### Indiana Election Commission Minutes February 24, 2022

**Members Present:** Zachary E. Klutz, Proxy for Paul Okeson, Chairman of the Indiana Election Commission ("Commission"); Suzannah Wilson Overholt, Vice Chair of the Commission; Karen Celestino-Horseman, member; Abhilash Reddy, Proxy for Litany A. Pyle, Member.

**Members Absent:** Paul Okeson, Chairman of the Indiana Election Commission; Litany Pyle, Member.

**Staff Attending:** J. Bradley King, Co-Director, Indiana Election Division of the Office of the Secretary of State (Election Division); Angela M. Nussmeyer, Co-Director of the Election Division; Matthew Kochevar, Co-General Counsel of the Election Division; Valerie Warycha, Co-General Counsel of the Election Division.

**Others Attending:** Ms. Lauren Box; Dr. Bryan Byers; Mr. Marc Chatot; Ms. Jen Dunbar; Mr. Jake German; Mr. Tyson Gosch; Mr. Bernie Hirsch.

#### 1. Call to Order:

The Chair called the February 24, 2022 meeting of the Commission to order at 1:30 p.m. EST in Conference Room A, Indiana Government Center South, 402 West Washington Street, Indianapolis.

#### 2. Transaction of Commission Business:

The Commission proceeded to transact the business set forth in the Transcript of Proceedings for this meeting prepared by Maria W. Collier, RPR, CRR, of Stewart Richardson and Associates, which is incorporated by reference into these minutes.

The Commission adjourned its meeting at 3:21 p.m. EST.

Respectfully submitted,

Sudley King

J. Bradley King

Co-Director

APPROVED:

Paul Okeson, Chairman

Angela M. Nussmeyer

Co-Director

### In the Matter Of:

## INDIANA ELECTION COMMISSION PUBLIC SESSION

\_\_\_\_\_

# **Transcript of Proceedings**

February 24, 2022

\_\_\_\_\_\_

1	
2	INDIANA ELECTION COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC SESSION
4	
5	
6	
7	Conducted on: February 24, 2022
8	
9	
10	
11	Conducted at: Indiana Government Center South 402 West Washington Street, Conference Room A
12	Indianapolis, Indiana
13	
14	
15	
16	A Stenographic Record by:
17	Maria W. Collier, RPR, CRR
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	STEWART RICHARDSON DEPOSITION SERVICES Registered Professional Reporters
25	(800)869-0873

1	APPEARANCES
2	INDIANA ELECTION COMMISSION:
3	Zachary Klutz as Proxy for Paul Okeson - Chairman
4	Suzannah Wilson Overholt - Vice Chairman
5	Abhilash Reddy as Proxy for Litany Pyle - Member
6	Karen Celestino-Horseman - Member
7	
8	INDIANA ELECTION DIVISION STAFF:
9	Angela M. Nussmeyer - Co-Director
LO	J. Bradley King - Co-Director
11	Matthew Kochevar - Co-Counsel
L2	Valerie Warycha - Co-Counsel
L3	
L4	
L5	
16	
L7	
18	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX OF AGENDA ITEMS		
2		PAGE	
3	Call to Order and Determination of	4	
4	Quorum	4	
5	Documentation of Compliance with Open Door Law	4	
6	Voting System Applications for Recertifications of Systems		
7	Receitifications of Systems		
8	Hart InterCivic Verity "Hybrid" Voting System 2.3	7	
9	Hart InterCivic Verity "Hybrid" Voting System 2.5	42	
10			
11	Approval of Voting System Engineering Change Orders		
12	Hart InterCivic Verity 2.3 and	44	
13	Verity 2.5 Engineering Change Orders 1447/1494, 1492, 1496, and 1500		
14	Voting System Applications for Recertifications of Systems		
15	MicroVote Direct-Record Electronic	47	
16	Voting System EMS 4.4-IN 4.4	4 /	
17	Approval of Voting System Engineering Change Orders		
18	MicroVote Direct-Record Electronic	62	
19	Voting System 4.4-IN 4.4 Engineering Change Order 135	VΔ	
20			
21	Voting System Application for Approval of New Voting System		
22	Unisyn OpenElect 2.2 Voting System	72	
23			
24			
25			

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. Good afternoon. We'll call the meeting to order. This is the meeting of the Indiana Election Commission, public session dated Thursday, February 24, 2020, at 1:30.

2.

2.2

For purposes of the record, I'll note the following members of the Commission are present:

Myself, Zach Klutz, serving as proxy for Chairman

Paul Okeson; Vice Chairman Susan Wilson Overholt -
VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Suzannah.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I'm sorry. Suzannah.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I do know that. Commission
Member Karen Celestino-Horseman; and to my right,
Abhi Reddy, proxy for Member Litany Pyle. Also in
attendance are Indiana Election staff: Co-Director
Brad King, Co-Director Angie Nussmeyer, Co-General
Counsels Matthew Kochevar and Valerie Warycha. Our
court reporter today is Maria Collier from Stewart
Richardson Deposition Services.

First item is documentation of compliance with Open Door. I'll request the co-directors confirm that the Commission meeting has been properly noticed as required under Indiana's Open Door Law.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, on behalf of myself and Co-Director

Nussmeyer, I certify that proper notice of this
meeting was given in accordance with Indiana's Open
Door Law.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you, Brad.

Next item is the administration of oaths. Any person who plans to testify at today's meeting on any matter, please stand and, if you are able, respond "I do" upon the reading of the oath.

I now recognize Matthew Kochevar to administer the oath.

MR. KOCHEVAR: All those who will testify before the Indiana Election Commission, please raise your right hand and say "I do" after recitation of the oath.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give to the Indiana Election Commission is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Please say "I do."

ALL: I do.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you, Matthew.

As we begin the next item, the applications for recertifications, I want to propose or make a motion for a procedural process that I hope will allow for an orderly and open meeting. I move for the following procedures to be adopted:

For each applicant, I will first recognize the co-directors of the Election Division and then representatives from VSTOP, which is Indiana's Voting System Technical Oversight Program, to present information regarding the applicable application for certification or recertification of a voting system before the Commission. The documents provided by the Election Division and VSTOP regarding these systems will be incorporated into the records for this proceeding.

2.

2.2

I will then recognize any representative of the applicant, meaning a voting system vendor, to testify regarding this matter for up to 3 minutes. This time limit can be extended by the consent of this body and will not include time spent answering questions posed by a Commission member.

I will then recognize any interested party or member of the public in the audience who wishes to testify or provide comments, again up to 3 minutes. It's my understanding a sign-up sheet has been distributed before this meeting convened, and I will recognize individuals to speak in the order the individual signed in. Again, the time limit can be extended on consent of the Commission and will not include time for questions posed by a

Commission member. 1 2 With respect to those procedural proposals, is 3 there a second to my motion? 4 VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Second. CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any discussion? All in favor say "aye." 6 VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye. MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: 8 Aye. 9 MR. REDDY: Aye. 10 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Aye. 11 Opposed? 12 The "ayes" have it. The motion with respect 13 to these procedures is adopted. 14 We have before us three different types of 15 applications. We have applications for 16 recertification; we have applications for change 17 order, engineering change orders; and we have an 18 application for a new certification. We will take 19 these in order by vendor and, it appears, 20 alphabetically, so we'll be hearing all 21 recertifications and change orders by vendor, first 2.2 by Hart InterCivic. 23 So the first matter of business for 24 consideration is Hart InterCivic Voting System 2.3, 25 application for recertification of the voting

```
1
              Similar to the procedures we just adopted,
 2.
     for purposes of commencing this discussion and
 3
     testimony, I'm going to make a motion that the
 4
     application submitted by Hart InterCivic for
     recertification of the Voting System 2.3 be
 5
     approved for marketing and use in Indiana for a
 6
     term expiring October 1, 2025, and subject to any
 7
     restrictions set forth in the report submitted by
 8
     VSTOP. And that motion is to commence discussion
 9
10
     and presentation.
                        Is there a second?
11
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
                                   Second.
12
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any discussion?
          All in favor say "aye."
13
14
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye.
15
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN:
                                   Aye.
16
          MR. REDDY:
                      Aye.
17
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ:
                           Opposed?
          The "ayes" have it.
18
19
          At this time I'll ask Brad King and Angie
20
     Nussmeyer to confirm proper document compliance
21
     with Indiana Code 3-11-7-19 regarding the filing of
2.2
     the application for Hart InterCivic Voting
23
     System 2.3 and to confirm proper notice of the
24
     application was provided to the applicable county
25
     clerks in Indiana and to provide us with any
```

```
1
     written correspondence received from those clerks
 2.
     regarding this specific application.
          MR. KING:
                     Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of
 4
     the Commission. I'll begin and then defer to
     Ms. Nussmeyer for additional information she may
 5
     wish to provide.
 6
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Excuse me.
                                                Can we
 7
     turn this down a little bit? There's a hum.
 8
          MS. WARYCHA: I will do my best, but IDOA set
 9
10
     it up, and I don't know exactly what I'm doing.
11
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: I'm sorry.
                                                There's
12
     like a reverb coming through.
13
                    Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of
          MR. KING:
14
     the Commission.
                      The first of the two Hart
     InterCivic applications are included in the binders
15
16
     behind the white tab with the label "Verity Voting
     System 2.3." The vendor, Hart InterCivic in this
17
18
     case, has submitted the IEC-11 application with the
19
     applicable fee required by statute and the
20
     information required under the applicable statutes,
21
     3-11-7.5-28 in particular, but also the others
2.2
     referenced in the application.
23
          As the Chair noted, we have given notice to
24
     the clerks of Cass County and Monroe County, who
25
     are currently using Version 2.3, for them to
```

```
provide input regarding the recertification process
 1
 2.
     of this system and have included the IEC-23,
 3
     Statement of Voting System Foreign National
 4
     Ownership or Control of Vendor document, all of
 5
     which, again, are in the binder.
          And I'll defer to Ms. Nussmeyer.
 6
 7
          MS. NUSSMEYER:
                          Thank you, Mr. King.
          Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, the
 8
     only thing I would add is that we had the
 9
     opportunity to review the report from VSTOP, and in
10
11
     addition to all the documentation Mr. King
12
     mentioned, we confirmed that the information
```

system vendor.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I will now recognize the VSTOP representatives here this afternoon to present VSTOP's findings regarding this application. Please proceed.

provided by the vendor or those documents that we

requested in the protocol and any questions that

staff had regarding the responses in the report

were adequately addressed by VSTOP and the voting

MR. CHATOT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: As a preliminary comment, before you speak -- and this goes to each audience member -- please state your name for the record,

the organization you're with, and speak clearly so
that the court reporter can hear you, especially
with the mask on.

MR. CHATOT: Sure. Marc Chatot with VSTOP.

That is M-a-r-c, C-h-a-t-o-t.

2.2

Okay. The Verity Voting 2.3 software includes four core components: Verity Data, Verity Build, Verity Central, and Verity Count. The type and quantity of Verity devices will vary by jurisdiction and may include Verity Controller, Touch, Scan, Touch Writer, Touch Writer Duo, and or Print devices. The current Verity 2.3 version to certify is identical to the Verity 2.3 version that was previously certified for use in Indiana on July 26, 2019. This system was certified by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission on March 15, 2019, and is compliant with the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines.

Changes being introduced in this voting system are ECO No. 1492, which adds additional orderable parts, approved by the EAC on August 12, '21; ECO 1496, which updates the Verity Duo Series power regulator circuit that was approved by the EAC on September 13 of 2021; ECO 1500, which supports Duo and Duo Standalone on Tabletop, this was approved

```
by the EAC on October 1st of 2021; and ECOs 1447
 1
 2
     and 1494, which are both improvements to the ballot
 3
     box, this was approved by the EAC on October 19,
     2021.
 4
          Findings and limitations. The Verity Touch
     Writer Duo is a series of up to 12 ballot marking
 6
     devices connected to a daisy chain network.
 7
     VSTOP's findings are that the network is closed and
 8
 9
     poses no additional vulnerability or threats
10
     without having direct physical access to the
11
     hardware.
12
          Recommendation. On the basis of VSTOP's
     review and evaluation, we find the voting system
13
14
     referenced herein, and with the scope of
15
     certification and the limitations therein, meets
16
     all requirements of the Indiana Code for use in the
17
     state of Indiana.
                        This finding includes compliance
18
     with legal requirements for voters with
19
     disabilities.
20
          Would you like me to go into the ECOs at this
21
     point or pause for comment?
2.2
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: The engineering change
23
     orders?
24
          MR. CHATOT: Yeah, for this --
25
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I think we want to keep this
```

strictly to the recertification.

MR. CHATOT: Okay.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Are you saying that the engineering change orders are part of this particular recertification?

MR. CHATOT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. Perhaps a summary of those, I think, would be appropriate.

MR. CHATOT: Okay. So these do apply to both 2.3 and 2.5 voting systems. ECO 1447 and 01494 makes mechanical improvements to the components of the ballot box in response to feedback received from customers and manufacturer. There are no electrical changes associated with this ECO. All proposed changes are mechanical improvements to the equivalent components of the ballot box.

Unused rivets are removed from the bill of material, and unnecessary lumber is removed from the top center rear of the ballot box and replaced with a panel plug to improve the cable insertion experience when Verity Scan is mounted. And an approved manufacturer list for panel plugs used for the ballot box is updated to add a part with more market availability.

ECO 1492 adds additional orderable parts to

the approved manufacturing list, AML, for Hart Part No. 1005808, the power controller used on Verity Duo devices. The added orderable part numbers are from the same existing approved manufacturer's part and vary only by component package and shape. An interposer is used to fit the component package on the existing Duo PCDA base cord with no changes needed for the board.

2.2

ECO 1496 modifies the power regulator circuit designed on the Verity Touch Writer Duo series base ports to move away from Linear Tech LT8711 power controller and instead use the more widely available Texas Instruments TPS552882 series part. This modification described in this ECO is intended to mitigate the effects of the global electronic component shortages.

And finally, ECO 1500 describes a modification to allow for the optional tabletop deployment of standard Verity Touch Writer Duo and Touch Writer Duo standalone devices rather than only on a Verity standard booth. There are no changes to the voting device hardware or software to support this change. This change is driven by supply chain challenges with raw materials required to manufacture our standard voting booths.

The modification described on this ECO affects deployments of Verity Touch Writer Duo and Touch Writer Duo standalone devices only in a standard configuration only. Hart will continue to require Verity-accessible booths for all accessible configurations. There are no changes to the voting devices or voting device software to support this change.

2.

2.2

And that is all applicable part ECOs.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. And I probably didn't respond to your question do you want to go through the change orders now correctly.

MR. CHATOT: You did want me to.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I did, and I said it incorrectly. So what I was -- the current motion before us is simply with respect to the recertification of the 2.3. I realize the 2.3 has recertification and change orders, but I think what we would like to do is take these separately.

MR. CHATOT: Okay. Sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: So while we won't ask you to do the summary again, we probably will ask questions when we get to the change order provision. Right now, I think, for purposes of our questioning and our discussion, I will turn to the

Commission for questions of VSTOP, knowing that 1 2. we're going to limit it to just the recertification 3 process and application. 4 MR. CHATOT: Okay. CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: So at this time I'll ask my fellow Commission members if they have any 6 7 questions for the VSTOP representatives. VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I quess for 8 clarification, my understanding is that this system 9 10 does not include a retraction method. Is that 11 correct? 12 MR. CHATOT: That is --13 VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I should say for 14 absentee ballots scanned before Election Day. 15 MR. CHATOT: So that would be -- the process 16 for spoiling a ballot would be that. 17 Is that correct? One second. 18 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: The next portion of this 19 process, while we're going to ask questions, the 20 next portion is for me to recognize a 21 representative from Hart InterCivic. 2.2 MR. CHATOT: Oh, yes, please. 23 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: So if we would like to have 24 that person come up now to assist, we could 25 probably do joint questions with VSTOP and Hart

1 InterCivic. 2 That would be great. MR. CHATOT: CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Just please state your name 4 for the court reporter. MR. GOSCH: My name is Tyson Gosch. certification project manager with Hart InterCivic. 6 VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I quess I'll put my 7 question to you since it looks like VSTOP is 8 9 turning to you to answer the question. 10 correct in understanding that a retraction method 11 is not being offered with this system for absentee 12 ballots scanned before Election Day? 13 MR. GOSCH: No. It does offer -- is this in regards to the state law if a person passes away 14 15 before Election Day to be able --16 VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Yes. 17 MR. GOSCH: -- to pull the ballot back? VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: 18 19 MR. GOSCH: Yes, we can do that. That's been 20 part of the system since Version 2.3 and up. 21 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: And not to make this awkward, 2.2 but does VSTOP agree with that conclusion? 23 MR. CHATOT: Yes. 24 MR. KOCHEVAR: If I may, really to address the 25 vice chair's question, and I'm speaking for myself.

```
1
     In reviewing this report on 2.3, while the vendor
 2.
     may say they have the ability to do it, it is
     not -- from my knowledge, VSTOP has not tested
 3
     this, and to my knowledge, the system that was
 4
 5
     previously certified that expired on October 1,
     2021, did not have anything expressly stated that
 6
     that retraction method that is available on that
 7
     voting system can be used in the state.
 8
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Maybe my question
10
     wasn't -- maybe I asked the wrong question.
11
     purposes of certification, was the retraction
12
     method included as part of the system and was that
13
     something that was considered during the
14
     recertification?
15
          DR. BYERS: We're looking. It should be
16
     there.
17
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
                                   Sorry.
                                            That was a
18
     severely simple question.
19
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Valerie, do you have any
20
     comment or thoughts?
21
                        The only thing I know for sure
          MS. WARYCHA:
2.2
     is that I do -- well, let me try and think how to
23
     phrase this. The ballot retraction, I think, may
     be a little different in this case than maybe other
24
```

cases you're thinking of since they were

25

```
1
     specifically talking to dead voters. I guess
 2
     they're not really a voter once they're passed
     away, but it might be a little different than some
 3
     of the other ballot retraction discussions that
     people have had. I'm not sure if I'm being very
 5
     clear about that, Brad.
 6
          MR. CHATOT: Yes. So we did test this, and it
 7
     would just be an update to the totals in the voting
 8
     numbers to retract the votes.
 9
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Can you direct us to the page
10
     you're looking at within the report.
11
12
          MR. CHATOT: This was recorded in our video.
13
     That's what the note says. And the note, page 19
14
     of Appendix A, the certification protocol. Let's
15
     see. It's the field-test protocol.
16
          DR. BYERS: Our field test.
17
          MR. CHATOT: Our field test, yes.
18
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: My appendix are numbered.
19
         VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I'm assuming, is it
20
     Attachment 8 --
21
          MR. CHATOT: Yes.
22
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: -- to the report,
23
     which is Appendix A? So that would be page 19?
24
          MR. CHATOT: Yes. Yeah, it says recorded on
```

video, so this is something that we discussed and

25

recorded in the recording of the field test.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: This is Scenario 1 in the middle of the page?

MR. CHATOT: Correct.

2.2

MR. KOCHEVAR: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Yes.

