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BE IT REMEMBERED that on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 9:05 a.m. Pacific time, before JOHN M.S. BOTELHO, Certified Court Reporter, appeared JOE FAIN, via videoconference, the witness herein; WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had, to wit:

```
<<<<<< >>>>>>
```

JOE FAIN,
having been first duly sworn
by the Certified Court Reporter, deposed and testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MS. MELL:
Q State your name.
A Joe Fain.
Q What is your address?
A 705 Southwest Colewood Lane, C-o-l-e-w-o-o-d Lane, Normandy Park, 98166.

Q (Videoconference technical difficulties.)
A I apologize. I coughed in the middle of that. What was that?

Q Your phone number?
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A (206) 409-9418.
Q Is that the phone number you used to conduct commission business?

A That number as well as the -- and I actually don't know this phone number -- the softphone program that was provided by the State.

Q What is a softphone program?
A It's a -- doesn't have a physical phone. It's just a program with a phone number assigned to it.

Q And so you use your personal technology to access the telecommunications system?

A That's correct.
Q Okay.
A Or we're able to look at things that came in through e-mail from that system.

Q How is that different than just looking at an e-mail?
A I'm not certain if it was an attached file or not. That system did not have a lot of traffic on it.

Q Okay. Did you use instant messaging to communicate about redistricting work?

A No.
Q Do you know if your staff did?
A No.
Q Is it correct that all of the legislative district changed in 2021 with the work that you performed?
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A I'm sorry. I don't understand the question.
Q Did all of the legislative district boundaries change with the work that you performed?

A I'm not entirely certain.
Q Have you reviewed what the commission transmitted to the supreme court or to the legislature in terms of documents that would reflect legislative boundaries to know whether or not the legislative boundaries of districts changed?

A I reviewed those documents when they were presented. Do you know what legislative district boundaries changed?

A I know many district boundaries changed.
Q What other district boundaries you can think of?
A Most of the district boundaries changed, in my recollection.

Q Is that legislative and congressional district boundaries?

A Yes.
If there was an agreement to leave the political metric status quo or zero percentage change in the political metric, how many different iterations of the district boundaries were possible?

> MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

Q (By Ms. Mell) How many different iterations of legislative or congressional district boundaries did you create?

A Could you repeat the question one more time?
Q How many different iterations of legislative or congressional district boundaries did you create?

A Me personally? A handful. I don't recall the exact number.

Q What were you using to drive the district boundaries in your iterations?

MR. WONG: (Videoconference
technical difficulties.)
THE WITNESS: I predominantly used
Edge, the Edge system.
THE REPORTER: Mr. Wong, what did you say there, if anything?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. MELL: Are we transmitting okay? We're just talking over?
(Reporter responds to counsel's inquiry.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) With the Edge system, what kind of input did you use to create district boundaries?
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A Can you define "input"?
Q Content. What did you put in to create your boundaries?

A I'm still a little unclear about the question. I'm sorry. Is it about how I drew it?

Q It is about how you drew it. I'm just wanting to know what information you used to come up with the boundaries in the Edge software program.

A The Edge software program that $I$ used had a number of different data sets predominantly around population as well as others.

Q Did it have political data?
A It did.
Q Did you use that political data?
A I did.
Q Was the political data a driving force for your consensus?

A It was one of the factors that $I$ considered.
Q What other factors did you consider?
A Things that made geographical sense. Natural boundaries. Traditional connected communities. Junior taxing districts. Local governments. Transportation corridors. Historic presence in the district.

Q What's your highest level of education?
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A I have a master's in business and a juris doctor.
Q When did you get your master's?
A Around 2008.
Q From where?
A Seattle University.
Q Your JD?
A Same. A joint program.
Q Okay. Did you become licensed to practice in any state?

A Yes.
Where are you licensed to practice?
A Washington.
Q Do you practice law?
A Not currently.
Q What is your job currently?
A I'm the president and CEO of the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce.

Q Do you have government experience with your work?
A I do.
Q What experience do you have working for government?
A I worked with the King County Council, with the University of Washington, with King County prosecutor's office, and in the Washington State Legislature.

Q When were you in the legislature?
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A 2011 through the end of 2018.
Q Were you a partisan member of the legislature?
A I was elected on a party -- with a party preference. What was the party preference?

A Republican.
Q And what was your district?
A The 47th.
Q Did you request on -- well, did you request that the commission caucus at any time such that it did caucus on November 15th?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't -- I don't understand exactly what you're asking there.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you agree that the commission caucused after the business meeting, regular business meeting started on November 15th, 2021?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you know who asked for a caucus?
A I don't recall.
Q Did you?
A I don't recall.
Q Do you know where the concept came from?
A I don't recall.
Q What did it mean?
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A To meet with your partisan counterpart and then occasionally for -- and occasionally just to sit there idly.

Q Did you specify political metrics that you would agree to with respect to either the congressional or district maps?

A I shared framework proposals for different versions of both maps.

Q And when you say the word "map," what do you mean?
A When I say the word "map," I mean a geographic representation of the state with its district boundaries. When I say the word "proposal" or "concept," it may not take that form.

Q What about the word "plan"? What does that mean? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: In what context would you be asking the question?

MS. MELL: Your redistricting work.
THE WITNESS: I think there's -- I
think there's a term-of-art question in there as well as a -- kind of a vernacular in there.

I'm not certain if you're asking about specifically the redis- -- redistricting plan as called out in statute.
(By Ms. Mell) If we're talking during the course of
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this deposition about a congressional or legislative plan, that's what I'm asking.

So what is the meaning of the plan in that context?

A Again still a little unclear by the question. The plan, as we -- in my understanding from the statute, is both the combined congressional and legislative map constitutes our redistricting plan.

Q And as the statute refers to a report to the legislature, what does the report encompass?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: To the best of my
recollection, a physical description of the geographical boundaries.

Q (By Ms. Mell) On November 15th, you did not approve a congressional or legislative map, correct?

A That is correct.
Q On November 15 th, you did not vote for or approve a congressional or legislative plan, correct?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: The -- there were no
physical maps or a geographical narrative accompanying -- that were generated at the time of the vote.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Was there a motion to approve a
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legislative district plan?
A I don't know what words were used, but there was a motion to approve a legislative district. And I don't know what word was used.
(Interruption by reporter due
to simultaneous speakers.)

## THE WITNESS: I don't know what

 word was used during the -- during the meeting, during the motion.Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you make a motion to approve a legislative redistricting plan?

A I don't believe so.
Q Did you make a motion to approve a congressional redistricting plan?

A Again, I don't know what word I used, but I did make a motion for the congressional map.

Q What was your motion?
A I would have to go back and see the transcript. I don't recall.

Q What did you intend to communicate?
A That we were to bring up the proposed framework for the congressional -- for the congressional map.

Q Why did you make up the motion with regard to congressional districts?
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A I don't understand the question.
Q Why did you make the motion?
A It was very late. It was moments before the statutory deadline. There was a -- there was a possibility that this framework that $I$ had discussed with Commissioner Walkinshaw might be agreeable, and I was very interested in getting the job that we'd appointed to be -- to do done.

Q What was the form of this proposed framework?
A Are you -- sorry. I'm also a little confused. Are you referring to the actual structure of the proposal or the mechanism by which it was communicated?

Q All those things. All those things.
Do you need me to break it down more?
A It would be helpful.
Q Okay. So let's start with: What was the form of the proposed framework in terms of its presentation on the 15th?
Was it in writing, or was it oral?

A It was verbal.
Q Okay. Who spoke the words that articulated this proposed framework?

A It was, I suppose, in conversation with Commissioner Walkinshaw.

All right. So at this verbal communication of a
proposed framework -- actually, strike that. Let me say it this way.

Had this verbal proposed framework been
communicated to anyone other than Commissioner Walkinshaw at the time the vote was taken?

A Again, it was very late and chaotic and rushed. I believe I would have shared the construct with Commissioner Graves.

Q Is that because you were sitting in the same room when you were formulating it?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. When I
was -- when I was --
MS. MELL: I said "formulating it." Maybe a better word is "negotiating it."

THE WITNESS: No.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. At the time -- let's take this step by step. I don't want to get ahead of myself. I'll come back to that.

MS. MELL: So, John, what was the last question right before he said it was very late? (Pertinent question read by the reporter.)

MS. MELL: So I don't know that I
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got an answer to that question.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you share this verbal proposed framework with anyone other than Commissioner Walkinshaw prior to the vote?

MR. WONG: Object; asked and answered.
(Clarification by reporter.)

MR. WONG: Are you not picking up my mike very well?

THE REPORTER: It's just Mr. Fain and you briefly overspoke each other.

MR. WONG: So, Commissioner Fain, if you can just pause for a second just so 1 can get my objection in. It's just for the record. It'd be appreciated. Thank you.
(Clarification by reporter.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) Is it correct that this verbal proposed framework was shared by you with Commissioner Walkinshaw and Commissioner Graves before the vote?
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A Commissioner Walkinshaw and I discussed a framework. And I later communicated that framework to Commissioner Graves.

Q How long before the vote did you communicate the framework to Commissioner Graves?

A I don't recall.
Q Do you know what Commissioner Sims knew about that framework prior to the vote?

A No.
Q Do you know what any other commissioner knew about that framework prior to the vote?

A I referenced the conversation I had with Commissioner Walkinshaw with Commissioner Graves. I don't believe I had a conversation with Commissioner Augustine.

Q What was the proposed framework with regard to content?

A Again, my recollection is -- and, again, $I$ can give a -- my best recollection here would be around a restacking of the 1st and 2nd district, static political performance in the 8 th congressional district, relatively status quo elsewhere.

Those were elements of it.
Q Was this written down anywhere?
A No, I don't believe so.
What does restacking the 1 st and 2 nd mean?
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A I want to, you know, briefly go back to your previous question, if $I$ may.

Many of these, you know, proposed concepts took the form of physical maps, so there may be partial physical maps that contain elements of things.

And then what was your follow-up question?
Q What does restacking the 1 st and 2 nd mean?
A Under current law, the 1st and 2nd district are long and skinny and stretch from the Central Puget Sound up to the Canadian border. Restacking them just means that the 1st -- the one district is on top of the other, north -- north-south.

Q Instead of like this, it's like this?
A That's correct.
Q Okay. For the record, I was --
A For the record.
-- doing lines with my hands horizontal and vertical.
Okay. And so there's, is it fair to say, thousands of different ways to restack in terms of where the actual district boundaries come out? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: There are many different permutations of how to draw stacked districts.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. So what was the restacking
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construct on the proposed framework that was voted on?

A I'm sorry. I guess I don't understand the question. Well, is it correct, then, that the -- that the proposed framework that required restacking of the 1st and 2 nd had not been articulated in any one of those thousand different ways that had yet to be done with the mapping?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: It is true that the maps built to effectuate this framework were not drawn at this point.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. And is it correct, then, that there was no agreement on where those boundaries would fall for accomplishing the element of the proposed framework of restacking Districts 1 and 2?

A It's a very long question. I apologize. Okay.

A You're -- you're asking -- if you could repeat.
Q Okay. The proposed framework that was voted on was not so definite that the district boundaries to accomplish the criteria of restacking the 1st and 2 nd were expressed?

A No, I don't believe so.
I'm sorry. Okay. We may be asking questions as
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double negatives. So --
Q Yeah.
A -- I apologize. I'm not trying to be unclear here.
Q No, I'm glad you're following carefully enough to be cautious in that regard. Let me ask it again.

Did the proposed framework with regard to restacking the 1 st and 2 nd districts have any additional information other than the 1st and 2 nd would be restacked?

A I don't recall. The other considerations may have included partisan performance in certain districts.

Q The partisan performance would overlay on how that restacking mapped out?

A That's a component.
Q Okay. So is it correct that on the 16th, you had to make decisions as to how to achieve the restacking of the 1st and the 2nd while the maps were being created?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: There were maps that were being drawn on the $16 t h$. And the various boundary lines -- I guess I -- I guess just answer the -- the maps, those maps that reflect the proposal were drafted on the $16 t h$.

Q (By Ms. Mell) But during the drafting of the maps,
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that's when the decisions had to be made as to how to restack Districts 1 and 2?

I guess I don't mean "how." "Where" would probably be the better word.

Where to draw the boundary line to accomplish restacking of Districts 1 and 2.

A I mean, yes, the -- the drafting of those lines was done on the 16th. The -- there have been, as I said, previous iterations drawn of what a stacked 1st and 2nd district would look like that informed that process, I'd imagine.

Q Okay. Did you know exactly where the boundaries would be of the restacked 1st and 2 nd district when you voted?

A No.
Q Static load performance. And I just wrote the number "8." I think you probably had another qualifying word around that, but $I$ don't know what it was.

Maybe it's the 8th district, or maybe it's --
A Oh, yes. Yes.
Q Okay. So what did you -- what was the content of the proposed framework relative to static load performance 8?

A I don't know if it was -- are you saying the word "load"?
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Q That's what I wrote down. Did I misunderstand it?
A I would just say static partisan performance in the 8th is -- was the framework.

Q Okay. Okay. So with regard to static partisan performance in the $8 t h$, how large is the $8 t h$ district?

A Three-quarters of a million people, roughly.
Q Where is the 8th?
A The current 8 th contains parts of King County out through Chelan.

Q When you say "the current 8th," what are you talking about?

A The one that's currently in law. The one that has been used over the last ten years.

Q Thank you. Okay.
So how many different iterations -- I don't want to ask that way.

Is it correct that there are multiple boundary
lines that can be drawn in the 8 th district to maintain static partisan performance?

## A Yes.

Q And was the boundary -- were the boundary lines of the 8th district changed while maintaining static partisan performance in the proposal you voted -- you transmitted to the legislature?

# MR. WONG: Object to form. <br> THE WITNESS: The proposal contemplated the, you know, equalization of population, which necessitated a change in the boundary lines. 

Q (By Ms. Mell) So were there multiple different ways to map the proposed framework that was voted on with respect to static partisan performance in the 8th?

A Most likely.
Q Okay. And that work was done on the $16 t h$ with the mapping, itself, correct?

A $\quad \mathbf{M m}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q I just have to have you answer orally.
A Oh. Yes. I'm sorry. Yes.
Q I hear a "uh-hum," but --
A Yes.
Q -- but you have to have yeses and noes. Okay. Thanks.

And then my last criteria that you describe of your proposed frameworks contain status quo, or I wrote down "status quo."

What does that mean?
A Limited -- limited geographic and partisan performance changes.

Q What's "limited"?
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A My interpretation of "limited" would be the least amount of change in both of those metrics required to achieve the population targets.

Q Is 1 percent consistent with status quo?
A I guess, 1 percent with reference to what metric?
Q Oh. I guess I should ask that.
What did you mean by "status quo"? What metrics did you mean by "status quo"?

A Geographical boundaries and partisan performance.
Q Okay. Can geographical boundaries be translated into a percentage change of 1 percent?

A I have not done -- to my knowledge, I've not done a calculation like that.

Q How did you articulate geographic boundary proposals?
A Typically by drawing maps.
Q Okay. So if the status quo were to be maintained with regard to partisan performance, would it have to be less than a 1 percent change?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Not necessarily.
Q (By Ms. Mell) In your mind, when you say "status quo," what kind of statistic were you looking at with regard to partisan performance?

A Different districts had different -- different districts had different metrics or ranges, depending
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on how competitive those districts would be.
Q What's the top end of the range?
A I don't have a top end.
Q So there's no number with all the districts that would be beyond the status quo?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: No. I'm -- I'm
saying that if there was a district that was a uncompetitive district, meaning its partisan performance was very far in one direction or very far any other direction, a change in that partisan performance that didn't change its nature as a uncompetitive district by partisan measures, if it didn't change that characteristic of the district, then the number, the percentage that it moved, wasn't as relevant.

Q (By Ms. Mell) So there's a lot of variation what the status quo means per district?

A There is variation. Correct.
Q Okay. So when you voted, did you know what the status quo variation was for each of the districts that you were approving?

A Again, my recollection is that the remaining districts would not move out of the competitiveness category that they were currently in, if that makes
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## any sense.

Q Nope. I guess, let's start with remaining districts. Remaining relative to what?

A Well, we discussed the 1st, 2nd, and 8th --
Q Okay.
A -- in our previous comments.
Q Okay. So there are 49 districts?
A I thought we were discussing congressional districts at this time.

Q Okay. How many congressional districts are there?
A There are ten.
Q Got it. Okay.
So that left seven remaining. That's what we're talking about. Seven remaining districts?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. So with those seven remaining districts, when you took a vote, did you know what the status quo percentage partisan performance was that you were voting on?

A Not a precise number.
Q If not precise, then what were you thinking with regard to the proposed framework of status quo with regard to the remaining districts?

A That those districts would not categorically change from being either a competitive district becoming not
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competitive or a not-competitive district becoming competitive.

Q How many different iterations of boundaries were those seven districts maybe drawn to maintain a status quo that would not categorically change the composition of the district?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
MS. MELL: Not the composition, but
the competitiveness of the district.
MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
Q (By Ms. Mell) So fair to say at least a thousand?
A I couldn't venture a guess.
Q Is it many?
A Several, yes.
Q Okay. So the work to pick one of those severals occurred on the 16th, correct?

A In -- in part. There have been previous maps, including, I believe, a few public maps that may have closely matched at least in some districts the -- the maps that were finalized on -- on the 16 th.

Q Okay. So there was some work product out there, but it hadn't been finalized and finally selected until the 16 th .

```
Is that a fair characterization?
```
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A Again, the maps to reflect that proposal that was adopted on the 15 th were drawn on the 16 th. So...

Q But what my point is that there were decisions that had to be made on the 16 th in order to get the maps to reflect the proposal, correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Who made those decisions on the 16 th as to each of those elements of your proposed framework?

A I'm sorry. The question's a bit vague.
Q Do I need to break down the proposed framework? Is it easier if $I$ do that? Or is it clearer if $I$ do that? Is that where you're struggling?

A Perhaps.
Q Okay. So who made the decisions with regard to the boundaries for the congressional district in order to maintain the status quo of the seven districts other than the 1st, 2 nd, and 8th?

A Again, I believe -- I believe I recollect that staff were in some cases -- in some cases reconciling different versions of existing maps that had been previously drawn.

Q When you say "staff," who do you mean?
A In this case, I believe Paul Campos was involved. I believe, is it Ali? From Senate staff.

Q Anyone else?
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A On the congressional map, $I$ don't -- I don't recall.
Q Do you know whether or not Paul and Ali were also trying to integrate and draw boundaries to reflect public comment, or were they just instructed to maintain the status quo?

MR. WONG: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, the -- excuse
me.
The previous -- the previous iterations of the maps that had been drawn as various proposals that were -- that were informing their work were -- took into account the voluminous amounts of public -public feedback, and so there was a great amount of public feedback that was contained in the final map.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you make any decisions on district boundaries on the 16 th relative to public input?

A In that I reviewed the product of reconciling these -- reconciling previous proposals that included substantial public input, in that way I did take into account public input on the $16 t h$.

Q Do you recall looking at -- well, strike that.
How many different proposed final maps did you look at on the 16th?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { MR. WONG: Objection to form. } \\
& \text { MS. MELL: Congressional district }
\end{aligned}
$$

maps.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
Likely there were at least the previous version that had been drafted by Paul and one that was drafted by Ali.

Q (By Ms. Mell) How many times did you look at what Paul and Ali were looking at to give input?

A I don't recall.
Q Multiple times?
A I did not -- on whole, I did not provide much input into the process on the 16 th .

Q Is it correct that you provided input on the process on the 16 th?

A We had conversations over the -- over a few boundary lines, yes.

Q What boundary lines were those?
A The amount that the 9 th district would travel into Seattle.

Q And when you said "we" in that sentence, I assume --
A I'm sorry. Go ahead.
Q I assumed you meant Paul and Ali? Is that correct assumption? Or were you talking more broadly?

A Oh, I was having a conversation with Commissioner Walkinshaw.

Q Okay. So when you said, "We had conversation
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over" -- I didn't get it all written down there. Did you say the 9th?

A No. Oh, I'm sorry. The 9th. Yes, I did say that. I apologize. Yes.

Q Okay. All right. So when you were having the conversation over the boundaries in the $9 t h$, the conversation occurred with Commissioner Walkinshaw alone, just you two, or were Paul and Ali there at the same time?

A Paul and Ali, $I$ believe, were there.
Okay. So do you remember what you said to
Commissioner Walkinshaw and what he said back to you?
A We had -- I had thought that a portion of the 9 th district in previous proposals had included a neighborhood, and those previous proposals did not. (Clarification by reporter.)

MS. MELL: I think you were saying about where you had put the disputed part of the district. I don't know what you called it either. Let's start that over.

THE WITNESS: Sorry. We can --
MS. MELL: Let's start that whole question over again.

> All right. So let me think how I framed that
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question that got us to that point.
I think I need to clean up the record. Let me try it right here.

Q (By Ms. Mell) So you spoke to Commissioner Walkinshaw in front of Paul and Ali about the 9th district. Okay. I'm refreshing my recollection.

When you had that conversation about the $9 t h$ district in front of Paul, Ali, and Commissioner Walkinshaw, what did you say and what did Commissioner Walkinshaw say?

A I brought up that a community that $I$ thought was included in the $9 t h$ district didn't appear to be on the draft map and asked Commissioner Walkinshaw if that was his recollection.

Somehow through that conversation, I was convinced that that had -- that I had been mistaken about where I thought those -- where I thought those lines were. And we spent a few minutes determining if there was a resolution and then quickly decided that -- to leave it alone.

Q So you didn't necessarily change the mind that you thought you were -- change your mind about whether or not you thought you were mistaken. You just thought it was time to move on?

MR. WONG: Objection to form.
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THE WITNESS: No, I believe that I
was mistaken.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. And what was the name of that district, or that area?

A Normandy Park.
Q Normandy Park.
What did Commissioner Walkinshaw use to base his understanding of where Normandy Park was?

A You have to ask Commissioner Walkinshaw.
Q What did you understand he was relying on to know where Normandy Park was?

A Again, that's a -- can't really speculate what he was...

Q Well, what were you mistaken about?
A So I have believed that a previous version of the map had included Normandy Park in the 9th. Paul informed me that it did not. Paul Campos.

