













2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 425, Seattle, WA 98121 • 206.389.9321 • Toll Free: 855.329.0919

2208 North 30th Street, Suite 202, Tacoma, WA 98403 • 253.627.6401 • Toll Fee: 800.649.2034

## ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

Digital Transcripts • Internet Realtime • HD Legal Video • Picture-in-Picture Depositions Remote Depositions • Designation Editing • Nationwide Scheduling • HD Videoconferencing

In the Matter of:

### WASHINGTON COALITION FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT

VS

#### STATE OF WASHINGTON

**JOE FAIN** 

January 12, 2022

Thank you for choosing BA Litigation Services for your court reporting, legal video, and deposition technology needs. It is always our goal to provide you with exceptional service. If there is anything we can do to assist you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR Vice President



The Premier Advantage<sup>™</sup> PDF transcript bundle contains:

- Full-size and condensed transcripts
- Printable word index
- Hyperlinked selectable word index
- Embedded printable exhibit scans
- Hyperlinked selectable exhibit viewing
- Common file formats: txt, lef, mdb accessed via *paperclip* icon

STRATEGY • TECHNOLOGY • DESIGN • DEPOSITIONS

# WASHINGTON COALITION FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT vs STATE OF WASHINGTON Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE IN AND FOR THURST	
WASHINGTON COALITION FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT, a non-profit, nonpartisan Washington organization,	) ) ) )
Plaintiff,	) No. 21-2-02069-34
v.	)
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, a state government, acting through THE WASHINGTON STATE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, a Washington State Agency, et al.,	) ) ) ) )
Defendants.	)

VIDEOCONFERENCE DEPOSITION OF JOE FAIN

January 12, 2022

Taken Remotely via Zoom

Reporter: John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR



1	APPEARANCES
2	(All parties appearing remotely.)
3	For Plaintiff Washington Coalition for Open Government:
4	Toom K Moll
5	Joan K. Mell III Branches Law 1019 Regents Boulevard
6	Suite 204
7	Fircrest, Washington 98466-6037 253.566.2510 253.664.4643 Fax
8	joan@3brancheslaw.com
9	Plaintiff Arthur West, Appearing Pro Se:
10	Arthur West
11	Pro Se 120 State Avenue Northeast
12	#1497
13	Olympia, Washington 98501-1131 360.593.4588
14	awestaa@gmail.com
15	For Defendant Washington Redistricting Commission:
16	
17	Gregory J. Wong Christina E. Jaccard Pacifica Law Group
18	1191 Second Avenue
19	Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98101-3404
20	206.245.1700 206.245.1750 Fax
21	greg.wong@pacificalawgroup.com christina.jaccard@pacificalawgroup.com
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (Continuing)
2	For Defendant State of Washington:
3	Brian H. Rowe
4	Andrew R. W. Hughes Office of the Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue
5	Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104-3188
6	206.464.7744 206.464.6451 Fax
7	brian.rowe@atg.wa.gov andrew.hughes@atg.wa.gov
8	andrew.magnes@acg.wa.gov
9	Also Present: Francis Muniz-Nava
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



1		EXAMINATION INDEX	
2	EXAMINATION BY	:	PAGE NO.
3	Ms. Mell		7
4	Mr. West		220
5			
6		EXHIBIT INDEX	
7	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
8	Exhibit No. 41	2 pages of e-mail communications.	230
9	Exhibit No. 42		230
10		Fain to Washington State Redistricting Commission	
11		dated 11/13/21.	
12	Exhibit No. 43	3-page Letter_PlanSubmittal_ Draft 08.12.21 - No Body.	230
13	Exhibit No. 43a	1-page messaging screenshot.	230
14		Labeled RC001993.	
15	Exhibit No. 44	4-page Final Resolution Letter_11.15.21.	230
16	Exhibit No. 44a	1 3 3 3	230
17		Labeled RC001994.	
18	Exhibit No. 45	1-page 11/15 regular meeting time stamp.	230
19	Exhibit No. 45a	1-page messaging screenshot.	230
20		Labeled RC001995.	
21	Exhibit No. 46	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC001996.	230
22	Exhibit No. 47	1-page messaging screenshot.	230
23		Labeled RC001997.	_
24	Exhibit No. 48	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC001998.	230
25			

	• •		9
1		EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing)	
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	Exhibit No. 49	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC001999.	230
4	Exhibit No. 50	1-page messaging screenshot.	230
5		Labeled RC002001.	
6	Exhibit No. 51	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002000.	230
7 8	Exhibit No. 52	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002002.	230
9	Exhibit No. 53	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002003.	230
10	Exhibit No. 54	1-page messaging screenshot.	230
11		Labeled RC002004.	
12	Exhibit No. 55	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002005.	230
14	Exhibit No. 56	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002006.	230
15	Exhibit No. 57	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002007.	230
16 17	Exhibit No. 58	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002008.	230
18	Exhibit No. 59	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002009.	230
19 20	Exhibit No. 60	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002011.	230
21	Exhibit No. 61	1-page messaging screenshot.	230
22		Labeled RC002010.	
23	Exhibit No. 62	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002012.	230
24	Exhibit No. 63	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002013.	230
25			

	<u> </u>		
1		EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing)	
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	Exhibit No. 64	1-page messaging screenshot. Labeled RC002015.	230
4	Exhibit No. 65	1-page messaging screenshot.	230
5		Labeled RC002014.	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			



1		BE IT REMEMBERED that on Wednesday,
2		January 12, 2022, at 9:05 a.m. Pacific time, before
3		JOHN M.S. BOTELHO, Certified Court Reporter, appeared
4		JOE FAIN, via videoconference, the witness herein;
5		WHEREUPON, the following
6		proceedings were had, to wit:
7		
8		<<<<< >>>>>
9		
10		JOE FAIN, having been first duly sworn
11		by the Certified Court
12		Reporter, deposed and
13		testified as follows:
14		
15		EXAMINATION
09:05:3 <b>1</b> 6		BY MS. MELL:
09:05:327	Q	State your name.
09:05:3 <b>18</b>	A	Joe Fain.
09:05:319	Q	What is your address?
09:05:3 <b>20</b>	A	705 Southwest Colewood Lane, C-o-l-e-w-o-o-d Lane,
09:05:4 <b>21</b>		Normandy Park, 98166.
09:05:5 <b>2</b> 2	Q	(Videoconference technical difficulties.)
09:05:5 <b>23</b>	A	I apologize. I coughed in the middle of that.
09:06:0 <b>24</b>		What was that?
09:06:025	Q	Your phone number?

	Fain, Jo	De - January 12, 2022 Page
09:06:021	A	(206) 409-9418.
09:06:062	Q	Is that the phone number you used to conduct
<b>09:06:11</b> 3		commission business?
09:06:124	A	That number as well as the and I actually don't
09:06:195		know this phone number the softphone program that
09:06:246		was provided by the State.
09:06:267	Q	What is a softphone program?
09:06:308	A	It's a doesn't have a physical phone. It's just a
09:06:349		program with a phone number assigned to it.
<b>09:06:31</b> 0	Q	And so you use your personal technology to access the
09:06:411		telecommunications system?
09:06:412	A	That's correct.
<b>09:06:41</b> 3	Q	Okay.
09:06:4 <b>1.4</b>	A	Or we're able to look at things that came in through
09:06:525		e-mail from that system.
<b>09:06:51</b> 6	Q	How is that different than just looking at an e-mail?
09:07:0 <b>127</b>	A	I'm not certain if it was an attached file or not.
09:07:0188		That system did not have a lot of traffic on it.
09:07:119	Q	Okay. Did you use instant messaging to communicate
<b>09:07:12</b> 0		about redistricting work?
09:07:121	A	No.
09:07:2222	Q	Do you know if your staff did?
09:07:223	A	No.
09:07:224	Q	Is it correct that all of the legislative district

changed in 2021 with the work that you performed?