MR. KOCHEVAR: Yeah. To provide some commentary on Scenario No. 1, this does not have to do with ballot retraction, retracting a voter's ballot. This particular scenario has to do with if you can adjust your -- the election management system when you canvass the ballots to adjust the vote count for when a candidate dies before Election Day and, if I'm thinking this is the right scenario, you replace the candidate before the election under a ballot vacancy law, which creates a scenario where ballots cast specifically for the deceased candidate don't count for the candidate who succeeded them on the ballot, but the straight party ticket has a different procedure.

That's what this is about. This is about ballot counting and how to read a ballot and apply that vote, as opposed to can we remove a voter's ballot from the system, can we cancel it, reject it because they are not a voter of -- a proper voter

```
or a voter of the precinct or had become deceased
 1
 2.
     before Election Day.
          MS. WARYCHA:
                        Thank you, Matthew. That's what
 4
     I was trying to get to, but I wasn't doing a very
 5
     good job of it.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Do you have a better example
 6
     or better confirmation of this capability?
 7
                             So we can --
          MR. CHATOT:
                       Yes.
 8
 9
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Can I ask a
10
    preliminary?
11
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Let's let him finish real
12
     quick.
13
          MR. CHATOT: Oh, yeah. So, yes, that's
14
     possible within the software.
15
          MR. GOSCH:
                      That was part of the testing that
16
     we did when we were at VSTOP.
17
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Well, wait, I want to
18
     make sure we're talking about the right thing.
19
     my question was not directed to these scenarios
20
     outlined on page 19. My question is directed to
21
     the scenario which, under the new state law, there
2.2
     would be a way to retract a ballot of someone who
23
     casts a ballot and then dies before Election Day or
24
     is disenfranchised -- what's the word? -- who is,
25
     for whatever reason, they're convicted and are no
```

longer allowed to vote between the time they cast their ballot and Election Day.

And so this is my very -- this is the 100,000-foot view of this, but just that was this system tested for the ability to retract, which is not, I don't think, defined in state law but to retract those types of ballots?

MR. CHATOT: Yes.

2.2

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Okay. So then can you explain how it works, because there's nothing in any of the documentation that says how -- the basis upon which they can retract and at the same time protect the voter's privacy.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: And I think in the context of retraction, it's not only an early voter on a machine, but an early mail-in vote.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Right.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Is there a tracking mechanism for the mail-in paper ballot that's voted early to retract? Is there a tracer or a tracker?

MR. GOSCH: So there's a unique identifier with each ballot, and you can make that unique identifier human readable. That's an option in the system, and you can use that to track each individual ballot.

```
1
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: When you say "ballot," are
 2
     you speaking of both paper and electronic?
 3
          MR. GOSCH: Yes. So I was speaking of mail
 4
     ballots, but, yeah, you can do it at a polling
     location as well. It's in the call retrievable
 5
     ballots, and it prints a unique code on the ballot.
 6
     And there's also a unique code that matches that
 7
     that prints out that the poll worker would -- I'm
 8
 9
     not sure what the procedure would be. They would
10
     document that code to go back and retrieve that
11
     ballot.
12
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. Any comments from
13
     VSTOP on that or do you agree with that?
14
          MR. CHATOT:
                       No.
                            That's how we tested it.
15
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Okay. So when you do
16
     the paper ballot, are you saying that, for every
17
     absentee ballot that goes out, the clerk, when
18
     they're printing off the ballots, they just have to
19
     hit a button and it automatically puts this unique
20
     voter ID on there?
21
          MR. GOSCH: When the ballot is being built in
2.2
     the early stages in the software, it's just a
23
     simple check box to activate retrievable ballot
24
     codes.
```

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN:

Okay.

25

```
1
                      And that will make it so that it
          MR. GOSCH:
 2.
     prints that code when that ballot is printed.
 3
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN:
                                   Okay. And so then
 4
     when you have it before -- in that period of time
     before the official tally has come and it's been
 5
     early absentee vote not on paper but through ECR,
 6
     then that number there, what is that?
 7
                                            That's
     randomly generated as well voter ID or is it tied
 8
 9
     into any, like, system?
10
          MR. GOSCH:
                      So I'm not sure if I understand
11
     you correctly exactly, but it's a unique identifier
12
     on the -- for that ballot. I'm not sure how it's
13
     generated. It is random, as far as I know, but
14
     it's unique to that ballot. It won't be repeated.
15
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: But it's not tied
16
     into, like, SVRS or anything?
17
          MR. GOSCH:
                      I'm not sure what SVRS --
18
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
                                   The voter
19
     registration system.
20
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Well, the voter registration
21
     system is not necessarily necessary by the locals.
2.2
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: No, but we do have a
23
     vendor who seems to imply that, but we'll get to
24
     that.
25
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Well, what is the
```

number? So this random -- the number that's assigned to the ballot, is that number linked to anything in a voter record or is it specific to someone's voter record?

2.

2.2

MR. GOSCH: It's not tied to a specific voter for voter privacy reasons. But when that ballot is printed in the polling location or anywhere else, my example here is at a precinct, the poll worker would have a code that prints out on their, what we call, controller. It's a poll-worker-facing device. But also the ballot, when it prints out after the voter has voted, would have that same matching code that's a unique code, so later on that could be matched up, if necessary.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: How, though?

MR. GOSCH: The code the poll worker has would document, but I'm not sure what the procedures are at the county level, if they would keep that little piece of paper that prints out or if they would just document it however they document it. I'm not sure what that process is. But they would document that number, and if they needed to go back to that ballot, they can go back into the system and find that ballot using that unique, retrievable ballot code.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I guess, so -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I'll ask the co-directors if they have knowledge -- I'll start with you, Brad -- of do counties have this process and procedure in place and are they aware of this ability and is this part of their standard protocol when someone votes absentee.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I think the answer varies depending upon the county and the type of voting system involved. There's a distinct difference between the direct-record electronic voting systems and the system that we're talking about here, which is legally an optical ballot card scan system.

With regard to the optical ballot card scan systems, no, I don't think that most counties are familiar with the technology. I would have a couple of questions to pose that might help flesh this out.

One is, I understood that, with regard to the Hart system, the code number, which I'll use for shorthand, requires the active intervention of an election worker who is providing an absentee ballot either for in-person early voting or through the

mail. It's not an automatic feature of the system.

2.2

And secondly, I note that the statute that we are referring to is Indiana Code 3-11.5-4-6, which was amended in 2021. So it's not been used in an election in almost every part of the state. It provides the county election board may scan an absentee ballot that's been voted not earlier than seven days before Election Day. But it adds the proviso that the ballot first may not be tabulated, despite being scanned, and secondly, the voting system has to be able to retract a previously scanned absentee ballot card of a voter who is later found to be disqualified for one of several reasons, such as moving out of state or death or disfranchisement due to imprisonment following a conviction.

So the summary answer is no, I don't think that the counties that are using the type of voting system that this particular vendor and others are bringing forward are familiar with that protocol and using it.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I'll turn to you. So if they are instructed in that protocol, this system has the ability to do exactly what that statute provided?

```
1
                      Correct, yes. And it's in our
          MR. GOSCH:
 2.
     documentation. Whether they do it or not, I don't
 3
     know, but it's in our admin guide on how to
     activate the retrieval of ballot codes. And it
 4
 5
     specifically mentions Indiana in the guide as it
     being a feature specifically for the state.
 6
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I failed to recognize
 7
     Ms. Nussmeyer after I asked Brad. Go ahead.
 8
 9
          MS. NUSSMEYER:
                          Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
                                                     If I
10
     could just piggyback Mr. King's comments.
11
     believe what's before you all today is a
12
     recertification of an existing system. And the
13
     system was certified in 2017; is that correct?
14
     2.3.
15
          MR. CHATOT:
                       2019.
16
          MS. NUSSMEYER:
                          2019. And was this a
     component that was approved by --
17
18
          MR. CHATOT:
19
                          The retraction method, even
          MS. NUSSMEYER:
20
     though there was no law that existed on the books
21
     in 2019 regarding retraction of absentee ballots
2.2
     for optical scan ballot cards?
23
          MR. CHATOT:
                      I believe so. That was before my
     time with VSTOP, that report, but that is my
24
25
     understanding, yes.
```

MS. NUSSMEYER: So it may have been a feature of the election management software, but this Commission could not certify or otherwise allow for a procedure on a -- within a voting system that allowed for retraction because there was no state law that authorized retractions for optical scan ballot cards.

2.2

So I guess my question would be, since the law was passed in 2021 and this system expired

October 2021 and is before this body today, I would make the argument that the retraction method should not be considered as part of the system that is before the Commission today because retraction method was not contemplated when the system was certified in 2019.

And further, your report does not explicitly state that this retraction method exists in the system because I reported to my commissioners it does not. Unlike other vendors where you say in your findings and recommendations that this retraction method under the statute was thoroughly tested and the vendor provided information regarding that retraction method, I don't see that type of documentation in the report that was provided to the Division staff and to the

1 | Commission.

2.2

MR. CHATOT: Okay.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: And also, you know, I think the concern too that we have here is we have no idea how your retraction system works. You have bare minimal -- I take it that's not your area of expertise. You have bare minimal knowledge of it, so we don't know what safeguards are taken to protect voters' information. We don't know whether these numbers -- well, you say they're randomly generated, so that would make an indirect association. We don't know -- our staff has not been able to look at -- I mean, they would have all kinds of questions.

So, I mean, I guess our choices are to vote to certify the system or vote to certify the system but not the retraction method and require them to work with the staff and provide them with information and everything so that that can get done, and VSTOP.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Although I'm not sure that's appropriate here if it wasn't part of the initially approved --

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Let me ask VSTOP this: Is there a way to update and amend your current report

so that we have confirmation within the report that this is or is not included and is or is not compliant with this new statute?

DR. BYERS: Yes. We could do a supplemental test of this particular feature.

2.2

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Although my thought would be, if Angie is correct -- and maybe Brad can weigh in on this -- sorry, Ms. Nussmeyer, Mr. King. I mean, it would seem to me that I think the point that this is a recertification, this is not a new certification, so that if retraction was not part of the initial certification and it seems to me that what we're -- I mean, I thought I was asking an easy, softball question, which is a little -- so given this, if retraction wasn't part of that previously certified system, Mr. King, do you agree that it should not be part of this recertification today?

MR. KING: And, Mr. Chairman, Vice Chair Overholt, recertification implies that the Commission has before it an identical voting system from 2019. It also implies recertification of any additional feature added between that initial certification in 2019 and today.

And what I'm hearing from the representatives

of VSTOP and the vendor is that they're alleging that the -- or they're asserting that the retraction feature required by this statute, which was not originally adopted in 2021 but amended, as I indicated earlier, was included. Then I think it becomes a question of fact, which VSTOP has offered to address by a supplemental report that goes into more detail regarding precisely what the retraction method used is and whether or not that was included in the material presented to the Commission in 2019 or subsequently when the Commission voted to certify the system. So I hope that addresses the question that you posed.

2.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Let me ask this: How much time would be required to obtain additional clarity and facts and a supplemental report?

DR. BYERS: I would think that we could probably get that done within a couple of weeks.

MR. CHATOT: Yeah, definitely.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Mr. Chairman, the law didn't require retraction until last year, so the system that they got certified was in 2019. We would not be looking at the retraction method in that system in 2019, so it would be a new certification.

Additionally, the fact of whether -- what VSTOP is looking at apparently because -- and recertification was not described in the protocols for instructing VSTOP what they needed to look for and everything, so all they're simply looking at is whether it works, can you go in and retrieve the ballot that you need to retrieve, when there are other issues involved in it. Like I was saying, you need to know, okay, if these numbers are randomly generated, what are the levels of protection, who is going to have access to them. Because, I mean, if you don't have firewalls in there, someone could go in -- because they have to create a general log of the number and the name, and the number and the name means that they can go in and take a look at the ballot information, such as who they voted for and all that.

1

2.

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So we need to know how that all works, and this gentleman right here, I don't think he can explain that to us. And it needs to then be discussed with our staff members.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Well, I mean, that's what I asked. I said how much time do you need for additional facts and clarity. That's a shorthand way of saying I agree with you.

And so I have no desire to hold things up and delay for delay. So I'd love for you to have it in a week or less, and we can get the meeting going again, and you can present and provide clarity and answer these questions. But, again, I'm not trying to kick a can down the road or delay and not make a decision. I'd love to make it soon. So I guess -- yes.

2.

2.2

MR. KOCHEVAR: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Two small points on this. So we had to deal with the recertification, which back in 2019, the retraction should not have been available. That should not be a feature that, even if it was built into the system, should not have been available for use by election --

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. We've discussed this. What's the new -- I need a new point.

MR. KOCHEVAR: So the new point will be that, even if you get this discussed, you can recertify with a modification. I think that's been done before. There are also two different questions that also need to be asked really of the vendor, was that even this -- again, going back, the feature was built into the system. Did the counties know about it and have instructions on how

to use it and did you market it for them to be used, this particular piece? Because if it wasn't certified by this state and you still marketed it anyway, that is a violation, unfortunately, of our Election Code.

2.

2.2

I feel that I have to bring this up because this was brought up before with another vendor some years ago, and so I feel that we should still approach those same things. I'm not saying you should take action now, but those are questions that should probably be posed and at least get something on the record in this meeting or in a future meeting.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. Duly noted.

I'm going to withdraw my motion. I'm going to make a new motion that we table this recertification. I would ask VSTOP to expeditiously prepare a supplement to the report that addresses the questions regarding retraction that have arisen in this meeting. And once submitted, we will talk with staff about an appropriate time frame to review that before we schedule a new meeting. That's my motion. Do I have a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any discussion? 2 MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: I have a question, 3 Mr. Chairman. 4 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Yes. MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: So does this mean they have to -- are they amending their 6 recertification or are they filing a new 7 certification on just the retraction? I don't know 8 9 how the system works. 10 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I think we've given them 11 enough fodder for what we have concerns about that 12 I would hope they would take it all in and figure 13 out the best path for either recertification, 14 addressing our concerns, what have you. 15 they'll come and say we need more time. 16 they'll come and say we did mess up. Maybe they'll 17 come and say you guys have no idea what you're 18 talking about, here it is, and we want recertified. 19 That may all --20 MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: And it may not get recertification. 21 2.2 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: It may play out that way. 23 MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: I'd just like to say 24 please make sure you talk with our staff when 25 you're going through this, both VSTOP and your

company, because they are the ones who brief us about this and they're the ones who are going to have all the questions.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: There is a motion pending and a second. All in favor signify by saying "Aye."

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Aye.

MR. REDDY: Aye.

2.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Opposed?

The "ayes" have it. The motion passes and this application has been tabled with further instruction. And this did not address the engineering change order. I know you've presented on that, but we'll get to that in due course.

Okay. The recertification for 2.3 was tabled. However, if there is anyone, an interested party present in the audience who would desire to make a statement for not more than 3 minutes regarding this motion, I would now recognize you. I have one individual, and I cannot read the writing.

MS. DUNBAR: I'm Jen Dunbar.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. Thank you. We're going to take some public comment. Please stand, identify yourself, talk clearly, spell your name, and make sure that you know you're being recorded

by the court reporter right there, so she's the 1 2. main person that needs to hear you. MS. DUNBAR: Jen Dunbar, I'm a Hoosier citizen for most of my life. I'm an army brat so --4 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Jen, real quick -- I'm sorry to interrupt -- can you please confirm you took the 6 oath at the beginning of the meeting. 7 MS. DUNBAR: Oh, you know, I didn't know I was 8 9 speaking for comments. I don't think I did that, 10 but I would be glad to take an oath. 11 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Mr. Kochevar, would you mind? 12 MR. KOCHEVAR: Yes, sir. 13 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. 14 MR. KOCHEVAR: Do you solemnly swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony 15 16 you are about to give to the Indiana Election Commission is the truth, the whole truth, and 17 nothing but the truth? 18 19 MS. DUNBAR: I do. 20 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Please proceed. Thank you. 21 MS. DUNBAR: Thank you, Commission. Ι 2.2 appreciate your time and your service here. 23 It was very fortuitous that you brought up the 24 retrieval method, for that is what I had -- one of

my comments that I was going to speak on today.

25

quote for the day, I try to do a quote. I think
last time I did The Gambler with Kenny Rogers. And
I'm going to do "Keep it secret, keep it safe."
And that's a quote from Lord of the Rings from
Gandalf to Frodo regarding the ring of power, which
is very appropriate since we are talking about
elections and the power in our state.

2.2

I bring up IC 22-6-5-2, and that is the right of any individual to vote by secret ballot. I always vote early absentee in person, and I was shocked to find out that there is such a retrieval method. So I think there is a contradiction in the law that there is even a retrieval method. I understand the rationale behind it, but I do find that it nullifies the secret ballot. I mean, right now you guys, you or the company, could go look up my name with the proper legal authority and find out who I voted for.

So I guess my question is, I would certify it without the retrieval method and to consider the contradiction in the law. You're saying I have the right to a secret ballot, but on the other hand, I think most Hoosiers would be shocked that you could look up my vote right now and see who I voted for. So that was number one.

Number two, that this actually happened in Fayette County in 2011. There was a mayoral recount where they were able to -- they disqualified the voters because of some paperwork, and they were able to pull those votes out. Both their names and who they voted for were made public at the Fayette County back in 2011.

2.

2.2

So I would say that there is a contradiction in the law and that the retrieval method in all voting systems, whether DRE or optical scan, should be nullified. Thank you again for your time and service. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you for your comments.

At this time I'll recognize Brad King and then Ms. Nussmeyer for any responses specifically as it relates to the secret ballot comments we just heard.

MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I appreciate the lady's testimony in this regard. I believe that there's been a mistake in understanding the Indiana statutes involved here. What was quoted was Indiana Code Title 22, which is labor and employment law. And I'm not familiar intimately with Title 22, except to say that I suspect the language may be referring

to ballots conducted with regard to unionization or similar types of activities, not elections put on by the county election boards.

2.

2.2

I would add, in addition, that because of the nature of the election process, it is impossible in every case to keep a ballot that a voter casts entirely secret. One actual example is there are precincts in Indiana in which only one person is registered to vote. And if that person casts an absentee ballot or votes in person, vote totals for that precinct have to be reported, and so, by default, that person's choices become a matter of public record if someone wishes to avail themselves of the opportunity to see those results.

And I'll yield to Ms. Nussmeyer for any further thoughts.

MS. NUSSMEYER: Thank you, Mr. King,
Mr. Chairman. The only additional comments, I
guess, I would offer is that, ultimately, if you
vote on a ballot card or on an electronic voting
system, that your right to secret ballot is
maintained through our procedures. While your
ballot card may be sealed for a period of
22 months, your individual choices should not be
known to a person who wants to -- I don't know --

review an election 22 months down the road because they're in university and have access to the ballot.

2.2

So when a person's voting history is recorded in our Statewide Voter Registration System, it's simply an indication in a primary election which ballot the person selected. But otherwise, our federal and state laws do require us to balance the desire to run efficient and effective elections, but also maintain a person's right to secret ballot, and we have procedures in place to protect that right.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. Anyone else from the public who has comments? If not, I'll close the public comment period and turn back to VSTOP, if there's any further comments before we move on to the next item.

Okay. We'll move on to the next item.