When you're talking about a previous version of the map, what previous version?

A One of the versions that we had been using to develop proposals with that evening.

Q Okay.
A That previous evening.
All right. So this was a version that had not been publicly revealed?
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A In its entirety, no.
Q Okay. But it is a previous version of the congressional district map that was shared between Commissioner Walkinshaw and yourself?

A I believe so.
Q And had it been shared with any of the other commissioners?

A I don't know.
Q How many maps did you create on the 15 th?
How many different versions of the congressional district map did you create on the 15th?

A I don't recall.
Q Who did you share any version of those maps with?
A Shared with Commissioner Walkinshaw, with staff, or staff shared with me.

There may have been other individuals, but I don't recall.

Q Would some of those other individuals have been Graves?

A I -- I may have -- I don't recall if our talk on the congressional map was just verbal or if $I$ actually shared a physical map. So I don't recall.

We did discuss it. Commissioner Graves was very focused on the legislative maps, so the congressional maps didn't get a lot of air time that night.
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Q I didn't mean to interrupt you. Sorry. Were you done?

A $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q Okay. So this conversation where you discussed the congressional maps with Commissioner Graves, where were you?

A Sick kids are at home today.
I believe we had a conversation that involved congressional maps in one of the rooms at the, $I$ think it was Hampton Inn in Federal Way.

Q Do you know how to describe the room you were in?
A It was a large -- this was a large hotel room with kind of two work spaces.

Q Okay. I'm just giggling about the --
A The noise in the background?
Q No. No. I was giggling about the transcript and hotel rooms and not wanting to be inappropriate. So the "large" in there was, like, okay, yeah, okay. You weren't holed up in a single suite.

But was it actually a hotel room, or was it just a business room in the hotel?

A The -- there was on the -- at parts on the 15th, there was an actual hotel suite that -- and actually there were a couple of different rooms that multiple staff and members were working out of.
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Q Okay.
MR. WONG: Joan, we've been going
about an hour. I don't know if you have -- want to finish your line of questioning here, but may be a good time to take a break pretty soon.

MS. MELL: Okay. Let me just get
some verbiage down on how to describe rooms in the hotels.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Have you read the past depositions?
A No.
Q You haven't seen the transcripts from the depositions the last couple days?

A (Videoconference technical difficulties.)
THE REPORTER: What was the answer there, Mr. Fain?

## THE WITNESS: No, I have not seen

## any depositions.

Q (By Ms. Mell) So one of the terms of art that we came up with to describe the large conference room on the first floor of the Hampton Inn was -- now I'm going to forget what $I$ was calling it.

It's the -- now I'm forgetting. You guys help me. What have we been calling it?

MR. WONG: I think the one on the
16th, the banquet room are you referring to? I think
you called it the event room or something.
MS. MELL: The event room. The event room. That's my word. "Event room."

MR. WONG: But are you talking
about the one on the $16 t h$, or are you talking about the 15 th still?

MS. MELL: I thought the event room was always the big room on the first floor, 15th and 16 th.
MR. WONG: I'll let

Commissioner Fain answer that. There was different rooms, I think, at different times.

MS. MELL: "Event room" is the word
I was trying to recall, so thank you for that. All right.

Q (By Ms. Mell) So as I understand it, there was a large conference room on the main floor that we've been referring to the event room at the Hampton.

Do you know what room that is?

## A I do.

Q How large would that room be, in your opinion?
A It is a -- it's a big room capable of hosting over a hundred people, I would --

Q Okay.
A -- imagine.
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Q Were there chairs set up in there for you?
A There were chairs in the room.
Q Was there seating for approximately a hundred, or was it just set up to accommodate your size?

A It wasn't really set up to accommodate. There were some chairs in the room that were available to grab and move around.

Q So how many chairs were in the room?
A I don't recall.
Q Okay. How many people did you have in that event room at any time?

A Probably as few as one and as many as ten.
Q Okay. And then so to distinguish that room from the room you were in, having the conversation with Commissioner Graves.

A $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q Was the room you were talking to Graves in an actual hotel suite?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And it was above the event room?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And is it your understanding that the Democrats had a different hotel suite they were working out of?

A It was my understanding that there were multiple
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rooms, yes.
MS. MELL: Okay. All right. We can take a break.

Q (By Ms. Mell) All right. Commissioner Fain, what discussions other than the one with Walkinshaw over the $9 t h$ did you have specific to the congressional district mapping on the $16 t h ?$

A Is your question about conversations that took place on the 15th or on the 16th?

Q On the 16th. I'm back, now we're in the room, the event center room.

And what are you saying to whom as it related to the congressional district map?

A Outside of Walkinshaw and those two staff members, I -- the only other conversation $I$ recall was very briefly with Commissioner Graves.

Q Okay. What did you say to Commissioner Graves, and what did he say to you?

A If I recall correctly, I asked him if he wanted to take a look at the map, which he declined.

Q When he declined to take a look at the map, was it your takeaway that he was trusting your work and
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would approve it based on the work you did or was he reserving his right to approve it at a later time? MR. WONG: Object to form.

## THE WITNESS: It was him saying

that he didn't want to look at the map.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Was there going to be another opportunity for him to look at the map?

A I don't know.
Q What arrangements were made, if any, with respect to commissioners looking at the map once completed?

A I don't recall any formal arrangements.
Q What were the informal arrangements?
A I don't recall any informal arrangements.
Q So what was your expectation with regard to the congressional district map as to the work performed on the 16th?

A That staff, once it had been completed in the Edge system, that it would be sent to commission staff for whatever process they needed to go through with it.

Q Do you know what process they had to go through with it?

A My understanding is that there's a program that analyzes shape files and converts that information to a written description.

Q Is that a necessary component of finalizing the
congressional district map?
MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not entirely
familiar with what the requirements are from the secretary of state's office, which I think is who is the holder of the redistricting plan once all other parties are done with it.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you know of any way that anyone would be able to ascertain the precise location of a mapped boundary without a written description?

A I say it's possible.
Q Do you know what the historical practice has been with regard to the necessity of having a written description of a congressional district map?

A I believe they have been included, but I don't recall seeing one.

Q So when you say it's possible without a written description to identify the specific boundaries of a district, how is it possible? How would you do it?

A If you had access to the shape file.
Q And if you had access to the shape file, would you necessarily have to have a software that reads a shape file or does something with a shape file?

A I don't quite understand the purpose of the question. Well, when you open a shape file, what does it look
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like?
A A shape. A geography. An overlay on a -- on a map.
Q Okay. So if you -- if you open a shape file, you necessarily can identify down to the road or latitude and longitude at the location of a district boundary?

A You can see a physical representation of the boundary as a line.

Q Is it specific enough so that you know which side of the line you're on if you're a voter?

A In most cases, yes. And depending on the software that you open the shape file in, you may be able to do an address search.

Q Is there software you were using?
A Edge.
Q Okay. Were others using different software than Edge?

A Yes.
Q Who was using a different software other than Edge?
A I wouldn't say "other than," but perhaps "in addition to" would be --

Q Okay.
A And -- and I would say most anyone who was drawing maps .

Q How about from the commission?
A I am not aware of other commissioners personally
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drawing maps, themselves.
Q But you personally drew maps using Edge?
A I did.
Can you give me a chronology of events on the 16th? MR. WONG: Object to form.
(Clarification by reporter.)

THE WITNESS: Could I ask you to be a little bit more specific so that I'm...?
(By Ms. Mell) At the time the meeting adjourned, what happened thereafter?

A I don't recall a point-by-point of what happened immediately following the meeting. Generally I either stay in my room and at one point $I$ was down in the event room during the time that staff was reconciling the congressional map. Did you actually sleep at the hotel at any time between the 12 th and the 17 th?

A No, I don't believe so.
Q Were you at the hotel overnight any of those days?
A I was there -- I was there until 4:30, 5. I don't recall the exact time on the $16 t h$ when $I$ left. So from when $I$ arrived the morning of the 15 th to -- to that time on the 16th.

Q Were you there the $12 \mathrm{th}, 13 \mathrm{th}$, or 14 th?
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A I don't believe $I$ was there the 12 th or the 13 th . And I believe I was there -- was Saturday the 14th?

Q Yes.
A I believe $I$ was there on -- for part of Saturday.
Q No, the 13th had to have been Saturday. The 14th would have been Sunday. The 15 th was Monday. And the 16th, Tuesday.

A Well, then maybe it was the Sun- -- maybe it was the Sunday that $I$ was there and not Saturday. I don't recall clearly. I have to go back and figure if I could piece that together.

Q Did you keep track of your time?
A No.
Q Do you know how many hours you were there on the Saturday or Sunday?

A Not exactly, no.
Q Was it more than five hours?
A On the Saturday, or -- again, I have to go back and check which day. I believe I was there on Sunday. I believe I was there a majority of the day on Sunday. Q But you didn't stay overnight into the 15 th, the day of the meeting?

A I don't believe so.
Q Were you staying in a different hotel down there, or were you always at the Hampton?
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A When $I$ was in Federal Way, $I$ was always at the Hampton.

Q Okay. And where did you set up?
MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: For what activity are
you referring?
Q (By Ms. Mell) I don't know how to distinguish the activities, so I need you to tell me where you set up for whatever it is you were doing.

MR. WONG: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: If the question is
where did $I$ spend my time at the hotel, in several locations on the first and second floor.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Where did you put your things?
A In several locations on the first and second floor.
Q If you were caucusing, where were you?
A I -- if I recall, the room that I referred to earlier on the second floor, not the -- not the event space, but the room I referred to earlier had been occupied by the chair days prior. And I don't remember, again, what day. They all blend together. But she had -- she -- that had been her room, and I believe that there was another room next door to that, that we were able to use.

And then on Monday, she left that room to spend
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more -- to spend her time in the event room, which allowed us access -- "us" meaning Commissioner Graves, his staff, and myself and my staff -- access to two separate rooms on the second floor.

Q So did you have one room and Graves and his staff had the other room with a door connecting, a connecting door between the two?

A I don't recall if there was a door between the two. If there were, it was not used. So if you wanted to enter one to go into the other, you'd go into the hallway.

Q But you and Graves were in the same room when caucusing?

A At different times, Commissioner Graves and I were in the same room, yes.

Q Were the two of you ever in one of those rooms without staff, just the two of you?

A I don't recall.
Q Were any of the other commissioners in either one of those two rooms that -- the two of you?

A No, not that $I$ recall.
Q And where were you conducting your negotiations on the congressional maps?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I discussed the
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congressional maps with Commissioner Walkinshaw in several locations from brief conversations in the hallway to a vacant part of the lobby. There's some corner booths.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Were you ever negotiating the congressional map with Walkinshaw in the event room? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: Commissioner
Walkinshaw and I obviously discussed the congressional maps on the 16 th when the map was being reconciled. I don't recall any conversations that I had with him in that room prior to that time.

Q (By Ms. Mell) So where were you during the action portion of the meeting, the regular business meeting scheduled for the 15th?

A In one of the two second-floor rooms.
Q Was anybody with you?
A At -- again, the on-camera time during that meeting happened in a number of different points throughout the evening. Is there a specific one that you're asking about?

Q Yes. I haven't left the action portion.
A Oh. The action portion, so the last few minutes of the -- Commissioner Graves may have been in the room during that time, but $I$ don't recall.
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Q During the action portion of the meeting, did you have any paper reflective of any action you were taking in front of you?

A I don't believe so.
Q What technology were you using to attend the action portion of the meeting?

A A laptop.
Q Personal laptop or a commission laptop?
A Personal laptop.
Q What kind of laptop is it?
A A Macbook.
Q How did you know to go to the action portion of the meeting?

A Possibly that Chair Augustine had told us to, either by physically telling us or through a text message. I don't recall.

Q What were you doing when you realized you needed to $\log$ in to the public portion of the Zoom meeting?

A I don't recall.
Q Were you in the Zoom meeting in a breakout room when you were off camera?

A I don't believe so.
Q Did you log in and out of Zoom each time you entered the meeting?

A I believe so.
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Q What did you think at the time the meeting started you were going to be doing?

A It was a very chaotic moment, so I think there was -at least for me, it was very unclear what was going to be happening next.

Q Did you have the sense that you would be taking a pro forma vote?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not certain what
you mean by "a pro forma vote."
Q (By Ms. Mell) Was it your belief, in part or in whole, that what you needed to do was vote on something, even if it wasn't complete?

A I think you're saying that we -- that $I$ believed we had to do something? Is that the way you phrased that?

Q I think that's fair. Or not "fair." Correct.
A Yeah, I didn't believe that we had to do anything. But my -- I mean, there's -- we could have not done anything. I'm certain it was an option. And just not even attend the meeting could have been an option.

So the question around you have to do something, like -- I guess I'm real hung up on what -- what you mean by that.
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Q Was it your belief that you were going to vote on something?

A I believe there was a possibility that we would have a vote.

Q And what were the possibilities conditioned on?
A Largely what the chair -- what the chair did next.
Q Did you know what the chair was going to do next before you logged in?

A No.
Q Did you have any idea that the chair would invite a motion on the congressional district?

A I knew it would be a possibility, or I believed it to be a possibility.

Q And what were you prepared to do if that happened?
A I had not made up my mind about much of anything at that point. These decisions were very much made in the moment.

Q Did you know when you were logging in, that if the chair invited a motion, you'd make a motion to adopt a congressional district map?

A No.
Q Did you know whether or not anyone was going to move to adopt a legislative district map?

A No.
Q Had you been informed that you should vote on
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something or make some motion to meet the deadline?
A I have my -- my own reasoning for doing what $I$ did. I can't speak for anyone else about the decision that founded their actions.

Q Do you remember what the motion was with regard to legislative districts?

A I don't recall the language that was used in the motion, no.

Q What do you think you voted on?
A I believe I voted on a framework proposal that -for -- you're asking about the legislative maps now -- a framework proposal for the legislative redistricting map.

Q Was the motion inclusive of the framework?
A I don't recall the language of the motion.
Q Did you know what the framework proposal was when you voted?

A Yes.
Q How did you know?
A Commissioner Graves must have communicated it to me.
Q When?
A At some point prior to rejoining the Zoom meeting. But at what point, I don't know.

Q It was on the 15th?
A Yes.
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Q Was it privately?
A Privately? I'm not certain if staff was present or not.

Q Was it off the -- off-line publicly?
A Yes.
MR. WONG: Object to form.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you remember it being in the second-floor suite?

A I don't recall.
Q What were the components of the framework proposal?
A Political performance changes in various legislative districts and lack of performance change in various other districts, among other factors.

Q Okay. Can you give me all of the elements of the framework proposal you voted on for the legislative district maps -- map?

A I can share with you what I recall it to be. I probably can't at this juncture give you an inclusive -- an exclusive list of things.

Q Did you ever see an exclusive list of things?
A See an exclusive list? No.
Q Was the legislative district map framework proposal ever expressed in writing?

A There were elements of the framework proposal, much like the congressional map, that built upon previous
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versions of the maps, proposals of the maps, I should say, but no single document that reflected everything.

Did you have a sense of what any one of those documents were when you voted?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Can you clarify?
(By Ms. Mell) I think you said there were elements expressed in some documents that had been created prior but not entirely inclusively.

So do you know what documents were the controlling documents in your mind when you voted?

A I can't recall. Again, I would say that there were just pre- -- there had been previous versions of maps that were part of the overall conversation. But, again, they did not reflect the entirety of the proposal that was brought for a vote on the 15 th. Okay. So tell me what you do remember about the elements.

Let me break it down so you don't have to --
A Yeah.
Q Let's start with: You did say there was an agreement on political performance changes in various legislative districts.

What legislative districts were there an
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agreement on political performance changes?
A I can share what I recall now, but I have not -- it's been several months. So I don't want to represent that I'm giving an exhaustive list of what may have been part of that at the time.

But there were several legislative districts in particular that had some -- had greater conversation around them than -- than others.

Q Okay. I get all those qualifiers.
Now what districts you recall.
A Oh, I'm sorry. The 40 -- I apologize.
Q That's okay.
A The 44th, 28th, 26th, 15th.
Those were some of the -- 47 th . I don't know if I ever said that already.

Those were some of the districts that had received more attention in the final few weeks of the process.

Q Okay. So when you vote -- when you voted to approve -- when you voted on the motion with respect to legislative districts on the 15th, you believed you were affirming political performance changes in the 44th, 28th, 26th, 15th, 47th, and possibly others?

A I was giving you a list of those districts that had
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been -- that had received more scrutiny or more conversation in the -- in the previous weeks.

In terms of what -- in terms of what specific districts were -- I believed I was voting on a framework that involved a number of these districts, various communities of interest, political performance.

And at this time, $I$ can't remember all the districts that may have come up in that conversation with Paul about the -- about the framework.

Q Okay. But I want to be sure I understood your prior testimony.

A Yeah.
Q Is it correct that the framework proposal that you believe that you were voting on with respect to legislative district included political performance changes in the 44th, 28th, 26th, 15th, and 47th, possibly others?

A It may not be just -- it may not be political performance changes. In many cases, it might be the lack of political performance changes.

But also there was -- with regards to the 15 th district, there was great deal of conversation around communities of interest and also -- again, I'm trying to recall best $I$ can conversations from that night.
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Q Okay. Let's go to the 28th.
A $\quad \mathbf{M m}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q Same question.
What was the political performance change in the 28 th that you thought you were approving when you voted on the legislative district motion on the 15th?

A Again, $I$ haven't reviewed the partisan performance in the final maps since they came out, and so I can't specifically recall all these.

My belief at the -- is that it was a modest sum amount of improvement for the Democratic party in the 28th.

Q And when you say "modest," can you give me a number at this point?

A I believe less than 1 percent.
Q What do you believe you approved in terms of political performance changes when you voted on the 15th on the motion with respect to legislative districts?

A The 15th district, I -- it would be a more competitive district than the current law map but would be -- would lean slightly Republican, and the boundaries would be changed to make it a majority Latinx district of voting age population.

Q I didn't hear what the majority -- the majority what?
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A Latinx.
Q Oh. Okay.
The 26 th. What did you believe you were approving as to political performance changes in this 26th legislative district on the 15 th when you voted on the motion --

A Again, my best --
(Interruption by reporter due
to simultaneous speakers.)

Q (Continuing by Ms. Mell) -- with regard to
legislative districts?
A Sorry. I didn't mean to talk over you.
Again, my best recollection is flat performance.
Q And what does "flat performance" mean?
A No significant change in partisan performance one way or the other.

Q Again, significant change in partisan performance leaves how much leeway?

A I don't think I have a -- a metric.
Q In the 26 th district, is a 1 percent change significant?

A Again, I believe at the time, I would have considered a 1 percent change to be a noticeable change.

Q Significant?
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A We can go back and forth on the -- on the word choice. I would just say that a 1 percent change would have -- would not be something I would have characterized as flat performance.

Q Okay. With regard to the 47th district, what did you believe that you were voting to approve as to political performance changes when the motion was made on the 15 th to approve legislative districts?

A Again, I believe my best memory would be it would be flat in the 47 th .

With regard to the 47 th district, is a 1 percent change flat performance?

A Again, both with the $26 t h$ and with the 47 th, a 1 percent change, that's on the bubble, I suppose. It's hard for me to...

Q Is it clear if it's 2 percent?
A That would be significant, in my mind.
So for the 47 th district, the statistic somewhere between 1 and 2 percent is the variation between flat performance and a significant performance change?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, my -- I'm
having difficulty assigning point values to words. MS. MELL: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And so I -- I want to
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make sure that I'm -- that I'm clear, and that -that just is hard. Since I hadn't have previously done that, it's hard to --

Q (By Ms. Mell) Let's do it this way.
Was a 2 percent change in the 47 th district outside the scope of what you thought you were approving?

A I believe so, yes.
Q Was a 1 percent change in the 47 th district outside the percent you thought you were approving?

A I believe so.
Q For the record, can you tell me what 1 percent means? MR. WONG: Object to form.
(Clarification by reporter.)

THE WITNESS: 1 percent would be a movement in one way or the other with regards to the partisan performance.

Q (By Ms. Mell) And when you say "partisan performance," can you explain what that means?

A Throughout the process, there was a number of different comparative -- comparison metrics that were thrown around to help people understand partisan perform- -- be able to talk about partisan performance.
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One that $I$ predominantly used when assessing legislative performance would have been the state treasurer's race from 2018, I believe.

So when we were discussing the 44 th, $28 t h, 26 t h$, 15th, and 47 th and trying to describe percentages, were you in your mind referencing the political metric of the state treasurer's race for 2018?

A It's possible.
Q When you placed your vote, did you know which political metric would be applicable to what you're voting on?

A Since we had used the treasurer's race in a number of conversations, I likely assumed that was the ongoing metric, though it would be important to note that most of these metrics track with them -- track with themselves. So while the performance of a particular candidate might be different, the relative performance in a district oftentimes stays the same.

So if, for instance, we're talking about a percentage gain or a percentage loss, if these two track closely, then it's not usually a significant difference in any given district.

Q Doesn't that depend on whether or not you use the final race or a primary?

A Could you -- could you be more clear about that?

11:06:501
11:06:532
11:06:563
11:06:58 4
11:07:025
11:07:07 6
11:07:117 11:07:12 8

11:07:179
11:07:10 0
$11: 07: 211$
11:07:212
11:07:313
11:07:314
11:07:315
11:07:416
11:07:4\$7
11:07:418
11:07:5B9
11:07:520
11:07:521
11:08:022
11:08:023
11:08:024
11:08:125

Q Well, isn't there the thing with the primary where you have to pick a partisan side to vote versus the final election where you can flip if you want to -you can pick your candidate of your choice -- so the nexus between whether or not they track political sides would be distinct from a primary and a final race?

A It would depend on the number of candidates and which party in the primary.

Q Okay.
A But $I$-- but $I$ believe my use of political data would focus primarily unintended there on the -- on the general election results.

Q Okay.
A For that reason and others.
Q Is it correct that there are many different iterations of how you can draw the district boundaries for the 44 th to have a particular point value improvement?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: It's likely that you
could draw it differently, yes.
Q (By Ms. Mell) And is your answer any different with regard to the $28 t h, 26 t h, 15 t h$, or $47 t h ?$

MR. WONG: Same objection.
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THE WITNESS: With regards to political performance, there would likely be different ways that those districts could be drawn.
(By Ms. Mell) I'm trying to get back to my laundry list of what the elements were of the framework proposal Commissioner Graves explained to you with regard to legislative districts. We went through political performance. I remember you saying communities of interest.