09:07:325

	Fain, Jo	be - January 12, 2022 Page 9
09:07:431	A	I'm sorry. I don't understand the question.
09:07:462	Q	Did all of the legislative district boundaries change
<b>09:07:50</b> 3		with the work that you performed?
09:07:524	A	I'm not entirely certain.
<b>09:08:07</b> 5	Q	Have you reviewed what the commission transmitted to
09:08:166		the supreme court or to the legislature in terms of
09:08:207		documents that would reflect legislative boundaries
09:08:228		to know whether or not the legislative boundaries of
09:08:289		districts changed?
09:08:3 <b>1</b> 0	A	I reviewed those documents when they were presented.
09:08:351	Q	Do you know what legislative district boundaries
09:08:432		changed?
09:08:413	A	I know many district boundaries changed.
09:08:484	Q	What other district boundaries you can think of?
09:08:525	A	Most of the district boundaries changed, in my
09:09:0106		recollection.
09:09:0107	Q	Is that legislative and congressional district
<b>09:09:01</b> 8		boundaries?
09:09:019	A	Yes.
09:09:020	Q	If there was an agreement to leave the political
09:09:221		metric status quo or zero percentage change in the
<b>09:09:22</b> 2		political metric, how many different iterations of
<b>09:09:32</b> 3		the district boundaries were possible?
09:09:324		MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

09:09:325

09:09:411	Q	(By Ms. Mell) How many different iterations of
09:09:442		legislative or congressional district boundaries did
09:09:473		you create?
09:09:49 <b>4</b>	A	Could you repeat the question one more time?
09:09:555	Q	How many different iterations of legislative or
09:09:586		congressional district boundaries did you create?
09:10:03 <b>7</b>	A	Me personally? A handful. I don't recall the exact
09:10:21 <b>8</b>		number.
09:10:219	Q	What were you using to drive the district boundaries
09:10:290		in your iterations?
09:10:291		MR. WONG: (Videoconference
09:10:292		technical difficulties.)
09:10:3 <b>1.3</b>		THE WITNESS: I predominantly used
09:10:3 <b>14</b>		Edge, the Edge system.
09:10:315		THE REPORTER: Mr. Wong, what did
09:10:416		you say there, if anything?
09:10:417		MR. WONG: Object to form.
18		THE REPORTER: Thank you.
19		MS. MELL: Are we transmitting
20		okay? We're just talking over?
21		(Reporter responds to
22		counsel's inquiry.)
09:10:4 <b>2</b> 3		
09:11:024	Q	(By Ms. Mell) With the Edge system, what kind of
09:11:0 <b>2</b> 5		input did you use to create district boundaries?

09:11:071 Can you define "input"? Α 09:11:102 Content. What did you put in to create your 0 09:11:133 boundaries? 09:11:144 I'm still a little unclear about the question. Α I'm 09:11:185 sorry. Is it about how I drew it? 09:11:216 It is about how you drew it. I'm just wanting to 0 know what information you used to come up with the 09:11:257 09:11:278 boundaries in the Edge software program. 09:11:319 The Edge software program that I used had a number of Α 09:11:3**1**0 different data sets predominantly around population 09:11:491 as well as others. 09:11:502 Did it have political data? 0 09:11:523 It did. Α 09:11:534 Did you use that political data? 0 09:11:545 Α I did. 09:11:566 Was the political data a driving force for your 0 09:12:057 consensus? It was one of the factors that I considered. 09:12:018 Α 09:12:099 What other factors did you consider? 0 09:12:120 Things that made geographical sense. Natural Α Traditional connected communities. 09:12:221 boundaries. Junior taxing districts. Local governments. 09:12:322 09:12:323 Transportation corridors. Historic presence in the 09:12:424 district.

What's your highest level of education?

Q

09:12:525

	Fain, Jo	be - January 12, 2022	Page
09:12:541	A	I have a master's in business and a juris doctor.	
09:13:062	Q	When did you get your master's?	
09:13:093	A	Around 2008.	
09:13:104	Q	From where?	
09:13:115	A	Seattle University.	
09:13:126	Q	Your JD?	
09:13:157	A	Same. A joint program.	
09:13:188	Q	Okay. Did you become licensed to practice in any	
09:13:259		state?	
09:13:210	A	Yes.	
09:13:2 <u>6</u> 1	Q	Where are you licensed to practice?	
09:13:2122	A	Washington.	
<b>09:13:28</b> 3	Q	Do you practice law?	
09:13:324	A	Not currently.	
<b>09:13:34</b> 5	Q	What is your job currently?	
09:13:316	A	I'm the president and CEO of the Bellevue Chamber	of
09:13:4 <b>17</b>		Commerce.	
09:13:488	Q	Do you have government experience with your work?	
09:13:5 <b>1</b> 9	A	I do.	
09:13:520	Q	What experience do you have working for government	?
09:14:021	A	I worked with the King County Council, with the	
09:14:122		University of Washington, with King County	

Legislature.

prosecutor's office, and in the Washington State

09:14:123

09:14:124

	Fain, Jo	pe - January 12, 2022 Page 13
09:14:201	A	2011 through the end of 2018.
09:14:282	Q	Were you a partisan member of the legislature?
09:14:363	A	I was elected on a party with a party preference.
09:14:444	Q	What was the party preference?
09:14:465	A	Republican.
09:14:486	Q	And what was your district?
09:14:547	A	The 47th.
<b>09:14:56</b> 8	Q	Did you request on well, did you request that the
09:15:119		commission caucus at any time such that it did caucus
<b>09:15:17</b> 0		on November 15th?
09:15:191		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:15:2102		THE WITNESS: I don't I don't
09:15:213		understand exactly what you're asking there.
09:15:214	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Do you agree that the commission
<b>09:15:31</b> 5		caucused after the business meeting, regular business
09:15:316		meeting started on November 15th, 2021?
09:15:387		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:15:318		THE WITNESS: Yes.
09:15:409	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Do you know who asked for a caucus?
09:15:420	A	I don't recall.
09:15:4 <b>2</b> 1	Q	Did you?
09:15:522	A	I don't recall.
<b>09:15:52</b> 3	Q	Do you know where the concept came from?
09:15:5 <b>24</b>	A	I don't recall.
	1	

Q What did it mean?

09:16:025

- 09:16:031 A To meet with your partisan counterpart and then 09:16:202 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.

Q (By Ms. Mell) If we're talking during the course of

09:16:354

09:16:485

09:16:536

09:16:547

09:17:038

09:17:049

09:17:15O

09:17:2%1

09:17:310.2

09:17:313

09:17:404

09:17:445

09:17:516

09:17:517

09:17:558

09:17:519

09:18:020

09:18:021

09:18:122

09:18:123

09:18:124

09:18:225

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 1
09:18:361		this deposition about a congressional or legislative
09:18:412		plan, that's what I'm asking.
09:18:443		So what is the meaning of the plan in that
09:18:464		context?
09:18:47 <b>5</b>	A	Again still a little unclear by the question.
09:19:01 <b>6</b>		The plan, as we in my understanding from the
09:19:04 <b>7</b>		statute, is both the combined congressional and
09:19:10 <b>8</b>		legislative map constitutes our redistricting plan.
09:19:179	Q	And as the statute refers to a report to the
09:19:230		legislature, what does the report encompass?
09:19:2761		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:19:2 <b>122</b>		THE WITNESS: To the best of my
09:19:3 <b>13</b>		recollection, a physical description of the
09:19:3 <b>14</b>		geographical boundaries.
09:19:51/5	Q	(By Ms. Mell) On November 15th, you did not approve
09:20:0106		a congressional or legislative map, correct?
09:20:0 <b>17</b>	A	That is correct.
09:20:118	Q	On November 15th, you did not vote for or approve a
09:20:189		congressional or legislative plan, correct?
09:20:2 <b>2</b> 0		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:20:2 <b>21</b>		THE WITNESS: The there were no
09:20:3 <b>22</b>		physical maps or a geographical narrative
09:20:4 <b>23</b>		accompanying that were generated at the time of
09:20:4 <b>24</b>		the vote.
	1	

Q (By Ms. Mell) Was there a motion to approve a

09:20:425

	airi, oc	Tage
09:20:551		legislative district plan?
09:21:03 <b>2</b>	A	I don't know what words were used, but there was a
09:21:05 <b>3</b>		motion to approve a legislative district. And I
09:21:10 <b>4</b>		don't know what word was used.
09:21:105		(Interruption by reporter due
09:21:106		to simultaneous speakers.)
09:21:107		
09:21:22 <b>8</b>		THE WITNESS: I don't know what
09:21:23 <b>9</b>		word was used during the during the meeting,
09:21:2 <b>16.0</b>		during the motion.
09:21:31/1	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Did you make a motion to approve a
09:21:342		legislative redistricting plan?
09:21:3 <b>1.3</b>	A	I don't believe so.
09:21:4104	Q	Did you make a motion to approve a congressional
09:21:4 <b>1</b> 5		redistricting plan?
09:21:4 <b>16</b>	A	Again, I don't know what word I used, but I did make
09:21:5 <b>117</b>		a motion for the congressional map.
09:21:518	Q	What was your motion?
09:21:5 <b>1.9</b>	A	I would have to go back and see the transcript. I
09:21:5 <b>20</b>		don't recall.
09:21:5 <b>2</b> 1	Q	What did you intend to communicate?
09:22:0 <b>22</b>	A	That we were to bring up the proposed framework for
09:22:1 <b>23</b>		the congressional for the congressional map.
09:22:2 <b>24</b>	Q	Why did you make up the motion with regard to
	1	

congressional districts?

