requests Protected Critical Infrastructure Information

33. In January 2017, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security designated election systems as critical infrastructure. Among the election infrastructure so designated were voter registration databases, voting systems, and other technology used to manage elections and to report and validate results.

- 34. "Critical infrastructure" are "systems and assets" that are "so vital to the United States" that their incapacity or destruction "would have a debilitating impact on security, national economic security, national public health[,] or safety." 42 U.S.C. § 5195c.
- 35. Federal law protects critical infrastructure and critical infrastructure information. 6 U.S.C. §§ 671-674; 42 U.S.C. § 5195c. Critical infrastructure is "information not customarily in the public domain and related to the security of critical infrastructure or protected systems" and includes "the ability of any critical infrastructure to resist interference," "any planned or past assessment . . . of the vulnerability of critical infrastructure," and "security testing, risk evaluation thereto, risk management planning, or risk audit." 6 U.S.C. § 671(3).
- 36. The Protected Critical Infrastructure Information (PCII) Program protects critical infrastructure information from public disclosure. 6 U.S.C. § 673; 6 C.F.R. §§ 29.1-29.9. To be covered by the PCII Program, a State must voluntarily submit critical infrastructure information not in lieu of compliance with any regulatory requirement. 6 U.S.C. § 673(a)(1); 6 C.F.R. § 29.5. When reports are submitted for PCII protection, those reports have the presumption of protection pending review. Once covered, the information cannot be made available under any State or local public records law, be disclosed or distributed to any party without written consent of the person or entity submitting the information, or be

used other than for the purpose of protecting critical infrastructure or protected systems. 6 U.S.C. § 673(a)(1); 6 C.F.R. § 29.8.

- 37. In accordance with federal law and U.S. Department of Homeland Security practice, the Department has properly submitted critical infrastructure information about the SURE system to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. This information is PCII.
- 38. Separately, the Department protects sensitive security information about the SURE system pursuant to Commonwealth data and IT security policies, including Pennsylvania Office of Administration/Office of Information

 Technology ITP-SEC019 and the Department's Traffic Light Protocol.
- 39. Paragraph 16 of the Subpoena demands disclosure of records that constitute PCII under federal law and sensitive security information under Commonwealth practice: specifically, records that provide detail about the Department's IT architecture and identify potential risks and vulnerabilities in the SURE system and the Department's IT infrastructure. These records would create a roadmap about how to attack the SURE system. As a result, these records can only be accessed in accordance with strict safeguarding and handling requirements, and only by those with an absolute need to know in order to perform homeland security duties.

V. The Auditor General's Audit of the SURE System

- 40. In June 2018, the Department asked the Pennsylvania Department of Auditor General (DAG) to perform an audit of the SURE system to assess its accuracy, operability, and efficiency. The audit was conducted pursuant to an Interagency Agreement between the Department and DAG.
 - 41. The audit covered the period of January 1, 2016, to April 16, 2019.
 - 42. The DAG published its final report in December 2019.²
- 43. The terms of the Department's Interagency Agreement made clear that DAG would protect the security and privacy of all data exchanged during the audit and would maintain data integrity as required by Pennsylvania Office of Administration/Office of Information Technology requirements. DAG agreed to destroy all data provided by the Department once the data was no longer needed. Only authorized personnel from DAG and the Department with a business need would have access to the data exchanged during the audit.
- 44. Data and systems security concerns were paramount in the Department's negotiations and dealings with the DAG in the course of their performance of the audit.

² Dep't of Auditor Gen., *Performance Audit Report, Pennsylvania Department of State, Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors* (Dec. 2019), https://www.paauditor.gov/Media/Default/Reports/Department%20of%20State_SURE%20Audit%20Report%2012-19-19.pdf.