However, I have a preliminary comment. This relates to Hart InterCivic Voting System 2.5, and in an attempt not to redo the entire conversation we just had, will we have the same issues with 2.5 in terms of retraction that we just had? And if so, I will likely make a motion that we table that as well. If there is some difference that we

```
1
     should know about before we get into the
 2.
     application, I'd be happy to talk about that as a
 3
     preliminary matter.
          MR. CHATOT: I believe the retraction method
 4
 5
     is the same between 2.3 and 2.5. Can you confirm
     that, Tyson?
 6
                      I believe so. I'd have to
 7
          MR. GOSCH:
     research a little bit to confirm that, but my
 8
 9
     understanding is yes.
10
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: It seems to me appropriate,
11
     then, that I make a motion that this application
12
     for recertification of the Hart InterCivic Voting
     System 2.5 also be tabled and subject to a
13
14
     supplemental report from VSTOP. I'd make that
15
     motion and, if there's a second, open it for
     discussion.
16
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
17
                                   Second.
18
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ:
                           Second. Any discussion by
19
     the Commission members? If this is just a
20
     different version of the same system and the same
21
     issue, I would rather not go through that.
2.2
          No further discussion. All in favor signify
23
     by saying "Aye."
24
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye.
25
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN:
                                   Aye.
```

1 MR. REDDY: Aye.

2.2

2 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Opposed "Nay."

The "ayes" have it. The Hart InterCivic

Voting System 2.5 application for recertification

of voting systems is tabled pending further

instructions, similar to the 2.3 voting system that
was tabled earlier.

The next matter before the Commission is now an engineering change order. This is with respect to Hart InterCivic Voting System engineering change orders for 2.3, 2.5 voting systems identified as Change Orders 1447/1494, 1492, 1496, and 1500. For purposes of this consideration of a change order, while we have heard a summary of the change orders, I will now recognize the co-directors and then representatives from VSTOP and ask for confirmation by the Election Division regarding the filing of this application. Mr. King.

MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll begin and then happily yield to Co-Director Nussmeyer. The applications for these engineering change orders were submitted on the IEC-11 in accordance with statute and were complete with regard to the items required by that application in state statute.

1 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you, Mr. King.

Ms. Nussmeyer.

2.2

MS. NUSSMEYER: Mr. Chairman, the only thing -- and I'll defer to Matthew because he will pull the statute up immediately. It's my understanding that a noncertified -- well, at this point both Hart systems are considered legacy systems and they cannot be modified. They have to stay in their existing form. And so I think these engineering change orders may be an improvement to the voting system, but you cannot improve a legacy system, of which both 2.3 and 2.5 would be, because they were both tabled today. At least that's my recollection of state law. Matthew's going to pull the statute. Mr. King might recall.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. While he's looking for that, Mr. King, do you have any comments?

MR. KING: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Co-Director Nussmeyer's point is well taken and that it is a recertification of two previously certified voting systems. Since you have tabled the one, tabled the main motion, if you will, for recertification, then logically, if you approve the engineering change orders, that's a modification

```
that would be contrary to what you've already done.
 1
 2.
          MR. KOCHEVAR: I believe the best answer that
 3
     I'm going to give you is going to be 3-11-7-15,
 4
     which really talks about changes or modifications
 5
     to a system. An ECO is also defined under state
     law as a non-de minimis change -- I had to think of
 6
     the word for right there -- which is a change
 7
     nonetheless. So you need to have an approved
 8
 9
     voting system to make changes to the system, so
10
     that is the statute.
11
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any comments from the fellow
     Commission members?
12
13
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: No.
                                        Seems like we
14
     should --
15
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: At this time I would make a
16
     motion that the Hart InterCivic Voting System
17
     engineering change order for Verity 2.3 and 2.5
18
     Voting Systems, Change Orders 1447/1494, 1492,
     1496, and 1500 be tabled. Is there a second?
19
20
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
                                   Second.
21
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any further discussion?
2.2
          All in favor signify by saying "Aye."
23
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye.
24
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Aye.
25
          MR. REDDY:
                      Aye.
```

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Opposed?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The "ayes" have it. The application is tabled.

We will now move to the MicroVote application for recertification of the EMS 4.4-IN 4.4 Direct-Record Electronic Voting System. Similar to prior matters before us, I will first recognize the co-directors and then representatives of VSTOP to present information regarding this application for recertification of the direct-record electronic voting system previously certified by the Commission. The documents provided by the Election Division and VSTOP regarding this system will be incorporated into the records of this proceeding. I will then recognize representatives from MicroVote to testify regarding this matter and then recognize any interested party in the audience who wishes to also provide comment.

For purposes of commencing and discussion and beginning testimony, I'll make a motion that the application submitted by MicroVote for recertification of the EMS 4.4-IN 4.4 Voting System be approved for marketing and use in Indiana for a term expiring October 1, 2025, subject to any restrictions set forth in the report submitted by

```
VSTOP. Again, I'm making this motion to begin
 1
 2.
     discussion of the application. Is there a second?
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
                                   Second.
 4
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any further discussion?
          All in favor signify by saying "Aye."
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye.
 6
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Aye.
 7
          MR. REDDY:
 8
                      Aye.
 9
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ:
                           Opposed?
10
          The "ayes" have it.
11
          Brad and Angie, please confirm for the
12
     Commission proper document compliance with Indiana
13
     Code 3-11-7.5-28 regarding filing of the
14
     application for MicroVote Direct-Record Electronic
15
     Voting Systems and note any written correspondence
16
     we received regarding this application.
17
          MR. KING:
                     Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of
18
                      The documents referenced are
     the Commission.
     behind the orange tab in the Commission members'
19
20
     binders. They include the IEC-11 application for
21
     voting system certification, which, as noted, is
2.2
     renewal of a previously certified voting system.
23
          The application material was submitted in
24
     compliance with the applicable statutes,
25
     3-11-7.5-28 in particular, and include a notice
```

that was given to the large number of counties that
currently use the MicroVote Direct-Record
Electronic Voting Systems advising them of this
pending application.

And finally, the IEC-23 form of Statement of Foreign National Ownership or Control of Vendor has been submitted, all in compliance with state statute.

2.2

And I'll yield to Co-Director Nussmeyer for additional comments.

MS. NUSSMEYER: Thank you, Mr. King. I would just add, again, we had the opportunity to review the full report and appreciate both the vendor and VSTOP pulling together the additional documentation that we requested to perfect the filing with the Commission today.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. I'll now recognize VSTOP representatives to present VSTOP's findings regarding this application.

MR. CHATOT: Thank you. This is for MicroVote, evaluation of a renewal of previously certified voting system for EMS 4.4-IN. The EMS 4.4 hardware, including the VVPAT software and firmware, is compatible with all existing Indiana certified hardware components. The current EMS 4.4

version to certify is identical to the EMS 4.4 that was previously certified for use in Indiana on July 27, 2020.

2.

2.2

The EMS 4.4 revision includes an updated panel which includes the Windows 10 operating system with a bright color display. This system also includes election management software enhancements to provide equipment tracking and status and election night reporting by location.

In addition to the mandatory precinct reporting, the equipment is now optionally assigned to locations, and then election reports can be viewed for individual locations or aggregated across multiple selected locations. This system was certified by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission on March 1, 2020, and is compliant with the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines.

Changes in this voting system are: ECO 126, which improves the trapping of stray marks, that was approved by the EAC on July 14, 2020, and the IEC on August 14, 2020; ECO 127, display running precinct and count -- count and batch count, approved by the EAC on July 14, 2020, and the IEC on August 14, 2020; ECO 132, which is a plastic paper roll retaining clip for VVPAT, approved by

```
the EAC on March 12, 2021, and the IEC on
 1
 2.
     August 18, 2021; ECO 134, the All-In Voting Station
     VB2, Revision A, approved by the EAC on August 18,
 3
     2021, and approved by the IEC on August 18, 2021;
 4
 5
     and new is ECO 135, is the 156K Tally card and
     updated Vote N card. This was approved by the EAC
 6
 7
     on November 9, 2021.
          Recommendation. On the basis of VSTOP's
 8
     review and evaluation, we find that the voting
 9
10
     system referenced herein and with the scope of
11
     certification meets all requirements of the Indiana
12
     Code for use in the state of Indiana.
13
     includes -- this finding includes compliance with
14
     the legal requirements for voters with
15
     disabilities.
16
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. Anything further?
17
          MR. CHATOT:
                       I'll hold the ECO for now.
18
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Yes, please.
19
          I'll now open for discussion of commissioners.
20
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Well, I guess since
```

we had to ask the last time, so was a retraction method -- does this system have a retraction method and was it tested as part of the recertification process?

MR. CHATOT: Yes. It does, yes.

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
1
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Can you just expand on that
 2.
     and provide us just the detail or commentary.
          MR. CHATOT: Yeah. Okay. So this would be
 4
     handled by the county board in a hand count for
     ballot retraction.
 5
          MS. NUSSMEYER: For what?
 6
         VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Ballot retraction.
 7
         MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Just for a hand
 8
 9
     count?
10
          MR. CHATOT: For the deceased candidate, it
11
     would be handled by --
12
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Wait, wait, wait.
13
     We're not talking about that. It's not the
14
     deceased candidate; it's a voter.
15
          MR. CHATOT: Okay. Sorry. That would be
16
    manual count and remarking of the ballot prior to
17
     scanning.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I do see a member of
18
19
    MicroVote. If you want to come up and we'll take
20
     questions.
21
         MR. HIRSCH: Sure. Happy to answer your
2.2
    questions.
23
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thanks. I think you heard
     the question pending. If you want to provide any
24
     commentary, that would be great.
25
```

MR. HIRSCH: I'm Bernie Hirsch with MicroVote, So ballot retraction has been handled for the CIO. many, many years, as you know, in Indiana with our For our DREs, which usually is 97 percent system. of the votes that come in, we have a special Vote N card where the jurisdiction can input an N number. Normally it's the voter ID, but it's separate from the voting system. That's determined usually by the e-poll book with the SVRS system. At any rate, it's separate from our voting system. A number is input when the voter votes early on a machine, and then that number can be used to retract their vote without ever knowing how they voted on Election Day.

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

For the paper optical scan ballots that are mailed in, which is normally about 3 percent of our volume, that's always handled on Election Day. We never even open those until Election Day. Now, there could be procedures that are implemented if the county wanted to open them early, but I don't really see that as happening, because even in 2020 when we had a great increase in the volume, our system just simply scaled up and they just had a few more counting boards to open more envelopes on Election Day. Either way, we were all done by 8 or

9 o'clock at night.

2.2

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I guess, if I might,
I guess the question is, so on the paper ballots
that go out for absentee voting, is there -- was
part of this recertification any system for putting
some sort of identifier on those paper ballots?

MR. HIRSCH: There's no accommodation for putting any kind of voter, indirect or direct, identification directly onto the ballot. I would suggest as a procedure which is outside of our voting system that you could put a voter number determined outside of our voting system on the secrecy envelope at the time that it's separated from the outer envelope where it contains the actual voter ID.

So you could have the direct information -the voter's name, address, all that, birth date,
signature -- verified, separate the secrecy
envelope, write some voter ID number on that
secrecy envelope, and if you wanted to scan those
early, you hand that to the scanning team. They
separate the ballot, scan it, put it back as
they're doing it, because, remember, in our system,
each individual ballot is scanned one at a time
into our system. It's not done in batches. You

could take it out of the secrecy envelope and put it right back in.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: And that scenario would arise when a county elects to count within seven days prior to the election; correct?

MR. HIRSCH: Yes. And the wording you had was may, may count in seven days. So if they decided to do that, which I don't really see a county doing that, then that's how they could do it.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: And that's a procedural thing outside of the certification?

MR. HIRSCH: Right.

2.2

MS. NUSSMEYER: Sorry, Mr. Chair, but I just want to briefly point that 3-11-10-26.2 actually requires a direct-record electronic voting system, not the optical scan component but the actual touch-screen component, it requires that, if the DRE is going to be used for in-person absentee voting, that the county election board has to create a policy about how a spoiled absentee ballot is to be cancelled in a DRE voting system.

So that's different than an optical scan where you might print an identifier on the paper ballot card that's a permanent record of the voter versus entering that unique identifier to retract a ballot

in the electronic voting system where you don't have actual access to the voter's choices and how they picked.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: What are you differentiating from?

MS. NUSSMEYER: So I think what Mr. Hirsch is saying, there's two components, right. For the DRE voting system, if you want to vote on Election Day or during in-person absentee voting, right, state law, there's a commandment that that retraction method be available in the MicroVote voting system to be able to delete a ballot if a person passes away or is disfranchised or is challenged on residence; right.

MR. HIRSCH: Yes.

2.

2.2

MS. NUSSMEYER: The optical scan piece is separate because the optical scan tabulators have their own separate laws where retraction really isn't defined or there's no commandment other than, if you want to prescan seven days before Election Day, you can.

So I just want to make sure that the Commission understood there is a statute that mandates that.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you.

1 Mr. King, any response to that?

2.2

MR. KING: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, Co-Director Nussmeyer has accurately set forth the requirements and the statute that's applicable to the direct-record electronic, which, as I noted earlier, is a very different type of system than the optical scan ballot card voting system in this regard.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: So it seems to me also there will certainly likely be a new training item on clerks' agenda for upcoming meetings, I would assume.

MR. KING: Uh-huh.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: So when you're talking about generating a voter ID number for the retraction, did I hear you correctly, did you say that that would be a number you could get from the SVRS or the voter ID that the clerk has or what?

MR. HIRSCH: So that's external to our voting system, whatever number is used. In Indiana, normally they've been using a voter ID number, but that, again, is a procedure outside of our voting system. We don't care what number they use as long as it's unique for that voter. And then on Election Day, if they need to retract someone, they

```
simply give us the list of numbers that they want
 1
 2.
     to retract, and we have no idea. The people doing
 3
     the work on Election Day can't link that number
 4
     back to a voter unless they have access to a
 5
     completely different system than ours.
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: So are you saying,
 6
 7
     then, that the county makes the decision whether
     they want to use the voter ID or social security
 8
 9
     number from the SVRS or that type of thing?
10
          MR. HIRSCH:
                       Correct.
11
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: And then they tell
12
     you that?
13
          MR. HIRSCH: Correct.
14
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: And then you set it
15
     up so that the ballots print out that way?
16
          MR. HIRSCH: No, no, no. There's no ballot to
17
    print.
18
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Oh, yeah, that's
19
     right.
20
          MR. HIRSCH: The number is input at the time
21
     the poll worker activates the voting machine for
2.2
     voting for that voter.
23
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Okay. So that's the
24
     county's decision. So then when you go to -- you
25
     have to go in -- okay. So what kind of
```

protections -- and this is the same thing we asked the other. What kind of protections do you have? So if someone sitting in the clerk's office wants to get into a little mischief, particularly since now if they can tie it into the SVRS, they can go in there and look up the number and --

2.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Well, let me ask how that's relevant to a vendor who has a machine? How is a mischievous clerk employee relevant to this discussion?

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Because it then provides an opening for the information, private information of a voter, and makes it possible for them to go in and look at the ballot. And as was explained, that is supposed to be our number one thing, privacy and the security of their ballot.

MR. HIRSCH: And, Commissioner, the answer to that question is, the person in the office can't see how the person voted. When they use the retraction feature, it only shows that they voted, not how they voted. That's never displayed in our EMS software to the user.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: But is it possible -VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Karen, just to
clarify, what I hear him saying, though, is that

1 it's not a function of their system. The way their 2. system works, they're inputting numbers provided by someone else. So it really goes to the point of, 3 4 if it's the county election board, the clerk's 5 office, whatever providing the numbers, it's not a function of the system. They're providing a 6 mechanism in the system for such numbers to be 7 8 entered, but it's not the system that is doing 9 anything about the numbers.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: I know.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: So, to me, that is a question that goes back to the county election officials or whomever that they had --

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: No, no, because what it goes to is that when they've created -- they might give them the numbers, but those numbers go into their software. And they have to then in their software -- the county clerk has the name and the number, so the software then retrieves according to the number; correct? So if I'm --

MR. HIRSCH: When you say "retrieve," it doesn't show on the screen or in a printout how that individual ballot was cast.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: And that's the question I'm trying to get to is that -- and that's

```
what I want to know. So in the act of retrieval,
 1
 2.
     retraction, that doesn't show. But if I have that
 3
     information and I'm able to get into the system,
     can I access it through another way or do you have
 4
 5
     firewalls built up in there?
          MR. HIRSCH: We have protections to prevent a
 6
     user from being able to see that information.
 7
     not displayed on the software.
 8
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Okay. Great.
10
     that was not tested by you all, right, because it
11
     wasn't part of the protocols?
12
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Well, it was tested to
13
     determine it was compliant with Indiana Code and
14
     all applicable regulations required for
15
     certification.
16
          So my next question will be, I believe this
17
     was in your final statement, but your
18
     recommendation was, based upon your review and
19
     evaluation, that this machine is compliant with all
20
     applicable Indiana codes and regulations; is that
21
     correct?
2.2
          MR. CHATOT:
                      Correct.
23
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any further discussion?
24
          There's a motion on the table. All in favor
```

25

signify by saying "Aye."

1 VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye. 2 MR. REDDY: Aye. CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Aye. 4 Opposed? MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: I'm going to say no because I think they have the obligation to show 6 that there's privacy and all that is protected and 7 your ballot is protected. And that --8 9 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. The motion 10 passes. 11 MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: And that wasn't done. 12 And I'm allowed to finish my sentence as a member 13 of this Commission. 14 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: The next matter before the 15 Commission is with respect to an engineering change 16 order, MicroVote Direct-Record Electronic Voting 17 System EMS 4.4 Engineering Change Order 135. Similar to our prior format, I'll recognize 18 19 co-directors and then representatives from VSTOP to 20 present information regarding this application for 21 approval of the change order. Documents provided 2.2 by the Election Division and VSTOP regarding this 23 engineering change order will be incorporated into

the record. I will then recognize representatives

of MicroVote to testify regarding this matter and

24

25

then anyone interested in the audience who desires to testify.

For purposes of commencing discussion and testimony, I'll move that the application submitted by MicroVote for approval of this engineering change order be approved for marketing and use in Indiana for a term expiring October 1, 2025, subject to any restrictions set forth in the report submitted by VSTOP. Again, I'm making this motion to commence testimony and discussion. Is there a second?

MR. REDDY: Second.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any further discussion?

Okay. At this time I will request that Brad and Angie confirm proper document compliance with Indiana Code 3-11-7.5-28.19 regarding the filing of this application for an engineering change order to the MicroVote voting system and that you please provide the Commission with any written correspondence it received regarding this specific application.

MR. KING: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, to confirm, yes, the engineering change orders previously referenced by the Chair were properly submitted on the IEC-11 application.