I didn't write down geographic boundaries. But were there geographic boundaries you discussed with Commissioner Graves with regard to the legislative district and the framework proposal?

A And then just to take a step back for a moment that -- that we're now at Month 11 or so of a pretty lengthy process where there had been a number of ideas that had shared from the public, from commissioners, and so this position that $I$ found myself at, at that time, was informed by all of that. And so $I$ just think that's important to note that this wasn't -- this didn't happen necessarily in just isolation.

Q Well, let me ask you -- before you answer the question, then, let me ask you this clarifying question.
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Were any of the past negotiations in public, or were they all in your dyads outside the public?

A Well, a lot of the -- I mean, there were -- the Democrats had issued second rounds of maps. And that had definitely informed the process.

And then $I$ think we all became aware in different ways, whether it be statements in the press or volume of certain types of public comment or other means, what -- what things were important to different commissioners.

Q Was the second rounds of maps from the Democrats presented in a public meeting and discussed in a public meeting?

A They were -- they were talked about in a public meeting. They were posted to the website. And they were subject to public comment, which was received by -- those public comments were received by each commissioner.

Q Okay. So with that understanding, then, let's go back and go over the framework proposal elements.

I just want to make sure $I$ have all of the elements of the framework that you thought you voted on.

I think my question is: Do you have geographical boundaries?
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Was there any expression as to geographical boundaries in the framework you voted on?

A I don't recall if there were any specific geographical boundaries that were brought up in the -- in any conversation on the 15 th where Commissioner Graves was communicating any of the elements of -- of his -- of his progress.

But I believe that there were some geographical elements that would need to be satisfied in order for the -- in order for the -- that were kind of contained in the agreement.

Q That, I was with you right up until you said "contained in the agreement."

What agreement are you talking about?
A So I mean the final voted-on proposal.
Q Okay. But you didn't talk to Graves about what that was when he told you that they had a -- he had a deal with Sims, right?

A I don't think he characterized it like that. I think he characterized -- he would have characterized the -- kind of the current state of -- of where those conversations were. I don't know if he -- again, I don't recall the exact words that he was used.

Going back to your earlier question, and just to cite some examples about different geographies in the
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state that were -- I don't know if "contested" is the right word, but that were a part of the conversation: There were various cities, and whether they would be split or not, that were part of this conversa- -that were a big part of the conversation.

The tribal communities in the tribal reservations and whether they would be contained in their own legislative district or -- or not.

So those -- those elements that -- that built over time, over the previous 11 months, I had considered being part of this -- being part of the proposal that $I$ voted on.

Q Okay. What cities?
A I won't be able to give you an exclusive list. But I had believed that in order for flat political performance in the $26 t h$, that Bain- -- or Bremerton would be -- likely be split, that the tribal communities with the exception of the Colville would be retained in their own legislative district and not split into multiples.

A vague recollection about a community, a city within the 44 th district that -- that was going to be moved out of the 44 th district. And at the moment, $I$ can't recall what that was. But I -- again --

Q Where's the 44th? Is that up north --
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A Snohomish County.
Q Snohomish County?
A Snohomish County, yeah.
Q Is it Lake Forest?
A I'm sorry. Which did you say? Lake Forest?
Q Yeah.
A I don't believe so.
Q Okay.
A I don't recall.
Q How about the 46 th? Any splits in the 46 th?
A I don't recall any specific conversation around the 46 th district.

Q Can you think of any other city splits you were tracking?

A I would think that we were tracking, you know, all city splits as a metric of -- 'cause it's one of the criteria that is in the statute around redistricting. So limiting city splits, I think, was a value that was held by me and was one that was communicated as a value that other commissioners cared about.

Q Do you know what city splits you voted to approve?
A At this time, $I$ don't recall an exclusive -exhaustive list of them.

Q Do you remember discussing any city splits with Commissioner Graves prior to the vote?
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A I don't recall.
Q And there would be no way to refresh your recollection about it with any document you can think of?

Do you remember there being any other witnesses present when you had this conversation with Graves?

A I don't recall.
May I take a quick second here and close this window? It seems my next door neighbor decided to use his blower now, and I'm having a hard time hearing. Just one second, please. I'm sorry about this.

Okay.
MR. WONG: This is the joy of Zoom
depositions.
THE WITNESS: Yes. It happens.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you want me to refresh your recollection where we were there?

A Oh. We were -- yeah, we were talking about is there something that would refresh my recollection on the city splits.

I'm not certain. It was something that we were tracking throughout the process. And in many cases, different versions of different maps would also sometimes highlight which cities were -- were split

11:20:061 11:20:062 $11: 20: 103$ 11:20:154 11:20:225 11:20:276 11:20:347 11:20:378 11:20:449
$11: 20: 440$ 11:20:451 11:20:412 11:20:5B3

11:20:52 4
11:21:015
11:21:026
11:21:027
11:21:058
11:21:019
11:21:080
11:21:121
11:21:122
11:21:163
11:21:22 4
11:21:225
in those.
I know that the proposals that came out both initially and then the -- the subsequent ones by the Democrats, $I$ think one of their metrics that they shared along with that map was -- was the number of cities that were kept whole.

Q So as you're sitting here today, you can't tell me what city -- cities you approved a split when you voted?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall right now which cities were split in the final agreement.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. I just want the record to be clear. I was going to ask that as a follow-up. So...

A Sorry.
Q You don't know what cities were split in the final agreement, correct?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I do not right now
recall what cities were split in the final map, all of the cities.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. As you sit here today, you do not recall what -- when you voted, what you approved in terms of city splits, correct?
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MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I do not recall
whether I had an exhaustive list of city splits in my mind at the time that $I$ voted.

Q (By Ms. Mell) And as we sit here today, you can't think of any city split that you voted to approve when the vote was taken?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, to -- again, I -- I -- I believe the framework, what $I$ voted on, included some city splits as would be necessary to effectuate some of the partisan performance metrics. There are a number of cities that I can articulate now that -- that would fall under that category. I would not want to attempt an exhaustive list of that. Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. So just give me what you recall.

A For example, $I$ believe that -- that Bremerton would be an example of a city that -- that would be split. There are areas that had previously been split that continued to be split. I believe the city of Kent. I think the city of Bellingham may be another. I believe the city of Auburn is another.

I think there are a number of cities that had historically been split and that continue to be split
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either as -- as a necessity for achieving these population equalization numbers or in some cases because they had other boundaries on top of them that -- that may have been prioritized over the city boundary, like, for instance, a city that might straddle a county.

Q Can you think of any other cities?
A I believe Wenatchee, from East Wenatchee. Again, I -- this -- this could be refreshed by looking at the -- at the final maps, obviously, 'cause those contained the -- the final city splits.

But, again, when you're -- you want to try to -you want to try to minimize city splits as a goal, but that's also not always possible and oftentimes is made impossible by the way the population grows.

Q When you voted on the legislative district on the measure on the -- strike that.

When you voted on the motion on the legislative districts, did you vote to approve a split of a district that hadn't -- a split of a city that had not previously been split?

A I don't recall.
Q Did your vote contemplate eliminating a split in any particular city?

A I don't recall at this time.
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Q Is there any number of different ways that you can draw a legislative district boundary to either incorporate into an entire district a city or split a city?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: There are multiple
ways to draw any number of district boundaries.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Where did you think the district boundary was relative to crossing the Cascades when you voted?

A I believe that the Cascades would cross in the -I'm -- pardon me if $I$ get the numbers back and forth a bit -- I believe it's the 12th district. I always get the 12 th and the 13 th mixed up in my head. But the district had traditionally held Chelan and Douglas Counties.

Q Did you have any conversation with Graves about the framework proposal specific to I-90?

A Could you be a little bit more specific there? What... ?

Q Did you have any conversation about where the district boundaries would be relative to following I-90?

A I recall conversations with regards to where the population that needed to move from eastern

11:28:051
11:28:102
11:28:103
11:28:14 4
11:28:215
11:28:24 6
11:28:277
11:28:32 8
11:28:35 9
11:28:310
11:28:421
11:28:412
11:28:493
11:28:54 4
11:28:58 5
11:29:02 6
11:29:067
11:29:118
11:29:119
11:29:180 11:29:221

11:29:252
11:29:32 3
11:29:38 4
11:29:425

Washington would come over to western Washington. I don't know --

Q Was there a nexus to I-90 with that?
A I-90 was one of the -- was one of the options.
Q So what were the specifics in the framework proposal with regard to the movement of that population?

A Again, my recollection is, is that the population needed to come over would come through that -- and, again, $I$ apologize -- 12th or 13th district.

I -- I believe it's the 12th. But the one that had previously held Chelan and Douglas Counties, that that would be where the population would come over.

Q When Graves told you about the framework proposal on the 15 th, do you remember communicating with him about that part of the proposal?

A I don't -- I don't recall anything.
Q Do you remember hearing anything earlier where there had been an agreement reached between Sims and Graves on that point?

A I don't recall when that element was brought to my attention.

Q Do you remember throughout the negotiations hearing from Graves what progress he and Sims were having on the legislative districts and their negotiations?

A Commissioner Graves and I discussed the number of
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proposals that had been a part of the -- his conversations.

Q And were you discussing that in the -- on the second floor in the suite?

A We regularly talked about different elements of the redistricting process and various proposals that were out there. I don't know of what kind of specific conversation you are referring to.

Q I'm just wondering how much of -- how much were you talking about the legislative and congressional district negotiations with one another outside of the public on the 15th?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: We did have
conversations about various proposals on the 15th.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Outside of the public meeting?
A While not logged in to the public meeting.
Okay. Did that include Commissioner Graves expressing where Commissioner Sims was with regard to the negotiations?

A No. It was -- let me -- let me backtrack a moment. When there might be a concept brought up that relates to one of the maps, that might be a concept that's brought up by another -- another commissioner, but it's not -- it's not a -- I mean, it's just one
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of many various proposals that are coming to light.
I guess I'm still a little unsure of what you're specifically asking.

Q I think I understand why you're struggling with the way I framed the question.

I guess, was it your understand- -- well, strike that.

Am I understanding your answer to mean that when you were talking about the proposals with

Commissioner Graves, there wasn't necessarily an attribution saying, well, Commissioner Sims, this was her particular idea versus anybody else's idea? It was just this is what we're discussing in the negotiations?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I mean, I -- I think
that is fair characterization of some of our conversations. Again, there are -- and this was an 11-month process. There were, I think, thousands of pieces of -- of public testimony and, you know, dozens and dozens of concepts thrown about. So I -I don't want to characterize a conversation, you know, too narrowly, I guess.

MS. MELL: Okay.
MR. WONG: Joan, we've been going
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about an hour and 15 minutes. Can we do a quick break?

MS. MELL: Can we do it right on
the hour? 'Cause I've got some people I'm supposed to meet with on the hour.

MR. WONG: Can we go off the record
for just a second to discuss this?

> (Discussion off the record.)
> (Pause in proceedings from
> 11:38 a.m. to $11: 43 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. )

Q (By Ms. Mell) So is it correct to say that on the 15th, outside the publicly viewable Zoom meeting, you were aware of the status of the negotiations with regard to the legislative districts by your conversations with Commissioner Graves?

A I would say that Commissioner Graves and I did discuss elements of the legislative maps.
Q And is it correct that there was -- one -- at one of those conversations -- I'm going to say privately; and when $I$ say it in that context, I mean not in the Zoom meeting that the public could view -- you actually discussed a framework proposal that was going to come before the commission during the action portion of the meeting?
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A I think there are a couple of assumptions built into that question, so $I$ just want to make sure $I$ unpack it.

The first is that would be coming for a vote. Again, $I$ wasn't necessarily sure what would be coming for a vote or if anything would be coming for a vote with certainty.

And, two, the word "discussion," with regard to that final -- that final -- as we were getting towards the end where Commissioner Graves would have shared with me -- and I don't remember entirely this -- this conversation, but I would characterize it more he's just relaying to me what the -- what the conversation he had with Commissioner Sims, some of the elements of that. So I wouldn't necessarily call it a discussion.

Q Did you communicate back to him whether or not you agreed with where they were?

A I don't believe so.
Did you give him any information as to whether or not their negotiations were including your concepts?

A At this particular conversation, I don't recall providing much feedback.

Okay. But you at least received information as to status of the negotiations on the legislative
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## districts?

A Commissioner Graves did relate to me the elements of -of that -- that proposal that eventually did end up being up for vote.

Q And how do you know that there was -- strike that.
Are you saying that there was a nexus between this conversation with Commissioner Graves and what came up for a vote?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not certain what
you mean by "nexus." I think --
Q (By Ms. Mell) Is there any -- any similarity between what was described by Graves in your conversation and what you thought you were voting on?

A I believe Commissioner Graves at some point late in that evening communicated to me elements of a -- of a proposal that -- and that that proposal was the basis for my -- my vote that evening.

Q Did he tell you that Sims and him -- he and Sims had reached an agreement on that framework?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
(By Ms. Mell) When you and -- well, how much time did you spend with Graves on the 15 th in the suites on the second floor?

11:49:261
11:49:362
11:49:453
11:49:484
11:49:515
11:49:566
11:50:007
11:50:018
11:50:059
11:50:020
11:50:131
$11: 50: 112$
11:50:113
11:50:214
11:50:215
11:50:336
11:50:327
11:50:5R8
11:51:119
11:51:280
11:51:321
11:51:322
11:51:323
11:51:424
11:51:525

A I'd say we were in -- were together at some point on the second floor off and on throughout the day and evening. In terms of a total amount of time spent in a room together, it would be measured in hours.

Q More than five?
A I can't narrow it down that tightly, but several hours.

Q Okay. And those several hours you were with Commissioner Graves, did the two of you ever strategize negotiation tactics?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I think we had
conversations about the status of the negotiation and speculation about whether or not this was -- this was going to end in a -- in a success or not.
(By Ms. Mell) Did you discuss -- did you discuss any methods to reach consensus?

A The specific instance where $I$ would reference would be the -- when it appeared that there was -- it appeared that the conversation between Commissioner Graves and Commissioner Sims was not going well and there didn't appear to be much progress.

And so you asked about tactics. I had suggested that they -- or I suggested to Paul that they ask Commissioner Augustine to participate in some way,
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offer a mediator's proposal.
Q Did she do that?
A Yes.
Q What was her mediator's proposal?
A I don't -- I don't know the details of the proposal, itself. I wasn't party to when they were -- when the commissioners were presented with it. I had merely been involved in asking Commissioner Augustine whether or not she would consider playing that role as a means of getting talks started again.

Q When you spoke to her, were any other commissioners present?

A No.
Q What generally do you know about the mediator's proposal?

A That it had to do with performance of -- there was some disagreement over performance in some legislative districts, probably some of the legislative districts that we previously mentioned, and that she offered a suggestion of a type of midway. And, again, I don't know the details of -of what that -- of what was offered.

Q When you say "midway," are you talking about a percentage point for those districts?

A Yeah, either a percentage point or that one district
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would be modified and one wouldn't with regards to partisan performance.

Q It's your understanding that she made a mediator's suggestion and that broke the -- the distance?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't -- I -- I
don't -- I don't know what impact her proposal or her suggestion had on the process.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you know that there was an impasse, and after she made a mediator's proposal, the impasse no longer existed?

A My recollection is that the impasse lasted well beyond the time that she provided a proposal to Commissioner Sims and Graves.

Q Do you know -- do you have knowledge that at some point in time the impasse ended?

A Well, there was a vote taken where the commissioners agreed to a framework and public session, so there must have been something that changed in the minds of different commissioners.

Q Were you aware that the impasse had been broken sometime prior to the vote?

A I was aware that conversations had -- had taken place. As $I$ said, $I$-- the content of -- of the proposal that $I$ believe $I$ voted on was relayed to me
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by Commissioner Graves sometime late in the evening.
Q Was it your understanding when the proposal was relayed to you by Commissioner Graves that Commissioner Sims had approved it?

A I did not know whether or not Commissioner Sims would be supporting it. It was proposal that -- that satisfied a number of the issues that -- that had been discussed going back many, many months from a priority standpoint, but $I$ didn't know where any individual commissioner was going to come down on it.

Q Okay.
A Myself included.
Okay. But did you understand at the point in time it was conveyed to you that it reflected the result of the negotiations between Sims and Graves?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I believe -- yeah, I believe that the -- I believe that the content of the proposed -- of the proposal had been part of the conversation that Commissioner Graves and Commissioner Sims had had.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. And to the best of your knowledge, Commissioner Sims, at the time the framework was conveyed to you, had no -- no expressed objections to it?
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A I did not have any conversation, the best of my recollection, with Commissioner Sims at this juncture in the process.

Q Was it your belief after speaking with Commissioner Graves about the framework that Commissioner Sims had not expressed any objections to it?

A Sorry. We got a lot of -- lot of questions going on there.

Yeah, would you be able to repeat that question one more time? I apologize.

Q I'll break it down.
Was it your understanding when Commissioner Graves expressed the proposed framework, that he and Commissioner Sims had come to terms on the framework such that neither were objecting to the framework as a proposal?

A I don't recall Commissioner Graves communicating any express objection to the framework that -- from -from Commissioner Sims.

Q Is it correct that you understood that the framework he was describing to you was the result of their work together and not a new proposal that Commissioner Sims had not had the opportunity to vet?

> MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I believed that the
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proposal that was shared with me was something that Commissioner Sims was aware of.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you know whether any other commissioner was aware of the framework proposed?

A I don't.
Q All right. So what did you vote to approve with regard to the legislative districts relative to communities of interest?

A It was my belief that a final proposal included the majority Latinx voting population district in the 15th, that -- that several reservations that had requested to be kept entirely within one legislative district would -- would be included in those districts.

I believe that -- that there was a split of a community of interest that was very disappointing to me in that Chelan and Douglas County, so -- and -and there may be others.

Those are things off the top of my head right now.

Q So when you were talking to Graves about the proposed framework, you knew that there was a disappointing split of the communities of interest in Chelan and Douglas County?

A I don't know if he -- I don't recall the conversation
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close enough to know if whether he explicitly stated it, but I knew the consequences of coming over the mountains with that particular district and drawing it such that it had enough population but not too much population. So $I$ don't know if it was expressly stated or if it was something $I$ inferred.

Q But it's not something -- it's not something that you became disappointed about on the 16 th when the maps were actually being drawn?

A Well, I was -- I mean, I guess, characterize disappointment and timing. I think -- I don't think there's been a time that $I$ haven't been disappointed by it.

Q Right.
But until it becomes a reality, there's no need to be disappointed, correct?

MR. WONG: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, I -- I viewed it as a -- and, again, I viewed it as part of the -- part of that final framework that came up for a vote, and so I didn't have any expectation that it was not going to be reflected in -- in the final maps.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that in taking a vote, the proper way to do it to clearly express the
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commission's collective intent would be to have the maps completed?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I would prefer to
have had the maps completed at the time of vote.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that it's virtually impossible to know what you collectively voted on when there's no written proposal?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Approving a framework
in the manner that the commission did does create ambiguities that $I$ think we've discussed already.
(By Ms. Mell) Would you agree it's not transparent? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I think I've stated publicly that $I$ do not believe that this -- that the final hours of the commission were conducted in the way that I wish they had been.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that they were not transparent?

MR. WONG: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I would -- I would
have -- I would have been far more -- it would have been more transparent for -- for participants in the public to have physical maps reviewed in advance of a
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vote, yes.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that it was not transparent to be negotiating in caucuses outside the public meeting?

MR. WONG: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I think every
commission has conducted some kind of dyad process in the formation of proposals and in the vetting of -of issues that are going to come up in the redistricting process. So in that regard, I think that this was -- the many elements of this were done as -- as has been historically done.

I'd say the key difference is that there was a lot more public participation and public input throughout the process than has been the case in the past by many magnitudes.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. So do you agree that the negotiations off-line on the 15 th were not transparent?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't really know
how to -- how to answer that question. I would say that my disappointment was that there were not visible physical maps that could be shared at the time of the vote for -- in advance of that for the
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public to review. That would have been a -- that certainly would have been a more transparent end to the commission's work.
(By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that meeting in caucuses -- strike that.

Would you agree that leaving the public meeting to negotiate in caucuses or dyads was not transparent?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
MS. MELL: What's the objection to
form?
MR. WONG: I think that when you're using the word "transparent," you're implying a legal conclusion. So that's -- that's the objection. And so every time you ask the same question, I'm just making the same objection.

THE WITNESS: There were a lot of things that were happening during the break, the caucus break. And a lot of those things sometimes included a whole lot of nothing. And so, you know, doing -- sitting around and waiting probably is not a -- probably not inappropriate to be done in -- in private. Conversations between commissioners that happened outside of the meeting are to be expected in any process like this.
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Q (By Ms. Mell) Why do you say that?
A Maybe -- more specific?
Q I mean, my question is: Was it -- was negotiating in caucuses and dyads outside the public transparent? And it's really a yes-or-no question.

Was it transparent?
MR. WONG: Objection.
THE WITNESS: Well, again, I -- I'd
say that the -- I guess I shared the same concern that it draws us for a bit of a conclusionary-type statement.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. Are you struggling with the fact that if you say "yes," it would suggest that you violated OPMA?

A I'm struggling with the characterization -- I'm struggling with the broad characterization that a conversation between two commissioners that does not occur on camera is somehow not transparent. It is not my belief -- and it's not my belief that that's the case.

Q Okay. So what kinds of conversations have to be on camera? And I don't mean camera in that sense. I'm using it in the sense --

A I understand what you're meaning.
Q -- that the public can view.
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A Again, my understanding, the, you know, official votes and the -- and the formation of a majority position or of formation of the majority position is something that occurs in the public meeting as it did. It's not my understanding that elements of proposals can't be discussed between commission members at other times.

Q What is your understanding with regard to serial meetings?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: What specifically -what specific aspect of serial meetings are you asking about?

Q (By Ms. Mell) I'm asking what your understanding is of serial meetings relative to open government.