09:22:325

- 09:22:351 A I don't understand the question.
- 09:22:392 O Why did you make the motion?
- 09:22:423 A It was very late. It was moments before the
- 09:23:024 statutory deadline. There was a -- there was a
- 09:23:145 possibility that this framework that I had discussed
- 09:23:226 with Commissioner Walkinshaw might be agreeable, and
- 09:23:337 I was very interested in getting the job that we'd
- 09:23:418 appointed to be -- to do done.
- 09:23:519 Q What was the form of this proposed framework?
- 09:23:510 A Are you -- sorry. I'm also a little confused. Are
- 09:24:111 you referring to the actual structure of the proposal
- 09:24:212 or the mechanism by which it was communicated?
- 09:24:313 Q All those things. All those things.
- 09:24:384 Do you need me to break it down more?
- 09:24:415 A It would be helpful.
- 09:24:416 Q Okay. So let's start with: What was the form of the
- 09:24:417 proposed framework in terms of its presentation on
- 09:24:498 | the 15th?
- 09:24:519 Was it in writing, or was it oral?
- 09:24:520 A It was verbal.
- 09:24:521 Q Okay. Who spoke the words that articulated this
- 09:25:022 proposed framework?
- 09:25:123 A It was, I suppose, in conversation with Commissioner
- 09:25:2**24** Walkinshaw.
- 09:25:205 | Q All right. So at this verbal communication of a

		5 Sandary 12, 2022
09:25:371		proposed framework actually, strike that. Let me
09:25:432		say it this way.
09:25:443		Had this verbal proposed framework been
09:25:484		communicated to anyone other than Commissioner
09:25:515		Walkinshaw at the time the vote was taken?
09:25:53 <b>6</b>	A	Again, it was very late and chaotic and rushed. I
09:26:05 <b>7</b>		believe I would have shared the construct with
09:26:07 <b>8</b>		Commissioner Graves.
09:26:139	Q	Is that because you were sitting in the same room
09:26:1 <b>5</b> 0		when you were formulating it?
09:26:191		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:26:2 <b>11.2</b>		THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. When I
09:26:2 <b>163</b>		was when I was
09:26:2124		MS. MELL: I said "formulating it."
09:26:3105		Maybe a better word is "negotiating it."
09:26:3 <b>16</b>		THE WITNESS: No.
09:26:357	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Okay. At the time let's take this
09:26:418		step by step. I don't want to get ahead of myself.
09:26:459		I'll come back to that.
09:26:4 <b>2</b> 0		MS. MELL: So, John, what was the
09:27:0 <b>2</b> 1		last question right before he said it was very late?
09:27:022		(Pertinent question read by
09:27:023		the reporter.)
09:27:2 <b>24</b>		
00.07.005		MC MULTA Co T January la T

MS. MELL: So I don't know that I

09:27:225

	. age
09:27:311	got an answer to that question.
09:27:322	Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you share this verbal proposed
09:27:343	framework with anyone other than Commissioner
09:27:384	Walkinshaw prior to the vote?
09:27:415	MR. WONG: Object; asked and
09:27:436	answered.
7	(Clarification by reporter.)
8	
9	MR. WONG: Are you not picking up
10	my mike very well?
11	THE REPORTER: It's just Mr. Fain
12	and you briefly overspoke each other.
13	MR. WONG: So, Commissioner Fain,
09:27:5164	if you can just pause for a second just so I can get
09:27:5185	my objection in. It's just for the record. It'd be
09:27:5186	appreciated. Thank you.
09:27:5187	(Clarification by reporter.)
09:27:5188	
09:28:1 <b>119</b>	THE WITNESS: Now I'm wondering
09:28:1 <b>20</b>	which question I'm supposed to ask. I apologize.
09:28:1 <b>2</b> 1	MS. MELL: Let's start this over.
09:28:1 <b>2</b> 2	Q (By Ms. Mell) Is it correct that this verbal
09:28:223	proposed framework was shared by you with
09:28:2 <b>24</b>	Commissioner Walkinshaw and Commissioner Graves
09:28:3 <b>2</b> 5	before the vote?

	Fain, Jo	be - January 12, 2022 Page 20
09:28:381	A	Commissioner Walkinshaw and I discussed a framework.
09:28:482		And I later communicated that framework to
09:29:033		Commissioner Graves.
09:29:074	Q	How long before the vote did you communicate the
09:29:105		framework to Commissioner Graves?
09:29:126	A	I don't recall.
09:29:137	Q	Do you know what Commissioner Sims knew about that
09:29:218		framework prior to the vote?
09:29:249	A	No.
<b>09:29:25</b> 0	Q	Do you know what any other commissioner knew about
09:29:311		that framework prior to the vote?
09:29:3122	A	I referenced the conversation I had with Commissioner
09:29:4 <b>1</b> 3		Walkinshaw with Commissioner Graves. I don't believe
09:29:484		I had a conversation with Commissioner Augustine.
<b>09:29:54</b> 5	Q	What was the proposed framework with regard to
09:30:116		content?
09:30:117	A	Again, my recollection is and, again, I can give
09:30:218		a my best recollection here would be around a
09:30:319		restacking of the 1st and 2nd district, static
09:30:520		political performance in the 8th congressional
09:30:521		district, relatively status quo elsewhere.
09:30:522		Those were elements of it.
<b>09:31:02</b> 3	Q	Was this written down anywhere?
09:31:0 <b>24</b>	A	No, I don't believe so.
	I	

Q What does restacking the 1st and 2nd mean?

09:31:125

09:31:201	A	I want to,	you know,	briefly	go back	to you	r previous
09:31:282		question, i	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 1st and 2nd 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?
- 09:32:214 A That's correct.
- 09:32:285 Q Okay. For the record, I was --
- 09:32:316 A For the record.

09:31:293

09:31:384

09:31:475

09:31:526

09:31:577

09:31:598

09:32:079

09:32:110

09:32:161

09:32:212

09:32:263

09:32:307

09:32:378

09:32:419

09:32:420

09:32:421

09:32:522

09:32:523

09:33:024

09:33:025

Q -- 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

- 09:33:101 construct on the proposed framework that was voted 09:33:162 on?
  - I guess I don't understand the question. Α I'm sorry.
  - Well, is it correct, then, that the -- that the 0 proposed framework that required restacking of the 1st and 2nd had not been articulated in any one of those thousand different ways that had yet to be done with the mapping?

Object to form. MR. WONG:

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

- (By Ms. Mell) Okay. And is it correct, then, that Q there was no agreement on where those boundaries would fall for accomplishing the element of the proposed framework of restacking Districts 1 and 2?
- It's a very long question. I apologize. Α
- 09:34:188 0 Okay.

09:33:163

09:33:244

09:33:275

09:33:306

09:33:377

09:33:398

09:33:419

09:33:4**1.0** 

09:33:4**%1** 

09:33:516.2

09:34:02/3

09:34:044

09:34:015

09:34:1106

09:34:1**47** 

09:34:220

09:34:321

09:34:39.2

09:34:423

09:34:424

09:34:5**25** 

- You're -- you're asking -- if you could repeat. 09:34:119
  - The proposed framework that was voted on was Okay. 0 not so definite that the district boundaries to accomplish the criteria of restacking the 1st and 2nd were expressed?
  - Α No, I don't believe so.

I'm sorry. Okay. We may be asking questions as

#### double negatives. So --

09:34:562 Yeah. 0

09:34:541

09:35:066

09:35:117

09:35:158

09:35:199

09:35:210

09:35:511

09:36:032

09:36:013

09:36:014

09:36:115

09:36:186

09:36:237

09:36:258

09:36:269

09:36:220

09:36:321

09:36:422

09:36:523

09:37:024

09:37:025

- 09:34:563 -- I apologize. I'm not trying to be unclear here. Α
- 09:34:594 No, I'm glad you're following carefully enough to be 0 09:35:045 cautious in that regard. Let me ask it again.