```
1
     Information was provided that was required by that
 2.
     application and is in the materials submitted by
     VSTOP and appears to be in compliance with Indiana
 3
 4
     statutes that you referenced.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you, Mr. King.
 6
          Ms. Nussmeyer.
 7
          MS. NUSSMEYER: I have nothing further,
     Mr. Chair.
 8
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you.
10
          I'll now recognize VSTOP representatives to
11
     present VSTOP's findings regarding this
12
     application.
13
          MR. CHATOT:
                       Thank you. ECO No. 135 is the
14
     Model No. 156K Tally and Vote N card.
                                             The current
15
     Tally and Vote N card platforms are end of life
16
     with manufacturer. Therefore, functionality has
17
     been transferred to current manufacturing with
18
     Smartcard platform, while also increasing the
19
     capacity of Tally card with an additional
20
     26,288 bytes of memory.
          Members of the VSTOP team have reviewed the
21
```

ECO and supporting documents and VS -- voting system testing laboratory reports. VSTOP finds that this ECO complies with the requirements for de minimis changes to hardware components. It was

2.2

23

24

25

```
1
    determined that the submitted updates will not
2.
    adversely affect system reliability, functionality,
3
    capacity -- capability -- excuse me -- or
    operation. No change to firmware or software is
4
5
    required. The ECO only applies to the specific
    EMS 4.4-IN Voting System noted in the table above.
6
    And MicroVote EMS 4.4-IN is EAC certified and was
7
    approved, and this ECO was also approved by the
8
9
    EAC.
```

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I'll now open it to fellow Commission members for any discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I actually -- so -sorry. This goes back to the vote we just took
because it affects the ability to approve the
change order. I may have misunderstood kind of a
material factor with respect to the MicroVote
system, that I thought it was somehow different
from Hart in terms of whether or not the retraction
issue was part of the originally certified system.

And in looking at these materials again quickly, I don't think that it was, which I think raises that same issue that was presented by Hart as to whether we can actually recertify -- well, first of all, the question whether retraction is

```
part of this recertification and, if it is, if the
 1
 2.
     retraction was included in the original
     certification of the system.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. Mr. King, do you have
 4
 5
     any comment on that?
                    Mr. Chairman, members of the
 6
          MR. KING:
     Commission, my understanding from previous
 7
     Commission consideration of the MicroVote system is
 8
     the retraction feature that was described in
 9
10
     MicroVote's testimony and VSTOP's presentation has
11
     been a part of the basic MicroVote system for many
12
     years and so is not, in fact, a new component that
13
     would not fall within the heading of
14
     recertification.
15
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: And is it all right
16
     if I ask --
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Yes. Go ahead.
17
18
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I know you were
19
     shaking your head yes, but could you --
20
          MR. HIRSCH: It's been a part of our system
     for over 20 years.
21
                         Indiana has retracted votes as
2.2
     long as I've been at MicroVote, which is almost
23
     20 years.
24
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I don't want to
25
     reopen the whole conversation. I just --
```

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: No. I agree. But there's a difference between being part of their system and being recertified. It could be part of their system for years, but we never looked at it before.

2.

2.2

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Well, I guess has staff -- because I don't want to be confused on this. I don't want to belabor the point, but I also want to make sure I'm clear in my understanding of staff's understanding of what was being considered for this recertification.

MS. NUSSMEYER: Certainly, Commissioner. The statutes under which MicroVote operate as a direct-record electronic voting system are different than the statutes that an optical scan ballot card voting system operate under. And the retraction method under Hart, which is an optical scan voting system, the retraction method or the idea of retraction was a statute that was introduced in 2021.

The language that I mentioned under 3-11-10-26.2 has been around for a very long time. I don't know how many years but at least since DREs were approved for use in the state of Indiana. And that feature would have to have been incorporated

in any sort of certification before the Commission because the county election board has a commandment that, if you are going to use this system for in-person absentee voting, you must be able to assign a unique identifier to be able to delete the ballot in a blind way from the system should the person pass away, be found otherwise ineligible before the election.

2.

2.2

So there is a substantial distinction between the two types of voting systems that we're contemplating, and the optical scan component of the MicroVote system does not contemplate a retraction method because the system isn't set up or designed to do that.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Okay. Thank you. I now feel much better about my understanding of the situation, and just I'll state for the record it appeared I do see a difference -- I thought I saw a difference, and that has now been verified between the MicroVote and the Hart.

MR. HIRSCH: I think the intent of that new law was trying to reach equity between the optical scan system and what the DREs were always able to do.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Thank you. All

```
right. I apologize, but thank you.
 1
 2.
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: And I apologize for
     my confusion on that as well.
 4
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Mr. King, any response or
 5
     comment to Ms. Nussmeyer's?
          MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, just to say I agree
 6
     entirely with Ms. Nussmeyer's remarks.
 7
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ:
                           Thank you.
 8
 9
          I have a question for VSTOP. Are these
10
     considered de minimis change orders or are these --
11
          MR. CHATOT:
                      Yes.
12
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: They are?
13
          MR. CHATOT:
                      Yes.
14
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any further questions on
15
     these pending change orders?
16
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: None from me.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: At this time there's a motion
17
     on the floor. All in favor for approving the
18
19
     change orders before us signify by saying "Aye."
20
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Aye.
21
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Aye.
2.2
          MR. REDDY:
                      Aye.
23
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Opposed?
24
          The "ayes" have it. The change orders are
25
     approved.
```

Just give me one minute here.

2.2

You know, I apologize. I needed to open it up to the public as well and I did not. So we still want to hear from you if you want to please come up and state your name. I apologize for taking the vote before we had a chance to hear your comments.

MS. DUNBAR: Thank you. Once again, my name is Jen Dunbar. Thank you again for taking public comments. You all are appreciated.

Again, to the theme keep it secret, keep it safe, the one thing from the last one for the right of the secret ballot, that there is no, right now -- and I agree with Ms. Nussmeyer about the policies and procedures would help keep it secret and safe.

But the question is, how do we, when it's in a computer, follow that to make sure those policies and procedures are followed. There's no way. Like in the old days, if they were stuck in the ballot box or whatever, you could see that, like, oh, wait why are you... You could look at the names and say, hey, this person is not eligible to vote, et cetera.

But how do we know that somebody didn't look at my vote? You have to look at the logs in the

computers, and I don't know that that's ever been done or there's a mechanism to do that. You know, the risk-limiting audits won't find that if somebody's done something poorly and looked at who I voted for, so that would be my question, to in the future consider ways to make sure your policies and procedures for a secret vote are kept.

2.

2.2

So in the keep it secret, keep it safe part, the safe part, I guess the question I have is that if you need VSTOP, if you need CISA, the Council on Cyber Security, and FireEye, is it really that safe in the beginning? You know what I'm saying? And then we hire FireEye and they're the company, the cyber security that's supposed to keep from hacking our systems, and they were hacked in 2020. So I just put that out there that I think we were safer with the hanging chads, the pull levers. I think we were safer with paper ballots.

So the last thing I'll say, because I'm not sure if there's another public speaking, was there's something miraculous that occurred that all the election integrity groups, including Indiana Vote by Mail, Free Speech for People, the League of Women Voters, and Verified Voting and Indiana First Audit, which is the citizens group that I volunteer

```
with, they all -- they recently submitted a letter
 1
 2.
     both to legislation, the county clerks for
     supporting paper ballots over machines.
 3
 4
          So, again, thank you for your service.
 5
     appreciate your time and hearing me.
                                            Thank you.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you for your comments
 6
     and participation in this hearing.
 7
          I'll now turn to our co-directors to see if
 8
 9
     they have any responses or comments.
10
          MR. KING:
                     No.
                          Thank you again to the lady
11
     for participating and offering remarks, but I have
12
     nothing to add.
13
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Ms. Nussmeyer.
14
          MS. NUSSMEYER: I have nothing further to add.
15
     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
16
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ:
                           Thank you.
17
          Moving on, final matter before the Commission
18
     with respect to recertification -- or certification
19
     is the Unisyn OpenElect 2.2 Voting System.
20
          Before I get into this, however, let me ask
21
     this question to the staff: We've heard of kind of
2.2
     two statutory regimes based upon the machines and
23
     based upon the retraction issue. Can you provide
```

us which regime statutory construct this falls

24

25

within?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, thank you for that complicated but very important question. The answer is the Unisyn system is described on the agenda itself as a hybrid voting system, but under Indiana law, it's defined as an optical scan ballot card system. And therefore, it is under the same statutory provisions of Hart InterCivic as opposed to MicroVote Corporation.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay.

2.

2.2

MS. NUSSMEYER: And, Mr. Chairman, if I might, as a reminder, this is not a recertification of the Unisyn system. This is a new application for a voting system, although I entirely agree with Mr. King that this is an optical scan voting system and those statutes would apply here.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: As opposed to starting this with a motion, I'll propose that we start simply with the presentations and then open it for discussion, and we can determine the appropriate motion at the time.

So as we've handled all these prior today, I will recognize the co-directors and then representatives from VSTOP to present information regarding this application for approval of a new type of optical scan voting system. The documents

provided by the Election Division and VSTOP regarding the system will be incorporated into the records of this proceeding. I will then recognize any representative from Unisyn to testify regarding this matter and then open the floor to the public who wishes to provide comment.

2.

2.2

For purposes of commencing this process, I will ask Brad and then Angie to confirm proper document compliance with Indiana Code 3-11-7 and Indiana Code 3-11-7.5 regarding the filing of an application for Unisyn Open Elect 2.2 Voting System and to provide -- and to please provide the Commission with any correspondence you received regarding this application. Mr. King.

MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. The material regarding this voting system can be found behind the second white tab labeled "Unisyn OpenElect 2.2" in your binders.

The material includes the IEC-11 application, which, as was noted, is for certification of a new voting system. The application with the required payment of fee was submitted to the Election Division and reviewed by VSTOP for completeness, and we are advised that the application material referenced in the IEC-11 is complete.

There are approximately six counties in Indiana that use another version of the Unisyn voting system, but they were not specifically notified regarding this application for a new voting system because, again, it's not a recertification.

2.

2.2

We've also included the IEC-23 -- oh, I should mention -- I'm sorry -- in the material, the list of existing counties using other versions are Floyd, Jackson, Montgomery, Posey, St. Joseph, and Vigo Counties.

And then the vendor has submitted the IEC-23, Statement of National Ownership or Control of Vendor, and I believe the vendor has submitted a complete application in accordance with the statute you referenced earlier.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you.

Ms. Nussmeyer, do you have any comments?

MS. NUSSMEYER: The only other comments I would make, Mr. Chairman, is again thanking VSTOP and the vendor for addressing the additional questions we posed as part of the report packet, and those questions were answered, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you.

I'll now recognize VSTOP representatives to

present their findings with respect to this application.

2.

2.2

MR. CHATOT: Thank you. This is for Unisyn
Voting Solutions, Incorporated, certification of a
new voting system. The Unisyn OpenElect Voting
System, here forward called OVS, provides a
complete system for election definition, ballot
printing, voting at the polls, scanning and
tabulation of ballots, as well as early voting and
handling absentee and provisional ballots at the
central site for tabulation, accumulation, and
reporting results.

The OVS is a ballot precinct voting system that offers both precinct and central tabulation. The OVS consists of the OpenElect central suite, OCS, installed at an election headquarters location; the OpenElect voting devices, OVDs, for use at the polls and for early voting; and the OpenElect voting central scan, OVCS, bulk scanner for use at a central location.

This system was certified by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission on November 18, 2021, and is compliant with the Voluntary Voting Systems

Guidelines. The Voting System is a modification of OpenElect 2.1, which was certified in Indiana until

- 1 | that certification expired on October 1, 2021.
- 2 | Changes introduced in this voting system are ECO
- 3 No. 17120, which adds a Dell Latitude 5220 to
- 4 OpenElect. This was approved by the EAC on
- 5 November 22, 2021.
- 6 Findings and limitations. Previous
- 7 | certification of OpenElect listed the limitation to
- 8 disable electronic ballot adjudication. This
- 9 | limitation is now subject to IC 3-11-15-13.8.
- 10 | VSTOP has verified that the adjudication software
- 11 | is a part of the election managements system, EMS,
- 12 | certified by the Election Assistance Commission as
- 13 part of the voting system. Such adjudication must
- 14 be conducted in compliance with Indiana law. The
- 15 | FET is capable of ballot retraction as allowed in
- 16 | SV260 in 2021 legislation IC 3-11.5-4-6. More
- 17 | information on that process is included in the
- 18 | Attachment 11.
- 19 On the basis of VSTOP's review and evaluation,
- 20 | the voting system referenced herein and with the
- 21 | scope of certification meets all requirements of
- 22 | the Indiana Code for use in the state of Indiana.
- 23 | This finding includes compliance with the legal
- 24 requirements for voters with disabilities.
- 25 And if you would like me to address the ECO

```
now, I can, or I can wait.
 1
 2
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: We have an ECO for this?
          MR. CHATOT:
                       Yes.
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: How can there be an
 4
 5
     ECO if it's a new system? I quess I don't
     understand that. Sorry, Mr. Chairman.
 6
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Mr. King, I don't recall
 7
     having an ECO in this.
 8
 9
          MR. KING: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no ECO
10
     on the agenda with regard to Unisyn.
11
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. With that, anything
12
     further from VSTOP?
13
          MR. CHATOT:
                       No.
14
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I'll open it to fellow
15
     commissioners for any questions or discussions.
16
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Well, I mean, my
17
     understanding is that this system is one where the
18
     retraction issue that we discussed with respect to
19
     Hart InterCivic and the same requirements apply,
20
     and I've got similar concerns just about -- I know
21
     this is a new system, but as to what processes
2.2
     might have been used to review the retraction
23
     process.
24
          And I think I would like for this to go back
25
     to VSTOP, you know, for us to be able to gather
```

some more information because I feel like we're acting and it's a new realm here, a new statute, and I feel like we need some more information before we are in a position to actually decide whether to approve the system. That's my comment.

2.

2.2

MR. CHATOT: Retraction was tested during the field test, and the final attachment in this application details the process, Attachment No. 11.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I guess in looking at that, I'm just concerned about specificity in terms of the guidelines that are going to be used, what protocols are going to be followed in terms of determining what individual identifiers are going to be used, whether they link in any way to an individual voter, the protections that may be in place, those types of issues, and I don't see that addressed here.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Okay. So we have the same issue. I do see representatives from Unisyn or counsel for Unisyn, if you want to state your name and respond to any comment of the Commission.

MS. BOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. My name is Lauren Box, B-o-x, like cardboard. I'm an attorney at Barnes & Thornburg. This is my colleague Jake German, G-e-r-m-a-n, like

the country. We are here representing Unisyn. And we were not planning on making a formal presentation, but we are certainly happy to try to address any questions or concerns that you might have.

2.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you. Well, so we have a whole issue of just understanding the retraction and understanding how this works and seeking additional information from VSTOP. I mean, I also have items that I want to understand and diligence as it relates to filings that were included with this, specifically the IEC-23. I just -- there's a reason those are required to be filed. I want to understand and talk to the appropriate people about that filing, so there's a second reason that I am particularly not ready to vote on this. So stating that for the record simply that I would support a motion to table this.

Having said that, if there's any information that VSTOP would like to provide us now about the retraction or if you believe it would be more appropriate in a supplemental, I'd be happy to listen to that as well. Or, Ms. Box, if you have comments as well.

MS. BOX: Could I just ask a clarification

question, Mr. Chairman?

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Sure.

MS. BOX: So my understanding is that VSTOP, because this is a new application, that VSTOP did, in fact, review and test the retraction process and provided a review and investigation of that as part of the application. I don't know if that's a question best posed for you or for VSTOP.

VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: We understand that —
I mean, yes, so we have information here indicating that VSTOP did — that there was testing for the retraction process. I guess I should be more clear the concern I have is that this is a new — so it's a new law, that for other requirements that apply to voting systems, the Commission — the Election Division staff and VSTOP have kind of worked together and developed protocols for testing systems on these various state law requirements and that this particular — you know, there are not specifics included in the testing protocols, the certification protocols that address the statute that was passed — or that went into effect last year.

So my concern is that, when we were talking about a method of tracking ballots, which is what

this retraction -- I mean, it's imposing a method of tracking certain types of ballots for very specific purposes, and I think it's critical to understand how those requirements are going to be implemented, what type of information is going to be tied to a ballot or to that number and kind of what happens with those. I mean, basically it comes to, you know, to make sure that that -- if it's a deceased voter, that the world isn't able to figure out that that deceased voter voted for Joe Smith right before the voter died, to simplify it, because that's about the level I can understand it at this point.

2.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: And the other thing I think we're looking for is confirmation of the scope of testing for the withdrawal of the ballot in terms of we would like confirmation -- there's a variety of ways a ballot can be retracted, and we want confirmation that each scenario was tested.

Brad, maybe you can provide some of those scenarios, but we need confirmation that that testing, in our minds, was adequate and covered the full scope. Can you give some examples.

MR. KING: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. In discussions with

VSTOP, which I understand reflect information 1 2. obtained from the vendor, it was my understanding 3 that the Unisyn system does have the ability to 4 retract an absentee ballot -- or retract a ballot 5 that is voted in person, whether that's on Election Day or prior to Election Day during early voting, 6 by the addition of a code number to thermal paper 7 that would then allow the ballot of the 8 disqualified voter to be extracted from the system. 10 But I also understand that this retraction feature 11 is not in place with regard to absentee ballots 12 that are sent through the mail to voters who are, 13 by definition, not appearing in person.

So my understanding is that there is a retraction method more detailed than what was before the Commission with Hart InterCivic's application, but not comprehensive with regard to any type of absentee ballot that might be scanned and, therefore, would be subject to the retraction procedure specified by state law.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. GERMAN: And just to elaborate a bit more, it does seem like that there is a distinction between the issues that were raised earlier and the issues that have been raised for the Unisyn system in that it is a very limited, limited necessarily

retraction piece. I think that's what Mr. King was 1 2. getting at there. 3 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Well, yeah. He's getting at 4 what we would like more confirmation from VSTOP on 5 that the retraction that's required covers the full scope of possible retractions, i.e., not only 6 in-person machine, but also mail-in absentee. 7 8 MS. BOX: And we can speak generally to how 9 the process would work, but as to the testing and 10 the scope of the testing, all of those questions 11 would have to be directed to VSTOP. 12 MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Mr. Chair? 13 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Yes. 14 MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Can we call upon 15 Co-Director Nussmeyer to address the concerns that 16 are present regarding the lack of documentation and 17 such in the report. 18 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: In the VSTOP testing report? 19 MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Yeah. 20 CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Well, I hope she does because 21 that would give clarity to what we would like in 2.2 the supplemental. And, again, I hope we can have 23 this hearing very soon. 24 MS. NUSSMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Chair,

Commissioner. In addition to the points Mr. King

25

raised, which were concerns raised by myself and my team as well at least reading the report, there have been representations made by RBM that the voter identification number found in SVRS would be the unique identifier that is printed on the ballot card and that would be the recommendation of the vendor to use.

2.

2.2

And in my view, linking a number directly out of our Statewide Voter Registration System in such a way and printing it on a ballot card that is a permanent record that is maintained by the county is not maintaining a voter's right to secret ballot because that permanent record exists on the ballot card. And it's my understanding, based on emails that we reached out -- my team and I reached out to vendors last summer regarding retraction features, that the ballot image itself would also maintain that unique identifier and those images would be available to staff to look at as well.

So those are concerns, and I think VSTOP probably needs to give some recommendations to the Commission so that we can provide best practices to counties that, if they're going to employ retraction methods for optical scan ballot cards, that we're doing it -- and even DRE systems, that

we're doing it in a way that maintains the voter's right to secret ballot.

2.

2.2

While I understand the system is built against the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines 1.0, the 2.0 standards do talk about a recallable ballot, which is generally applied to provisional ballots, but the guidance in the VVSG 2.0 say that a recallable ballot should not use direct voter information like a voter's first name, last name, driver's license number, or voter ID number.

And so whatever instructions that the vendor is providing to the counties, I think, needs to be contemplated by the Commission as part of their purview, but also some reassurance that the numbers being used by county election administrators are not those that are directly linkable to a voter because the county voter registration file and an individual voter registration record are public information.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you, Ms. Nussmeyer.

Brad, would you like to add any comment?

MR. KING: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

members of the Commission. Again, I'm in general

agreement with Co-Director Nussmeyer regarding the

points raised.

I would add for perspective that, in the past when the Commission has considered the approval of voting system application or recertification of a voting system, that the Commission, in my view, has acted within its scope by imposing conditions upon recertification that the vendor must meet. For example, one vendor many years ago was required to post a sizable performance bond because the Commission had a concern regarding whether particular functionality that the voting system vendor was providing would be fully functional and be in compliance with statute.

2.2

And so I bring this before the Commission as a matter for a future meeting. If you receive information regarding these systems from the VSTOP program, I think you do have the legal authority to impose conditions upon the vendor within the framework of Indiana statutes.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you, Mr. King.

Anything else from VSTOP regarding this matter?

MR. CHATOT: No, not at this moment.

MS. BOX: I would just ask, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that there were questions that were posed to Unisyn throughout the process about

additional information that was requested. My
request here would be, are we going to receive a
list of the additional questions or information
that you need or how will we receive that so that
we know that we're fully complying with the request
of the Commission?

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Yeah. That's a good question. Brad, I think what we should do is if you could work with the staff on kind of summarizing the Commission's concerns that you heard here today as it relates to compliance with the retraction and the scope of retraction in terms of not only machine, but the paper early ballots. And I think it goes to more of what we want VSTOP to show us in terms of their testing as opposed to specific questions, but we'll -- and it may morph as we work with VSTOP on that.

I guess I would also ask VSTOP -- I hate causing delays, and so I feel like I am causing delays. So if we could do this as quickly as possible, and then we'll try to get this scheduled right away.

DR. BYERS: We want it to be right.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Correct, yes.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Mr. Chairman, since

we have two co-directors, can we have them work equally together on that, please?

2.

2.2

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Yes. When I said "staff," I was hoping it would be the co-directors. That would be the desired method.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, just to respond, it was my intent to work with Co-Director Nussmeyer in crafting a letter that we could both agree to that would summarize the subject matter that the Commission is requesting additional information about.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: And so, again, to harp on I hate causing delays, these two companies have economic interests in getting this done quickly, so I want to be back here as soon as possible.

DR. BYERS: Mr. Chairman, with the blessing of the Commission, we would like to propose, should additional testing be needed, that we be able to do it remotely in order to expedite the process of testing as much as possible. There is some precedent for doing this with electronic poll book testing, and we would like to be able to implement that, if you would approve. That would save a lot of time with regard to the transportation of equipment. We could do it electronically through