MR. WONG: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: You mean definition? That a -- that a minority of a governing body -- the different members of a minority always constituting a minority of a governing body can't meet in sequence with one another to come to a final decision about a action before the body.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Is it your understanding that a minority of the governing body cannot meet in sequence to come to a final decision -- strike that.
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I'm not asking that correctly.
My question pertains to your use of the phrase "a final decision."

Can a minority of the governing body meet in sequence to communicate about, in this instance, legislative and congressional district maps outside the public view?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: It was not my -- it
was not my belief that conversations between various commissioners constituted a breach of the Open Public Meetings Act. Conversations that dealt with the subject matter of redistricting (Videoconference technical difficulties.)

THE REPORTER: "Subject matter..."
It kind of got garbled there because you sped up. Repeat that.

THE WITNESS: Sorry. I'll -- I'll
say it again.
It is not my belief that conversations pertaining to the redistricting process that occur between various commissioners at different times constitutes a violation of the Open Public Meetings Act.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Would you characterize your conversations with other commissioners on the 15th
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off-line or not on camera were negotiations over the redistricting congressional legislative district maps or plans?

A I would say my conversations with Commissioner Walkinshaw were -- the conversation I had with Commissioner Walkinshaw dealt with the different elements at play in the congressional map, where we disagreed, where we were finding other issues to discuss, and eventually in the formation of a -- of a proposal that we could bring before the full body.

Q And how about with Graves? Same thing?
A With Graves, it was mostly -- it was just information sharing.

Q And strategizing how to negotiate?
A It's a broad term, so I don't -- I mean, I was not telling him to offer certain -- I wasn't providing feedback to -- again, I'm trying to go back to this -- to this time on the 15th and really understand those conversations.

They were status reports and a lot of waiting is really what constituted the time on the 15th. There was a lot of time spent not really knowing what was going on or not really knowing, you know, if this process was even going to continue.

Q Was there a lot of time communicating proposals and
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## counterproposals?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: You mean
communicating proposals or counterproposals between whom?

MS. MELL: The voting
commissioners.
THE WITNESS: I was having
conversations with Commissioner Walkinshaw about the congressional maps, and there were in some cases draft maps that accompanied those conversations.

I believe that similar conversations were going between Commissioner Graves and Commissioner Sims on the legislative maps, but $I$ don't know -- I don't know anything other than what was shared with me by Commissioner Graves as a status update.

Q (By Ms. Mell) And Augustine, to the extent she was mediating?

A I didn't talk with Commissioner Augustine really about the substantive -- about the substance of -- of any of the maps. I had merely asked her if -- I'd asked her if she would be willing to participate by seeing if they could -- seeing if her involvement, and I encourage the conversation continue.
'Cause at that particular juncture in the
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evening -- and $I$ can't recall what time it was. Late afternoon, early evening. At that juncture, it didn't appear as though much progress was being made.

Q But you did also discuss how to do a mediator's proposal, right? You talked with her about coming up with a middle ground?

A I didn't talk to her about the substance of what factors were in play. I don't recall. I -- my recollection is $I$ just asked her whether or not she felt comfortable playing that role, and if so, then she could get Commissioner Graves and Sims and ask them if they would be comfortable with her participating in that way.

Q Did you work with Commissioner Graves on preparing a Republican proposal to the supreme court in the event there was no majority approval of the commissioners on any other proposal by midnight?

A Throughout the process, there was discussion about what $a$-- what would happen if we were unable to reach consensus as a commission and whether or not we would have any role to play in the subsequent action before the supreme court, whether we should develop a proposal for the supreme court to review along with some rationale that we may prepare about it. That was -- but that was discussed, yeah.
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Q And when you say, "That was discussed," who did you discuss that with? Any commissioners?

A I discussed that with Commissioner Graves.
Q Any other commissioners?
A I don't recall.
Q Do you know whether or not your conversations with Graves about that were shared with any other commissioners?

A I don't know.
Q Was your staff authorized to be communicating with other caucus staff about conversations like the framework for a proposed legislative map or a congressional district map from the negotiations in the dyad?

A Staff had varying -- sorry. Greg, did I talk over you there?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Staff had different
roles in this process, but $I$ believe that the staff to any individual commissioner was often involved in the direct conversations on -- on the substance of -of the maps. And, I guess, in most cases, they were charged with drafting up the various proposals, themselves.
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Q (By Ms. Mell) That would work where -- because each of you had your own staff people. You and the commissioners would talk in front of your staff, and then your staff would go do the work to reflect what they heard their representative commissioner saying and share that to try to make sure they were -- well, to create an expression of where they thought those conversations were at that moment, correct?

A At times, that would happen. That wouldn't happen all the time.

Q But that was happening on the 15 th outside the public view?

A I believe that there were a number of different maps that were drawn up on the $15 t h$ by varying staff people. I don't recall specifically what they all reflected.

Q But -- yeah. But what $I$ was saying wasn't limited to maps.

There were conversations occurring between you and other commissioners where your respective staff were present. And you -- as I understand the commissioners, the two working in a dyad would be conversing and negotiating. And staff would be there to help translate that into something that they could communicate with one another?
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A I think -- I think, in part, that's correct.
I think I'd referenced earlier that after midnight, the process of drafting the agreed-to map, it often involved the reconciliation of different maps that previously existed, that, you know, may have been drawn in a process like what you're describing.

Q Right.
And that involved you and other commissioners in that process, correct?

A That would involve the commissioners that are -- that were charged as a dyad. So I believe that -- that there was some map drawing as part of the conversations that I've had with Commissioner Walkinshaw with regards to the congressional map.

Again, really chaotic environment. I'm not entirely sure what was drawn when or by whom.

Q Was it your expectation that the staff assigned to you would communicate with the other staff about trying to express your wishes, or was it your expectation that they would not talk about what -how to express your wishes?

A I don't think it was a hard-and-fast rule. I think if something was going to be shared with other staff, I believe it was usually done so at my direction. I
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don't believe it was customary to just hit "send" on every, you know, conversation that we had and every map proposal that we drafted up.

Q But that's what makes a good staff member, right?
They know how to gauge what you want communicated and what you don't and translate that into work product? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: A lot of good things
make a good staff member.
MS. MELL: Okay. I had a question
in my mind. It just went out. Just a second here. I lost it. Okay.

THE WITNESS: I've been there.
MS. MELL: Yeah.
Well, I hear that my guests are downstairs, so I need to take a break.

MR. WONG: Can we go off the record real quick?

MS. MELL: Yeah. Sure.

> (Discussion off the record.)
> (Pause in proceedings from
> $12: 26$ p.m. to $1: 14$ p.m.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) Commissioner Fain, did you
intentionally avoid communications with other voting
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commissioners so that you would not trigger OPMA while negotiating the legislative and congressional district maps privately?

A I had conversations with various commissioners at different times. The Open Public Meeting Act was something that was on my mind during this process, but I never believed that that precluded me from having conversations one-on-one with other commissioners.

Q Did you arrange your communications in such a way that you would not be communicating out of the public forum with other voting commissioners where there were three of you communicating at one time?

A I specifically remember that -- that we avoided having three voting commissioners on a Zoom or in a in-person meeting, or encounter even, so that we wouldn't trigger an OPMA issue.

How about with regard to other forms of digital communication, text threads, instant messaging, that kind of thing?

Did you avoid linking text or text threads or e-mail or instant messaging where the communications would be with three voting commissioners at any given time?

A I don't -- I can't recall an instance where $I$ was on
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a e-mail or a text thread with three or more voting commissioners outside some of the regular business communication that would come from the commission about meeting times and things like that.

I can't recall any specific instance at this time.

Q I think my question is a little bit different.
I'm trying to examine you with regard to your intent.

Did you take active steps to set up text communications with other commissioners where the thread would be limited to one other commissioner but not two other commissioners?

A Again, $I$ don't recall a text thread that $I$ was on that involved three or more voting commissioners and that I was -- I was trying to avoid situations where three or more voting commissioners would be together, discussing commission business outside of a public meeting.

Q All right. And with regard to triggering events for OPMA as you understood it, or $O-P-M-A$, if three commissioners were together, was that enough to trigger OPMA in your mind or was the content of the communications of significance to you?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
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THE WITNESS: First, I'd say I don't recall any time when -- other than, you know, walking past one another in a hallway -- where three voting -- three or more voting commissioners were in the same place at one time.

My understanding of the OPMA is that it would be permissible for them to be in the same area but that would not be permissible to be discussing commission business together.
(By Ms. Mell) And one of the things that you didn't say there that $I$ think you had said in one of your previous answers was acting on or taking a vote on commission business.

So I'm trying to ascertain in your mind, is there collective work that could be done among three voting commissioners without taking a vote that would not have given you pause or concern about the legal implications under the open government or OPMA?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I guess I'm being
asked to speculate, which I'm not -- not too comfortable in doing. So I guess I'd ask for more of a specific example or specific instance that -- that I might be able to respond to.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. So in your mind, was there a
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concern for you about open government implications if there were three or more of you in the room conversing about redistricting issues if you didn't reach a consensus --

MR. WONG: Object to form.
Q (Continuing by Ms. Mell) -- or take some kind of vote?

A I would just say that we -- or that -- again, speaking for myself, I avoided -- I avoided being in a situation where there would be three or more voting commissioners so that there, you know -- as I thought that was the -- kind of the most black-and-white way to ensure $I$ was following my understanding of the OPMA .

Q Okay. So then what about, did you apply the same standard to your e-mail communications?

A Again, I think I asked -- answered that before. I don't recall a time being on an e-mail thread, but I don't -- I mean, there were quite a -- quite a few e-mails sent throughout the -- throughout the process to one another, and I have not had a chance to review them all.

Q Okay. Can you see any documents in your chat room right now?

A Not yet.
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Q Maybe I'll just do the share screen again. I think we decided that was a little bit better.

A Yeah, it's easier for me.
Q Okay. Just a second here. Back to share screen. Share.

Okay. How about now? Can you see the share screen?

A I can. Let me change my screen size so $I$ can see it a little better.

Q Actually, hold on just a second. I've got to see if this one has a Bates number on it.

Yeah, that one does. I'm going to -- well, wait a minute.

Well, I guess that's the way it was produced, so let me just -- yeah, I guess that is the way it was produced. So let's work with this one.

MS. MELL: Mr. Court Reporter, I'd
like to mark -- I believe it has been marked as Exhibit 41, RC003040, and uploaded to you. It's a two-page document. It's an e-mail. It's this one.
(Discussion off the record.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) So, Commissioner Fain, showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 41, do you recognize that document?
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A I do.
Q What is it?
A It is a e-mail that -- with a memo attached that I sent to members of the commission.

Q And how many members of the commission did you send that to?

A Appears $I$ sent it to the chair and copy to the remainder of the commission.

Q So would you agree that this is a communication between a majority of the voting commissioners?

A Yes, I would.
Q What were you asking -- or did you in this communication ask the voting commissioners to do anything?

A I would want to review. I don't recall all the details of this memo.

Q All right. It was produced to me in public records separately, so I'll open it here.

Let me see. Did I get one that's Bates-numbered? Yes, I did. Okay.

Let's look at this one, then. MS. MELL: Let's mark the memo portion of the e-mail exchange as Exhibit 42.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Showing you what's being marked as Exhibit 42 , what is that?
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A The memo that was attached to the e-mail that I'd sent commissioners.

Q How do you want me to do this so that you can answer the prior question? Do you want me to scroll through this like this?

A Yeah, if you'd scroll to the bottom.
Q Scroll to the bottom.
A Yeah.

## Thanks.

Okay.
Q I believe the question was: What did you ask the commissioners to do relative to this communication via e-mail?

A The sentence that uses the word "asks" relates to maintaining overall balance of competition, something that had been primary priority for me throughout this entire process and something I'd spoken about frequently.

Q Why did you send this e-mail with this memo?
A I had -- I did not sense that members had calibrated their expectations in a way that would be productive. And by that I mean I wanted to be clear about what prioritizing competitive -- a competitive -- a competitive map would look like and how I viewed what a competitive map would look like statistically.
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Q Did you -- well, strike that. Let's start with this. Did you actually write Exhibit 42?

A I did.
Q Did you write it on November 13th, 2021?
A I wrote it in or around that date. I don't remember when the first draft was put together, but it was not something that I'd worked on over -- the memo portion, itself, $I$ think, was written around that date.

Q Did you write this memo while in negotiations at the Hampton?

A No. I believe it was prior to that. I don't -yeah.

Q November 13, if that's the Saturday or Sunday.
Is that before you went to the Hampton is your recollection or while you were there?

A My recollection is that $I$ wrote this prior to going to the Hampton. Again, I can't remember exactly what day it was there. I believe that this was written prior to that.

Q Do you recall writing this to help facilitate the negotiations going on at the Hampton?

A I wrote it as a -- as a way of showing -- as a -illustrating a way of viewing my priority of competitive districts through a data -driven lens.
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Q Did you use it as a means of clearly communicating what kind of plans you would approve?

A Sorry.

## I -- I used it as a means of sharing my

 priorities and how $I$ would -- one of the data points I would use to -- in considering proposals.Q Do you know how any of the commissioners use Exhibit 42?

A I don't.
Q Did Commissioner Graves speak to you about the content of Exhibit 42 at any time?

A I think I may have shared it with him in advance of sending it to the full commission.

Q Do you remember how -- how you shared it with him? Is it the kind of thing where you are -- strike that. Give me a picture of how you shared it with him. Where were you when you shared it with him?

A I don't remember how. But I believe it was electronically.

Q So it's not the kind of thing that you were sitting on the second floor, in the suite, looking at your computer and talking about it?

A No, I don't believe so. Again, I believe this was largely drafted prior to that. But, again, I -that's my recollection at the moment.
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Q Okay. So then if your answer is that you e-mailed it to him, did you also talk to him about it or did you only communicate with him on e-mail? I guess is my question.

A I don't recall.
Q How much of what's contained in Exhibit 42 was in the proposal you voted to affirm?

A I don't have that analysis in front of me, so it's a little hard for me to recall. I think at some point I looked at a -- at a chart that mapped the final -the final maps using this metric, but $I$ don't recall exactly how they matched up. It certainly was by no means a perfect match.

Q Did you do that work, or did a staff person do that work for you?

A For the final map? A staff person.
Q Before you approved a final map, did you have the analysis in front of you?

A There were -- there were many versions of this analytical tool that were developed either by me or for me throughout the process. So I'm not certain which version $I$ had before me at that time. But -so I don't recall.

Q Is it correct that Exhibit 42 was a form of your method of keeping track of what your priorities were?
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MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I think that I made no -- I made a very high priority of making competitiveness an open and well-known goal of mine through this process. And then this analytical tool was one of the mechanisms used to evaluate whether different proposals -- how different proposals may have performed along that priority.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Okay. Do you have any knowledge of whether any commission staff received this Exhibit 42?

A Again, I recall Commissioner Augustine asking if she could share it with her staff. And I personally drafted much of it, but the charts and the final formatting were done by my staff. So they would have had access to it as well.

Q Did you permit your staff to share it with other commissioners' staff?

A I don't know if $I$ explicitly did that. But $I$ believe they knew it was drafted to send to the commission. And so I -- if they shared it, that wouldn't surprise me. But $I$ don't have knowledge of that.

Q Did you use it to analyze whether or not the map finally transmitted to the legislature or to the supreme court integrated any of the concepts from Exhibit 42?
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MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I asked staff to prepare a chart similar to the one that's in this document using the data from the final map so that $I$ could view that information after the work had been done.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did staff prepare you a chart that looked like this that had the color codes in it?

A It's my recollection that they -- they did.
Q What is Pellicciotti?
Oh. I don't even know if $I$ said that right.
"Pellicciotti"? I don't know.
A It's not a commonly properly pronounced name. So "Pellicciotti."

Q So I badly butchered it? Is that what you're saying?
A It's a typically butchered name. "Pellicciotti" --
Q Okay.
A -- is my belief. And he is the current Washington State treasurer.

Q Oh. That's even worse. And it's an existing, living human being in an elected official position. Wow. Bad. Bad. Okay.

All right. So I don't understand, then, how is that -- $I$ don't know what it means in this context, then.
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What's the reference? When it says "Draft_ Pellicciotti," what does that mean?

A The current Pellicciotti is the performance that the Democratic candidate for treasurer received in the districts that are listed there at the bottom under "Current District," and the draft either on this chart or other charts would typically be a given proposal that $I$ might be evaluating at a given time.

Q Pellicciotti, then, being a Democrat?
A That's correct.
Q Were you taking direction from anyone on the negotiations?

A No.
Q When you did the comparison to the final map that was transmitted to the supreme court and/or to the legislature, what did the chart reflect? Integration of your concepts or not?

A I don't actually recall what the chart looks like. I'd need to be refreshed on that. I don't believe I've reviewed it since the day it was produced.

Q Do you have a generalized recollection of whether or not there was anything included?

A The -- the metric here is a tool for assessing plans after the fact, not necessarily in creating plans. So it's more of a diagnostic tool rather than a
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formative tool. So I -- I, again, would have to look and see what the chart actually reflected to see whether or not it was more or less competitive than the current map under these metrics.

Q How would I locate what your staff prepared for you?
A I would have only received it over e-mail at some point, so it would have been -- if it exists, which again I believe it was prepared for me, but, again, this would have been in the early hours of the 16 th or -- you know, one of those -- one of those days. So I'm not entirely sure, but I thought I recall them producing one for me and e-mailing it to me.

Q Sorry. Just a minute. I'm just taking a quick review to see if anything strikes me as obviously being in the piles that $I$ have.

A No problem.
Q Do you think it would have come in an Adobe form or different kind of document?

A Sorry. I didn't -- what kind of form?
Q What kind of format would be used? Would it be an Adobe document or something else?

A It could have been an Excel spreadsheet.
Q Okay.
A That's where they were originally created.
Q Yeah, I'm sorry. I don't see it. I don't see
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anything that obviously would be it.
Did you make sure that this document was published to the public?

A I don't recall if $I$ ever made this document public. Did you intend for it to be public, or did you intend it to be limited to dissemination of the commissioners during the course of the negotiations?

A If I recall at the time, I think if -- you know, I -it's never my intention to put my colleagues in a -to call out my colleague, so to speak. And so I think I recall at the time that I didn't see the need to publish it if there was ability to get to a final agreement, but I wanted to have a document prepared that could articulate my position in the event that there -- that there was failure.

Q Is one of the reasons that you wanted there to be a express written communication of your position so that the dyad could negotiate knowing what you wanted?

A I -- I had communicated this rubric that $I$ was using to commissioners prior to the sharing of this document, so it was just a way of articulating what competitiveness but at what -- one metric, not necessarily all the metrics, but what one metric of measuring the competitiveness of a plan might look
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like.
Q Was it a way of memorializing in writing what you -what your position would -- strike that.

Was it a way of memorializing the position you had taken in the negotiations?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I would say it's a
way of memorializing my priority of -- of competitive districts in the same way that $I$ had written about and spoken about in commission meetings and spoken about publicly and had reflected in proposals I put forward.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Showing you again what's been marked as Exhibit 41, is it correct that you e-mail your fellow commissioners and communicate to them that you've attached a memo "that highlights my priorities and concerns as we enter the final few days of negotiation" and that you "hope it can help chart a path for finding compromise before Monday's deadline"?

A Those are the words, yes.
Q And sitting here today, do you have any reason to believe that this is an inaccurate communication?

A I guess I'm not understanding what you're asking there.
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Q I'm just asking you to actually authenticate the e-mail and say that -- and acknowledge that this is you communicating on that date and that time as set forth in the document.

A I believe that I wrote that e-mail, yes.
Q Okay. And when you expressed, "I look forward to discussing it with you," what did you mean?

A I think most of the message that's written there is just trying to strike a friendly tone at a tense time. I don't believe I chose those words with any specific meaning other than to make sure that my priority of competitive -- competitiveness was continued to be known.

I think a lot of my e-mails probably end, "I look forward to discussing it with you." That's a common way that $I$ would close an e-mail when there's further work to be done.

Q Other than "good-bye"?
A Don't think I've ever said "good-bye," but who knows? Possibly.

Q So do you know whether or not you discussed your e-mail and the attached memo with Brady Walkinshaw?

A I don't believe we discussed the memo specifically. I don't believe so.

Q Did you discuss the e-mail, then the memo, or the
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e-mail and the memo with April Sims?
A I don't believe $I$ discussed the memo with Commissioner Sims.

Q Did you say, "I do not"?
A I don't -- I don't believe so.
And, again, just to clarify, the memo contained a rubric that had -- that was not novel at this time. It was something that $I$-- that concept or something that had been shared before. But at this juncture, $I$ don't believe we discussed the memo.

Q And the concept you had shared with other voting commissioners privately as well as publicly, correct?

A Correct.
Q And to the best of your knowledge, in any private discussion with any other voting commissioner, it was a one-and-one discussion as opposed to involving more than one voting commissioner?

A That is correct.
Q At any time in your one-on-one conversations with voting commissioners about the content and concepts expressed in this e-mail or memo, did any other voting commissioner communicate to you what other commissioners had said to them about the concepts or communication in Exhibit 41 and 42?

A Not to my recollection.
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Q Do you recall your staff, during the negotiations on the 15th off-line, off the -- off the public Zoom, sharing with you what other commissioners were thinking or asking for in the negotiations?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Not to my

## recollection.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you remember during the course of your negotiating the districts, what the other two commissioners thought about the status of the negotiations or any of the confines of the proposals?

A Sorry. That was a -- had a bit of a hard time following that.

Q When you were negotiating the districts, at any time did you know what the other two voting commissioners thought about the negotiations?

A I guess I'm -- I guess I'm looking for a little bit more specificity in the question.

Q What are you tripping up on?
THE REPORTER: What was that, Joan?
MS. MELL: I'm asking him what is it that he's tripping up on, meaning:

Q (By Ms. Mell) Where am I being ambiguous?
A Is this a holistic sense of -- of the negotiations as a whole that you're asking about, at which point $I$
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really can't speak to the mind set of the other participants, or is it specific to some element that we might be discussing at any given time?

Q Well, timing-wise, in my mind, I was asking the question as to the 15 th or anything post the memo.

So I suppose the 14 th and 15 th --
A $\quad \mathbf{M m}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
-- timing-wise.
And beyond that, I'm asking: With respect to the negotiations you were engaged in with one other commissioner, at any time did you know -- I guess it would have been just what Commissioner Sims thought about your negotiations.