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

- I don't recall. The other considerations may have Α included partisan performance in certain districts.
- The partisan performance would overlay on how that 0 restacking mapped out?
- That's a component. Α
- 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?

Object to form. MR. WONG:

THE WITNESS: There were maps that were being drawn on the 16th. 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 16th.

(By Ms. Mell) But during the drafting of the maps, Q

	rain, Jo	De - January 12, 2022 Fage 24
09:37:131		that's when the decisions had to be made as to how to
09:37:152		restack Districts 1 and 2?
09:37:243		I guess I don't mean "how." "Where" would
09:37:264		probably be the better word.
09:37:285		Where to draw the boundary line to accomplish
09:37:316		restacking of Districts 1 and 2.
09:37:34 <b>7</b>	A	I mean, yes, the the drafting of those lines was
09:37:50 <b>8</b>		done on the 16th. The there have been, as I said,
09:38:05 <b>9</b>		previous iterations drawn of what a stacked 1st and
09:38:1 <b>120</b>		2nd district would look like that informed that
09:38:1 <b>111</b>		process, I'd imagine.
09:38:212	Q	Okay. Did you know exactly where the boundaries
09:38:2153		would be of the restacked 1st and 2nd district when
09:38:2184		you voted?
09:38:3 <b>15</b>	A	No.
09:38:3126	Q	Static load performance. And I just wrote the number
09:38:417		"8." I think you probably had another qualifying
09:38:418		word around that, but I don't know what it was.
09:38:4159		Maybe it's the 8th district, or maybe it's
09:38:4 <b>20</b>	A	Oh, yes. Yes.
09:38:521	Q	Okay. So what did you what was the content of the
09:38:522		proposed framework relative to static load

I don't know if it was -- are you saying the word

Α

09:38:523

09:39:0**24** 

09:39:025

performance 8?

"load"?

Did I misunderstand it?

- 09:39:031 That's what I wrote down. 0 I would just say static partisan performance in the 09:39:072 Α 09:39:133 8th is -- was the framework.
  - Okay. So with regard to static partisan 0 Okav. performance in the 8th, how large is the 8th district?
  - Α Three-quarters of a million people, roughly.
  - Where is the 8th? 0

09:39:154

09:39:245

09:39:276

09:39:277

09:39:358

09:39:511

09:39:542

09:39:5**43** 

09:40:0**14** 

09:40:01/5

09:40:016

09:40:137

09:40:148

09:40:219

09:40:220

09:40:321

09:40:322

09:40:323

09:40:424

09:40:425

- 09:39:389 The current 8th contains parts of King County out Α 09:39:4**10** through Chelan.
  - When you say "the current 8th," what are you talking 0 about?
  - The one that's currently in law. The one that has Α been used over the last ten years.
  - 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 8th district to maintain static partisan performance?

- Α Yes.
- And was the boundary -- were the boundary lines of 0 the 8th district changed while maintaining static partisan performance in the proposal you voted -- you transmitted to the legislature?

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 2
09:40:501		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:40:52 <b>2</b>		THE WITNESS: The proposal
09:40:58 <b>3</b>		contemplated the, you know, equalization of
09:41:03 <b>4</b>		population, which necessitated a change in the
09:41:08 <b>5</b>		boundary lines.
09:41:166	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So were there multiple different ways
09:41:187		to map the proposed framework that was voted on with
09:41:258		respect to static partisan performance in the 8th?
09:41:33 <b>9</b>	A	Most likely.
09:41:4 <b>1</b> 00	Q	Okay. And that work was done on the 16th with the
09:41:42.1		mapping, itself, correct?
09:41:4 <b>12</b>	A	Mm-hmm.
09:41:4163	Q	I just have to have you answer orally.
09:41:4 <b>1</b>	A	Oh. Yes. I'm sorry. Yes.
09:41:5105	Q	I hear a "uh-hum," but
09:41:5 <b>1.6</b>	A	Yes.
09:41:527	Q	but you have to have yeses and noes.
09:41:518		Okay. Thanks.
09:41:569		And then my last criteria that you describe of
09:42:020		your proposed frameworks contain status quo, or I
09:42:021		wrote down "status quo."
09:42:0 <b>2</b> 2		What does that mean?
09:42:0 <b>23</b>	A	Limited limited geographic and partisan
09:42:2 <b>24</b>		performance changes.

Q

What's "limited"?

09:42:225

09:42:261 My interpretation of "limited" would be the least Α 09:42:382 amount of change in both of those metrics required to 09:42:453 achieve the population targets. 09:42:484 Is 1 percent consistent with status quo? 0 09:42:535 Α I guess, 1 percent with reference to what metric? 09:43:076 I quess I should ask that. 0 Oh. 09:43:107 What did you mean by "status quo"? What metrics 09:43:158 did you mean by "status quo"? 09:43:169 Geographical boundaries and partisan performance. Α 09:43:290 Okay. Can geographical boundaries be translated into 0 09:43:371 a percentage change of 1 percent? 09:43:392 I have not done -- to my knowledge, I've not done a Α 09:43:443 calculation like that. 09:43:464 How did you articulate geographic boundary proposals? 0 09:43:51.5 Α Typically by drawing maps. 09:43:596 Okay. So if the status quo were to be maintained 0 09:44:087 with regard to partisan performance, would it have to 09:44:128 be less than a 1 percent change? 09:44:169 MR. WONG: Object to form. 09:44:120 THE WITNESS: Not necessarily. 09:44:221 In your mind, when you say "status (By Ms. Mell) 0 09:44:222 quo, what kind of statistic were you looking at with 09:44:283 regard to partisan performance? 09:44:324 Α Different districts had different -- different

districts had different metrics or ranges, depending

09:44:425

- on how competitive those districts would be.
- 09:45:002 | Q What's the top end of the range?
  - A I don't have a top end.

09:44:561

09:45:073

09:45:154

09:45:175

09:45:196

09:45:217

09:45:228

09:45:299

09:45:310

09:45:311

09:45:422

09:45:418.3

09:45:514

09:45:525

09:46:026

09:46:057

09:46:108

09:46:129

09:46:120

09:46:221

09:46:222

09:46:323

09:46:424

09:46:525

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

	rain, Jo	De - January 12, 2022
09:46:531		any sense.
09:46:542	Q	Nope. I guess, let's start with remaining districts.
09:47:003		Remaining relative to what?
09:47:024	A	Well, we discussed the 1st, 2nd, and 8th
09:47:095	Q	Okay.
09:47:106	A	in our previous comments.
09:47:127	Q	Okay. So there are 49 districts?
09:47:198	A	I thought we were discussing congressional districts
09:47:229		at this time.
<b>09:47:24</b> 0	Q	Okay. How many congressional districts are there?
09:47:2161	A	There are ten.
09:47:282	Q	Got it. Okay.
<b>09:47:31</b> 3		So that left seven remaining. That's what we're
09:47:384		talking about. Seven remaining districts?
09:47:415	A	That's correct.
09:47:426	Q	Okay. So with those seven remaining districts, when
09:47:457		you took a vote, did you know what the status quo
09:47:488		percentage partisan performance was that you were
09:47:519		voting on?
09:47:520	A	Not a precise number.
09:48:021	Q	If not precise, then what were you thinking with
09:48:122		regard to the proposed framework of status quo with
<b>09:48:12</b> 3		regard to the remaining districts?
09:48:1 <b>24</b>	A	That those districts would not categorically change

from being either a competitive district becoming not

09:48:225

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 3
09:48:301		competitive or a not-competitive district becoming
09:48:332		competitive.
09:48:413	Q	How many different iterations of boundaries were
09:48:454		those seven districts maybe drawn to maintain a
09:48:505		status quo that would not categorically change the
09:48:546		composition of the district?
09:48:567		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:48:588		MS. MELL: Not the composition, but
09:48:599		the competitiveness of the district.
09:49:010		MR. WONG: Object to form.
09:49:011		THE WITNESS: I don't know.
09:49:022	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So fair to say at least a thousand?
09:49:013	A	I couldn't venture a guess.
09:49:104	Q	Is it many?
09:49:115	A	Several, yes.
09:49:206	Q	Okay. So the work to pick one of those severals
09:49:317		occurred on the 16th, correct?
09:49:318	A	In in part. There have been previous maps,
09:49:51.9		including, I believe, a few public maps that may have
09:50:120		closely matched at least in some districts the the
09:50:121		maps that were finalized on on the 16th.
<b>09:50:23</b> 2	Q	Okay. So there was some work product out there, but
<b>09:50:22</b> 3		it hadn't been finalized and finally selected until
09:50:2 <b>9</b> 4		the 16th.