```
Zoom, and we could videotape it the same way or
 1
 2.
     very similarly as we would an in-person test.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ:
                           Thank you for the request,
     and I'll ask the co-directors if they see any issue
 4
 5
     with allowing that. I have none.
                    Mr. Chairman, no, the Commission, I
 6
          MR. KING:
     think, certainly has the ability to authorize the
 7
     type of testing that's being requested by VSTOP.
 8
 9
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Did you mention utilizing
10
     Zoom or Teams or --
11
          DR. BYERS: Yes, something of that nature.
12
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: -- something that could be
13
     recorded so you could preserve the record?
14
          DR. BYERS: Yes. And we have secure VPN.
15
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Ms. Nussmeyer.
16
          MS. NUSSMEYER: The only issue, if I might,
17
     Mr. Chairman, would be -- I don't have an issue
18
     with the remote testing, but if there's an issue or
19
     concern that is raised during field tests and you
20
     need to get your hands on the equipment and have it
21
     transported to your offices, that, you know, you do
2.2
     your due diligence and that, if that is required,
23
     that that be followed through on.
24
          DR. BYERS:
                      Absolutely.
25
          MS. NUSSMEYER: But otherwise, I don't have an
```

issue with remote testing.

2.2

DR. BYERS: We will absolutely do that.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any further comments from the Commission?

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: I think there was also a question about a ballot card that you all produced that didn't have the party designation next to each candidate. So I was just wondering if there was something -- there was no explanation as to why that was missing.

MS. BOX: I think if you could just include that as part of the additional information that you're requesting, we would be happy to provide whatever additional information that you need.

MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Anything else?

At this time I'll open this matter, this application for voting system certification, to the floor. I have one individual who has signed up, and three minutes for public comment.

MS. DUNBAR: I just have one sentence. Again, Jen Dunbar. The question -- I don't know if this is for the Commission or for more of a legislative thing, but I feel strongly that all of the firms, be it Unisyn, ES&S, MicroVote, Hart InterCivic,

```
1
     et cetera, et cetera, their ownership structure
 2
     should be available for the public to know since --
     I mean, how do we know candidates don't own these?
 3
 4
          I just think transparency is key, which is
     there foreign ownership, is it American ownership,
 6
     that that should be something that either VSTOP
 7
     could find out or the Commission, or is that
     something that needs to be handled legislatively
 8
 9
     that it needs to be required that ownership
10
     structures of the companies should be put out
11
     there. And that's all.
12
          Thank you again for your service.
                                             Ι
13
     appreciate it.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Thank you for coming.
14
15
     believe there are filings that you can look up to
     find out that.
16
17
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN: You want the IEC-23.
18
          MS. DUNBAR:
                       Okay. Thank you.
19
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: With that, we've concluded
20
     the business on the agenda. Any old business or --
21
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: I don't think we
22
            Did we vote?
     voted.
23
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Oh, I'm sorry. We have not
24
     formally voted.
25
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Because we flipped
```