A I don't have any insight into what Commissioner Sims thought about anything during this time.

Q So you were negotiating with Walkinshaw, correct?
A That's correct.
Q And you know that Graves knew what you were negotiating about and his thought about it because you were talking to Graves, correct?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't know all of
his feedback on it. Again, it was more of a communication about what was going on, less of -MS. MELL: Okay.
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THE WITNESS：－－a discussion．
So．．．
Q（By Ms．Mell）But you knew Graves＇reaction to your negotiations with Walkinshaw？

A I didn＇t receive a lot of reaction from Commissioner Graves on the congressional maps during these，to my recollection，during these times．His focus was predominantly on the legislative maps．

Q Well，I don＇t think I asked you to quantify it．I just asked if you had any sense of his－－sense that he understood where your negotiations were with Walkinshaw．

A I－－what he understood I don＇t know．
What I communicated to him was the issues and－－ and elements that were still being－－that were being discussed with Commissioner Walkinshaw on the congressional map．

So I guess－－so okay．
So then with regard to your negotiations with Walkinshaw，did you similarly have communications with April Sims such that you know she knew something about your negotiations with Walkinshaw？

MR．WONG：Object to form．
THE WITNESS：I don＇t recall having very many conversations with Commissioner Sims or
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very much conversation with Commissioner Sims in these final few days. So --

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you have any -- I'm sorry.
A Go ahead. What was your question?
Q So did you have any communications with Sims such that you knew what her -- what information she had about your negotiations with Walkinshaw?

A I can't recall anything specific at the moment.
Q Did your staff say anything to you that would lead you to believe that Commissioner Sims understood what was happening or had information about what was happening in the negotiations between you and Walkinshaw?

A Not to my recollection.
Q I heard "not," and then I didn't hear what was after that.

A Not in my recollection.
Can you give me a list of decisions made -- decisions that you made on the $16 t h$ after the public meeting concluded?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I can't provide a
exclusive list of actions taken that -- in the early hours of the morning. So probably would help to be more specific about what you're asking about.
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Q (By Ms. Mell) I don't need an exclusive list. I need to know what you recall about the 16 th after the public meeting ended with respect to any decision you made.

A Again, I'm not certain what in this case constitutes a decision or not. We had referenced previously the conversation that Commissioner Walkinshaw and I had over the $9 t h$ congressional district and not proceeding with any change to -- to the framework. If you consider that a decision or not. I think that's -- that's subjective.

Q Let's break it down. Let's go piece by piece. So when the public meeting -- I'll strike that. Was it your decision to end the public meeting?

A I don't believe so.
Q Did you -- was there a motion to affirm? I mean, was there a motion to adjourn that you affirmed?

A I don't recall.
Q Do you know what your standard practice was with regular business meetings? Would there be a motion to adjourn?

A My recollection is that the chair would just adjourn the meeting.

Q Okay.
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A But I don't -- I don't recall in this instance.
Q Okay. So when the chair adjourned the meeting, you made a decision to do something, correct?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I did something
following the meeting.
Q (By Ms. Mell) And did you do that on your own accord?

A Talking a little bit in -- we're a little vague right here. I want to -- I guess I'm -- and I -- I'd said that I -- you know, I think I went outside and got some very, very cold fresh air. Those are decisions I made immediately following the adjournment of the meeting that I can recall.

Q And what did you do after getting some refreshing cold air?

A I don't know what immediately followed then.
What followed after you were outside?
A At one point $I$ was in the event space that we referred to before.

Q Do you think you went from being outside to get fresh air to the event room?

A I don't recall.
Q Do you know why you went to the event room?
A There -- I think there was the -- the map
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reconciliation process, and I knew that there would be individuals and -- and my staff would probably be there, so $I$ think it was a natural place to -- to go.

Q When you got to the event room, who was in the event room?

A There were various people in and out of the event room throughout the early hours of that day. I don't know who was there at that exact time.

Q When you arrived in the event room, were there any other voting commissioners there?

A I don't recall.
Q Was the chair there?
A I believe she was there.
Q Did you say anything to her?
A I did talk with the chair as well as other individuals from the time that the meeting ended to the time that $I$ left in the early hours of the morning. So, yes, $I$ did have conversations, and the chair being one of them.

Q What time did you leave the event room?
A Sometime around 5, 5:30. I -- I don't know exactly, but it was sometime in that ballpark.

Q A.m.?
A A.m., yes.
Do you know approximately when you got there?
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A When I got to the event room or when I got to the hotel?

Q The event room.
A I don't recall. Again, sometime -- sometime after midnight, obviously.

Q Before 1?
A I would imagine, yes.
Q Did you have pass cards to make your way around the hotel?

A Yes.
Q So you had to use a card to get into the event room?
A I don't -- I don't recall if the event room -- yeah, the event room did have a lock on it. I remember throughout the evening there was one or two times that I -- that it was closed, I believe. And I don't think my key card opened it, or at least $I$ never tried to open it with my key card. There were other times when the event room door was just open.

Q So if you needed to get into the event room and the door was closed, did you just ping your staffer inside the room or knock on the door?

A I think $I$ just -- I mean, $I$ don't know if $I$ had a time that $I$ needed to be in the event room when it was closed. If it was closed and I came by, I probably just kept going.
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Q Okay. Did you have an opportunity to observe what Chair Augustine was doing in the event room?

A I spoke with her from time to time throughout -- and, again, are we referring to after midnight or throughout the day?

Q No, from the -- I just want to focus in this line of questioning on the, I'm just going to call it a 12:30 to 5:30 time frame --

A Okay.
Q -- if that sounds like a fair approximation of when you were in there.

A In the ballpark.
Q Okay.
A I spoke with her a couple of times during that window.

Q When you spoke with Chair Augustine, was your conversation limited to how your family was doing?

A No.
Q What do you recall the topic of your conversations with Chair Augustine during that 12:30 to 5:30 time frame?

A I mean, we had a -- probably talked about a number of topics, including the status of -- of where the redistricting process sat at that moment.

Q In each of your conversations with Chair Augustine,
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was anybody else within earshot?
A I don't recall.
Q As you're sitting here recalling communications with Chair Augustine, are you thinking about times when the two of you were speaking with one another without anyone else present?

A Sorry. I'm a little confused as to the question.
Q Try to get inside your head as to what you're talking about, so I'm trying to create a picture in my mind of what picture's in your mind. And I don't know what's in your mind. So I wasn't there. I'm trying to figure that out.

So in your communications with Chair Augustine, was there any other person who was obviously an active participant in that conversation?

## A I don't recall.

Q And do you recall whether or not there was any other person who may have been a passive participant in the conversation, meaning within earshot?

## A I don't recall.

Q In any of your communications with Chair Augustine, did you have a conversation --

In your communications with Chair Augustine, was -- were there communications about next steps?

A Yes.
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Q What next steps did you discuss?
A The context around this moment in time immediately following the meeting was certainly colored by the attorney general's or the deputy attorney general's e-mail with regards to jurisdiction of the redistricting process.

Q And you're talking about the e-mail saying jurisdiction's in the hands of the supreme court?

A That is correct.
Q Do you know what time that communication -- that you received that communication?

A To the best of my recollection, 12:01.
Q So did you talk to Chair Augustine about her lack of jurisdiction -- strike that. That's a bad way of saying it.

Did you talk to Chair Augustine about the AG's e-mail indicating jurisdiction was with the supreme court?

MR. WONG: Object to the extent the answer calls for any sharing of any attorney-client privilege.

I instruct you not to answer. If you can answer that question without sharing any privileged information, you can do so.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you say something, or are you
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still thinking?
A Well, given the advice that I'm receiving from counsel, I'm trying to determine -- trying to determine the extent of privilege in this case, not wanting to -- I'm sorry. I don't know how to proceed.

Q Okay. So one thing I could offer at this point is that the attorney has made the objection and is asserting that you should answer to the extent it won't waive the attorney-client privilege.

I'm amenable to not making an argument that it
has been waived based on your answer and allowing the court to work through that process just so that we can get the answer on the record and then move on. MR. WONG: I think that's okay to the extent it's not actually conveying any privilege -- any -- the content, the substance of anything the attorney general said.

Does that make sense? I don't want him sharing, you know, any --

MS. MELL: "She said this to me.
She said this to me."
MR. WONG: Yeah, that kind of
stuff. And so I understand what you're saying, and I'm just trying to make sure that we're protecting
the substance of the communication.
THE WITNESS: And if I may, I have a question. Because the protective nature of that particular e-mail was something that was in question, and so $I$ haven't received official guidance on whether or not that's considered protected.

MS. MELL: I mean, I can share that
I know I've seen an e-mail that says that your jurisdiction has ended. And I believe that was from an assistant attorney general. So don't worry about that contact. I've seen it.

MR. WONG: I think that that has been out publicly, the fact that that message was sent at that time. But $I$ don't know to the extent there's anything further beyond that that was communicated that would be protected.

THE WITNESS: All right. I will -I believe I -- I -- I believe I can proceed.

MR. WONG: Want to try asking the question again, Joan, so --

MS. MELL: I think we're at the point of, yes, let me ask the question again. Q (By Ms. Mell) What was the content of your conversation with Chair Augustine about the attorney general's e-mail communication that the supreme court

14:15:331
$14: 15: 342$
$14: 15: 363$
$14: 15: 384$
$14: 15: 415$
$14: 15: 426$
14:15:477
14:15:518
14:15:569
14:15:180
14:16:111
14:16:072
14:16:0.93
$14: 16: 104$
14:16:115
$14: 16: 146$
$14: 16: 167$
14:16:18
14:16:129
14:16:230
14:16:211
14:16:252
14:16:233
14:16:274
14:16:215
now had jurisdiction?
MR. WONG: I'll make the same
objection and same direction to the witness.
You can answer to the extent you can without disclosing any privileged information.

THE WITNESS: So what $I$ tell, what
I -- what I may or may not have said to Chair
Augustine at this time -- is it my attorney's contention that that would be privileged information so long as it -- if it does not include additional information that may have been received from counsel?

MS. MELL: What you told Chair
Augustine would not be privilege.
MR. WONG: As long as it's not conveying what the attorney general told you.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, we have an e-mail. Everybody's seen the e-mail. It identifies -- it just said that the jurisdiction had passed.

My comment to Chair Augustine was that I was -- I was operating under that -- that belief base and that the -- that the commission had not -- that the commission had not finished the work before the midnight deadline and that we no longer had jurisdiction.
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Q (By Ms. Mell) What did she say in response to your comment that you had not finished the work of the commission?

A I don't recall.
Q And do I need to go through that whole litany of was anyone else present, or just do your answers apply similarly?

A I don't remember who or who wasn't. There was -again, to set the scene so that it's -- so that I'm not being unclear, there were times when there were many people in the room. "Many" being, you know, of the dozen or so participants in -- in this. But at any given time, $I$ couldn't tell you who was where or anything like that.

Q And was any of what was happening in that room recorded or conveyed publicly?

A The maps were drawn and reconciled in that room, and those maps were released publicly.

Q How about the conversations?
A I don't -- I don't have any knowledge of that.
Q Did you make the comment that now that the supreme court had jurisdiction, OPMA did not apply or you didn't need to worry about OPMA?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall -- if
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that was said or if that was something that $I$ had said, I don't recall.

Q
(By Ms. Mell) Do you have any recollection about any comment made about OPMA during that time frame, that 12:30 to 5:30 time frame?

A Since jurisdiction had been transferred and we no longer had it, I did not, you know -- and there were no more decisions before us, I didn't believe that -that it applied at that time and I don't recall if I communicated that to everyone.

So from your perspective, since the supreme court had jurisdiction, any of the decision-making in that time frame would not implicate OPMA?

> MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I viewed the next
step in the process, so to speak, once the commission lost jurisdiction, as completing a -- a plan that could be given to the supreme court as a data point in their deliberations since they then had jurisdiction.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Is it correct, then, that with the shift in jurisdiction to the supreme court, you felt liberated to have conversations and discussions privately, meaning not in a televised meeting or a publicized meeting, to achieve your objectives with
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regard to communications to the supreme court?
MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall it triggering any -- any change. It was just a belief that I had, being that there were no more actionable items before the commission and that we received counsel that -- and that we'd been told that we were no longer -- that we no longer had jurisdiction. (By Ms. Mell) Okay. And when you say "no more actionable items," what do you mean?

A That there were no further -- there was no authority to make decisions about the substance of -- of the maps in a manner which would -- in a manner that is described in statute in the constitution for the Redistricting Commissions to operate. That that time had passed; therefore, none of those issues were still before the -- none of that power still rested in the Redistricting Commission.

Q So is it your understanding that the work performed on the 16 th -- well, strike that.

All right. So I'm going to try to parse what you just said to make sure $I$ understand it.

It was your perception during the hours of 12:30 and 5:30 on the 16 th that any of the decisions you did make didn't implicate OPMA because they were
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being made without jurisdictional authority defined either the supreme court or the legislature?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I didn't believe that
the commission had any formal authority at this point. And therefore, absent formal authority, I didn't think that there was anything triggering those rules. Again, I don't -- yeah.
(By Ms. Mell) Okay. And so then there's one last piece I want to follow up, and I hope I don't lose this thought here. Let me think this through.

Were you of the impression, then, as you were completing your mapping work and creating a final map that the supreme court, with its jurisdiction -strike that.

Was it your understanding that the work that you were performing to create and finalize maps could be transmitted and accepted or rejected by the supreme court in its discretion, that your transmittal and final maps would not be deemed within the formal authority of the commission?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I believe that the
supreme court had total authority over the map drawing process at that juncture.
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## MS. MELL: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And what they choose to do with it is -- was their -- is solely their authority.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Has your opinion on that particular point with regard to the supreme court's sole authority over the map drawing at that point changed since the $16 t h ?$

A The supreme court issued an order stating that the commission substantively complied with its deadline. So I suppose, retroactively, the court changed the -the court's interpretation definitely changed the -the outcome of the -- of the redistricting process.

Q Is it your understanding that the supreme court did not comment on compliance with OPMA?

A It's been well over a month since $I$ read the supreme court's order, so I don't want to -- I don't want to put words in their mouth.

My understanding is that their order was that the commission had -- had substantially completed their work and still had juris- -- and they declined -- the court declined jurisdiction. But I believe there was a element in their decision with regards to other substantive issues that they're not opining on issues, any number of litigable matters in the
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redistricting, and my -- my impression that they weren't commenting on those factors.

Q So would you agree that the supreme court has not indicated to you that the actions of the commission were consistent with open government standards?

A I just don't feel comfortable speculating on a legal conclusion like that.

Q Okay. Let me ask it differently.
Do you feel like the supreme court has communicated to you that open government standards were met in your actions?

A I don't recall any communications specifically referencing those -- that issue.

Q Do you think that you met open government standards? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: In terms of -- and, again, $I$-- I do not believe that $I$ violated the Open Public Meetings Act, if that's the question.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you believe that you violated commission rules specific to open government? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: Very particular rules specifically that you're referencing?
(By Ms. Mell) Taking action on a -- or acting on a congressional or district plan privately.

MR. WONG: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: I don't agree with the characterization that it was acted upon privately.

Q (By Ms. Mell)
Did you take a secret vote?
A No.
Q Did you take a sham vote?
MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I didn't hear what
that said.
(By Ms. Mell) Did you take a sham vote?
MR. WONG: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: We took a vote on a framework agreement that was later translated into maps at a time where the -- it was my belief that the commission no longer had jurisdiction.

Q (By Ms. Mell) What is a secret vote to you?
MR. WONG: Object to form.
MS. MELL: I should say "mean" in
there.
Q (By Ms. Mell) What does "secret vote" mean to you?
A Again, not wanting to comment or speculate to a legal standard, I will tell you that I avoided, you know, the formation of a -- of a position in which the voting members each knew the position of the other
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voting members prior to a vote in public.
Q Was there ever a point in time, to the best of your knowledge, when at least three voting commissioners knew your position prior to a vote in public on any redistricting plan?

A Not that I can recall.
MR. WONG: Joan, we've been going about another hour and ten here. Do you mind taking a short break?

MS. MELL: I don't. I usually go
for two hours before I take a break, so --
MR. WONG: You have more stamina
than I do, then.
MS. MELL: That's fine. We'll take a break.

> (Pause in proceedings from $2: 31$ p.m. to $2: 42$ p.m.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) Training. What was your OPMA training, if any?

A The -- a deputy attorney general held a presentation during one of the early commission meetings on the OPMA.

Q Is that your complete training with respect to OPMA?
A I was trying to remember if I had received any OPMA
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training, you know, years earlier when $I$ was with the King County Council, but I couldn't remember having done so.

Q Are you of the opinion that your training with respect to OPMA complied with the statute? MR. WONG: Object to form. THE WITNESS: At the time, I believe that it -- that it was sufficient. (By Ms. Mell) When you say -- give me the time you're talking about when you say --

A At the time -- at the time of receiving the -- the training, $I$ didn't -- or soon -- I did not believe that $I$-- let me rephrase.

Throughout the majority of the redistricting process, $I$ was -- I did not believe that $I$ was under some unfulfilled obligation to do additional training.

Do you recall the assistant attorney general who gave the presentation to the commission indicating his presentation did not comply with -- was not sufficient to comply with the training requirements of OPMA?

A Again, during the majority of the time on the commission, that was not my recollection. Recently I've -- I had re-reviewed that and was aware that
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that was set now.
Q Okay. Suffice it to say, since that was -- since you -- strike that.

What were your thoughts on training when you became a commissioner relative to open government?

A Can you be more specific about what you're necessarily asking?

Q Did you have any knowledge that there was an expectation that you receive OPMA training when you became a commissioner?

A I -- let me phrase it that way. I mistakenly believed that the requirement for training was applied to local governments and that it -- and -and I didn't -- I didn't recall that that obligation was on state volunteer commissions as well. So if that answers.

Q Did you ask for meetings to be held in Federal Way?
A Not to my recollection.
Do you know that the commission's rules mandate meetings be held in Olympia?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of
that.
(By Ms. Mell) Are you aware that there's any reference in the commission's rules as to where the
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meetings should be convened?
A I don't recall.
Q Did you ever read the commission rules as a commissioner?

A There was a brief period of time when there was a rule-making process, and I reviewed them at some time during that time, but $I$ don't recall all the specifics of what was included in them.

Q Suffice it to say, you didn't write the rules?
A I did not uniquely draft -- draft the rules. And, again, contextually, pretty odd time for a commission to be meeting given the many different things going on that were changing the way that this commission needed to function compared to previous commissions.

Q Are you talking about COVID?
THE REPORTER: "Previous," what?
THE WITNESS: Previous commissions
had to act rel- -- you know, COVID being one of the bigger ones, but also the delay in the -- in receiving data from the Census Bureau.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you and your fellow commissioners and staff wear face masks throughout the negotiations in November while at the Hampton?

A I recall wearing a face mask at some times. I'm -- I don't recall all the time. I believe the hotel lobby
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still operated under the face mask -- had a "face mask" sign up. I don't recall.

Q Is it correct that you -- the work done between 12:30 and 5:30 in the event room was maskless?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, $I$-- I don't recall.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Were your conversations with Commissioner Graves maskless?

A I believe so.
Q Were your conversations with Commissioner Walkinshaw maskless?

A I don't recall each and every conversation, whether it was maskless or not. Wouldn't want to guess. Did you stay more than six feet away from any other person during those negotiations?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I don't
have -- I don't have a recollection of how much distance was between individuals other than, in general, we were all keeping more distance between ourselves, even in casual conversation, these days.

Q (By Ms. Mell) How about when working with staff or the maps?

A Again, are we talking about the -- those two days in
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## Federal Way or beyond that?

Q No, those days in Federal Way.
A Again, I recall times when individuals were wearing masks and times when they were not.

Q I was asking the distance requirement.
Between 12:30 and 5:30 on the 16 th, when you were working with staff and Commissioner Walkinshaw on finalizing the maps, were you at all times six feet away from them?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I -- I can't say with all assurance that we were always six feet apart from one another.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you have --
A - -
Q -- any markers?
THE REPORTER: Sorry, Joe. "From one another," what?

THE WITNESS: I think that was the end of what I said.

Q (By Ms. Mell) And then my question was: Did you have any markers?

A Not in all of the spaces that we occupied during that time.

Q Do you recall any markers in any of the space?
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A There may have been markers in the check-in area by the lobby.

Q Did we complete the exchange of information between you and Chair Augustine with respect to the point in time when you had the conversation over the supreme court having jurisdiction?

Is there anything else you recall that we haven't already discussed about that point, that conversation?

A Again, I'm sure there were multiple conversations throughout the evening on a variety of topics, so I -- I can't -- I don't want to say that that was the entirety of the conversation.

Q As you sit here today, can you think of any other subjects you communicated on with Chair Augustine between 12:30 and 5:30 on the 16th?

A Again, $I$ don't recall the timing, but $I$ believe there was a draft of $a--$ of a statement that would be released by the commission floating around at some time around there.

Q That you discussed with Chair Augustine?
A I don't know how much of that was discussed one-on-one and how much of that was conversed over e-mail. I actually don't remember.

Q Do you know whether or not the commissioners
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collectively weighed in on that?
A I don't know what their input would have been if they had their own conversations with Chair Augustine.

Q What was your input to Chair Augustine?
A That we be definitive in that we did not meet the deadline and that the jurisdiction had been transferred to the court. But because we had reached an agreement in principle, that we would continue -that we had continued our work to draft maps that we would then be submitting to the court for their consideration amongst the other various individuals and organizations that would also likely be submitting their own suggestions to the court.

Q Did you approve the statement that was actually transmitted to the supreme court?

A I don't recall if I -- oh. I'm sorry. The statement that was given to the supreme court? Is that what you're asking about? Chair Augustine's?

No, I did not have a role -- I did not have a role in approving that.

Q Was it communicated -- was the statement communicated to you for purposes of approving it?

A No.
Was a statement, a public statement communicated to you for purposes of approval?
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A There -- I believe there was a draft of a public statement that might have been circulating on the -would have been whatever that Tuesday morning is. And, again, $I$-- I don't recall as to the timing.