Is that a fair characterization?

09:50:325

- 09:50:321 Again, the maps to reflect that proposal that was Α adopted on the 15th were drawn on the 16th. So... 09:51:012 09:51:083 But what my point is that there were decisions that Q 09:51:104 had to be made on the 16th in order to get the maps 09:51:145 to reflect the proposal, correct? 09:51:216 Α Yes. 09:51:247 Who made those decisions on the 16th as to Q Okay. 09:51:298 each of those elements of your proposed framework? 09:51:469 I'm sorry. The question's a bit vaque. Α 09:51:570 Do I need to break down the proposed framework? Is 0 09:52:001 it easier if I do that? Or is it clearer if I do 09:52:022 Is that where you're struggling? that? 09:52:013 Perhaps. Α 09:52:064 Okay. So who made the decisions with regard to the 09:52:095 boundaries for the congressional district in order to 09:52:126 maintain the status quo of the seven districts other than the 1st, 2nd, and 8th? 09:52:177 Again, I believe -- I believe I recollect that staff 09:52:218 Α 09:52:31.9 were in some cases -- in some cases reconciling 09:52:420 different versions of existing maps that had been 09:52:521 previously drawn.
- 09:52:522 Q When you say "staff," who do you mean?
- 09:52:523 A In this case, I believe Paul Campos was involved. I 09:53:024 believe, is it Ali? From Senate staff.
- **09:53:12**5 | Q Anyone else?

- On the congressional map, I don't -- I don't recall. Α
- Do you know whether or not Paul and Ali were also 0 trying to integrate and draw boundaries to reflect public comment, or were they just instructed to maintain the status quo?

Objection to form. MR. WONG:

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.

- (By Ms. Mell) Did you make any decisions on district Q boundaries on the 16th relative to public input?
- In that I reviewed the product of reconciling Α these -- reconciling previous proposals that included substantial public input, in that way I did take into account public input on the 16th.
- Do you recall looking at -- well, strike that. Q

How many different proposed final maps did you look at on the 16th?

> MR. WONG: Objection to form.

MS. MELL: Congressional district

09:55:021 09:55:022

09:53:141

09:53:242

09:53:273

09:53:304

09:53:345

09:53:376

09:53:387

09:53:408

09:53:409

09:53:520

09:54:0101

09:54:012

09:54:113

09:54:144

09:54:235

09:54:266

09:54:327

09:54:498

09:54:549

09:54:520

- 09:55:023
- 09:55:124
- 09:55:125

	. a, oc	
09:55:181		maps.
09:55:19 <b>2</b>		THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
09:55:57 <b>3</b>		Likely there were at least the previous version that
09:56:09 <b>4</b>		had been drafted by Paul and one that was drafted by
09:56:14 <b>5</b>		Ali.
09:56:186	Q	(By Ms. Mell) How many times did you look at what
09:56:227		Paul and Ali were looking at to give input?
09:56:25 <b>8</b>	A	I don't recall.
09:56:279	Q	Multiple times?
09:56:3 <b>10</b>	A	I did not on whole, I did not provide much input
09:56:4 <b>111</b>		into the process on the 16th.
09:56:41/2	Q	Is it correct that you provided input on the process
09:56:4923		on the 16th?
09:56:5 <b>114</b>	A	We had conversations over the over a few boundary
09:56:5 <b>15</b>		lines, yes.
09:56:5186	Q	What boundary lines were those?
09:57:0 <b>11.7</b>	A	The amount that the 9th district would travel into
09:57:0 <b>188</b>		Seattle.
09:57:0189	Q	And when you said "we" in that sentence, I assume
09:57:1 <b>20</b>	A	I'm sorry. Go ahead.
09:57:1 <b>2</b> 1	Q	I assumed you meant Paul and Ali? Is that correct
09:57:1 <b>2</b> 2		assumption? Or were you talking more broadly?
09:57:2 <b>23</b>	A	Oh, I was having a conversation with Commissioner
09:57:2 <b>24</b>		Walkinshaw.
00.57.0 <b>0</b> 5		

09:57:225 | Q Okay. So when you said, "We had conversation

- 09:57:371 over" -- I didn't get it all written down there. Did 09:57:402 you say the 9th?
  - Oh, I'm sorry. The 9th. Yes, I did say that. Α I apologize. Yes.
  - All right. So when you were having the 0 conversation over the boundaries in the 9th, the conversation occurred with Commissioner Walkinshaw alone, just you two, or were Paul and Ali there at the same time?
  - Paul and Ali, I believe, were there. Α
  - So do you remember what you said to Okay. 0 Commissioner Walkinshaw and what he said back to you?
  - We had -- I had thought that a portion of the 9th Α district in previous proposals had included a neighborhood, and those previous proposals did not.

(Clarification by reporter.)

I think you were saying MS. MELL: 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

LITIGATION SERVICES

09:59:220 09:59:221

09:57:413

09:57:434

09:57:445

09:57:476

09:57:547

09:57:578

09:58:039

09:58:010

09:58:011

09:58:142

09:58:1**13** 

09:58:2**9.4** 

09:58:31.5

09:58:326

09:58:31/2 7

09:59:228

09:59:239

09:59:322

09:59:323

09:59:324

09:59:325

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 9th 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 9th 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.

09:59:513 09:59:524 09:59:555 10:00:016 10:00:037 10:00:068 10:00:099 10:00:110 10:00:1**21** 10:00:212 10:00:311.3 10:00:4**14** 10:00:415 10:00:5**16** 10:00:5**17** 10:01:018 10:01:119 10:01:220 10:01:221 10:01:322 10:01:323

10:01:324

10:01:325

09:59:401

09:59:482

	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.
Q	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.
Q	All right. So this was a version that had not been
	publicly revealed?
	<b>А</b> Q <b>А</b> Q <b>А</b> Q <b>А</b> Q <b>A</b>

- 10:03:001 In its entirety, no. Α 10:03:062
  - Okay. But it is a previous version of the 0 congressional district map that was shared between Commissioner Walkinshaw and yourself?
- 10:03:175 I believe so. Α

10:03:093

10:03:134

10:03:289

10:04:116

10:04:197

10:04:198

10:04:259

10:04:220

10:04:321

10:04:422

10:04:523

10:04:524

10:04:525

- 10:03:246 And had it been shared with any of the other 0 10:03:277 commissioners?
- 10:03:278 I don't know. Α

0

- How many maps did you create on the 15th? 10:03:400 How many different versions of the congressional 10:03:431 district map did you create on the 15th?
- 10:03:452 I don't recall. Α
- 10:03:523 Who did you share any version of those maps with? Q
- 10:03:544 Shared with Commissioner Walkinshaw, with staff, or Α 10:04:015 staff shared with me.

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

- Would some of those other individuals have been 0 Graves?
- I -- I may have -- I don't recall if our talk on the Α 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.

- 10:05:041 Q I didn't mean to interrupt you. Sorry.
  10:05:072 Were you done?
- 10:05:083 A Mm-hmm.