```
the order on that.
 1
 2
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: I would make a motion that we
     table the pending application for voting system
 3
     certification by Unisyn OpenElect 2.2 Voting
 4
 5
     System.
 6
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: Second.
 7
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Any further discussion?
          All in favor signify by saying "Aye."
 8
 9
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
                                   Aye.
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN:
10
                                  Aye.
11
          MR. REDDY:
                     Aye.
12
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: Opposed?
13
          The "ayes" have it. The motion is tabled.
          The Indiana Election Commission has finished
14
     its business for the day. Is there a motion to
15
16
     adjourn?
17
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT: So moved.
18
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: All in favor?
19
          VICE CHAIRMAN OVERHOLT:
                                  Aye.
20
          MS. CELESTINO-HORSEMAN:
                                  Aye.
21
          MR. REDDY:
                      Aye.
          CHAIRMAN KLUTZ: This meeting is adjourned.
22
23
     Thank you.
          (The Indiana Election Commission Public
24
25
     Session was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.)
```

1	STATE OF INDIANA
2	COUNTY OF HAMILTON
3	I, Maria W. Collier, a Notary Public in and
4	for said county and state, do hereby certify that the
5	foregoing public session was taken at the time and
6	place heretofore mentioned between 1:30 p.m. and
7	3:21 p.m.;
8	That said public session was taken down in
9	stenograph notes and afterwards reduced to typewriting
10	under my direction; and that the typewritten
11	transcript is a true record of the public session.
12	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
13	hand and affixed my notarial seal this 16th day of
14	March, 2022.
15	
16	mea W. Cari
17	Maria W. Collier
18	NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL  STATE OF INDIANA  Commission No. NP0593933
19	My Commission Expires Dec. 5, 2024
20	
21	My Commission expires: December 5, 2024
22	December 3, 2024
23	Job No. 169792
24	
25	

**2.2** 72:19 74:11,18 0 4 **2.3** 7:24 8:5,23 9:17,25 11:6,12, 13 13:10 15:17 17:20 18:1 28:14 01494 13:10 **4.4** 47:5,22 49:23,25 50:1,4 37:15 43:5 44:6,11 45:12 46:17 62:17 **2.5** 13:10 42:20,22 43:5,13 44:4, 1 **4.4-IN** 47:5,22 49:22 65:6,7 11 45:12 46:17 **20** 66:21,23 **1** 8:7 18:5 20:2,8 47:24 50:16 5 63:7 77:1 **2011** 40:2,7 **1.0** 86:4 **5220** 77:3 **2017** 28:13 **10** 50:5 **2019** 11:15,17 28:15,16,21 8 29:15 31:22,24 32:10,22,24 100,000-foot 22:4 34:11 **1005808** 14:2 **8** 19:20 53:25 2020 4:4 50:3,16,20,21,23,24 **11** 77:18 79:8 53:21 71:15 9 **12** 11:21 12:6 51:1 **2021** 11:24 12:1,4 18:6 27:4 29:9,10 32:4 51:1,2,4,7 67:20 **126** 50:18 9 51:7 54:1 76:22 77:1,5,16 **127** 50:21 **97** 53:4 **2025** 8:7 47:24 63:7 **13** 11:24 **21** 11:21 Α **132** 50:24 **22** 40:23,24 41:24 42:1 77:5 **134** 51:2 **22-6-5-2** 39:8 **Abhi** 4:14 **135** 51:5 62:17 64:13 **24** 4:4 **ability** 18:2 22:5 26:6 27:24 **14** 50:20,21,23,24 65:15 83:3 90:7 **26** 11:15 **1447** 12:1 13:10 **absentee** 16:14 17:11 23:17 26,288 64:20 24:6 26:8,24 27:7,12 28:21 **1447/1494** 44:12 46:18 39:10 41:10 54:4 55:18,20 56:9 **27** 50:3 **1492** 11:20 13:25 44:12 46:18 68:4 76:10 83:4,11,18 84:7 **1494** 12:2 3 absolutely 90:24 91:2 **1496** 11:22 14:9 44:12 46:19 access 12:10 33:11 42:2 56:2 **3** 6:13.19 37:18 53:16 58:4 61:4 **15** 11:16 **3-11-10-26.2** 55:14 67:22 accessible 15:5 **1500** 11:24 14:17 44:12 46:19 **3-11-15-13.8** 77:9 accommodation 54:7 **156K** 51:5 64:14 **3-11-7** 74:9 **accordance** 5:2 44:23 75:15 **17120** 77:3 **3-11-7-15** 46:3 accumulation 76:11 **18** 51:2,3,4 76:22 **3-11-7-19** 8:21 accurately 57:3 **19** 12:3 19:13,23 21:20 **3-11-7.5** 74:10 act 61:1 **1:30** 4:4 **3-11-7.5-28** 9:21 48:13,25 acted 87:5 **1st** 12:1 **3-11-7.5-28.19** 63:16 acting 79:2 **3-11.5-4-6** 27:3 77:16 2 action 35:10 activate 23:23 28:4 **2.0** 86:4.7 activates 58:21 **2.1** 76:25

**active** 26:23 agreement 86:24 **approved** 8:6 11:21,23,25 12:3 13:22 14:1.4 28:17 30:23 46:8 activities 41:2 ahead 26:2 28:8 66:17 47:23 50:20,23,25 51:3,4,6 63:6 actual 41:7 54:15 55:16 56:2 **All-in** 51:2 65:8 67:24 69:25 77:4 **add** 10:9 13:23 41:4 49:12 alleging 32:1 approving 69:18 72:12,14 86:21 87:1 allowed 22:1 29:5 62:12 77:15 approximately 75:1 added 14:3 31:23 area 30:6 allowing 90:5 addition 10:11 41:4 50:10 83:7 alphabetically 7:20 argument 29:11 84.25 amend 30:25 arise 55:3 additional 9:5 11:20 12:9 13:25 amended 27:4 32:4 arisen 35:20 31:23 32:15 33:24 41:18 49:10, 14 64:19 75:21 80:9 88:1,3 army 38:4 amending 36:6 89:10,18 91:12,14 **AML** 14:1 asserting 32:2 Additionally 33:1 assign 68:5 Angie 4:16 8:19 31:7 48:11 address 17:24 32:7 37:12 54:17 63:15 74:8 77:25 80:4 81:21 84:15 assigned 25:2 50:11 answering 6:15 addressed 10:16 79:17 assist 16:24 apologize 69:1,2 70:2,5 addresses 32:12 35:19 **Assistance** 11:16 50:15 76:22 77:12 apparently 33:2 addressing 36:14 75:21 appeared 68:18 association 30:12 adds 11:20 13:25 27:8 77:3 appearing 83:13 **assume** 57:12 adequate 82:22 assuming 19:19 **appears** 7:19 64:3 adequately 10:16 attachment 19:20 77:18 79:7,8 appendix 19:14,18,23 adjudication 77:8,10,13 **applicable** 6:5 8:24 9:19,20 attempt 42:21 adjust 20:11,12 15:9 48:24 57:5 61:14,20 attendance 4:15 **admin** 28:3 applicant 6:1,12 attorney 79:24 administer 5:9 application 6:6 7:18,25 8:4,22, audience 6:18 10:24 37:17 administration 5:5 24 9:2,18,22 10:21 16:3 37:11 47:17 63:1 43:2,11 44:4,18,24 47:2,4,9,21 administrators 86:15 Audit 71:25 48:2.14.16.20.23 49:4.19 62:20 adopted 5:25 7:13 8:1 32:4 63:4,17,21,25 64:2,12 73:12,24 **audits** 71:3 74:11,14,19,21,24 75:4,15 76:2 adversely 65:2 79:8 81:4,7 83:17 87:3 91:18 **August** 11:21 50:21,24 51:2,3,4 advised 74:24 **applications** 5:21 7:15,16 9:15 authority 39:17 87:16 advising 49:3 44:21 authorize 90:7 affect 65:2 applied 86:6 authorized 29:6 affects 15:1 65:15 applies 65:5 automatic 27:1 affirm 5:15 38:14 **apply** 13:9 20:22 73:15 78:19 automatically 23:19 81:14 afternoon 4:1 10:20 **avail** 41:13 appreciated 70:9 agenda 57:11 73:4 78:10 availability 13:24 approach 35:9

approval 62:21 63:5 73:24 87:2

**approve** 45:24 65:15 79:5 89:23

**aware** 26:6

awkward 17:21

aggregated 50:13

agree 17:22 23:13 31:16 33:25

67:1 69:6 70:13 73:13 89:8

**aye** 7:6,7,8,9,10 8:13,14,15,16 37:5,6,7,8 43:23,24,25 44:1 46:22,23,24,25 48:5,6,7,8 61:25 62:1,2,3 69:19,20,21,22

**ayes** 7:12 8:18 37:10 44:3 47:2 48:10 69:24

В

**B-O-X** 79:23

**back** 17:17 23:10 25:22,23 34:11,23 40:7 42:15 54:22 55:2 58:4 60:12 65:14 78:24 89:15

balance 42:8

ballot 12:2,6 13:12,16,19,23 16:16 17:17 18:23 19:4 20:9,10, 16,19,22,24 21:22,23 22:2,19, 22,25 23:1,6,11,16,17,21,23 24:2,12,14 25:2,6,11,23,24 26:15,16,24 27:7,9,12 28:4,22 29:7 33:7,16 39:9,15,22 40:16 41:6,10,20,21,23 42:3,7,11 52:5, 7,16 53:2 54:9,22,24 55:20,23, 25 56:12 57:7 58:16 59:14,16 60:23 62:8 67:16 68:6 70:12,19 73:5 76:7,13 77:8,15 82:6,16,18 83:4,8,18 85:5,10,12,13,17,24 86:2,5,8 91:6

**ballots** 16:14 17:12 20:12,17 22:7 23:4,6,18 28:21 41:1 53:15 54:3,6 58:15 71:18 72:3 76:9,10 81:25 82:2 83:11 86:6 88:13

bare 30:6,7 Barnes 79:24

base 14:7,10

based 61:18 72:22,23 85:14

basic 66:11 basically 82:7

basis 12:12 22:12 51:8 77:19

**batch** 50:22 **batches** 54:25

begin 5:21 9:4 44:20 48:1

**beginning** 38:7 47:20 71:12

behalf 4:25 belabor 67:8 Bernie 53:1

bill 13:17

binder 10:5

binders 9:15 48:20 74:18

birth 54:17

bit 9:8 43:8 83:21

blessing 89:16

**blind** 68:6

**board** 14:8 27:6 52:4 55:19 60:4

68:2

boards 41:3 53:24

body 6:15 29:10

**bond** 87:8

book 53:9 89:21

books 28:20 booth 14:21

**booths** 14:25 15:5

**box** 12:3 13:12,16,19,23 23:23 70:20 79:22,23 80:23,25 81:3

84:8 87:23 91:11

**Brad** 4:16 5:4 8:19 19:6 26:4 28:8 31:7 40:14 48:11 63:14 74:8 82:20 86:21 88:8

**brat** 38:4

briefly 55:14

bright 50:6

**bring** 35:6 39:8 87:13

bringing 27:20

brought 35:7 38:23

Build 11:7

built 23:21 34:13,24 61:5 86:3

**bulk** 76:19

business 7:23

**button** 23:19

**BYERS** 18:15 19:16 31:4 32:17 88:23 89:16 90:11,14,24 91:2

**bytes** 64:20

С

**C-H-A-T-O-T** 11:5

**cable** 13:20

call 4:2 23:5 25:10 84:14

called 76:6

**cancel** 20:24

cancelled 55:21

**candidate** 20:13,15,18 52:10,

14 91:8

canvass 20:12

capability 21:7 65:3

capable 77:15

capacity 64:19 65:3

**card** 26:15,16 27:12 41:20,23 51:5,6 53:6 55:24 57:7 64:14,15, 19 67:16 73:6 85:6,10,14 91:6

cardboard 79:24

cards 28:22 29:7 85:24

**care** 57:23

case 9:18 18:24 41:6

cases 18:25

Cass 9:24

cast 20:17 22:1 60:23

casts 21:23 41:6,9

**causing** 88:19 89:13

Celestino-horseman 4:13 7:8 8:15 9:7,11 21:9 22:9 23:15,25 24:3,15,22 30:3 32:20 36:2,5,20, 23 37:7 43:25 46:24 48:7 52:8 57:14 58:6,11,14,18,23 59:11,23 60:10,14,24 61:9 62:5,11 67:1 69:2,21 84:12,14,19 88:25 91:5, 15

**center** 13:19

central 11:8 76:11,14,15,19,20

**certification** 6:6 7:18 12:15 17:6 18:11 19:14 31:11,12,24 32:25 36:8 48:21 51:11 55:11 61:15 66:3 68:1 72:18 74:20 76:4 77:1,7,21 81:21 91:18

Index: certified..comprehensive

**certified** 11:14,15 18:5 28:13 29:15 31:16 32:22 35:3 45:22 47:11 48:22 49:22,25 50:2,15 65:7,20 76:21,25 77:12

**certify** 5:1 11:13 29:3 30:16 32:12 39:19 50:1

**cetera** 70:23 **chads** 71:17

chain 12:7 14:23

**Chair** 9:23 31:19 55:13 57:2 63:22,24 64:8 72:15 84:12,24

**chair's** 17:25

Chairman 4:1,7,8,9,10,11,12,24 5:4,20 7:4,5,7,10 8:11,12,14,17 9:3,13 10:8,18,23 12:22,25 13:3, 7 15:10,14,21 16:5,8,13,18,23 17:3,7,16,18,21 18:9,17,19 19:10,18,19,22 20:2,5,6 21:6,11, 17 22:14,17,18 23:1,12 24:18, 20,25 25:15 26:1,3,9 27:22 28:7, 9 30:21,24 31:6,19 32:14,20 33:22 34:9,16 35:14,25 36:1,3,4, 10,22 37:4,6,9,22 38:5,11,13,20 40:13,18 41:18 42:13 43:10,17, 18,24 44:2,19 45:1,3,16,19 46:11,13,15,20,21,23 47:1 48:3, 4,6,9,17 49:17 51:16,18,20 52:1, 7,12,18,23 54:2 55:3,10 56:4,25 57:9 59:7,24 60:11 61:12,23 62:1,3,9,14 63:13 64:5,9 65:10, 13 66:4,6,15,17,18,24 67:6 68:15,25 69:4,6,8,12,14,16,17, 20,23 72:6,13,16 73:1,9,10,16 74:15 75:17,20,24 78:2,4,6,7,9, 11,14,16 79:9,18,22 80:6 81:1,2, 9 82:14,24 84:3,13,18,20 86:20, 22 87:19,23 88:7,24,25 89:3,6, 12,16 90:3,6,9,12,15,17 91:3,16

challenged 56:13

challenges 14:23

chance 70:6

**change** 7:16,17,21 12:22 13:4 14:22,23 15:8,12,18,23 37:13 44:9,10,12,13,14,22 45:10,25 46:6,7,17,18 62:15,17,21,23 63:6,17,23 65:4,16 69:10,15,19, 24

**Chatot** 10:22 11:4 12:24 13:2,6, 9 15:13,20 16:4,12,15,22 17:2, 23 19:7,12,17,21,24 20:4 21:8,

13 22:8 23:14 28:15,18,23 30:2 32:19 43:4 49:20 51:17,25 52:3, 10,15 61:22 64:13 69:11,13 76:3 78:3,13 79:6 87:22

check 23:23

choices 30:15 41:12,24 56:2

CIO 53:2

circuit 11:23 14:9

**CISA** 71:10

citizen 38:3

citizens 71:25

clarification 16:9 80:25

clarify 59:25

clarity 32:15 33:24 34:4 84:21

clear 19:6 67:9 81:12

clerk 23:17 57:18 59:9 60:18

clerk's 59:3 60:4

clerks 8:25 9:1,24 72:2

clerks' 57:11

clip 50:25

close 42:14

closed 12:8

**Co-director** 4:15,16,25 44:20 45:20 49:9 57:3 84:15 86:24 89:7

**co-directors** 4:21 6:2 26:3 44:15 47:8 62:19 72:8 73:22 89:1,4 90:4

Co-general 4:16

**code** 8:21 12:16 23:6,7,10 24:2 25:9,13,16,25 26:22 27:3 35:5 40:22 48:13 51:12 61:13 63:16 74:9,10 77:22 83:7

codes 23:24 28:4 61:20

colleague 79:25

Collier 4:18

**color** 50:6

commandment 56:10,19 68:2

commence 8:9 63:10

**commencing** 8:2 47:19 63:3 74:7

**comment** 10:23 12:21 18:20 37:23 42:15,19 47:18 66:5 69:5 74:6 79:5,21 86:21 91:20

commentary 20:8 52:2,25

**comments** 6:19 23:12 28:10 38:9,25 40:13,16 41:18 42:14,16 45:18 46:11 49:10 70:6,9 72:6,9 75:18,19 80:24 91:3

Commission 4:3,6,12,22,25 5:12,17 6:7,16,24 7:1 9:4,14 10:8 11:16 16:1,6 26:10 29:3,13 30:1 31:21 32:10,11 38:17,21 40:19 43:19 44:8 46:12 47:12 48:12,18,19 49:16 50:16 56:23 57:3 62:13,15 63:19,23 65:11 66:7,8 68:1 72:17 74:13,16 76:22 77:12 79:21,23 81:15 82:25 83:16 85:22 86:13,23 87:2,4,9,13 88:6 89:10,17 90:6 91:4,23

Commission's 88:10

**Commissioner** 59:17 67:12 84:25

**commissioners** 29:18 51:19 78:15

companies 89:13

company 37:1 39:16 71:13

compatible 49:24

**complete** 44:23 74:25 75:15 76:7

completely 58:5

completeness 74:23

**compliance** 4:20 8:20 12:17 48:12,24 49:7 51:13 63:15 64:3 74:9 77:14,23 87:12 88:11

**compliant** 11:17 31:3 50:16 61:13,19 76:23

complicated 73:2

complies 64:24

complying 88:5

**component** 14:5,6,16 28:17 55:16,17 66:12 68:11

**components** 11:7 13:11,16 49:25 56:7 64:25

comprehensive 83:17

conviction 27:16 **Data** 11:7 computer 70:17 date 54:17 computers 71:1 cord 14:7 concern 30:4 81:13,24 87:9 core 11:7 dated 4:4 90:19 Corporation 73:8 day 16:14 17:12,15 20:14 21:2, concerned 79:10 23 22:2 27:8 39:1 53:14,17,18, **correct** 16:11,17 17:10 20:4 25 56:8,21 57:25 58:3 83:6 concerns 36:11,14 78:20 80:4 28:1,13 31:7 55:5 58:10,13 84:15 85:1,20 88:10 60:20 61:21,22 88:24 **days** 27:8 55:4,7 56:20 70:19 conclusion 17:22 correctly 15:12 24:11 57:16 **de** 64:25 69:10 conditions 87:5.17 correspondence 9:1 48:15 dead 19:1 63:20 74:13 conducted 41:1 77:14 deal 34:10 Council 71:10 configuration 15:4 death 27:14 counsel 79:20 configurations 15:6 deceased 20:18 21:1 52:10,14 Counsels 4:17 82:9,10 confirm 4:21 8:20,23 38:6 43:5, decide 79:4 8 48:11 63:15,23 74:8 count 11:8 20:13,18 50:22 52:4, 9,16 55:4,7 confirmation 21:7 31:1 44:16 decided 55:7 **counties** 26:5,17 27:18 34:25 82:15,17,19,21 84:4 decision 34:7 58:7.24 49:1 75:1.9.11 85:23 86:12 confirmed 10:12 default 41:12 counting 20:22 53:24 confused 67:7 defer 9:4 10:6 45:4 country 80:1 confusion 69:3 **defined** 22:6 46:5 56:19 73:5 county 8:24 9:24 25:18 26:11 connected 12:7 27:6 40:2,7 41:3 52:4 53:20 definition 76:7 83:13 consent 6:14.24 55:4,8,19 58:7 60:4,12,18 68:2 delay 34:2,6 72:2 85:11 86:15,17 consideration 7:24 44:13 66:8 delays 88:19,20 89:13 county's 58:24 considered 18:13 29:12 45:7 delete 56:12 68:5 67:11 69:10 87:2 couple 26:19 32:18 **Dell** 77:3 court 4:18 11:2 17:4 38:1 consists 76:15 depending 26:10 covered 82:22 construct 72:24 deployment 14:18 contemplate 68:12 covers 84:5 deployments 15:2 **contemplated** 29:14 86:13 crafting 89:8 **Deposition** 4:19 contemplating 68:11 create 33:14 55:20 describes 14:17 context 22:14 created 60:15 designation 91:7 continue 15:4 creates 20:16 designed 14:10 68:14 contradiction 39:12,21 40:8 critical 82:3 desire 34:1 37:17 42:9 current 11:12 15:15 30:25 contrary 46:1 49:25 64:14.17 desired 89:5 **Control** 10:4 49:6 75:13 customers 13:13 desires 63:1 controller 11:10 14:2.12 25:10 **cyber** 71:11,14 detail 32:8 52:2 convened 6:21 detailed 83:15 conversation 42:21 66:25 D details 79:8 convicted 21:25 determine 61:13 73:19 **daisy** 12:7

determined 53:8 54:12 65:1

determining 79:13

developed 81:17

device 14:22 15:7 25:11

**devices** 11:9,12 12:7 14:3,20 15:3,7 76:17

died 82:11

dies 20:13 21:23

**difference** 26:12 42:25 67:2 68:18,19

differentiating 56:4

diligence 80:10 90:22

direct 12:10 19:10 54:8,16 86:8

**direct-record** 26:13 47:6,10 48:14 49:2 55:15 57:5 62:16 67:14

directed 21:19,20 84:11

directly 54:9 85:8 86:16

disabilities 12:19 51:15 77:24

disable 77:8

**discussed** 19:25 33:21 34:16, 19 78:18

**discussion** 7:5 8:2,9,12 15:25 36:1 43:16,18,22 46:21 47:19 48:2,4 51:19 59:10 61:23 63:3, 10,13 65:12 73:19

discussions 19:4 78:15 82:25

disenfranchised 21:24

disfranchised 56:13

disfranchisement 27:15

display 50:6,21

displayed 59:21 61:8

disqualified 27:13 40:4 83:9

distinct 26:12

distinction 68:9 83:22

distributed 6:21

**Division** 6:2,8 29:25 44:17 47:13 62:22 74:1,23 81:16

**document** 8:20 10:4 23:10 25:17,20,21 48:12 63:15 74:9

**documentation** 4:20 10:11 22:11 28:2 29:24 49:14 84:16

**documents** 6:8 10:13 47:12 48:18 62:21 64:22 73:25

Door 4:21,23 5:3