Q Did you approve the form that was submitted to the -I'm confusing them and conflating them. I'm sorry. Did you approve the form of the press statement or public statement that was publicized?

A I don't recall.
Q Any other conversations with Chair Augustine that you recall for the $12: 30$ to 5:30 time frame?

A I can't recall -- I can't recall the content of any of the other conversations right now. I'm sure there were some conversations of a personal nature as well.

Q Between 12:30 and 5:30, did you make a decision about publication of the maps?

A I guess I'll just say my position was $I$ wanted the maps to become public when they were -- when commission staff had completed their work.

Q How did you know when commission staff completed their work?

A I was gone by the time that occurred. So I don't remember exactly what form it took. I might have received an e-mail from Lisa later in the day with files attached. I don't recall.
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Q Was it your position that the commission staff would have completed its work after you approved the version of the map presented to you by staff?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't think I anticipated additional involvement at that stage.

Q (By Ms. Mell) To be clear, you did not anticipate any further involvement at what stage?

A Once the commission staff had the shape files, I didn't -- I didn't anticipate being reached out to for further feedback.

Q So explain to me your involvement in getting to the shape files. Were you making choices -- strike that. When the staff at -- how did you know when the staff's shape files were complete?

A With regards to the congressional map, I was present for much of the time that -- either present in the room, in the large event space, or present in with staff while they were creating the shape file.

That -- I don't recall what time they completed their work, but to the best of my recollection, $I$ was still present when caucus staff completed the congressional shape file.

I was not present when staff completed the legislative shape file.
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Q Had you looked at any configuration of the legislative map between 12:30 and 5:30?

A During their drafting of a few of the districts, $I$ came over, but there wasn't really anything for me to -- to do. So I was only there for a moment, then let them be.

Q When you were with the staff drafting the legislative maps, were you formulating an opinion that the mapping was consistent with what you thought you voted on?

A I think I was leaving that up to staff largely. I don't -- I don't fully remember what information $I$ even had access to while that process was going on. A couple of staffers hunched over a -- over a computer are not always the most interactive way to learn about stuff.

Q As a matter of fact, it's a lot of pressure for the staff and probably not very productive, right?

Hovering. Hovering is never productive with support staff.

So when you left, did you leave with the understanding that you would have an opportunity to review the final legislative map at some point, and if inconsistent with what you thought you had voted on, you could withdraw your vote?

15:03:271
15:03:332
15:03:363
15:03:39 4
15:03:455
15:03:476
15:03:487
15:03:54 8
15:03:59 9
15:04:012 0
15:04:111
15:04:152
15:04:213
15:04:2I 4
15:04:215
15:04:32 6
15:04:327
15:04:408
15:04:4B9
15:04:420
15:04:521
15:04:522

15:05:023
15:05:124
15:05:125

A I don't recall that, no. I should say, I don't recall that being the case, no.

Q When you left, did you have any expectation that you would see a legislative map and look at it to ascertain whether or not it reflected what you thought you voted on?

A I don't recall that being the case.
Q Did you -- when you left, was Commissioner Walkinshaw still there?

A I don't recall.
And let me get the context of my leaving. My -I had a pretty large event that I had to host virtually that morning. And so just to give you a sense of my attention had to quickly pivot to a lot of stuff that $I$ had to get ready before 7,7 a.m. or so.

Okay. Were you of the mind set that it didn't really matter at that point?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I was in the mind set
that I believed that what would be drafted would conform with the -- the framework that we had voted on, but it was still also of the mind set that this would be presented to the court as, you know, a -basically a citizen's recommendation from a
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commission that didn't have jurisdiction any longer but that -- but I still, you know, believed that it -that it was important.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Who was doing the mapping?
A Can you refresh me on the -- the name of Commissioner Sims' staff person?

Q Sims' staff person? No.

## Campos? No?

A Commission -- so Campos was doing drafting on the -on the congressional map along with, $I$ believe Ali from Brady's staff. And I think Anton was doing drafting on the legislative map along with --

Q Osta?
A Osta, yeah.
Q Okay. So how did the staff know what the framework was?

A The staff had probably been involved in as many conversations about the maps as the -- as the members had. So, I mean, I think that's -- there was just a level of understanding 'cause they had been present for -- for that.

In terms of any other specific direction, I'm -can't think of anything specific off the top of my head.

Q Were you commissioners there so that you could answer
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staff questions?
A There were commissioners present on and on -- on and off throughout those early morning hours.

Q But was one of the purposes for the commissioners to stay for hours after the meeting to ensure that the maps were created?

A I can only speak for myself. I wanted to stay through the creation -- through the creation of the congressional map to ensure that there weren't any disagreements between the maps that were being reconciled to create, you know, these final maps.

That's what led to the conversation over the 9 th congressional district that $I$ referenced earlier, but that was not a -- that wasn't a difference between various different versions or anything. That was my misunderstanding.

Q But there were differences between the staff proposals that had to be reconciled that happened in those hours, correct?
MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I believe there were in the legislative maps, and I don't have a lot of details about that.

I'm trying to recall if there were anything, what might have been there in the -- in the congressional
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maps, and nothing is -- I don't recall. I don't recall.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you have any reason to believe that Ali O'Neil's account of the events during that time frame would be incorrect?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I would want to -- I
wouldn't want to make a generalized representation about her statements.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Have you read her statement?
A Yes. But it's been -- yes, I have. I think I -- I think I -- I think I've reviewed it recently as well, but...

Q I believe it's been marked as Exhibit 2. I'll pull it up here and have you take a look at it.

It seems to have disappeared from that file folder. Just a second here.

I'm going to try to drag this into the right place so you can see it. I'm going to put it in the chat room just in case you want to look at it more carefully. I can also scroll through it.

A Okay.
MR. WONG: Joe, are you able to see it on your screen, or are you waiting for her to share screen?
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THE WITNESS: I'm waiting for her
to share screen.
MS. MELL: Here we go.
Q (By Ms. Mell) You good?
A Yep.
Q Okay. Just tell me your pace, if you want to just say "'kay, 'kay" or whatever, however you want to communicate, "scroll, scroll, scroll."

A Is there a specific question that you have about any of the statements?

I'm wanting to know if you disagree with her representations in this memo in any regard.

A I -- probably more helpful to be able to highlight a specific contention and then discuss that. I don't want to --

Q You don't want to just go through? Okay.
A Well, I don't want to be in a situation where $I$ don't object to something that's said because I missed it as I'm trying to read through here and that's interpreted as me --

Q Okay.
A -- agreeing to it, so...
Okay. I don't think there's any dispute that you agree there were no congressional or legislative maps voted on at the eleventh-hour vote on Monday,
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November 15th?
A That's correct.
Q Undisputed.
You don't dispute that they were not finalized at the time of the vote?

A That's correct.
Q Is it correct that the vote was simply an agreement on political metrics in the maps with perhaps one or two geographic specifics?

A I don't know about the use of the term "one or two," but as I've characterized it before, the vote was an agreement on a framework that involved communities of interests, political metrics, and some geographic boundaries.

So I don't wish -- I don't want to quibble about it, but that's -- I want to make sure how I phrased it.

Do you believe it is correct that her team was told that the new maps would be drawn to fit the agreement on political metrics prior to the vote?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Can you highlight
what area you're referring to?
MS. MELL: She says, "My
understanding what our team was told is that the new
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maps would be drawn to fit the agreement on political metrics."

THE WITNESS: I can't comment on what her understanding was. I can tell you that the framework agreement did involve political metrics.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you communicate to staff that there was an agreement on political metrics that would be mapped out after the vote?

A I think we've kind of asked and answered that one. We've established that the mapping took place after the vote and that components of that involve political metrics.

Q Do you agree that all commissioners would be able to review and give final sign-off on those maps prior to any transmittal?

A That was not my understanding.
Q Did you hear anyone discuss that?
A I don't recall.
Q Do you have any recollection of Commissioner Walkinshaw taking the position that he -- his vote was conditional on review of the final maps?

A I don't recall hearing him say that.
Q Was your vote conditioned on being able to give final approval on maps?

A I don't -- I don't recall making that a condition,
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and that's not what happened. Best of my recollection.

Q Did you ever tell staff that the commissioners would have the opportunity to review and provide final approval of the maps before they were transmitted?

A I don't recall.
Q Were you involved in any -- strike that.
Is it correct that before there was any public communication of the maps, that the commissioners would have an opportunity to review them?

A Again, $I$ don't -- I don't recall. I don't -- I don't believe I've reviewed the maps from the commission staff prior to them being made public. But, again, $I$ don't recall specifically.

Q And you certainly weren't upset about that, because you didn't believe that that was an agreement?

A I don't recall that being an agreement.
Do you remember a conversation about taking down the congressional map from the website?

A Are you referencing something in writing here?
Q No. No. I'm looking at you.
A Oh. I don't -- I don't think I remember anything like that.

Is there more context that you have for that?
Q Well, I've heard testimony that there was a
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discussion between the 12:30 and -- certainly between the 12:30 and later time frame that the congressional map had been published and the commissioners didn't want that publication at that point in time. And they asked to have it taken down.

A I -- again, operating on very little sleep and with a big event coming up ahead of me, I -- I don't recall that at this time.

Q That next paragraph, she seems to be timing when draft legislative maps were made available.

Do you have any knowledge that her statement there would be incorrect?

A Are you referring to the paragraph starting, "While Commissioner Walkinshaw"?

Q Correct.
MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you repeat your question again?

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you share maps with any staff, legislative maps with staff prior to 10:48 on Monday, since the time of the meeting?

A Yeah, I don't recall.
Q Did you tell staff or did you hear conversations in the presence of staff that there would be a substantive mapping discussion about certain
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potentially competing priorities and how those priorities would play out in the actual drawing of the lines?

A I don't recall. I don't -- I'm trying to read that here.

I don't recall. I don't recall anything like that occurring in the congressional map drafting.

Q Did you ever hear Commissioner Sims tell staff or you that she wanted to finalize the negotiations around partisanship numbers before moving to any mapping?

A I don't recall Commissioner Sims saying that.
Q Do you remember that to be a strategy that was being deployed during those days, 15th and 16 th?

A So there's strategy, and then there's -- and then there's efficiency. And so, you know, to have conversations over things didn't always require them to be painstakingly mapped. That's just background that I can provide.

Again, $I$ don't -- I don't know if Commissioner Sims said that or what she was necessarily refer- -what she was trying to accomplish if she did say that.

Q And you don't remember having to break an impasse in the negotiations because you weren't negotiating on partisanship numbers?
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MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm actually confused by the question.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Was there an impasse in the negotiations at any time because you weren't negotiating around partisanship numbers?

A Again, is this referencing a particular part of her statement here so that I can...?

Q Well, not really. I'm creating --
A $\quad \mathrm{Oh}, \mathrm{okay}$.
-- based --
A Oh, I apologize.
Q -- on what I understand her to be saying.
But the statement here is, "Commissioner Sims told us repeatedly throughout the final days that she wanted to finalize the negotiations around partisanship numbers before moving to any mapping." Was it your observation that there were negotiations around partisanship numbers before moving to any mapping?

A There was both -- again, there was both mapping work regularly being done and discussion over partisan performance regularly happening throughout this -throughout this entire process.

Q Was there a point in time where there was an impasse
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reached because the negotiations around partisanship numbers had not been finalized?

A The time that $I$ referenced previously where $I$ suggested that Chair Augustine consider a mediator's proposal could fit that description.

Q Do you have any personal knowledge about whether or not the SDC team -- I'm assuming that's Senate Democratic Caucus team -- were forced to compromise on stated priorities and at this -- and at times disregard what was shared with the commission during the months of gathering public input when finalizing the maps?

A The commission received thousands of pieces of input, many of which were contradictory with one another. So by definition, the final maps would have to -would have to favor some input over others in order to -- in order to complete the work. So I guess I'm a little confused at that statement.

Q Sounds like you -- it sounds like you agree that it happened, but you're not necessarily certain that that was to be unexpected?

> MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I would say that every -- again, not speaking for other participants. Because $I$ as a participant in the process went into
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the process assuming that $I$ wasn't going to get everything $I$ wanted and that folks who came to testify before the commission were going to have people who disagreed with them, and by definition, they wouldn't all get what they wanted either, which I think is the nature of governing in this case. So I'm -- I don't see much in that statement that's surprising.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did Ali O'Neil repeatedly voice her concerns about the difficulty of translating the partisanship numbers that were being discussed into actual maps?

A I don't -- I don't recall hearing her do so. But, again, $I$ wasn't with her the entire time.

Q Would you agree that the lack of communication and transparency contributed to the chaotic events that transpired?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I would say that it would have been preferable that the -- that draft maps be presented publicly prior to the vote, as I've stated before, and that that would -- where that had been possible, that would have been beneficial.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Were you aware that there were offers exchanged via text message and in-person meetings?
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A Is there a specific passage that you're referring to there?

There have been various concepts and proposals that have been shared at each stage of this process, and sometimes those included maps. So...

Q Would you agree that proposals were being exchanged in person and via text message on both of the maps among the voting commissioners?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Say there were
conversations about various concepts and frameworks that -- including the relative performance of different districts being one of the factors that were communicated between commissioners in those dyads.

Q (By Ms. Mell) And among -- and between dyads, correct?

A I don't know what would -- what -- I can't speak to what may or may not have been shared between Commissioner Sims and Commissioner Walkinshaw as I've stated previously. Commissioner Graves -- I was kept informed as to elements of the -- of the conversation he had with Commissioner Sims, which is what allowed me to take a final vote on a proposal.

Do you agree that Commissioner Augustine -- the
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proposal you had as mediator with Commissioner Augustine would be that she would convey the negotiation terms between the commissioners?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't -- I
don't -- I don't -- wouldn't characterize that -- I wouldn't say that characterization is accurate. As I've said previously, I had approached Commissioner Augustine to see if she would be willing to offer mediator proposal on one of the items that seemed to me part of the conversation that had led to limited progress if she had agreed to do so.

At that point, I believe she met with
Commissioner Graves and Commissioner Sims, but I wasn't involved in that --

Q (By Ms. Mell) And Graves --
THE REPORTER: "I wasn't
involved..."? Sorry?
THE WITNESS: I wasn't involved
with that beyond that point -- sorry -- is how I finished.

Q (By Ms. Mell) So in terms of your understanding of Augustine's mediation tactics, was she mediating between an $R$ and $a D$ and then the $R$ and the $D$ were coming back to the other $R$ and the $D$, or was she
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mediating between caucus designations, mediating between the Rs and the Ds?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I wouldn't -- I read
this to -- I read this paragraph as containing the number of words around and, you know, and act as a go-between and to convey an active role as a mediator. And that's now how I would characterize Commissioner Augustine's role. I believe her role was isolated to that one instance and -- and did not extend beyond that.

Q (By Ms. Mell) But you would -- you would fairly characterize her as a go-between with regard to that impasse? The go-between was to do a mediator's proposal and communicate that between the two?

A I wouldn't want to use -- I wouldn't want to use a term of art that I haven't already used and what I've used now is that -- which are the words that I used when discussing it with Commissioner Augustine, which was would she be comfortable reviewing where they are at and -- and offering some third-party suggestion or medi- -- I've had to call it a mediator or a Chair's --

Q Proposal?
A -- chair's proposal. And she agreed to that, and
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then my involvement in that ended there.
Q Okay. And I just want to understand what you know about who she was doing the mediator's proposal with.

Who was Chair Augustine doing the mediator's proposal with? Who was she communicating her proposal to?

A I believe she communicated it to Commissioners Sims and Graves.

Q And then did she communicate it back to you?
A I don't recall her talking to me about it, no. Do you remember Graves talking to you about it?

A I believe he mentioned it, yes.
Q Okay. And you don't know what Sims and Walkinshaw talked about?

A I don't.
Q Okay. So that's pretty consistent with -- her last bullet on Page 2 is consistent with what you're saying, correct?

A No.
Q Did you say "yes" or -- did you say "no"?
A Yeah, the -- what it reads here is Commissioner Augustine conveyed a proposal on behalf of the Republicans on partisan metrics to Commissioner Sims, but it was rejected.

I don't -- this was -- again, my understanding,
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this is -- was not a proposal that was created by the Republicans, that this was purely her having looked at the current state of the conversation between Commissioner Sims and Commissioner Graves, that this was her independent suggestion, but it was not a proposal that she was presenting on our behalf.

Q Got it. Okay. Thank you.
How about the first bullet? "Although
Commissioner Fain did send a congressional map proposal at around this same time, he indicated to Commissioner Walkinshaw that he was not interested in discussing the congressional maps if the legislative maps were not also progressing."

A I communicated to Commissioner Walkinshaw that I viewed a legislative plan as both the legislative and congressional map and that -- that I felt at the time our responsibility was to do both or neither.

Was there ever a point in time when you thought you would be going to take a vote on one and not the other?

A Early in the process, I don't think I fully considered what the definition of a plan was. And I think that was an open question.

All $I$ can say is that at this time $I$ communicated to Commissioner Walkinshaw that -- that I viewed a
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plan as being both a congressional and legislative map.

Q Did you change your mind on that at any time prior to your vote?

A Sorry. I'm a little, again, unclear about the question.

I changed my mind about what exactly?
Q Whether or not the statutory requirement that you adopt a plan meant both a congressional and a legislative district.

A Again, my recollection is later in the process, $I$ settled on the belief that -- that both were required and that $I$ wasn't prepared to do one without the other.

Q And I think what I'm asking is, did you maintain that position through the time of the vote?

A I -- again, $I$-- I don't necessarily -- so I don't necessarily know how to answer that question because -- I would say, in part, that position was a little -- on my part, again, just speaking for myself -- is a little bit of bluster.

Not because I didn't think that it was -- not because I didn't think that it was a position that I should hold but so that it was -- I wanted to make sure no one could play games by, you know, taking
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care of -- of one map that might be important to some interests and not another map.

And so in terms of during the vote, itself, you know, I have -- I can't speculate about if the -- one of the maps had not been approved, how I would have treated the second map. I can't go back and -- and relive a hypothetical.

Q I think my -- what I'm having trouble understanding is the -- the action portion of the meeting.

So do you recall that Chair Augustine invited a motion on a congressional district?

A I do, yes.
Q She didn't invite a vote on a plan, correct?
A That's correct.
Q Do you know why she bifurcated the motion and didn't just invite a motion on the plan?

A I don't have any recollection at that time.
Do you remember any conversation about how the action items should move through the process?

A I don't recall.
Q Whether they should be individualized or consolidated into a plan?

A I don't recall.
Again, this was a very chaotic time, and there was certainly nothing scripted about how the voting
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process took place.
Q Do you recall a strategy being deployed to break the impasse in the late hours of the 15th?

A I don't recall that.
Q Do you have a recollection of why you were at the -do you have any recollection about any events that preceded moving into the action item that would explain the timing of moving into the action item of the agenda?

A Again, I -- I don't recall the chronology as how things came together at that time.

Q Do you recall any last-minute deals or negotiations, compromises?

A Again, I -- as I previously said, Commissioner Graves had relayed to me the substance of the con- -- the last conversation that he had with Commissioner Sims and --

Did you --
A Go ahead.
Q And then did you do the same with respect to the congressional district plan you'd been negotiating? You shared that with Graves?

A I believe so.
Q And at the time that conversation occurred, was it moments before midnight?

15:40:421
15:40:442
15:40:483
15:40:504
15:40:585
15:41:05 6
15:41:077
15:41:15 8
15:41:189
15:41:210
15:41:2B1
15: 41: 2§2
15:41:213
15:41:314
$15: 41: 365$
15:41:316
15: 41: 4I7
15:41:512 8
15:41:5B 9
15:42:020
15:42:021
15:42:122
15:42:123
15:42:16 4
15:42:185

A I don't remember what time that was.
Q Did you feel a sense of urgency at the time you were communicating with Graves?

A I can say I felt a sense of urgency throughout the entire evening and a sense of exhaustion and urgency as the time approached midnight.

Q Was there an agreement on when a plan needed to be submitted in order to take a vote or a proposal even needed to be submitted before taking a vote -- in order to take a vote?

A Can you re-ask the question for me? I want to make sure $I$ understand what you're saying.

Q Did you have an understanding that there was a deadline set to complete your negotiations by 5:00 on the 15th?

A I don't know of any specific time. I know that there was some conversation from staff that -- that they needed a certain amount of time in order to go through that process that I described earlier to put a shape file into a final -- into the final format that some of commission staff believed it needed to be in.

Q Did you ever participate in any conversations about changing that time?

A I don't -- I don't know if it was -- I don't think it
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was a time that was -- it was not a time that $I$ read or any other individual said. I think it was just something that staff had said was the amount of time that they would need to be able to do certain mechanical or certain technical things. And with any map. Not just -- not like a -- any map that was going to be in a -- in a position to be considered by the commission.

Q Is it correct that between 6:30 and 7:30 p.m., several offers were being traded back and forth between Commissioner Graves and Commissioner Sims that were relayed to Ali O'Neil and Commissioner Walkinshaw in person?

> MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I can't comment about conversations that $I$ was not a part of.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you remember a point in time where you heard Commissioner Sims -- heard that Commissioner Sims was unwilling to accept any of the proposals offered by the Republicans just before 7 or so?

A No, I don't recall that. Again, I don't --
Q Did you --
A Go ahead.
Did you attend a meeting scheduled by Justin Bennett
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or an invite to a meeting? Did you accept an invite to a meeting by Justin Bennett?

A I don't recall -- I don't recall that meeting invite. I'm not saying I didn't receive it. $I$ just don't recall it.

Q Was there --
A What was that?
Q Was there a final map verification meeting?
A I don't know. Again, the -- wasn't -- I didn't participate in any meeting like that, and I don't believe I talked with Justin Bennett at any point during the process.

Q If Ali O'Neil witnessed one commissioner pass by two other commissioners who were discussing something in the hallway, do you have any reason to believe that one of those three was you?

A Again, $I$ don't -- $I$ don't know what she is alleging there. Walking through the hallway doesn't seem...

Q Certainly you were in the hallway, talking with --
A Yeah.
Q -- other commissioners at times. I think you've said that, right?