10:05:25**7** 

10:05:418

10:05:469

10:05:5**40** 

10:05:5121

10:06:0**12** 

10:06:2**13** 

10:06:234

10:06:2165

10:06:286

10:06:3107

10:06:378

10:06:389

10:06:420

10:06:421

10:06:422

10:07:023

10:07:0**24** 

10:07:125

- 10:05:084 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.

	airi, oc	r age 5
10:07:141	Q	Okay.
10:07:182		MR. WONG: Joan, we've been going
10:07:193		about an hour. I don't know if you have want to
10:07:224		finish your line of questioning here, but may be a
10:07:245		good time to take a break pretty soon.
10:07:266		MS. MELL: Okay. Let me just get
10:07:287		some verbiage down on how to describe rooms in the
10:07:328		hotels.
10:07:329	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Have you read the past depositions?
10:07:3 <b>10</b>	A	No.
10:07:311	Q	You haven't seen the transcripts from the depositions
10:07:312		the last couple days?
10:07:3 <b>1 3</b>	A	(Videoconference technical difficulties.)
10:07:3184		THE REPORTER: What was the answer
10:07:3125		there, Mr. Fain?
10:07:4 <b>16</b>		THE WITNESS: No, I have not seen
10:07:4 <b>1.7</b>		any depositions.
10:07:458	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So one of the terms of art that we
10:07:5119		came up with to describe the large conference room on
10:07:520		the first floor of the Hampton Inn was now I'm
10:08:021		going to forget what I was calling it.
10:08:0 <b>2</b> 2		It's the now I'm forgetting. You guys help
10:08:1 <b>2</b> 3		me. What have we been calling it?
10:08:1 <b>24</b>		MR. WONG: I think the one on the
10 00 14 -		

16th, the banquet room are you referring to? I think

10:08:12:5

10:08:171		you called it the event room or something.
10:08:192		MS. MELL: The event room. The
10:08:213		event room. That's my word. "Event room."
10:08:224		MR. WONG: But are you talking
10:08:235		about the one on the 16th, or are you talking about
10:08:266		the 15th still?
10:08:277		MS. MELL: I thought the event room
10:08:298		was always the big room on the first floor, 15th and
10:08:319		16th.
10:08:310		MR. WONG: I'll let
10:08:3 <b>1</b> 1		Commissioner Fain answer that. There was different
10:08:312		rooms, I think, at different times.
10:08:3133		MS. MELL: "Event room" is the word
10:08:314		I was trying to recall, so thank you for that. All
10:08:415		right.
10:08:416	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So as I understand it, there was a
10:08:417		large conference room on the main floor that we've
10:08:418		been referring to the event room at the Hampton.
10:08:489		Do you know what room that is?
10:08:5 <b>20</b>	A	I do.
10:08:5 <b>2</b> 1	Q	How large would that room be, in your opinion?
10:08:5 <b>22</b>	A	It is a it's a big room capable of hosting over a
10:09:1 <b>23</b>		hundred people, I would
10:09:1 <b>24</b>	Q	Okay.

-- imagine.

10:09:1**25** 

10:09:141 Were there chairs set up in there for you? 0 There were chairs in the room. 10:09:182 Α 10:09:193 Was there seating for approximately a hundred, or was Q 10:09:274 it just set up to accommodate your size? 10:09:315 It wasn't really set up to accommodate. There were Α 10:09:356 some chairs in the room that were available to grab 10:09:39**7** and move around. 10:09:408 So how many chairs were in the room? 0 I don't recall. 10:09:429 Α 10:09:450 Okay. How many people did you have in that event 0 10:09:471 room at any time? Probably as few as one and as many as ten. 10:09:438.2 Α 10:10:0183 Okay. And then so to distinguish that room from the Q 10:10:124 room you were in, having the conversation with Commissioner Graves. 10:10:15 10:10:116 Mm-hmm. Α 10:10:197 Was the room you were talking to Graves in an actual Q hotel suite? 10:10:238 10:10:219 Yes. Α 10:10:220 Okay. And it was above the event room? 0 10:10:2**21** Yes. Α 10:10:22.2 Okav. And is it your understanding that the 0 10:10:323 Democrats had a different hotel suite they were 10:10:324 working out of?

It was my understanding that there were multiple

Α

10:10:325

		- Vallaci, 12, 2022
10:10:401		rooms, yes.
10:10:442		MS. MELL: Okay. All right. We
<b>10:10:45</b> 3		can take a break.
10:10:474		(Pause in proceedings from
<b>10:10:47</b> 5		10:10 a.m. to 10:21 a.m.)
10:21:376		
10:21:377	Q	(By Ms. Mell) All right. Commissioner Fain, what
10:21:408		discussions other than the one with Walkinshaw over
10:21:439		the 9th did you have specific to the congressional
<b>10:21:49</b> 0		district mapping on the 16th?
10:21:511	A	Is your question about conversations that took place
10:21:5122		on the 15th or on the 16th?
10:22:0 <b>1</b> 3	Q	On the 16th. I'm back, now we're in the room, the
10:22:044		event center room.
<b>10:22:0</b> 5		And what are you saying to whom as it related to
10:22:106		the congressional district map?
10:22:127	A	Outside of Walkinshaw and those two staff members,
10:22:2108		I the only other conversation I recall was very
10:22:219		briefly with Commissioner Graves.
10:22:320	Q	Okay. What did you say to Commissioner Graves, and
10:22:321		what did he say to you?
10:22:322	A	If I recall correctly, I asked him if he wanted to
10:22:423		take a look at the map, which he declined.
10:22:524	Q	When he declined to take a look at the map, was it
	I	

your takeaway that he was trusting your work and

**10:22:52**5

	- aiii, 50	e - January 12, 2022
10:23:011		would approve it based on the work you did or was he
10:23:052		reserving his right to approve it at a later time?
10:23:093		MR. WONG: Object to form.
10:23:10 <b>4</b>		THE WITNESS: It was him saying
10:23:12 <b>5</b>		that he didn't want to look at the map.
10:23:146	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Was there going to be another
10:23:197		opportunity for him to look at the map?
10:23:21 <b>8</b>	A	I don't know.
10:23:229	Q	What arrangements were made, if any, with respect to
10:23:3100		commissioners looking at the map once completed?
10:23:3 <b>11</b>	A	I don't recall any formal arrangements.
10:23:41/2	Q	What were the informal arrangements?
10:23:4 <b>1.3</b>	A	I don't recall any informal arrangements.
10:23:41/4	Q	So what was your expectation with regard to the
10:23:525		congressional district map as to the work performed
10:23:516		on the 16th?
10:23:5 <b>17</b>	A	That staff, once it had been completed in the Edge
10:24:0 <b>18</b>		system, that it would be sent to commission staff for
10:24:1 <b>1.9</b>		whatever process they needed to go through with it.
10:24:1 <b>2</b> 0	Q	Do you know what process they had to go through with
10:24:2 <b>2</b> 1		it?
10:24:2 <b>22</b>	A	My understanding is that there's a program that
10:24:3 <b>23</b>		analyzes shape files and converts that information to
10:24:3 <b>24</b>		a written description.

Q Is that a necessary component of finalizing the

10:24:525

10:24:581 congressional district map?

10:24:592

10:25:013

10:25:114

10:25:15**5** 

10:25:196

10:25:25**7** 

10:25:288

10:25:319

10:25:360

10:25:4**1.1** 

10:25:49 2

10:26:023

10:26:014

10:26:0**15** 

10:26:1**16** 

10:26:117

10:26:288

10:26:329

10:26:320

10:26:421

10:26:482

10:26:52:3

10:26:5**24** 

10:27:025

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.
- Q Well, when you open a shape file, what does it look

	airi, JC	r age 40
10:27:051		like?
10:27:05 <b>2</b>	A	A shape. A geography. An overlay on a on a map.
10:27:133	Q	Okay. So if you if you open a shape file, you
10:27:164		necessarily can identify down to the road or latitude
10:27:205		and longitude at the location of a district boundary?
10:27:24 <b>6</b>	A	You can see a physical representation of the boundary
10:27:33 <b>7</b>		as a line.
10:27:368	Q	Is it specific enough so that you know which side of
10:27:429		the line you're on if you're a voter?
10:27:4 <b>10</b>	A	In most cases, yes. And depending on the software
10:28:1 <b>111</b>		that you open the shape file in, you may be able to
10:28:1 <b>12</b>		do an address search.
10:28:153	Q	Is there software you were using?
10:28:2 <b>1.4</b>	A	Edge.
10:28:2125	Q	Okay. Were others using different software than
10:28:316		Edge?
10:28:3 <b>1.7</b>	A	Yes.
10:28:3168	Q	Who was using a different software other than Edge?
10:28:4 <b>19</b>	A	I wouldn't say "other than," but perhaps "in addition
10:28:5 <b>20</b>		to" would be
10:28:521	Q	Okay.
10:28:5 <b>22</b>	A	And and I would say most anyone who was drawing
10:28:5 <b>23</b>		maps.
10:28:5 <b>24</b>	Q	How about from the commission?
	_	

A I am not aware of other commissioners personally

10:29:0**25** 

	- a, oc	
10:29:091		drawing maps, themselves.
<b>10:29:11</b> 2	Q	But you personally drew maps using Edge?
10:29:173	A	I did.
10:29:184	Q	Can you give me a chronology of events on the 16th?
10:29:365		MR. WONG: Object to form.
10:29:366		(Clarification by reporter.)
10:29:487		
10:29:498		THE WITNESS: Could I ask you to be
10:29:499		a little bit more specific so that I'm?
<b>10:29:5</b> 50	Q	(By Ms. Mell) At the time the meeting adjourned,
10:29:591		what happened thereafter?
10:30:0102	A	I don't recall a point-by-point of what happened
10:30:313		immediately following the meeting. Generally I
10:30:464		either stay in my room and at one point I was down in
10:31:0105		the event room during the time that staff was
10:31:116		reconciling the congressional map.
10:31:127	Q	Did you actually sleep at the hotel at any time
10:31:118		between the 12th and the 17th?
10:31:219	A	No, I don't believe so.
10:31:320	Q	Were you at the hotel overnight any of those days?
10:31:321	A	I was there I was there until 4:30, 5. I don't
10:31:522		recall the exact time on the 16th when I left. So
10:31:523		from when I arrived the morning of the 15th to to
10:31:524		that time on the 16th.
	1	

Q Were you there the 12th, 13th, or 14th?