- A. The Department Provided DAG Auditors with Restricted Access to the SURE System Under Controlled Conditions
- 45. The Department and the DAG established protocols to address all aspects of data security. The Department provided DAG auditors with limited and restricted access to the SURE system and SURE system data under carefully controlled circumstances to reduce the risk of inadvertent intrusions into or tampering with the SURE system and prevent the unauthorized disclosure of information, including private, personal voter information.
- 46. For example, the Department gave the DAG auditors access to a snapshot of several tables in SURE VR contained sensitive personal information about registered voters in Pennsylvania. To ensure the security of the snapshot, it was stored on an encrypted external hard drive, which was kept in the Department's Office of Chief Counsel in a secure lock box within a locked cabinet. Only the auditors had a key to the lockbox, and only Department Chief Counsel personnel had a key to the cabinet.
- 47. The Department also gave "read-only" SURE user credentials to certain DAG auditors to allow them to review the SURE system. Because the access was "read-only," the DAG auditors could not input or change any information in the SURE system. They could not copy any information in the SURE system to duplicate it. Although the DAG auditors could view private, personal voter information in the SURE system, DAG auditors were not permitted

to carry such information out of the building, either in their working papers or by other means.

- 48. To access the snapshot and the read-only version of the SURE system, DAG auditors had to come to the Department's office in the North Office Building and use Department equipment and hardware. When needed during the audit, the DAG auditors and Department personnel would retrieve the hard drive from the lock box in the locked cabinet. The auditors would then connect the hard drive to a Department workstation with no wireless access in a room in the basement of the Department. If the auditors wanted to check a specific voting record in the SURE system, they would use their read-only credentials on a Department workstation in the same room. One member of Department staff, typically an employee of the Bureau of Elections Security and Technology, was physically present in the room to monitor use of the snapshot and access to the SURE system. Each evening, on the days when they needed the hard drive, the DAG auditors and Department personnel would replace the hard drive in the lock box, which would then be placed back inside the locked cabinet.
- 49. The Department also provided the DAG auditors with a copy of the full voter export, which does not contain driver's license or partial Social Security numbers.

50. DAG auditors also visited with select county election officials as part of the audit. The Department facilitated these visits by providing a Department staff member to be present for the auditors' discussions with counties. The purpose of having a Department staff member present was to ensure data and system security to the maximum extent possible.

B. The Department Withheld PCII relating to the SURE system from the Auditor General in Accordance with Federal Law

- 51. Because election systems are critical infrastructure, *see* Part III, *supra*, federal law governs what information about election systems can be shared, even with other state agencies when they perform audits.
- 52. In the course of conducting the audit, the DAG requested security reports related to the SURE system. The Department Office of Chief Counsel explained to DAG auditors that the requested reports were PCII and could not be released.
- 53. In order to cooperate with the DAG while respecting the information-sharing restrictions imposed by federal law, the Department provided the DAG auditors with an affidavit regarding information technology security protocols relating to the SURE system.

I declare that the facts set for in this Declaration are true and correct. I understand that this Declaration is made subject to the penalties for unsworn falsification to authorities set forth in 18 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 4904.

Executed on this 13th day of October, 2021

Jonathan M. Marks

Deputy Secretary for Elections and Commissions

Pennsylvania Department of State

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Case Records*Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Dated: July 27, 2022

/s/ Bradie R. Williams
Bradie R. Williams

PAEL BREAKEN LEGON DE NOCHACH DOCKET COM

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am this day serving the foregoing document upon the following persons by regular mail, which service satisfies the requirements of Pa.

R.A.P. 121:

Matthew Haverstick
Joshua John Voss
Samantha G. Zimmer
Shohin Hadizadeh Vance
KLEINBARD LLC
1717 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Counsel for Petitioner Pennsylvania
Senate Intergovernmental Operations Committee

Keith Edward Whitson
Stephen J. Shapiro
Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis LLP
120 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2700
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Counsel for Intervenors
Common Cause Pennsylvania, et al.

Witold J. Walczak
Marian Karen Schneider
ACLU of Pennsylvania
P.O. Box 60173
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Counsel for Intervenors
Common Cause Pennsylvania, et al.

Clifford B. Levine Emma F.E. Shoucair 625 Liberty Avenue, 5th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15222-3152 Counsel for Senate Intervenor-Respondents Claude J. Hafner, II Ronald N. Jumper Shannon A. Sollenberger Democratic Caucus Senate of Pennsylvania Room 535 Main Capitol Building Harrisburg, PA 17120 Counsel for Senate Intervenor-Respondents

Dated: July 27, 2022 /s/ Bradie R. Williams

Bradie R. Williams
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 963-5000
bradie.williams@morganlewis.com