A That's correct. Yeah. And if a -- again, in a situation, again, not referencing what she may or may not be referencing there, so I don't know what she
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did or did not see. But if -- I do recall being in the hallway where $I$ was talking with a commissioner and if another commissioner came within earshot or that that commissioner immediately turned around or, you know, the conversation was stopped until that commissioner had gotten where they needed to go so that we would continue to avoid having three voting commissioners in any conversation.

Q Did you ever get instruction to join the public meeting more frequently and give more detailed updates on what you were discussing?

A I'm waiting for my counsel on that one.
MS. MELL: Oh.
MR. WONG: Yeah, I mean, I'll
object to the extent it asks for attorney-client privilege. If you were instructed by anybody other than counsel on something, then you can certainly answer.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I guess I'm still at a -- I still have a question as to the application of attorney-client privilege in this circumstance.

MS. MELL: Let me see if we can
figure out how to walk through it.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you receive instruction from
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anyone other than legal counsel to join the public meeting more frequently and give more detailed updates on what you were discussing?

MR. WONG: You can answer that
question.

## THE WITNESS: If my knowledge

was -- okay.
Yeah, I would -- I would still see -- I would still see this communication as attorney-client privilege, myself. And so, but again, I may be misinterpreting things.

MR. WONG: So, Joe, I think the question is a yes-or-no question that was asked is --

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. WONG: -- how I --
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE REPORTER: "Is how I," what?
MR. WONG: A yes-or-no question as
I heard it asked. And certainly Ms. Mell can correct me if that's incorrect. But $I$ think she was framing it very carefully, and $I$ heard it as a yes-or-no question.

## THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. WONG: That's something you could answer. If you want to read it back, John,
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perhaps that may be helpful.

> (Pertinent question read by the reporter.)

THE WITNESS: Yes.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Who was that?
MR. WONG: You can answer this
question too as to who it was.
THE WITNESS: Commissioner

## Augustine.

Q (By Ms. Mell) How did you respond to her instruction?

A I had been -- I had been in my -- in the public sessions, already attempting to communicate about the issues that seem to be a part of -- about the overall redistricting -- the redistricting issues that were -- that seem to be pertinent, and so there's a -- I think a number of times on different meetings, I don't remember exactly where $I$ either refer to different parts of the state or asked questions about different elements of the - - of the negotiation.

Q So I heard your answer to be that you felt like you had already been sharing.

So did you do anything differently after your conversation with Chair Augustine?
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A I think I just continued to have open conversations in the -- in the live meeting on some of the substantive issues that were part of the process. Did you ever share with the public that there had been a framework reached -- a proposed framework reached?

A Sorry. Could you repeat the question?
Q Did you ever communicate to the public that there had been a proposed framework reached prior to the action portion of the meeting?

A No, I don't believe so. I don't believe there was a -- there wasn't an agreement -- there wasn't an agreement reached prior to the meeting because there hadn't been communication between the members. I didn't know what the members would be on the proposal.

Q But there was a framework in existence prior to the action portion of the agenda for both the congressional and legislative districts, correct?

A There was a framework that was communicated to me, yes, but $I$ don't know who -- I don't know which of the commissioners, what their level of support for various -- there was a lot of frameworks that were generated during these -- during this lengthy 11-month process or ten-month process, and I didn't
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know if this was a framework that had enough support to be adopted.

Q Right.
But you knew it was the -- it was the agreement between Graves and Sims. And as to you, it would be between you and Walkinshaw.

You had a framework that you two -- the two collective dyads had reached frameworks that they agreed upon prior to the action item of the meeting? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I would distinguish between bringing forward a framework and actually -and actually being in a position where you're prepared to cast a vote. I think that all -- I think -- I can only, again, speak for me. I know I was continually conflicted on both maps at all times during this process, and -- and I would be -- and I did not know where other commissioners were, even with regard to the legislative map and Commissioners Sims and Graves.

Q (By Ms. Mell) In terms of -- well, how to parse through that again, to be very specific.

It was communicated to you that there was an agreement between Sims and Graves on a proposed framework prior to the action item, correct?
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A The framework -- a framework was presented after their final conversation. And I do not know -- I did not know what that meant in terms of whether or not that was -- that represented a vote by Commissioner Sims or if that was the latest iteration of the conversation.

This was a very, very -- I think we were using the word "messy," the word "chaotic." You're -you're out of time, and you kind of -- and I think the chair asked for motions. And so this is the -this is the framework that -- that's in front of us, and so this is what we're going to bring up.

Q But there were no express frameworks on the record ever, right?

A No.
Q Okay. So there was some communication about what you were voting on prior to the vote, correct, that was off the record?

A As I said, Commissioner Graves communicated what that -- what the details of the last conversation that he'd had with Commissioner Sims.

Q And vice versa, you communicated to Graves the details on the last conversation that you'd had with Walkinshaw?

A Correct.
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Q Okay. And to the best of your knowledge, you and Graves had a common understanding of frameworks going into the action portion of the meeting?

A To the best of my knowledge, I had -- I understood what the proposed framework was.

Q And was it your expectation that the same kind of conversation had happened between the Democrats as occurred between you and Graves?

A I had no expectation about any communications that I wasn't a party to.

Q Do you have reason to believe that the same kind of conversation occurred between Sims and Walkinshaw?

A Again, $I$ don't mean to be difficult, but $I$ don't want to speculate on something that $I$ wasn't witness to.

I did witness them have a conversation in and around this late time period but not one that $I$ was able to hear or was a party to.

Q Okay. So where did you observe that conversation occur?

A I believe there's a reference to it in her document where she said she believes it was Senator Fain or -"Senator," excuse me -- Commissioner Fain that communicated down from the second floor. So I -- it would have been later than that.

Q Keep going.
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A Yeah, it's, like, second-to-the-last bullet point there. Again, in my recollection, Commissioners -and, of course, there's a record of this, but $I$ haven't reviewed it.

But I believe Commissioner Augustine, myself, and Commissioner Graves were on the meeting Zoom line, the public meeting, but neither Commissioner Grave- -- or Commissioner Sims or Commissioner Walkinshaw were -- and I looked down -- above the room, we looked down and saw that they were talking in the lobby. And I didn't know if they knew that we were -- excuse me. I didn't know if they knew we were on, so I informed them that we were on the Zoom call at that time.

Q So is it correct that there -- there was -- there were communications about voting in concept or on frameworks without maps prior to moving into the action items portion of the agenda?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not quite certain of the question that you're asking.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you have any communications with anyone about voting on frameworks without maps prior to moving into the action portion of the agenda?

A I don't recall. We -- I didn't know if -- if the
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chair was -- what -- how the chair was going to proceed once we were all on the call. And, you know, obviously we did not have actual maps in front of us.

Q So you did know, moving into the action portion of the agenda, that if you were taking a vote on anything, it would be in concept, not with actual maps?

A Yes. In the framework. We use a number of different words. I don't want to use a lot of words to describe it. It was a --

Q It was the extent --
A -- framework proposal.
Q -- of it?
THE REPORTER: "It was a," what?
Sorry, Mr. Fain?
THE WITNESS: It was a frame -- the
framework proposal that -- that we voted on.
(By Ms. Mell) Well, now that you made me go way beyond the last bullet $I$ was on.

A Sorry.
Q So we'll see if we can get through this.
I think we're kind of getting laboriously into this. Let's try to have the bullet points that are -- that you would know something about. So I'm just going to quickly look for your name and see if $I$
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got -- I think we were around 7, right? Yeah, we were right there.

And did the calendar invite.
Do you remember at some point Commission- -- this sparks something in my mind, so don't look for it in the document.

Do you remember Commissioner Graves asking you to communicate his strategic position to Commissioner Walkinshaw?

A With regards to anything in particular?
Q I believe it was as to the maps at the time.
A Anything specific about the maps?
Q I can't be more specific in -- at this moment.
A Okay.
Q I can ask it a different way. Let me see if it refreshes your recollection this way.

Do you recall text communications with Graves asking you to communicate to Walkinshaw, messaging, carry a message to Walkinshaw?

A That may have happened. I would like to -- if you have a text, it'd be helpful to be able to -- to see it so $I$ can comment on it.

And also, would it be permissible to have a 45second break?

Q Sure.
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A Is that all right? Apologize.
MS. MELL: Well, let's take a
five-minute one.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't -- I don't need a full five minutes. I would want to keep going, but...

## MS. MELL: Okay.

(Pause in proceedings from 4:04 p.m. to 4:06 p.m.)

MR. WONG: At the break, Ms. Mell and I were discussing the text messages that she received in response to a Public Records Act request. And for purposes of this deposition, we have stipulated that the text messages that were identified in folders, the folder titled "Fain Texts from Personal Devices $11-15$ to $11-16, "$ we will not be disputing authentication of those at this -- that time. And if any issue arises, we agree to confer on it and discuss.

And, Ms. Mell, does that reflect your understanding?

MS. MELL: It does. And I appreciate that stipulation.

MR. WONG: Thank you. Hopefully
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that will --
MS. MELL: And then I would just
simply add: To the extent as I'm going through these, like, there was the exhibit from Graves yesterday that -- well, we might come across it here. Let's just see how it goes.

But generally to the extent that we're using the titles and documents from the public records request as labeled, the stipulation would be that they are what they were represented to be by the commission. MR. WONG: Agree.

And, Mr. Fain, just direction for you. If for some reason Ms. Mell is referring to a conversation and it appears incorrect for some reason, it's not with who it appears to be from based on the label or Ms. Mell's questions, just please point it out. But we don't have any reason to believe that will be the case.

## THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. WONG: Thank you.
MS. MELL: All right.
MR. WONG: That may expedite this
some.
MS. MELL: Yeah. And so -- and this is getting tedious enough that $I$ want to go
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through it quickly.
And to the extent, Commissioner Fain, that you have a specific recollection about content in here that's attributable to you that you can affirm or reject as true and correct and direct me to that, I'm happy to expedite it in that manner. Otherwise, I just got to scroll through it and look for your name and ask you the question.

THE WITNESS: That's probably most

## thorough.

MS. MELL: Okay.
Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you have any reason to believe that that $8: 45$ time frame is inaccurate with regard to when the final proposed frameworks were being communicated?

A I don't have any recollection of what time anything happened, so $I$ can't really speak to the -- can't really speak to the times.

Q This directive here, "At this point staff was asked to start mapping based on the partisanship numbers in the agreement."

Was there a point in time when you directed staff to start mapping based on partisanship numbers in an agreement?

A Again, I don't recall -- I don't recall when the ma- --
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the mapping activity occurred other than that which occurred in the event space after midnight.

And throughout this entire day, staff members were feverishly mapping one thing or another, so can't give a -- can't give a clear sense of when they were mapping what.

Q Okay. "Between 9 and 9:30 p.m., Commissioner Walkinshaw told me he was going to meet with Commissioner Fain to discuss the congressional map proposals. Shortly thereafter, they came to the hotel lobby where I and Paul Campos, Senate Republican Caucus, were present."

Did that occur?
A Again, I don't know what -- at what time, but there was a time that evening where the staff members and individuals referenced there were present in the lobby. I believe I referenced that earlier in our conversation.

Q Were you looking at a map on Ms. O'Neil's laptop, giving instructions on how to make changes to the map?

A I think we were looking at maps on multiple laptops. And I can't recall all the details of what -- what was being discussed.

Q Okay. Do you know whether or not your staff, around
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10:45, received an updated congressional map proposal?

A I don't recall.
Q So in this first bullet on Page -- whatever page I'm on -- 5, it says, "On multiple occasions Commissioner Augustine was communicating to the commissioners that they needed to be prepared to take a vote before the commission lost jurisdiction at midnight."

Is that a correct statement from your perspective?

A I don't recall any specific direction from Commissioner Augustine. I can share that she communicated the desire that she had that the commission complete its work in time.

Q Do you remember a suggestion that the commissioners should vote on the transmittal letter without any maps ready to approve?

A Again, $I$ don't recall any of those -- any conversation along that. The final -- again, I don't recall a conversation about it.

Q Did you execute a resolution with placeholder blank lines in it?

A I don't recall if there were placeholder blank lines. I hadn't reviewed that resolution for several weeks at minimum back to, I think, the time that it was
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drafted and first sent to us, so...
Q I can't tell which exhibit number this has been marked as. But just showing you what's been labeled here "Letter_PlanSubmittal_Draft 08.12.21 - No Body Signed.pdf (SECURED)" refresh your recollection as to whether or not you executed a blank resolution or transmittal letter for purposes of whatever, I guess? I don't even know what purpose you would do it for.

A So, well, if you look at the dates here.
Q Do you need to see these ones bigger?
A No. No. I think I can provide some context to this document, which is $I$ think this was the -- this particular document, at least based upon the dates that $I$ see there, would be the test authorization document that staff had asked each of the commissioners to electronically sign to make sure that we were signing documents correctly.

So based on the signature dates there, my -- my best recollection would be that that is what this document is.

Q Okay. And so then do you remember -- do you remember whether or not the tran- -- not the transmittal letter but the resolution, itself, required file paths to identify the final plan?

A Again, I haven't -- I hadn't reviewed that document
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for several weeks up to the time of the final
commission meeting, and I don't think I've looked at it since.

Q Do you have a recollection of as to whether -- what form the transmittal letter was in when you signed it?

A Can you be more specific about what form?
Q Was the form that you signed exactly the same as what was transmitted?

A I didn't review the document, again, at the time that I electronically signed it. There was a Internet outage, and Zoom went -- our Zoom connection went down. And it was 11:59 or midnight, and I just -- it was a -- it was chaos.

Q Do you remember signing the final resolution before it was moved?

A I don't recall doing it before it was moved, but if you have time stamps that say otherwise.

Q Well, the time stamp I'm looking at on this document says November 15th, 2021, 23:59.

A Okay.
MR. WONG: Are you sharing a
document on your screen, Joan? I'm not seeing one.
MS. MELL: I'm looking at it in my
hands because $I$ think it's back in a exhibit that has
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not yet been marked. Hold on.
Mr. Court Reporter, can we mark this as whatever number we're up to exhibit, this document that says "Final Resolution Letter_11.15.21 - signed"?
(Discussion off the record.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) So do you know when the resolution was moved?

A I -- I don't. I -- no.
Q Are you aware of a timeline of any kind that reflects the commission's position on the timing of the motions?

A I'm sorry. I didn't quite follow the question.
Q Have you approved a timeline of the motions?
A Have I approved the timeline of the motions?
Q Correct.
A Sorry. Still don't follow what you're -- what you're asking.

Q Have you approved any representation of the timeline of the 15 th and 16 th?

A I have not.
Q Okay. Did you ever authorize Chair Augustine to speak on behalf of the commission to the supreme court?

A I don't believe a question of authorization came
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before the commission.
Q Did you as a commissioner have the opportunity to make any decisions about the communication from the supreme court requesting a timeline?

A No. My recollection was that the -- she as the chair was the one that was being charged with responding, not the commission as a whole.

Q And was that based on anything other than legal advice?

A I mean, I think that was what the order was, what the order said.

Q It was directed to her?
A My -- my best recollection of the order from the supreme court was that the chair was to -- was to provide this --

Q Okay.
A -- yeah.
THE REPORTER: "Was to provide," what?

THE WITNESS: Was to provide a timeline as well as a statement.

Q (By Ms. Mell) So opening up Exhibit 45, I will represent to you that that's the timeline that's been provided to me in the public records requests. So I'm going to scroll down to see.
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Looks like the representation in the timeline at Exhibit 45 is that the chair asks Maria to send the resolution at 11:59:50 p.m.

Do you see that there?
A I'm sorry. Which -- what line are you referring to again?

Yes, I see that.
Q Do you have any reason to believe that that is incorrect?

A I don't.
Do you remember the motion, or the -- there being a motion on the resolution prior to midnight?

A Again, $I$ don't recall -- $I$ don't -- I don't recall the specific mechanics of the meeting. I'm relying on the document that you have here.

Q Okay. So showing you what's been marked as -- I didn't mark that one. Shoot. Or else the label didn't change. Let me close this and get it open again. There we go. Okay.

Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 44, do you recognize that document to be the final resolution?

A Based on the time stamps below, I assume it's the final one.

Q Okay. And do you see your signature on that
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document?
A I do.
Q Do you have any reason to believe that the date and time below your signature is incorrect?

A I don't.
Q Based on the time reflected there, did you execute the resolution prior to it being moved?

A Again, can you go and see what the --
Q Should we do a side-by?
A Yeah, that might be helpful. I don't have...
Q Where did the -- that's the memo. Where did it go? There we go.

Let me see if $I$ can get them so we can lookie-loo at exactly what it says.

Sorry. Tired. Fat fingers.
A I understand.
Q Then you. Okay.
Can you see them there?

## A $\quad \mathbf{M m}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

Q Okay. Motion to approve is at 11:59:57.
A Okay.
Q I guess we don't know because the date/time isn't specific enough, right?

A Yeah, I would probably -- yeah, it doesn't seem to include a milliseconds, and also $I$ wouldn't want to
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vouch for the -- whatever chronometer was being used to create either one of those stamps when we're talking about a matter of possibly milliseconds but certainly seconds.

Q Okay. With regard to Exhibit -- oh, strike that. Did you have anything to do with the preparation of this timeline in Exhibit 45?

A No.
Q And you don't know where these times came from?
A I don't have actual knowledge of where those came from.

Q And you don't have any independent knowledge as to what the correct times are for any of these noted events?

A I don't.
Q And do you have any way to ascertain what the correct times are, to the best of your knowledge?

A Again, I think the time stamp on the document that you're showing there would be one way, and another would be to use the time index on the TVW recording. Those would be the two places that I would look if I needed to verify. I don't...

Okay. So scrolling back through the resolution, do you see the file? Is this a file path, in your opinion?
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A Appears to be a file path.
Q So when you signed the resolution, do you believe that these -- these file path numbers were in it?

A Again, I haven't reviewed this resolution since several weeks before it was adopted, so I did not recall what was actually contained within the language.

Can you repeat the question for me?
Q Do you know if, when you signed the resolution, these file paths were in there?

A I don't believe any additional files were sent at the time of signing.

Q Okay. So am I to understand that the files didn't exist at the time of the signing of the resolution?

A The -- if those files are meant to represent the map files, then that mapping work was done after the time of the signing.

Q And how would I ascertain -- well, strike that.
Do you have an understanding of how the file path would read to reflect the final map?

A I have -- I don't have any knowledge about the naming conventions that staff used in -- in dividing this.

There was a -- yeah, $I$ don't -- I don't recall any discussion about naming conventions outside of short bit of public testimony that we received one day from
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an interested member of the public.
Q There was a -- what did you say? There was a what?
A Said I don't have any recollection of any discussion about naming conventions for the -- for these files other than a bit of public testimony from a random member of the public who -- who came during public testimony once and shared his thoughts about cyber security and -- and naming conventions.

Q Okay. Do you know whether or not the metadata on the maps that were finally transmitted would accurately reflect the final iteration in terms of date and time?

A Sorry. I don't quite understand your question.
Q So if the maps that were finally transmitted contain in the metadata a date and time, do you know how that date and time in the metadata on the maps that were transmitted correlate to when the maps were finalized?

A I can't speak to what metadata might accompany a file that $I$ wasn't a party to creating.

Q Okay. So you were not party to any discussions about how to label or -- label the files in final form or whether or not the metadata links to any time clock that is contemporaneous to the date and time?

A I don't recall any discussion or presentation during
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the -- during a commission meeting. There may have
been some reference to file names when -- several
weeks before the last day of the commission when
these documents were -- had been -- had been drafted.
Again, they were -- I think everyone was under the -- I won't speak for everyone. I was under the impression and the expectation that we would have these files ready to transmit as part of the -- as part of the final vote. That was my expectation leading up to the final few days of this -- of this process.

Q Okay. All right. Turning back to the memo timeline from Ms. O'Neil. Let's see. Just trying to refresh my recollection on the last bullet point we were on. I think we had left off here with regard to voting on something before midnight.

Did you ask -- did you ask to seek out any AG's advice on the legalities of a vote without a map?
MR. WONG: I'll object and instruct

Mr. Fain not to answer to the extent it pertains to the substance of any communications between you and the attorney general's office in regard to legal advice sought or provided.

You can answer to the extent if you -- as to "yes" or "no" whether you did contact the attorney
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general's office at this exact moment.
MS. MELL: Or seek it out. I think
I would modify the direction that way.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall. I don't believe I contacted the attorneys general -attorney general's office at this time. And I don't have recollection of asking someone to do so on my behalf.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Were you present at any time you would have heard the content of what's conveyed in this bullet point, Ali O'Neil voicing her concerns about voting without a map?

A No.
Q Boy, there's a word I haven't heard.
Okay. Let's keep going here.
MR. WONG: That's one for your
stipulated facts.
MS. MELL: I know. I know. I'm just trying to envision what kind of font we put that in and what kind of bold and highlights.

Let me see here. Okay. I see your name in this one. I see your name here.

Q (By Ms. Mell) I guess you wouldn't have any personal knowledge on the validity of this, but I'm assuming you probably don't dispute it; is that correct?
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A No personal knowledge.
If I may, what time are we at about right now?
Q Oh, the real time? Real time I have is --
A Oh, no, no. I'm sorry. Time in the -- in the -- on the document. I wanted to --

Q Oh, I don't have anything other than this bullet comes right before 12:38.

A Oh. Okay.
(Interruption by reporter due
to simultaneous speakers.)

THE WITNESS: I don't have any knowledge of what she was doing that time. I don't really know what time that is.

MS. MELL: Talked about that.
(By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that the AutoBound Edge upload and processing would take several hours?

A Yes, I believe that process takes quite a while. And we talked about that bullet. I think that that all reflects what you said.

How about this sentence in the first bullet on Page 7? "Commissioners Fain and Walkinshaw ask staff to look at different scenarios for the 7 th and 9 th congressional district border, especially with Normandy Park."
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I recollect that's consistent with what you said earlier. Do you disagree?

A Just put the context around it that that was a very brief conversation that -- that we kind of collectively agreed was not worth the bother. So...

Q Would you agree that you looked at extending the eastern border down along the edge of Lake Washington to balance the population?

A We did briefly look at what would be necessary for that to occur and quickly concluded that it was not -- it was not -- again, not worth the -- not worth the effort.

Q Do you agree at approximately this time you were probably one of the two commissioners here agreeing to send the congressional map file to the commission staff?