**10:31:52**5

10:32:041 I don't believe I was there the 12th or the 13th. Α 10:32:202 And I believe I was there -- was Saturday the 14th? 10:32:293 Q Yes. 10:32:294 I believe I was there on -- for part of Saturday. Α 10:32:325 No, the 13th had to have been Saturday. The 14th 10:32:356 would have been Sunday. The 15th was Monday. And 10:32:377 the 16th, Tuesday. 10:32:418 Well, then maybe it was the Sun- -- maybe it was the Α 10:32:499 Sunday that I was there and not Saturday. I don't 10:32:520 recall clearly. I have to go back and figure if I 10:32:511 could piece that together. Did you keep track of your time? 10:32:552 0 10:32:51/3 No. Α 10:32:584 Do you know how many hours you were there on the 0 10:33:085 Saturday or Sunday? 10:33:116 Not exactly, no. Α 10:33:137 Was it more than five hours? Q 10:33:118 On the Saturday, or -- again, I have to go back and Α check which day. I believe I was there on Sunday. I 10:33:229 10:33:220 believe I was there a majority of the day on Sunday. 10:33:221 But you didn't stay overnight into the 15th, the day Q 10:33:322 of the meeting? 10:33:323 I don't believe so. Α 10:33:324 Were you staying in a different hotel down there, or Q

were you always at the Hampton?

LITIGATION SERVICES

10:33:425

- 10:33:421 A When I was in Federal Way, I was always at the 10:33:462 Hampton.
  - Q Okay. And where did you set up?

MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: For what activity are

## you referring?

10:33:473

10:33:534

10:33:555

10:33:576

10:34:047

10:34:058

10:34:089

10:34:110

10:34:121

10:34:16.2

10:34:243

10:34:304

10:34:355

10:34:416

10:34:547

10:35:018

10:35:019

10:35:120

10:35:221

10:35:222

10:35:223

10:35:324

10:35:325

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

	airi, 50	e - January 12, 2022
10:35:431		more to spend her time in the event room, which
10:35:492		allowed us access "us" meaning Commissioner
10:35:593		Graves, his staff, and myself and my staff access
10:36:034		to two separate rooms on the second floor.
<b>10:36:07</b> 5	Q	So did you have one room and Graves and his staff had
10:36:176		the other room with a door connecting, a connecting
10:36:217		door between the two?
10:36:228	A	I don't recall if there was a door between the two.
10:36:269		If there were, it was not used. So if you wanted to
10:36:290		enter one to go into the other, you'd go into the
10:36:321		hallway.
10:36:312	Q	But you and Graves were in the same room when
<b>10:36:42</b> 3		caucusing?
10:36:414	A	At different times, Commissioner Graves and I were in
10:36:435		the same room, yes.
10:36:5 <b>1</b> 6	Q	Were the two of you ever in one of those rooms
10:36:557		without staff, just the two of you?
10:37:018	A	I don't recall.
10:37:019	Q	Were any of the other commissioners in either one of
10:37:020		those two rooms that the two of you?
10:37:1 <b>21</b>	A	No, not that I recall.
10:37:1 <b>2</b> 2	Q	And where were you conducting your negotiations on
<b>10:37:22</b> 3		the congressional maps?
10:37:224		MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I discussed the

10:37:225

		1 age 5
10:37:281		congressional maps with Commissioner Walkinshaw in
10:37:322		several locations from brief conversations in the
10:37:383		hallway to a vacant part of the lobby. There's some
10:37:524		corner booths.
<b>10:37:55</b> 5	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Were you ever negotiating the
10:38:006		congressional map with Walkinshaw in the event room?
10:38:037		MR. WONG: Object to form.
10:38:048		THE WITNESS: Commissioner
10:38:109		Walkinshaw and I obviously discussed the
10:38:120		congressional maps on the 16th when the map was being
10:38:181		reconciled. I don't recall any conversations that I
10:38:222		had with him in that room prior to that time.
<b>10:38:25</b> 3	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So where were you during the action
10:38:314		portion of the meeting, the regular business meeting
10:38:375		scheduled for the 15th?
10:38:316	A	In one of the two second-floor rooms.
10:38:487	Q	Was anybody with you?
10:38:498	A	At again, the on-camera time during that meeting
10:39:0109		happened in a number of different points throughout
10:39:020		the evening. Is there a specific one that you're
10:39:021		asking about?

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.

10:39:022

10:39:123

10:39:224

10:39:225

	rain, Jo	De - January 12, 2022 Page 5
10:39:271	Q	During the action portion of the meeting, did you
10:39:312		have any paper reflective of any action you were
10:39:363		taking in front of you?
10:39:37 <b>4</b>	A	I don't believe so.
10:39:385	Q	What technology were you using to attend the action
10:39:466		portion of the meeting?
10:39:47 <b>7</b>	A	A laptop.
10:39:508	Q	Personal laptop or a commission laptop?
10:39:54 <b>9</b>	A	Personal laptop.
10:39:5 <b>%</b> O	Q	What kind of laptop is it?
10:39:5 <b>½1</b>	A	A Macbook.
10:40:01/2	Q	How did you know to go to the action portion of the
10:40:153		meeting?
10:40:1 <b>5.4</b>	A	Possibly that Chair Augustine had told us to, either
10:40:3 <b>15</b>		by physically telling us or through a text message.
10:40:4 <b>16</b>		I don't recall.
10:40:437	Q	What were you doing when you realized you needed to
10:41:058		log in to the public portion of the Zoom meeting?
10:41:1 <b>19</b>	A	I don't recall.
10:41:2 <b>2</b> 0	Q	Were you in the Zoom meeting in a breakout room when
10:41:321		you were off camera?
10:41:3 <b>22</b>	A	I don't believe so.
10:41:323	Q	Did you log in and out of Zoom each time you entered
10:41:3 <b>2</b> 4		the meeting?

Α

10:41:425

I believe so.

10:41:531 What did you think at the time the meeting started 0 10:41:592 you were going to be doing? 10:42:013 It was a very chaotic moment, so I think there was --Α 10:42:184 at least for me, it was very unclear what was going 10:42:205 to be happening next. 10:42:276 Did you have the sense that you would be taking a pro forma vote? 10:42:317 10:42:328 Object to form. MR. WONG: 10:42:349 THE WITNESS: I'm not certain what 10:42:3**10** you mean by "a pro forma vote." (By Ms. Mell) Was it your belief, in part or in 10:42:361 0 10:42:432 whole, that what you needed to do was vote on 10:42:453 something, even if it wasn't complete? 10:42:4**9.4** I think you're saying that we -- that I believed we Α had to do something? Is that the way you phrased 10:42:5**12.5** 10:43:016 that? I think that's fair. Or not "fair." Correct. 10:43:017 Q Yeah, I didn't believe that we had to do anything. 10:43:1**1.8** Α 10:43:1**49** But my -- I mean, there's -- we could have not done 10:43:220 anything. I'm certain it was an option. And just 10:43:3**21** not even attend the meeting could have been an 10:43:322 option. 10:43:323 So the question around you have to do something,

like -- I guess I'm real hung up on what -- what you mean by that.