DRE 40:10 55:18,21 56:7 85:25

DRES 53:4 67:23 68:23

**driven** 14:23

driver's 86:9

due 27:15 37:14 90:22

**Duly** 35:14

**Dunbar** 37:21 38:3,8,19,21 70:7,8 91:21,22

**Duo** 11:11,22,24,25 12:6 14:3,7, 10,19,20 15:2,3

#### Ε

**e-poll** 53:9

**EAC** 11:21,23 12:1,3 50:20,23 51:1,3,6 65:7,9 77:4

earlier 27:7 32:5 44:7 57:6 75:16 83:23

**early** 22:15,16,19 23:22 24:6 26:25 39:10 53:11,20 54:21 76:9,18 83:6 88:13

easy 31:14

**ECO** 11:20,22,24 13:10,14,25 14:9,14,17 15:1 46:5 50:18,21, 24 51:2,5,17 64:13,22,24 65:5,8 77:2,25 78:2,5,8,9

economic 89:14

ECOS 12:1,20 15:9

**ECR** 24:6

**effect** 81:22

effective 42:9

effects 14:15

efficient 42:9

elaborate 83:21

**Elect** 74:11

**election** 4:3,15 5:12,16 6:2,8 11:16 16:14 17:12,15 20:11,14,

16 21:2,23 22:2 26:24 27:5,6,8 29:2 34:15 35:5 38:16 41:3,5 42:1,6 44:17 47:12 50:7,8,12,15 53:13,17,18,25 55:5,19 56:8,20 57:25 58:3 60:4,12 62:22 68:2,8 71:22 74:1,22 76:7,16,21 77:11, 12 81:15 83:5,6 86:15

**elections** 39:7 41:2 42:9

electrical 13:14

**electronic** 14:15 23:2 26:13 41:20 47:6,10 48:14 49:3 55:15 56:1 57:5 62:16 67:14 77:8 89:21

electronically 89:25

elects 55:4

eligible 70:22

**emails** 85:14

**employ** 85:23

employee 59:9

employment 40:23

**EMS** 47:5,22 49:22,23,25 50:1,4 59:22 62:17 65:6,7 77:11

**end** 64:15

**engineering** 7:17 12:22 13:4 37:13 44:9,10,21 45:10,25 46:17 62:15,17,23 63:5,17,23

enhancements 50:7

entered 60:8

entering 55:25

**entire** 42:21

envelope 54:13,14,19,20 55:1

envelopes 53:24

equally 89:2

**equipment** 50:8,11 89:25 90:20

**equity** 68:22

equivalent 13:16

**ES&S** 91:25

**evaluation** 12:13 49:21 51:9 61:19 77:19

examples 82:23

excuse 9:7 65:3

existed 28:20 existing 14:4,7 28:12 45:9 49:24 75:9 exists 29:17 85:13 expand 52:1 expedite 89:19 expeditiously 35:18 experience 13:21 expertise 30:7 expired 18:5 29:9 77:1 expiring 8:7 47:24 63:7 explain 22:10 33:20 explained 59:15 explanation 91:9 explicitly 29:16 expressly 18:6 **extended** 6:14,24 external 57:19

F

fact 32:6 33:1 66:12 81:5

factor 65:17

extracted 83:9

facts 32:16 33:24

failed 28:7

fall 66:13

falls 72:24

familiar 26:18 27:20 40:24

**favor** 7:6 8:13 37:5 43:22 46:22 48:5 61:24 69:18

**Fayette** 40:2,7

**feature** 27:1 28:6 29:1 31:5,23 32:3 34:13,24 59:20 66:9 67:25

83:10

features 85:16

February 4:4

federal 42:8

fee 9:19 74:22

feedback 13:12

feel 35:6,8 68:16 79:1,3 88:19

91:24

fellow 16:6 46:11 65:11 78:14

**FET** 77:15

field 19:16,17 20:1 79:7 90:19

field-test 19:15

figure 36:12 82:10

file 86:17

**filed** 80:13

**filing** 8:21 36:7 44:17 48:13 49:15 63:16 74:10 80:15

10.10 00.10 1 1.11

**filings** 80:11

final 61:17 72:17 79:7

finally 14:17 49:5

find 12:13 25:23 39:11,14,17

51:9 71:3

finding 12:17 51:13 77:23

**findings** 10:20 12:5,8 29:20 49:19 64:11 76:1 77:6

40.10 04.11 70.1

**finds** 64:23

finish 21:11 62:12

**Fireeye** 71:11,13

firewalls 33:12 61:5

firms 91:24

firmware 49:24 65:4

fit 14:6

**flesh** 26:19

floor 69:18 74:5 91:19

**Floyd** 75:10

fodder 36:11

**follow** 70:17

Foreign 10:3 49:6

form 45:9 49:5

formal 80:2

**format** 62:18

fortuitous 38:23

forward 27:20 76:6

found 27:13 68:7 74:17 85:4

frame 35:22

framework 87:18

Free 71:23

Frodo 39:5

full 49:13 82:23 84:5

fully 87:11 88:5

function 60:1,6

functional 87:11

functionality 64:16 65:2 87:10

future 35:13 71:6 87:14

G

G-E-R-M-A-N 79:25

Gambler 39:2

Gandalf 39:5

**gather** 78:25

general 33:14 86:23

generally 84:8 86:6

generated 24:8,13 30:11 33:10

generating 57:15

gentleman 33:19

German 79:25 83:21

give 5:16 38:16 46:3 58:1 60:16

70:1 82:23 84:21 85:21

**glad** 38:10

**global** 14:15

good 4:1 21:5 88:7

**Gosch** 17:5,13,17,19 21:15

22:21 23:3,21 24:1,10,17 25:5,

16 28:1 43:7

great 17:2 52:25 53:22 61:9

group 71:25

**groups** 71:22

**guess** 16:8 17:7 19:1 26:1 29:8 30:15 34:7 39:19 41:19 51:20 54:2.3 67:6 71:9 78:5 79:9 81:12

88:18

guidance 86:7

Index: guide..initial

guide 28:3,5

**guidelines** 11:18 50:17 76:24 79:11 86:4

guys 36:17 39:16

Н

**hacked** 71:15

hacking 71:14

hand 5:13 39:22 52:4,8 54:21

handled 52:4,11 53:2,17 73:21

handling 76:10

hands 90:20

hanging 71:17

happened 40:1

happening 53:21

happily 44:20

happy 43:2 52:21 80:3,22 91:13

**hardware** 12:11 14:22 49:23,25 64:25

harp 89:12

Hart 7:22,24 8:4,22 9:14,17 14:1 15:4 16:21,25 17:6 26:22 42:20 43:12 44:3,10 45:7 46:16 65:19, 23 67:17 68:20 73:7 78:19 83:16 91:25

hate 88:18 89:13

**head** 66:19

heading 66:13

headquarters 76:16

**hear** 11:2 38:2 57:16 59:25 70:4,

**heard** 40:17 44:14 52:23 72:21 88:11

hearing 7:20 31:25 72:5,7 84:23

hey 70:22

hire 71:13

**Hirsch** 52:21 53:1 54:7 55:6,12 56:6,15 57:19 58:10,13,16,20 59:17 60:21 61:6 66:20 68:21

history 42:4

**hit** 23:19

hold 34:1 51:17

Hoosier 38:3

Hoosiers 39:23

hope 5:23 32:12 36:12 84:20,22

hoping 89:4 human 22:23 hybrid 73:4

I

**i.e.** 84:6

IC 39:8 77:9,16

**ID** 23:20 24:8 53:7 54:15,19 57:15,18,21 58:8 86:10

idea 30:5 36:17 58:2 67:19

identical 11:13 31:21 50:1

identification 54:9 85:4

identified 44:11

identifier 22:21,23 24:11 54:6 55:23,25 68:5 85:5,18

identifiers 79:13

identify 37:24

**IDOA** 9:9

IEC 50:21.23 51:1.4

**IEC-11** 9:18 44:22 48:20 63:25 74:19,25

**IEC-23** 10:2 49:5 75:7,12 80:12

image 85:17

**images** 85:18

immediately 45:5

implement 89:22

implemented 53:19 82:5

implies 31:20,22

**imply** 24:23

important 73:2

**impose** 87:17

imposing 82:1 87:5

impossible 41:5

imprisonment 27:15

improve 13:20 45:11

improvement 45:10

improvements 12:2 13:11,15

improves 50:19

**in-person** 26:25 55:18 56:9 68:4 84:7 90:2

**include** 6:15,25 11:10 16:10 48:20,25 91:11

included 9:15 10:2 18:12 31:2 32:5,9 66:2 75:7 77:17 80:11 81:20

**includes** 11:6 12:17 50:4,5,6 51:13 74:19 77:23

including 49:23 71:22

incorporated 6:9 47:14 62:23 67:25 74:2 76:4

incorrectly 15:15

increase 53:22

increasing 64:18

Indiana 4:3,15 5:12,16 8:6,21, 25 11:14 12:16,17 27:3 28:5 38:16 40:21,22 41:8 47:23 48:12 49:24 50:2 51:11,12 53:3 57:20 61:13,20 63:7,16 64:3 66:21 67:24 71:22,24 73:5 74:9,10 75:2 76:25 77:14,22 87:18

Indiana's 4:23 5:2 6:3

indicating 81:10

indication 42:6

indirect 30:11 54:8

individual 6:23 22:25 37:20 39:9 41:24 50:13 54:24 60:23 79:13,15 86:18 91:19

individuals 6:22

ineligible 68:7

information 6:5 9:5,20 10:12 29:22 30:9,19 33:16 47:9 54:16 59:12,13 61:3,7 62:20 64:1 73:23 77:17 79:1,3 80:9,19 81:10 82:5 83:1 86:8,19 87:15 88:1,3 89:10 91:12,14

initial 31:12,23

initially 30:23

input 10:1 53:6,11 58:20

inputting 60:2

insertion 13:20

installed 76:16

instructed 27:23

instructing 33:4

instruction 37:12

instructions 34:25 44:6 86:11

Instruments 14:13

integrity 71:22

intended 14:14

intent 68:21 89:7

**Intercivic** 7:22,24 8:4,22 9:15, 17 16:21 17:1,6 42:20 43:12 44:3,10 46:16 73:7 78:19 91:25

Intercivic's 83:16

interested 6:17 37:16 47:17

63:1

interests 89:14

interposer 14:6

interrupt 38:6

intervention 26:23

intimately 40:24

introduced 11:19 67:20 77:2

investigation 81:6

involved 26:12 33:8 40:22

**issue** 43:21 65:20,23 72:23 78:18 79:19 80:7 90:4,16,17,18 91:1

**issues** 33:8 42:22 79:16 83:23,

item 4:20 5:5,21 42:17,18 57:10

items 44:24 80:10

J

Jackson 75:10

Jake 79:25

**Jen** 37:21 38:3,5 70:8 91:22

**job** 21:5

**Joe** 82:10

joint 16:25

**Joseph** 75:10

July 11:15 50:3,20,23

jurisdiction 11:10 53:6

Κ

Karen 4:13 59:24

**Kenny** 39:2

kick 34:6

**kind** 54:8 58:25 59:2 65:16 72:21 81:16 82:6 88:9

kinds 30:14

King 4:16,24 8:19 9:3,13 10:7, 11 26:9 31:8,16,19 40:14,18 41:17 44:18,19 45:1,15,17,19 48:17 49:11 57:1,2,13 63:22 64:5 66:4,6 69:4,6 72:10 73:1,14 74:14,15 78:7,9 82:24 84:1,25 86:22 87:19 89:6 90:6

King's 28:10

**Klutz** 4:1,7,10,12 5:4,20 7:5,10 8:12,17 10:18,23 12:22,25 13:3, 7 15:10,14,21 16:5,18,23 17:3, 21 18:19 19:10,18 20:2,6 21:6, 11 22:14,18 23:1,12 24:20 26:3 27:22 28:7 30:24 32:14 33:22 34:16 35:14 36:1,4,10,22 37:4,9, 22 38:5,11,13,20 40:13 42:13 43:10,18 44:2 45:1,16 46:11,15, 21 47:1 48:4,9 49:17 51:16,18 52:1,18,23 55:3,10 56:4,25 57:9 59:7 61:12,23 62:3,9,14 63:13 64:5,9 65:10 66:4,17 69:4,8,12, 14,17,23 72:6,13,16 73:9,16 75:17,24 78:2,7,11,14 79:18 80:6 81:2 82:14 84:3,13,18,20 86:20 87:19 88:7,24 89:3,12 90:3,9,12,15 91:3,16

**know** 4:12 9:10 18:21 24:13 28:3 30:3,8,9,12 33:9,18 34:25 36:8 37:13,25 38:8 41:25 43:1 53:3 60:10 61:1 66:18 67:23 70:2,24 71:1,2,12 78:20,25 81:7, 19 82:8 88:5 90:21 91:22

knowing 16:1 53:13

knowledge 18:3,4 26:4 30:7

**Kochevar** 4:17 5:9,11 17:24 20:5,7 34:9,18 38:11,12,14 46:2

L

**label** 9:16

labeled 74:18

labor 40:23

laboratory 64:23

lack 84:16

lady 72:10

lady's 40:19

language 40:25 67:21

large 49:1

Latitude 77:3

**Lauren** 79:23

law 4:23 5:3 17:14 20:16 21:21 22:6 28:20 29:6,8 32:20 39:13, 21 40:9,23 45:14 46:6 56:10 68:22 73:5 77:14 81:14,18 83:20

laws 42:8 56:18

**League** 71:23

legacy 45:7,11

**legal** 12:18 39:17 51:14 77:23 87:16

legally 26:15

legislation 72:2 77:16

legislative 91:23

letter 72:1 89:8

level 25:18 82:12

levels 33:10

**levers** 71:17

license 86:9

life 38:4 64:15

limit 6:14,23 16:2

limitation 77:7,9

limitations 12:5,15 77:6

limited 83:25

Linear 14:11

link 58:3 79:14

linkable 86:16

linked 25:2

linking 85:8

list 13:22 14:1 58:1 75:8 88:3

listed 77:7

listen 80:23

Litany 4:14

locals 24:21

location 23:5 25:7 50:9 76:17,

20

locations 50:12,13,14

log 33:14

logically 45:24

logs 70:25

long 57:23 66:22 67:22

longer 22:1

looked 67:4 71:4

Lord 39:4

lot 89:23

love 34:2,7

**LT8711** 14:11

**lumber** 13:18

### М

**M-A-R-C** 11:5

machine 22:16 53:11 58:21

59:8 61:19 84:7 88:13

**machines** 72:3,22

made 40:6 85:3

mail 23:3 27:1 71:23 83:12

mail-in 22:16,19 84:7

**mailed** 53:16

main 38:2 45:23

maintain 42:10 85:17

maintained 41:22 85:11

maintaining 85:12

maintains 86:1

**make** 5:22 8:3 17:21 21:18 22:22 24:1 29:11 30:11 34:6,7 35:16 36:24 37:17,25 42:24 43:11,14 46:9,15 47:20 56:22

67:9 70:17 71:6 75:20 82:8

makes 13:11 58:7 59:13

making 48:1 63:9 80:2

management 20:11 29:2 50:7

managements 77:11

manager 17:6

mandates 56:24

mandatory 50:10

**manual** 52:16

manufacture 14:24

manufacturer 13:13,22 64:16

manufacturer's 14:4

manufacturing 14:1 64:17

Marc 11:4

March 11:16 50:16 51:1

**Maria** 4:18

market 13:24 35:1

marketed 35:3

marketing 8:6 47:23 63:6

marking 12:6

**marks** 50:19

**mask** 11:3

matched 25:14

matches 23:7

matching 25:13

**material** 13:18 32:10 48:23 65:17 74:16,19,24 75:8

materials 14:24 64:2 65:21

**matter** 5:7 6:13 7:23 41:12 43:3 44:8 47:16 62:14,25 72:17 74:5

87:14,21 89:9 91:17

matters 47:7

Matthew 4:17 5:9.20 21:3 45:4

Matthew's 45:14

mayoral 40:2

meaning 6:12

means 33:15

mechanical 13:11,15

mechanism 22:18 60:7 71:2

meet 87:6

**meeting** 4:2,22 5:2,6,24 6:21 34:3 35:12,13,20,23 38:7 87:14

meetings 57:11

meets 12:15 51:11 77:21

member 4:13,14 6:16,18 7:1

10:25 52:18 62:12

members 4:6,24 9:3,13 10:8 16:6 26:9 33:21 40:18 43:19 46:12 48:17 57:2 63:22 64:21 65:11 66:6 74:15 79:22 82:25

86:23

members' 48:19

memory 64:20

mention 75:8 90:9

mentioned 10:12 67:21

mentions 28:5

mess 36:16

**method** 16:10 17:10 18:7,12 28:19 29:11,14,17,21,23 30:17 32:9,23 38:24 39:12,13,20 40:9 43:4 51:22 56:11 67:17,18 68:13 81:25 82:1 83:15 89:5

methods 85:24

**Microvote** 47:4,16,21 48:14 49:2,21 52:19 53:1 56:11 62:16, 25 63:5,18 65:7,17 66:8,11,22 67:13 68:12,20 73:8 91:25

Microvote's 66:10

middle 20:3

**mind** 38:11

minds 82:22

minimal 30:6.7

minimis 46:6 64:25 69:10

minute 70:1

minutes 6:13,19 37:18 91:20

miraculous 71:21

mischief 59:4

mischievous 59:9

**missing** 91:10

mistake 40:21

misunderstood 65:16

mitigate 14:15

Model 64:14

**modification** 14:14,17 15:1

34:20 45:25 76:24

modifications 46:4

modified 45:8

modifies 14:9

moment 87:22

Monroe 9:24

Montgomery 75:10

months 41:24 42:1

morph 88:16

**motion** 5:23 7:3,12 8:3,9 15:15 35:15,16,23 37:4,10,19 42:24 43:11,15 45:23 46:16 47:20 48:1 61:24 62:9 63:9 69:17 73:17,20 80:18

mounted 13:21

**move** 5:24 14:11 42:16,18 47:4

63:4

moving 27:14 72:17

multiple 50:14

# Ν

names 40:6 70:21

National 10:3 49:6 75:13

nature 41:5 90:11

Nay 44:2

necessarily 24:21 83:25

needed 14:8 25:22 33:4 70:2

89:18

**network** 12:7.8

night 50:9 54:1

**non-de** 46:6

noncertified 45:6

nonetheless 46:8

note 4:5 19:13 27:2 48:15

**noted** 9:23 35:14 48:21 57:6

65:6 74:20

notice 5:1 8:23 9:23 48:25

noticed 4:23

notified 75:4

November 51:7 76:22 77:5

nullified 40:11

nullifies 39:15

**number** 24:7 25:1,2,22 26:22 33:14,15 39:25 40:1 49:1 53:6, 10,12 54:11,19 57:15,17,20,21, 23 58:3,9,20 59:6,15 60:19,20 82:6 83:7 85:4,8 86:10

numbered 19:18

**numbers** 14:3 19:9 30:10 33:9 58:1 60:2,5,7,9,16 86:14

Nussmeyer 4:16 5:1 8:20 9:5 10:6,7 28:8,9,16,19 29:1 31:8 40:15 41:15,17 44:21 45:2,3 49:9,11 52:6 55:13 56:6,16 57:3 64:6,7 67:12 70:13 72:13,14 73:10 75:18,19 84:15,24 86:20, 24 89:7 90:15,16,25

Nussmeyer's 45:20 69:5,7

#### 0

oath 5:8,10,14 38:7,10

**oaths** 5:5

obligation 62:6

**obtain** 32:15

obtained 83:2

occurred 71:21

**OCS** 76:16

October 8:7 12:1,3 18:5 29:10

47:24 63:7 77:1

offer 17:13 41:19

offered 17:11 32:6

offering 72:11

offers 76:14

office 59:3,18 60:5

offices 90:21

official 24:5

officials 60:13

Okeson 4:8

**open** 4:21,23 5:2,24 43:15 51:19 53:18,20,24 65:11 70:2 73:18 74:5,11 78:14 91:17

**Openelect** 72:19 74:18 76:5,15, 17,19,25 77:4,7

17,10,2077.4,

opening 59:12

**operate** 67:13,16

operating 50:5

operation 65:4

opportunity 10:10 41:14 49:12

**opposed** 7:11 8:17 20:23 37:9 44:2 47:1 48:9 62:4 69:23 73:7, 16 88:15

**optical** 26:15,16 28:22 29:6 40:10 53:15 55:16,22 56:16,17 57:7 67:15,17 68:11,22 73:5,14, 25 85:24

**option** 22:23

optional 14:18

optionally 50:11

orange 48:19

**order** 4:2 6:22 7:17,19 15:23 37:13 44:9,13 46:17 62:16,17, 21,23 63:6,17 65:16 89:19

orderable 11:20 13:25 14:3

orderly 5:24

**orders** 7:17,21 12:23 13:4 15:12,18 44:11,12,14,22 45:10, 25 46:18 63:24 69:10,15,19,24

organization 11:1

original 66:2

originally 32:4 65:20

outer 54:14 outlined 21:20 OVCS 76:19 OVDS 76:17 Overholt 4:8,9,11 16:8,13 17:7,16,18 19:19,22 21:17 22:

Overholt 4:8,9,11 7:4,7 8:11,14 16:8,13 17:7,16,18 18:9,17 19:19,22 21:17 22:17 24:18,25 25:15 26:1 30:21 31:6,20 35:25 37:6 43:17,24 46:13,20,23 48:3, 6 51:20 52:7,12 54:2 59:24 60:11 62:1 65:13 66:15,18,24 67:6 68:15,25 69:16,20 78:4,16 79:9 81:9

Oversight 6:4
OVS 76:6,13,15

Ownership 10:4 49:6 75:13

Ρ

package 14:5,6 packet 75:22 panel 13:20,22 50:4

**paper** 22:19 23:2,16 24:6 25:19 50:25 53:15 54:3,6 55:23 71:18 72:3 83:7 88:13

paperwork 40:4

part 13:4,23 14:1,3,4,13 15:9 17:20 18:12 21:15 26:7 27:5 29:12 30:22 31:11,15,17 51:23 54:5 61:11 65:20 66:1,11,20 67:2,3 71:8,9 75:22 77:11,13 81:6 86:13 91:12

participating 72:11 participation 72:7 parts 11:21 13:25

**party** 6:17 20:20 37:16 47:17 91:7

**pass** 68:7

passed 19:2 29:9 81:22

passes 17:14 37:10 56:12 62:10

past 87:1path 36:13Paul 4:8

pause 12:21payment 74:22PCDA 14:7

penalties 38:15

**pending** 37:4 44:5 49:4 52:24 69:15

**people** 19:5 58:2 71:23 80:14

percent 53:4,16

perfect 49:15

performance 87:8

period 24:4 41:23 42:15

perjury 38:15

permanent 55:24 85:11,13

**person** 5:6 16:24 17:14 38:2 39:10 41:8,9,10,25 42:7 56:12 59:18,19 68:7 70:22 83:5,13

person's 41:12 42:4,10

perspective 87:1

**phrase** 18:23

physical 12:10

picked 56:3

piece 25:19 35:2 56:16 84:1

piggyback 28:10

place 26:6 42:11 79:16 83:11

planning 80:2

plans 5:6

plastic 50:24 platform 64:18

platforms 64:15

**play** 36:22

**plug** 13:20

**plugs** 13:22

**point** 12:21 31:9 34:17,18 45:7, 20 55:14 60:3 67:8 82:13

**points** 34:10 84:25 86:25

policies 70:14,17 71:6

**policy** 55:20

poll 23:8 25:8,16 58:21 89:21

poll-worker-facing 25:10