A I was still present at the -- at the event room at that time. And since it was the -- my staffer that sent the file, $I$ was likely present for that.

Q And you don't disagree that that occurred?
A Again, I don't have clear recollection of that happening, but -- though I believe Paul had sent the file at some point, so...

Q Do you remember a discussion about hurrying up and finishing the maps before the reporters woke up?
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A Where are you referencing?
Sorry. Am I looking for your cursor or something else?

Q Oh. Right here.
A Yeah, I don't remember any specific conversation around that. I know that I personally wanted the -I wanted to have the maps completed quickly so that -- so that they were out there.

Do you remember communications that are consistent with this bullet point?
"At around 5:30 or 6 a.m., Commissioner Fain left the Hampton Inn. Soon after this, Commissioner Graves received a phone call, which I believe was from Commissioner Fain."

A I don't recall a conversation at that time, but that's not -- I don't -- I can't say that one didn't occur.

Q Did you have a conversation with Commissioner Graves about the questionable legality of what happened and communicate that to the commissioners?

A Again, $I$ don't recall the conversation. But, again, not to say it did or did not happen. I think we were operating on very little sleep at that point or no sleep.

Q Were she says, "The vote" -- "and the vote should be
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portrayed to the public," do you know what that means?

A I don't want to put words in her mouth. I know what -- I think we had discussed earlier about what $I$ communicated to Chair Augustine was what I -- you know, what I thought needed to be communicated.

Q And is that the point about that they were not complete?

A I had communicated earlier in the evening with Chair Augustine that my position that the commission did not -- based on the attorney general's e-mail, the commission had not completed its work --

Q Okay.
A -- in time and that -- that that should be communicated.

Q Okay. So I think, then, at this stage in her recitation, commissioners must necessarily exclude you because you were gone by that time since the call had come from you right around then.

So I doubt you're going to have any firsthand knowledge about any of this stuff.

I think I asked you whether or not you agree not to post the maps before the 10 a.m. press conference. Did I?

A Yeah. And I don't recall any conversation around
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## that.

Q Okay. There's no more scrolling.
Let's move on. I'm going to close some of this down so $I$ can get it cleaned up. I think we might have to trip up a little bit on exhibit numbers as I move into the text messages, so bear with me here.

And, Mr. Court Reporter -- I don't think it's in this one. I believe we -- that's you. We dealt with those.

Okay. So where are we in the -- where are we in what you have that starts with this number? Does it have an exhibit already in it?
(Discussion off the record.)

MR. WONG: A time check here, Joan. We are at 4:46 Seattle time.

MS. MELL: Okay.
MR. WONG: So wanting to hopefully wrap this up soon.

MS. MELL: Yeah.
Okay. These have all been premarked. And since we futzed with some of the numbers, can you just -up to the duplicated numbers, which would be 43 through 45, I'm just going to put an "a" there.

Does that give anybody heartburn?
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MR. WONG: As long as the court reporter can follow it and we get a final set of exhibits properly marked, I don't have any heartburn over that.

MS. MELL: Okay. I think I just need to go up to that number, so there we go. All right.

Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 43a -let's move it back over here. I don't know why it's doing that.
(Discussion off the record.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) And Adam Smith. Do you know which day this text message reflects with regard to your communications with Adam Smith?

Would that be Tuesday the 16 th at 7:58?
A I think that's a fair assumption. Because just inferring based on whether or not the commission was going to release maps, 'cause he would have -- if it was later, he would have known that it had.

Q I don't know why these aren't scrolling.
A Might be the end of the text.
Q Oh. Is it? Okay.
A (Videoconference technical difficulties.)
THE REPORTER: What was that there,
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Mr. Fain?
THE WITNESS: I said that could be the end of the text. She asked why it was not scrolling. That was my...

Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you remember telling Adam Smith in the follow-up phone call that you did not reach a deal?

A I don't remember -- I don't remember if we even had a phone call at this point.

Q With regard to Exhibit No. 45a, this appears to be a text to -- is this a text to you? You're receiving via text Sarah Augustine's communication to the chief justice; is that correct?

A It appears that that is what this document is.
Q And do you recall whether or not this was a done deal at the time or whether or not you were approving it?

A Again, I don't believe I had any approval authority for this -- for this.

Q Okay. I think this just generally was procedural talk with the chair about publicizing map proposals.

Do I have that correct?
A Yeah, that was in the previous month. That was about a month before the final deadline.

Okay. Okay. Do you know what this means, document?
A Based on the time, my -- and I'm not a hundred
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percent sure, but $I$ am more sure than not that it is the memo that we've gone over earlier.

Q Okay. Okay. And I don't see the time stamp. Can you -- do you know when that was?

A It would have been sometime the morning, I believe sometime in the morning of -- well, this is with reference to the draft, so I'm not entirely certain at what the time stamp is.

Okay. And I don't need to have this whole conversation on the record, but just make note that we need to make sure you don't destroy any of your texts and that we ultimately get a metadata version so that these times are reflected.

A Okay.
Q And am I correct that you're the one making these screenshots?

A Yes, that's correct.
Did you delete any texts before you made screenshots?
A I don't believe so.
Q In this communication, "We were walking back together he will be on in 2," what does that mean?

A 6:06 p.m.
This was after I had inquired whether or not she would be willing to do a mediator's proposal. And I think this is that Paul and I had walked over to grab
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a bite to eat, but $I$ think she was ready to meet, and so Paul was headed back to meet with her.

Q And why didn't you go with Paul to meet with her? Is that because you were assigned to the different negotiations?

A This was a issue that she was working with between April and Paul. Really didn't involve me. I had just suggested that she might offer some assistance. Okay. I don't think this one tells us anything more.

A I think that's a similar screenshot.
Nothing new here, it doesn't look like, either.
I thought there'd be something further down. Let me just look here.

Okay. All right. So here's a text thread between you, Paul, and Sarah; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q One in which you didn't participate?
A It doesn't appear so.
Q When it says, "When are you ready to come back to our meeting?" what did that mean?

A I -- again, I assume it means the -- come back to the Zoom meeting.

Q The public meeting?
A Correct.
Q What does -- when Sarah is saying, "Staff think that
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if we have a shape file and a resolution that will be enough," what did you do with that information?

A I don't think I did anything with that information.
Q It's correct that you never had a shape file on the 15th?

A I'm sorry. What was your -- what did you just say there?

Q It is correct that you never had a shape file on the 15th for --

A That's correct.
Q Okay.
THE REPORTER: "For," what, Joan?
MS. MELL: I think I got halfway
through the word "for presentation," but I think he assumed that that's what $I$ meant.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Any correction there, Commissioner?
A We did not have a shape file on the 15th for any final maps.

Q Repeat.
I don't know why these got repeated like that.
I mean, when you were doing screenshots, were you sometimes overlapping just to make sure you got the whole conversation and not verifying for sure that it was du- -- okay.

A Yeah, so they're -- usually the last conversation
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will be part of the first and the next.
Q Okay. So this is a text communication between you and Walkinshaw, giving status updates as to the negotiations.
Is that a fair -- or is that a correct
characterization of these communications?
A I would probably correct. I would characterize that as a bit more bluster than a dispassionate update on the stage of the negotiation.

Q And when you're saying "blustered," sort of strategically stating things in a way to move the process along?

A Just to make my contention clear that I'm -- that a plan involved both congressional and legislative, in the event that that somehow put additional pressure to find resolution for commissioners.

Okay. So did you expect that, with that communication, that messaging would go back to April?

A That message was really intended for Brady. So I -in my mind, it did not need to go anywhere beyond that.

Q Okay. Okay. And so then is this you meeting -indicating that you met with Brady to talk about his communications with April?

A Part of that screen is cut off there, so I'm -- I
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can't see the right half. I'm going to --
Q Which way? My right? This way?
A It might be something I can fix. But, yeah, I got it now. Mm-hmm. Okay. Can you repeat the question for me?

Q Does this text communication with Brady indicate that you were meeting up with Brady in the hotel to talk about the status of the negotiations he was just finishing up with April?

A No. I think he's just telling me why he's held up.
Q This, "Ok, give me a sec- I'll be down in 10," suggests to me that he's trying to meet up with you. Is that an incorrect assumption?

A Yes, I believe I -- I asked -- he asked if you want to touch base. I had responded, "Sure. Where at?" He let me know why he was not ready at this exact moment. I told him where I was, and then he told me he'd be down soon.

So it was really just transitory stuff of, you know, arranging to meet.

Q But what did you meet up and talk about?
A I don't recall. But this was at a time when we were discussing the -- you know, we had had regular conversations about the congressional maps during

16:59:361 16:59:372 16:59:473 16:59:514

16:59:565
17:00:066
17:00:087
17:00:118
17:00:159
17:00:210
17:00:211
17:00:212
17:00:32 3
17:00:34 4
17:00:315
17:00:416
17:00:417
17:00:428
17:00:519
17:00:520
17:01:011
17:01:122
17:01:133
17:01:124
17:01:125
these times.
Q So based on this exchange, would you expect that right around 10:13 on Monday, you met with Brady to discuss the congressional maps?

A I believe that -- I don't know what time I first met with Brady on -- on Monday morning, and that doesn't provide me enough information. I think it tells me that they were -- that Brady and his staff were going to send us over some concept proposals to look at.

I don't think it -- I think there was probably some time passage between the, "Ok, give me a secI'll be down in 10," and the, "We're getting u a map in a few." But I -- yeah.

Q Okay. Like, there was a meeting in between here in the long run?

A Yeah, I think that -- that may have occurred. We did meet prior to 10:13 that evening.

Q And discussed redistricting?
A I believe so.
Q Okay. Why did that not open?
You and Brady. I don't know why this changed format, but it seems to have.

So do these text exchanges reflect you and Brady negotiating the terms?

A I don't know what -- I mean, this appears to be a
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back-and-forth with regards to the congressional map. I don't know what -- what specific questions do you have?

Q My specific question is: Does -- did -- was there -was there an exchange around this time of maps that were reflective of the terms you guys were negotiating?

A I mean, I think there were draft maps that went back and forth frequently, and then there was the conversation that we held together with our staff in the lobby. So I think they sort of all -- all fit together as part of the process.

Q I don't think that's new.
MR. WONG: Joan, we're a little bit
after 5:00 right now. You said you had a meeting. And we've been going since 9 a.m. So if we could wrap it up, please.

MS. MELL: We've got seven more to
go.
MR. WONG: Okay. Expedite it.
That'd be appreciated.
MS. MELL: These are all August,
August, August.
Looking for the one, but this was -- okay.
Q (By Ms. Mell) So here's you sending your letter, so
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that is the Adobe document. I see that.
That's to Paul? Did you agree?
A I did, yes.
Q Okay. Okay. This is the one I've been looking for. Okay. I think.

Okay. Yes, this is the one I'm looking for.
So can you tell from this text exchange set forth in Exhibit 61 whether or not this is you, the colored communications are you?

A I believe it is -- I believe the blue-colored box inside the gray box is me.

Q And Paul Graves communicated to you, "And I think I mentioned it yesterday, but you can absolutely tell him that I'm a hard no on the congressional map without a leg map."

That's Paul Graves asking you to tell Walkinshaw that he -- that Graves is a hard "no" on the congressional map without a leg map? MR. WONG: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I believe that is a text message from Paul.

Q (By Ms. Mell) To that effect?
Did you tell Walkinshaw that Graves was a hard "no" on the congressional map without a legislative map?
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A I think as we talked about before, I expressed my position that it was a plan involved both a legislative and a congressional map, or my position at the time. And I actually don't recall whether or not $I$ did, in fact, tell him Paul's position.

Q Does your text message to Paul suggest that you were telling Paul you had told Walkinshaw that it was both your positions that you were both hard "no" on the congressional map without a leg map?

A My text message, it does say that, yes.
Q Do you have any reason to believe you did not do that?

A I just am stating from my recollection. I'm not certain that $I$ did. But $I$-- that is my text message, so...

Q All right. So this now is you communicating with Sims about meeting to discuss the congressional district maps; is that correct?

A Sorry. I'm switching earphones.
Are you able to hear me right now?
Q Yep.
A Okay. Thanks.
Yep, that's what it appears that I'm texting -I'm sorry. This is to April Sims, is the recipient of this.
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MR. WONG: Can you scroll to the top of this one, Joan, just so he can see the name? THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR. WONG: Thank you.
Q (By Ms. Mell) So you invite, "Would u like a visit from the congressional visit fairy?"

Did that mean you?
A I assume $I$ was referencing myself.
Q Okay. And April's negotiating back and saying, if you say "yes" to the legislative district proposal, then she would be free to talk about congressional districts?

A I interpret that as her making a joke there.
Q Meaning -- what's the joke?
A The joke is --
Q I mean, don't you think -- I'm sorry.
A Go ahead. I'm sorry. What were you going to say?
Q April Sims was serious that she wanted you to agree to the legislative district proposal so that she could talk to you about congressional districts, correct?

A You would have to --
MR. WONG: Form.
THE WITNESS: Excuse me.
You would have to ask her what her intention was.
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What $I$ read in that was that it -- I read that as being a joke.
(Clarification by reporter.)

Q (By Ms. Mell) Meaning she's ribbing you, that she would --

A Yes.
Q -- still talk to you, but she wasn't serious? Okay.
A I think, yeah, both joking. And then I don't believe we had a follow-up conversation there, so I think it was her way of -- again, how I interpreted her way of saying, "I'm focused on the LD maps," and then giving me a little poke like, "You do everything we want and, sure, I'd be happy to chat," which is like a ribbing to your point.
Q Okay. What's the, "Or you can call Brady," mean?
A I think it's exactly what it says, which is if you want to work on the congressional district maps, should continue working with Brady.
Q She would continue working with Brady, or you could call Brady?

A That I should call Brady.
Q Oh, that you should. I get it. Okay. I get it now. All right. I'm getting tired.

Okay. Let's see. Don't care about your lattes.
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This is the same.
More duplication than $I$ recall.
Okay.

## A And again.

Q And again.
MS. MELL: All right. Thank you.
I've done what $I$ can do in the time frame we've got allotted here.

MR. WONG: And, Mr. West, do you plan on asking any questions? If so, I'd ask that they be very brief, because we are over time.

MR. WEST: I do plan on asking some very brief questions, if that's okay.

MR. WONG: Let's just wrap it up right now and get it done. But please do keep them brief, I request.

MR. WEST: Okay.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. WEST:
Q Mr. Fain, do you recall at around 12:38 a.m. on the 16th, a point where all the staff and the commissioners gathered in that main meeting or event room on the first floor of the Hampton Inn hotel?
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A Commissioners and staff were in and out of the event room throughout the early morning hours of -- of, $I$ guess that'd be Tuesday morning. So I recall being there during those hours.

Q Do you recall a point where all the commissioners and staff gathered in the meeting room?

A I don't recall a -- the time when they were all gathered in a -- not to -- not to parse words. I want to -- there is a time when all the commissioners and staff may have been in the event room. But in terms of gathered around a central point in conversation, if that was the insinuation, $I$ don't recall a time where that occurred.

Q Do you recall a time when they were all in the event room?

A Not specifically. But, again, commissioners and staff were coming in and out rather frequently, so it would be --

Q To the extent that all --
THE REPORTER: Sorry. "Rather
frequently, so it would be," what? Mr. Fain. Sorry. THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. What
was the...?
THE REPORTER: "Not specifically.
But, again, commissioners and staff were coming in
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and out rather frequently..." Was there more after that?

THE WITNESS: I don't know what else I would have said.

THE REPORTER: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Sorry.
THE REPORTER: No problem.
Sorry, Mr. West. Go ahead.
Q (By Mr. West) Extent that four commissioners may have been present in that room at the same time, is it fair to say you wouldn't recall that?

A I don't recall -- can you -- can you restate the question? I want to make sure I'm answering it clearly.

Q To the extent that all four commissioners may have been present at the same time in that event room, is it fair to say that you would not recall that?

A I cannot -- I will not categorically say that there was no time, that all four commissioners were not located somewhere in that event room at the same time.

Q Okay. So do you recall a time when they were all there together?

A I don't specific --
Q All in the event room.
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A Yeah, $I$ don't specifically recall a time when all the commissioners were in the room together, but I'm not -I'm not stating that that may not have occurred. It was a large event space.

Q Back to the original question.
To the extent that all the commissioners were there in the room at the same time, you don't remember that?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think I've -I've tried to answer that question the best of my ability.

MR. WEST: Okay. Thank you.
Q (By Mr. West) Do you agree that the commissioners agreed to send the congressional map file to commissioner staff -- to commission staff at around 4:37 a.m.?

A Again, I don't recall the time that -- that any of that occurred. But as I previously stated, I believe that Paul Campos sent that to commission staff sometime either before or shortly after I left the hotel.

Q Okay. Do you recall what time you left the hotel?
A I think I've been asked that question before, and I think we said sometime between 5 and 5:30, but I
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don't --
Q Okay.
A -- recall specifically.
Do you recall the commissioners agreeing to send the congressional map files to commission staff?

A I don't recall a time where there were more than Commissioner Walkinshaw and I reviewing anything to do with the congressional maps in that time frame. I don't recall.

Go ahead.
Okay. Is your memory perfect during this period of time?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: It's a very late --
very late, slash, very early hour without a lot of sleep.

Q (By Mr. West) So to the extent that you could have been discussing that matter with more than one other commissioner, is it fair to say that you might not recall that at this point?

A The -- I have referenced one other time where I had -- where I recall referencing the congressional map with another commissioner, and that was when $I$ asked Commissioner Graves if he wanted to take a look, which he declined.

17:17:061 17:17:082

17:17:113
17:17:14 4
17:17:145
17:17:15 6
17:17:167
17:17:168
17:17:189
17:17:200
17:17:221
17:17:2B2
17:17:213
17:17:32 4
17:17:35 5
17:17:38 6
17:17:417
17:17:45 8
17:17:419
17:17:520
17:17:581
17:18:022
17:18:063
17:18:084
17:18:025

And to my recollection, that was the only other time that $I$ had a conversation with another commissioner other than Commissioner Walkinshaw about the congressional maps --

Q Is it possible --
A -- during that time frame.
Q Oh. Sorry.
Is it possible that there were other such times that you do not now recall?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I can only state to
what I can recall right now, and I don't recall another time.

Q (By Mr. West) Okay. Do you recall a point where the commissioners were urging staff to hurry and finish up the maps so they could be posted as quickly as possible before the reporters woke up?

A I think some form of this question has been asked before. And I think there was a general sense of urgency to complete the mapping job so that we could make the maps public.

Q Do you recall which commissioners were urging staff to do that?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
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Q (By Mr. West) Do you recall any communications with one or more commissioners about that?

A Can you specify what "that" is in the subject? "That" being subject of finishing up the maps quickly or -- and/or getting them done before the reporters woke up.

A I don't recall anything in reference to a specific time that we were trying to reach. I personally did not anticipate that that process would take as long as it did.

Do you recall any communications with the other commissioners about finishing up the maps?

A Had conversations with -- I mean, I've already referenced conversations with Commissioner Walkinshaw with regards to the -- the work that was done after midnight with regards to the congressional maps. Do you recall any conversations involving -- serial or otherwise -- involving more than one other commissioner about finishing up the maps? MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm a little confused at what the question is. I think I've previously expressed the -- previously described the activities that $I$ was involved in during this time frame.
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Q (By Mr. West) Okay. Do you recall any time during that period where you discussed with -- either serially or at one point with more than one other commissioner finishing up the maps?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry. I don't -- I don't fully understand the question.

I worked with Commissioner Walkinshaw on the completion of the -- of the congressional maps during that time.

Q (By Mr. West) Do you recall any period where you had any discussions with more than one commissioner concerning finishing up the maps?

MR. WONG: Objection; asked and answered.

Mr. West, this is going to be --
MR. WEST: I think he's been
evading this question. There's a yes-or-no question. If he wants to say "yes" or "no" to that, I'd be happy to hear that answer.

MR. WONG: I disagree, Mr. West.
I'm lodging my objection for the record.
MR. WEST: Okay.
MR. WONG: The witness can answer.
It's been asked and answered now already.
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MR. WEST: Is that "yes" or a "no"?
I have not heard a "yes" or "no" to that.
THE WITNESS: I apologize. I think
I was trying to understand what you were asking.
I don't recall a time when $I$ was involved with a conversation with more than one other voting commissioner with regards to the substance of -- of the -- of the maps.

Q (By Mr. West) Okay. Are you sure that that didn't happen?

MR. WONG: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I think I've answered that question. To the best of my recollection, $I$ don't recall.

Q (By Mr. West) Okay. Your recollection during these events, because you were so tired because it was so chaotic, is admittedly not perfect?

A I'm not representing my recollection as being perfect.

Q Okay. So for the record, then, your recollections of this -- of these events during the 12:30 to 5:00 or so when you left are imperfect?

Very good.
THE REPORTER: Sorry. Can $I$ get an answer there?
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MR. WONG: Mr. West, can we please wrap this up? This is going on longer --

MR. WEST: I have just a couple more questions.

MR. WONG: Okay. Thank you.
THE REPORTER: So I didn't get the last answer from you, Mr. Fain.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm a bit
lost here. I don't even know what we're...
MR. WEST: Apparently Mr. Fain does not recollect the last question.

Q (By Mr. West) Do you recall leaving the Hampton Inn at some point in the morning?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall what time you left?
MR. WONG: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: As previously stated, it's my recollection that $I$ left sometime between 5 and 5:30.

Q (By Mr. West) Okay. And did you make any phone calls on your way home?

A As we've discussed before, $I$ don't recall making a phone call, but I'm not -- I don't -- I can't categorically say that $I$ didn't.

Q So it's possible you made a phone call, but you do
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not recall now?
A That's possible.
Q Thank you. Very good.
Generally, do you have any medical or physical problems that would impair your memory or subject you to amnesia?

Are you in good health?
A To your first question, not to my knowledge.
To your second question, I'm in fair health.
MR. WEST: Thank you very much.
I'm done with this witness.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MS. MELL: I don't need to go back on the record.
(Signature reserved.)
(Deposition concluded at
5:24 p.m.)
(Exhibit Nos. 41 through 43, 43a, 44, 44a, 45, 45a, and 46 through 65 marked for identification.)
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