polling 23:4 25:7

**polls** 76:8,18

poorly 71:4

portion 16:18,20

ports 14:11

pose 26:19

**posed** 6:16,25 32:13 35:11 75:22 81:8 87:25

**Posey** 75:10

position 79:4

post 87:8

**power** 11:22 14:2,9,11 39:5,7

practices 85:22 precedent 89:21

precinct 21:1 25:8 41:11 50:10,

22 76:13,14 **precincts** 41:8

precisely 32:8

**preliminary** 10:23 21:10 42:19 43:3

prepare 35:18

prescan 56:20

**present** 4:6 6:5 10:20 34:4 37:17 47:9 49:18 62:20 64:11 73:23 76:1 84:16

presentation 8:10 66:10 80:3

presentations 73:18

presented 32:10 37:13 65:23

preserve 90:13 prevent 61:6

previous 66:7 77:6

**previously** 11:14 18:5 27:11 31:16 45:21 47:11 48:22 49:21 50:2 63:24

primary 42:6

print 11:12 55:23 58:15,17
printed 24:2 25:7 85:5

**printing** 23:18 76:8 85:10

printout 60:22

**prints** 23:6,8 24:2 25:9,11,19

**prior** 47:7 52:16 55:5 62:18 73:21 83:6

privacy 22:13 25:6 59:16 62:7

private 59:12

procedural 5:23 7:2 55:10

**procedure** 20:20 23:9 26:5 29:4 54:10 57:22 83:20

**procedures** 5:25 7:13 8:1 25:17 41:22 42:11 53:19 70:14, 18 71:7

proceed 10:21 38:20

proceeding 6:10 47:14 74:3

**process** 5:23 10:1 16:3,15,19 25:21 26:5 41:5 51:24 74:7 77:17 78:23 79:8 81:5,12 84:9 87:25 89:19

processes 78:21

produced 91:7

program 6:4 87:16

project 17:6

**proper** 5:1 8:20,23 20:25 39:17 48:12 63:15 74:8

properly 4:22 63:25

proposals 7:2

propose 5:22 73:17 89:17

proposed 13:15

protect 22:13 30:9 42:11

protected 62:7,8

protection 33:11

protections 59:1,2 61:6 79:15

**protocol** 10:14 19:14,15 26:7 27:20.23

**protocols** 33:3 61:11 79:12 81:17,20,21

**provide** 6:19 8:25 9:6 10:1 20:7 30:18 34:4 47:18 50:8 52:2,24 63:19 72:23 74:6,12 80:20 82:20 85:22 91:13

**provided** 6:8 8:24 10:13 27:25 29:22,25 47:12 60:2 62:21 64:1 74:1 81:6

**providing** 26:24 60:5,6 86:12 87:11

provision 15:24

provisional 76:10 86:6

provisions 73:7

proviso 27:9

proxy 4:7,14

**public** 4:3 6:18 37:23 40:6 41:13 42:14,15 70:3,8 71:20 74:5 86:18 91:20

**pull** 17:17 40:5 45:5,14 71:17

pulling 49:14

**purposes** 4:5 8:2 15:24 18:11 44:13 47:19 63:3 74:7 82:3

purview 86:14

**put** 17:7 41:2 54:11,22 55:1 71:16

**puts** 23:19

putting 54:5,8

**Pyle** 4:14

### Q

### quantity 11:9

**question** 15:11 17:8,9,25 18:9, 10,18 21:19,20 29:8 31:14 32:6, 13 36:2 39:19 52:24 54:3 59:18 60:12,25 61:16 65:25 69:9 70:16 71:5,9 72:21 73:2 81:1,8 88:8 91:6,22

questioning 15:25

**questions** 6:16,25 10:14 15:23 16:1,7,19,25 26:19 30:14 34:5, 21 35:10,19 37:3 52:20,22 69:14 75:22,23 78:15 80:4 84:10 87:24 88:3,16

quick 21:12 38:5

quickly 65:22 88:20 89:14

quote 39:1,4

**quoted** 40:22

## R

raise 5:13

raised 83:23,24 85:1 86:25

90:19

raises 65:23

random 24:13 25:1

randomly 24:8 30:10 33:10

rate 53:9

rationale 39:14

raw 14:24

**RBM** 85:3

reach 68:22

reached 85:15

read 20:22 37:20

readable 22:23

reading 5:8 85:2

ready 80:16

real 21:11 38:5

realize 15:17

**realm** 79:2

rear 13:19

reason 21:25 80:13,15

reasons 25:6 27:14

reassurance 86:14

recall 45:15 78:7

recallable 86:5,7

receive 87:14 88:2,4

**received** 9:1 13:12 48:16 63:20 74:13

recently 72:1

recertification 6:6 7:16,25 8:5 10:1 13:1,5 15:17,18 16:2 18:14 28:12 31:10,17,20,22 33:3 34:11 35:17 36:7,13,21 37:15 43:12 44:4 45:21,24 47:5,10,22 51:23 54:5 66:1,14 67:11 72:18 73:11 75:6 87:3,6

recertifications 5:22 7:21

recertified 36:18 67:3

recertify 34:19 65:24

recitation 5:14

**recognize** 5:9 6:1,11,17,22 10:19 16:20 28:7 37:19 40:14 44:15 47:7,15,17 49:18 62:18,24 64:10 73:22 74:3 75:25

recollection 45:14

recommendation 12:12 51:8 61:18 85:6

recommendations 29:20 85:21

**record** 4:5 10:25 25:3,4 35:12 41:13 55:24 62:24 68:17 80:17 85:11,13 86:18 90:13

**recorded** 19:12,24 20:1 37:25 42:4 90:13

recording 20:1

records 6:10 47:14 74:3

recount 40:3

**Reddy** 4:14 7:9 8:16 37:8 44:1 46:25 48:8 62:2 63:12 69:22

redo 42:21

**referenced** 9:22 12:14 48:18 51:10 63:24 64:4 74:25 75:16 77:20

referring 27:3 40:25

reflect 83:1

regard 26:16,21 40:20 41:1 44:24 57:8 78:10 83:11,17 89:24

regime 72:24 regimes 72:22

registered 41:9

**registration** 24:19,20 42:5 85:9 86:17,18

regulations 61:14,20

regulator 11:23 14:9

reject 20:24

relates 40:16 42:20 80:11 88:11

relevant 59:8,9 reliability 65:2

remarking 52:16

remarks 69:7 72:11

remember 54:23

reminder 73:11

remote 90:18 91:1

remotely 89:19

remove 20:23

removed 13:17,18

renewal 48:22 49:21

reopen 66:25

repeated 24:14

replace 20:15

replaced 13:19

**report** 8:8 10:10,15 18:1 19:11, 22 28:24 29:16,24 30:25 31:1 32:7,16 35:18 43:14 47:25 49:13 63:8 75:22 84:17,18 85:2

reported 29:18 41:11

reporter 4:18 11:2 17:4 38:1

reporting 50:9,11 76:12

reports 50:12 64:23

representations 85:3

representative 6:11 16:21 74:4

representatives 6:3 10:19 16:7 31:25 44:16 47:8,15 49:18 62:19,24 64:10 73:23 75:25 79:19

representing 80:1

request 4:21 63:14 88:2,5 90:3

**requested** 10:14 49:15 88:1 90:8

requesting 89:10 91:13

require 15:4 30:17 32:21 42:8

**required** 4:23 9:19,20 14:24 32:3,15 44:24 61:14 64:1 65:5 74:21 80:13 84:5 87:7 90:22

requirements 12:16,18 51:11, 14 57:4 64:24 77:21,24 78:19 81:14,18 82:4

requires 26:23 55:15,17

research 43:8

residence 56:14

**respect** 7:2,12 15:16 44:9 62:15 65:17 72:18 76:1 78:18

respond 5:8 15:11 79:21 89:6

response 13:12 57:1 69:4

responses 10:15 40:15 72:9

restrictions 8:8 47:25 63:8

results 41:14 76:12

retaining 50:25

retract 19:9 21:22 22:5,7,12,20 27:11 53:12 55:25 57:25 58:2

retracted 66:21 82:18

retracting 20:9

retraction 16:10 17:10 18:7,11, 23 19:4 20:9 22:15 28:19,21 29:5,11,13,17,21,23 30:5,17 31:11,15 32:3,8,21,23 34:11 35:19 36:8 42:23 43:4 51:21,22 52:5,7 53:2 56:10,18 57:16 59:20 61:2 65:19,25 66:2,9 67:17,18,19 68:13 72:23 77:15 78:18,22 79:6 80:7,21 81:5,12 82:1 83:10,15,19 84:1,5 85:16, 24 88:12

retractions 29:6 84:6

retrievable 23:5,23 25:24

retrieval 28:4 38:24 39:11,13,20 40:9 61:1

retrieve 23:10 33:6,7 60:21

retrieves 60:19

reverb 9:12

review 10:10 12:13 35:22 42:1 49:12 51:9 61:18 77:19 78:22 81:5.6

reviewed 64:21 74:23

reviewing 18:1

revision 50:4 51:3

Richardson 4:19

ring 39:5

**Rings** 39:4

standalone 11:25 14:20 15:3

**standard** 14:19,21,25 15:3 26:7

sizable 87:8 risk-limiting 71:3 sentence 62:12 91:21 rivets 13:17 **small** 34:9 **separate** 53:7,10 54:18,22 56:17,18 road 34:6 42:1 Smartcard 64:18 separated 54:13 Rogers 39:2 Smith 82:11 separately 15:19 roll 50:25 social 58:8 September 11:24 run 42:9 softball 31:14 series 11:22 12:6 14:10,13 running 50:21 **software** 11:6 14:22 15:7 21:14 service 38:22 40:12 72:4 23:22 29:2 49:23 50:7 59:22 60:17.18.19 61:8 65:4 77:10 S Services 4:19 solemnly 5:15 38:14 serving 4:7 **safe** 39:3 70:11,15 71:8,9,11 Solutions 76:4 session 4:3 safeguards 30:8 somebody's 71:4 set 8:8 9:9 47:25 57:4 58:14 safer 71:16,18 63:8 68:13 someone's 25:4 save 89:23 severely 18:18 sort 54:6 68:1 **scaled** 53:23 shaking 66:19 **speak** 6:22 10:24 11:1 38:25 84:8 scan 11:11 13:21 26:15,16 27:6 **shape** 14:5 28:22 29:6 40:10 53:15 54:20,22 **speaking** 17:25 23:2,3 38:9 **sheet** 6:20 55:16,22 56:16,17 57:7 67:15,18 71:20 68:11,23 73:5,14,25 76:19 85:24 shocked 39:11,23 special 53:5 **scanned** 16:14 17:12 27:10,12 shortages 14:16 **specific** 9:2 25:3,5 63:20 65:5 54:24 83:18 82:3 88:16 shorthand 26:23 33:24 scanner 76:19 **show** 60:22 61:2 62:6 88:15 specifically 19:1 20:17 28:5,6 scanning 52:17 54:21 76:8 40:15 75:3 80:12 shows 59:20 scenario 20:2,8,10,15,17 21:21 specificity 79:10 sign-up 6:20 55:3 82:19 specifics 81:20 signature 54:18 scenarios 21:19 82:21 **Speech** 71:23 signed 6:23 91:19 schedule 35:23 **spell** 37:24 signify 37:5 43:22 46:22 48:5 scheduled 88:21 **spent** 6:15 61:25 69:19 scope 12:14 51:10 77:21 82:15, spoiled 55:20 similar 8:1 41:2 44:6 47:6 62:18 23 84:6,10 87:5 88:12 78:20 spoiling 16:16 **screen** 60:22 similarly 90:2 St 75:10 **sealed** 41:23 simple 18:18 23:23 **staff** 4:15 10:15 29:25 30:12,18 **secrecy** 54:13,18,20 55:1 33:21 35:21 36:24 67:7 72:21 simplify 82:11 **secret** 39:3,9,15,22 40:16 41:7, 81:16 85:19 88:9 89:3 **simply** 15:16 33:5 42:6 53:23 21 42:10 70:10,12,14 71:7,8 58:1 73:17 80:17 staff's 67:10 85:12 86:2 **sir** 38:12 **stages** 23:22 **secure** 90:14 site 76:11 stand 5:7 37:23 security 58:8 59:16 71:11,14

sitting 59:3

situation 68:17

seeking 80:8

selected 42:7 50:14

standards 86:5

start 26:4 73:17

starting 73:16

**state** 10:25 12:17 17:3,14 18:8 21:21 22:6 27:5,14 28:6 29:5,17 35:3 39:7 42:8 44:25 45:14 46:5 49:7 51:12 56:9 67:24 68:17 70:5 77:22 79:20 81:18 83:20

stated 18:6

**statement** 10:3 37:18 49:5 61:17 75:13

**Statewide** 42:5 85:9

stating 80:16

Station 51:2

**status** 50:8

**statute** 9:19 27:2,24 29:21 31:3 32:3 44:23,25 45:5,15 46:10 49:8 56:23 57:4 67:19 75:15 79:2 81:21 87:12

**statutes** 9:20 40:21 48:24 64:4 67:13,15 73:15 87:18

statutory 72:22,24 73:7

**stay** 45:9

Stewart 4:18

straight 20:19

stray 50:19

strictly 13:1

strongly 91:24

stuck 70:19

**subject** 8:7 43:13 47:24 63:8 77:9 83:19 89:9

**submitted** 8:4,8 9:18 35:21 44:22 47:21,25 48:23 49:7 63:4, 9,25 64:2 65:1 72:1 74:22 75:12,

subsequently 32:11

substantial 68:9

succeeded 20:19

suggest 54:10

**suite** 76:15

summarize 89:9

summarizing 88:10

**summary** 13:7 15:22 27:17 44:14

summer 85:16

supplement 35:18

**supplemental** 31:4 32:7,16 43:14 80:22 84:22

**supply** 14:23

support 14:22 15:7 80:17

**supporting** 64:22 72:3

supports 11:24

supposed 59:15 71:14

Susan 4:8

suspect 40:25

Suzannah 4:9,10

SV260 77:16

**SVRS** 24:16,17 53:9 57:18 58:9 59:5 85:4

swear 5:15 38:14

**system** 6:4,7,12 7:24 8:1,5,23 9:17 10:2,3,17 11:15,18,19 12:13 16:9 17:11,20 18:4,8,12 20:12,24 22:5,24 24:9,19,21 25:23 26:11,14,15,22 27:1,11, 19,23 28:12,13 29:4,9,12,14,18 30:5,16 31:16,21 32:12,22,24 34:14,24 36:9 41:21 42:5,20 43:13,20 44:4,6,10 45:11,12 46:5,9,16 47:6,11,13,22 48:21, 22 49:22 50:5,6,14,17,18 51:10, 22 53:4,8,9,10,23 54:5,11,12,23, 25 55:15,21 56:1,8,11 57:7,8,20, 23 58:5 60:1,2,6,7,8 61:3 62:17 63:18 64:23 65:2,6,18,20 66:3,8, 11,20 67:3,4,14,16,18 68:3,6,12, 13,23 72:19 73:3,4,6,12,13,14, 25 74:2,11,17,21 75:3,5 76:5,6, 7,13,21,24 77:2,11,13,20 78:5, 17,21 79:5 83:3,9,24 85:9 86:3,4 87:3,4,10 91:18

**systems** 6:9 13:10 26:13,17 40:10 44:5,11 45:7,8,22 46:18 48:15 49:3 68:10 71:15 76:23 81:15,18 85:25 87:15

Т

tab 9:16 48:19 74:17

table 35:16 42:24 61:24 65:6

80:18

**tabled** 37:11,15 43:13 44:5,7 45:13,22,23 46:19 47:3

**tabletop** 11:25 14:18

tabulated 27:9

tabulation 76:9,11,14

tabulators 56:17

taking 70:5,8

**talk** 35:21 36:24 37:24 43:2 80:14 86:5

**talking** 19:1 21:18 26:14 36:18 39:6 52:13 57:15 81:24

talks 46:4

tally 24:5 51:5 64:14,15,19

team 54:21 64:21 85:2,15

**Teams** 90:10

Tech 14:11

Technical 6:4

technology 26:18

term 8:7 47:24 63:7

**terms** 42:23 65:19 79:10,12 82:16 88:12,15

**test** 19:7,16,17 20:1 31:5 79:7 81:5 90:2

**tested** 18:3 22:5 23:14 29:22 51:23 61:10,12 79:6 82:19

**testify** 5:6,11 6:13,19 47:16 62:25 63:2 74:4

**testimony** 5:15 8:3 38:15 40:19 47:20 63:4,10 66:10

**testing** 21:15 64:23 81:11,17,20 82:16,22 84:9,10,18 88:15 89:18,20,22 90:8,18 91:1

tests 90:19

**Texas** 14:13

thanking 75:20

theme 70:10 thermal 83:7

**thing** 10:9 18:21 21:18 45:4 55:10 58:9 59:1,16 70:11 71:19 82:14 91:24

things 34:1 35:9

thinking 18:25 20:14

Thornburg 79:24

thought 31:6,13 65:18 68:18

thoughts 18:20 41:16

threats 12:9

Thursday 4:4

ticket 20:20

tie 59:5

tied 24:8,15 25:5 82:6

time 6:14,15,23,25 8:19 16:5 22:1,13 24:4 28:24 32:15 33:23 35:22 36:15 38:22 39:2 40:11,14 46:15 51:21 54:13,24 58:20 63:14 67:22 69:17 72:5 73:20 89:24 91:17

Title 40:23,24

**today** 4:18 28:11 29:10,13 31:18,24 38:25 45:13 49:16 73:21 88:11

today's 5:6

top 13:19

totals 19:8 41:10

**Touch** 11:11 12:5 14:10,19 15:2

touch-screen 55:17

**TPS552882** 14:13

tracer 22:20

track 22:24

tracker 22:20

tracking 22:18 50:8 81:25 82:2

training 57:10

transferred 64:17

transportation 89:24

transported 90:21

trapping 50:19

truth 5:17,18 38:17,18

turn 9:8 15:25 27:22 42:15 72:8

turning 17:9

**type** 11:8 26:11 27:18 29:24 57:6 58:9 73:25 82:5 83:18 90:8

**types** 7:14 22:7 41:2 68:10 79:16 82:2

**Tyson** 17:5 43:6

U

**U.S.** 11:16 50:15 76:21

**Uh-huh** 57:13

ultimately 41:19

**understand** 24:10 39:14 78:6 80:10,14 81:9 82:4,12 83:1,10 86:3

understanding 6:20 16:9 17:10 28:25 40:21 43:9 45:6 66:7 67:10 68:16 78:17 80:7,8 81:3 83:2.14 85:14 87:24

understood 26:21 56:23

unionization 41:1

**unique** 22:21,22 23:6,7,19 24:11,14 25:13,24 55:25 57:24 68:5 85:5,18

**Unisyn** 72:19 73:3,12 74:4,11, 18 75:2 76:3,5 78:10 79:19,20 80:1 83:3.24 87:25 91:25

university 42:2

**Unlike** 29:19

unnecessary 13:18

**Unused** 13:17

upcoming 57:11

update 19:8 30:25

**updated** 13:23 50:4 51:6

updates 11:22 65:1

user 59:22 61:7

utilizing 90:9

٧

vacancy 20:16

Valerie 4:17 18:19

**varies** 26:10

variety 82:17

vary 11:9 14:5

**VB2** 51:3

vendor 6:12 7:19,21 9:17 10:4, 13,17 18:1 24:23 27:19 29:22 32:1 34:22 35:7 49:6,13 59:8 75:12,14,21 83:2 85:7 86:11 87:6,7,11,17

vendors 29:19 85:16

**verified** 54:18 68:19 71:24 77:10

**Verity** 9:16 11:6,7,8,9,10,12,13, 22 12:5 13:21 14:2,10,19,20 15:2 46:17

Verity-accessible 15:5

**version** 9:25 11:12,13 17:20 43:20 50:1 75:2

versions 75:9

versus 55:24

vice 4:8,9,11 7:4,7 8:11,14 16:8, 13 17:7,16,18,25 18:9,17 19:19, 22 21:17 22:17 24:18,25 25:15 26:1 30:21 31:6,19 35:25 37:6 43:17,24 46:13,20,23 48:3,6 51:20 52:7,12 54:2 59:24 60:11 62:1 65:13 66:15,18,24 67:6 68:15,25 69:16,20 78:4,16 79:9 81:9

video 19:12,25

videotape 90:1

view 22:4 85:8 87:4

viewed 50:13

**Vigo** 75:11

violation 35:4

volume 53:17,22

**Voluntary** 11:17 50:17 76:23 86:4

volunteer 71:25

**vote** 20:13,23 22:1,16 24:6 30:15,16 39:9,10,24 41:9,10,20 51:6 53:5,12 56:8 64:14,15 65:14 70:6,22,25 71:7,23 80:16

**voted** 22:19 25:12 27:7 32:11 33:17 39:18,24 40:6 53:13 59:19,20,21 71:5 82:10 83:5

**voter** 19:2 20:25 21:1 22:15 23:20 24:8,18,20 25:3,4,5,6,12 27:12 41:6 42:5 52:14 53:7,11 54:8,11,15,19 55:24 57:15,18, 21,24 58:4,8,22 59:13 79:15 82:9,10,11 83:9 85:4,9 86:8,10, 16,17,18

**voter's** 20:9,23 22:13 54:17 56:2 85:12 86:1,9

**voters** 12:18 19:1 40:4 51:14 71:24 77:24 83:12

voters' 30:9

**votes** 19:9 26:8 40:5 41:10 53:5, 11 66:21

voting 6:4,7,12 7:24,25 8:5,22 9:16 10:3,16 11:6,17,19 12:13 13:10 14:21,25 15:6,7 18:8 19:8 26:11,13,25 27:10,18 29:4 31:21 40:10 41:20 42:4,20 43:12 44:4, 5,6,10,11 45:11,22 46:9,16,18 47:6,11,22 48:15,21,22 49:3,22 50:17,18 51:2,9 53:8,10 54:4,11, 12 55:15,19,21 56:1,8,9,11 57:7, 19,22 58:21,22 62:16 63:18 64:22 65:6 67:14,16,18 68:4,10 71:24 72:19 73:4,13,14,25 74:11,16,21 75:3,5 76:4,5,8,9, 13,17,18,19,23,24 77:2,13,20 81:15 83:6 86:4 87:3,4,10 91:18

**VPN** 90:14

VSTOP 6:3,9 8:9 10:10,16,19 11:4 16:1,7,25 17:8,22 18:3 21:16 23:13 28:24 30:20,24 32:1,6 33:2,4 35:17 36:25 42:15 43:14 44:16 47:8,13 48:1 49:14, 18 62:19,22 63:9 64:3,10,21,23 69:9 71:10 73:23 74:1,23 75:20, 25 77:10 78:12,25 80:9,20 81:3, 4,8,11,16 83:1 84:4,11,18 85:20 87:15,20 88:14,17,18 90:8

**VSTOP's** 10:20 12:8,12 49:18 51:8 64:11 66:10 77:19

vulnerability 12:9

VVPAT 49:23 50:25

**VVSG** 86:7

W

wait 21:17 52:12 70:20 78:1

wanted 53:20 54:20

Warycha 4:17 9:9 18:21 21:3

ways 71:6 82:18

week 34:3

weeks 32:18

**weigh** 31:8

white 9:16 74:17

whomever 60:13

widely 14:12

Wilson 4:8

Windows 50:5

wishes 6:18 41:13 47:18 74:6

withdraw 35:15

withdrawal 82:16

Women 71:24

wondering 91:8

word 21:24 46:7

wording 55:6

**work** 30:18 58:3 84:9 88:9,17 89:1,7

**worked** 81:16

**worker** 23:8 25:8,16 26:24 58:21

**works** 22:10 30:5 33:6,18 36:9 60:2 80:8

world 82:9

write 54:19

**Writer** 11:11 12:6 14:10,19 15:2,

writing 37:20

written 9:1 48:15 63:19

wrong 18:10

Υ

year 32:21 81:23

**years** 35:8 53:3 66:12,21,23 67:4,23 87:7

yield 41:15 44:20 49:9

Z

**Zach** 4:7

**Zoom** 90:1,10