10:43:3**24** 

10:43:425

10:43:431 Was it your belief that you were going to vote on 0 10:43:462 something? 10:43:483 I believe there was a possibility that we would have Α 10:43:53**4** a vote. 10:43:555 And what were the possibilities conditioned on? 0 10:43:576 Largely what the chair -- what the chair did next. Α 10:44:087 Q Did you know what the chair was going to do next 10:44:138 before you logged in? 10:44:149 No. Α 10:44:140 Did you have any idea that the chair would invite a 0 10:44:171 motion on the congressional district? I knew it would be a possibility, or I believed it to 10:44:1**9.2** Α 10:44:216.3 be a possibility. 10:44:2564 And what were you prepared to do if that happened? 0 10:44:325 Α I had not made up my mind about much of anything at 10:44:316 These decisions were very much made in that point. 10:44:4**117** the moment. 10:44:4708 Did you know when you were logging in, that if the 0 chair invited a motion, you'd make a motion to adopt 10:44:479 10:44:520 a congressional district map? 10:44:5**21** Α No. 10:45:02.2 Did you know whether or not anyone was going to move 0 10:45:02:3 to adopt a legislative district map? 10:45:0**24** Α No.

Had you been informed that you should vote on

0

10:45:025

something or make some motion to meet the deadline? 10:45:101 10:45:14**2** I have my -- my own reasoning for doing what I did. Α 10:45:27 **3** I can't speak for anyone else about the decision that 10:45:32**4** founded their actions. 10:45:335 Do you remember what the motion was with regard to Q 10:45:556 legislative districts? 10:45:57**7** Α I don't recall the language that was used in the 10:46:018 motion, no. 10:46:029 What do you think you voted on? 0 10:46:0**10** I believe I voted on a framework proposal that --Α 10:46:2**1.1** for -- you're asking about the legislative maps now -- a framework proposal for the legislative 10:46:2**1.2** 10:46:323 redistricting map. 10:46:344 Was the motion inclusive of the framework? 0 10:46:31.5 I don't recall the language of the motion. Α 10:46:416 Did you know what the framework proposal was when you 0 10:46:4287 voted? 10:46:5**18** Α Yes. 10:46:519 How did you know? 0 10:46:520 Commissioner Graves must have communicated it to me. Α 10:46:521 When? 0 At some point prior to rejoining the Zoom meeting. 10:46:5**22** Α 10:47:023 But at what point, I don't know. 10:47:024 It was on the 15th? 0

Yes.

Α

10:47:125

- 10:47:131 | Q | Was it privately?
- 10:47:162 A Privately? I'm not certain if staff was present or
- 10:47:26**3 not.**
- 10:47:274 | Q Was it off the -- off-line publicly?
- 10:47:32**5 A Yes.**
- 10:47:336 MR. WONG: Object to form.
- 10:47:347 Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you remember it being in the 10:47:398 second-floor suite?
- 10:47:42**9** A I don't recall.
- 10:47:410 Q What were the components of the framework proposal?
- 10:47:41 A Political performance changes in various legislative 10:47:512 districts and lack of performance change in various
- 10:48:013 other districts, among other factors.
- 10:48:114 | Q Okay. Can you give me all of the elements of the
- 10:48:115 framework proposal you voted on for the legislative
- 10:48:1**1**6 district maps -- map?
- 10:48:127 A I can share with you what I recall it to be. I
- 10:48:318 probably can't at this juncture give you an
- 10:48:319 inclusive -- an exclusive list of things.
- 10:48:420 | Q Did you ever see an exclusive list of things?
- 10:48:421 A See an exclusive list? No.
- 10:48:422 | Q Was the legislative district map framework proposal
- 10:48:523 ever expressed in writing?
- 10:48:524 A There were elements of the framework proposal, much
- 10:49:025 like the congressional map, that built upon previous

10:49:101 versions of the maps, proposals of the maps, I should say, but no single document that reflected 10:49:152 10:49:223 everything.

> Did you have a sense of what any one of those 0 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 0 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?

- I can't recall. Again, I would say that there were Α just pre- -- there had been previous versions of maps that were part of the overall conversation. again, they did not reflect the entirety of the proposal that was brought for a vote on the 15th.
- Okay. So tell me what you do remember about the 0 elements.

Let me break it down so you don't have to --

## Yeah. Α

10:49:244

10:49:295

10:49:346

10:49:357

10:49:388

10:49:399

10:49:420

10:49:471

10:49:492

10:49:513

10:49:594

10:50:0105

10:50:016

10:50:157

10:50:198

10:50:269

10:50:320

10:50:321

10:50:32.2

10:50:423

10:50:424

10:50:425

Let's start with: You did say there was an agreement 0 on political performance changes in various legislative districts.

What legislative districts were there an

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.

10:50:461

10:50:492

10:50:543

10:51:004

10:51:075

10:51:116

10:51:16**7** 

10:51:218

10:51:239

10:51:290

10:51:3**1.1** 

10:51:352

10:51:3**1.3** 

10:51:5**14** 

10:51:5**1.5** 

10:52:016

10:52:0**1.7** 

10:52:1**18** 

10:52:179

10:52:220

10:52:221

10:52:322

10:52:32:3

10:52:424

10:52:425

A The 44th, 28th, 26th, 15th.

Those were some of the -- 47th. 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

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 15th 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.

10:52:451

10:52:502

10:52:533

10:53:054

10:53:175

10:53:276

10:53:307

10:53:348

10:53:439

10:53:4**1**0

10:53:521

10:53:552

10:53:516.3

- 10:54:0**9**7
- **10:54:15**8
- 10:54:1**1**9
  10:54:2**2**0
- 10:54:321
- 10:54:322
- 10:54:323
- 10:54:424
- 10:55:025

10:55:071 I think I've answered your question, but -- but if not --10:55:222 10:55:233 I don't think --Q 10:55:254 -- come back --Α 5 -- you have. -- at me --6 Α But that's --7 Q -- again. 8 Α 9 -- okay. 0 10:55:2**5**0 I'm sorry. Α 10:55:261 I don't think you have. But I got confused at least 0 10:55:29 2 by your answer. You may have been answering the 10:55:313 question, but now I'm confused, so let's take it one 10:55:314 by one. 10:55:345 What political performance change in the 44th did 10:55:386 you believe you were approving on the 15th when you 10:55:417 voted on the motion regarding legislative districts? 10:55:418 At this time, I don't think I can recall the exact Α 10:55:519 number, but it would have been a point value 10:55:520 improvement for the Democratic party in -- in the 44th district. 10:56:021 10:56:022 What is the point value improvement for the 0 10:56:123 Democratic party in the legislative district in the 10:56:12:4 final map that was transmitted to the legislature?

I don't know that off the top of my head.

Α

10:56:125

- 10:56:221 | Q Okay. Let's go to the 28th.
- 10:56:28**2** | **A** Mm-hmm.

10:56:283

10:56:304

10:56:335

10:56:376

10:56:40**7** 

10:56:468

10:56:539

10:56:5**10** 

10:57:0**1** 

10:57:0**9.2** 

10:57:093

10:57:13:4

10:57:1**45** 

10:57:156

10:57:247

10:57:278

10:57:3109

10:57:320

10:57:4**21** 

10:57:5**22** 

10:58:023

10:58:2**24** 

10:58:225

Q Same question.

What was the political performance change in the 28th 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?

10:58:311	A	Latinx.
10:58:362	Q	Oh. Okay.
10:58:403		The 26th. What did you believe you were
10:58:444		approving as to political performance changes in this
<b>10:58:48</b> 5		26th legislative district on the 15th when you voted
10:58:526		on the motion
10:58:547	A	Again, my best
10:58:548		(Interruption by reporter due
10:58:549		to simultaneous speakers.)
10:59:000		
10:59:01	Q	(Continuing by Ms. Mell) with regard to
<b>10:59:01</b> 2		legislative districts?
10:59:013	A	Sorry. I didn't mean to talk over you.
10:59:024		Again, my best recollection is flat performance.
<b>10:59:15</b> 5	Q	And what does "flat performance" mean?
10:59:186	A	No significant change in partisan performance one way
10:59:3107		or the other.
10:59:388	Q	Again, significant change in partisan performance
<b>10:59:42</b> 9		leaves how much leeway?
10:59:420	A	I don't think I have a a metric.
10:59:521	Q	In the 26th district, is a 1 percent change
<b>10:59:52</b> 2		significant?
11:00:023	A	Again, I believe at the time, I would have considered
11:00:124		a 1 percent change to be a noticeable change.
<b>11:00:22</b> 5	Q	Significant?

11:00:281 We can go back and forth on the -- on the word Α I would just say that a 1 percent change 11:00:382 11:00:433 would have -- would not be something I would have 11:00:484 characterized as flat performance. 11:00:505 Okav. With regard to the 47th district, what did you 0 11:00:556 believe that you were voting to approve as to political performance changes when the motion was 11:01:017 11:01:068 made on the 15th to approve legislative districts? 11:01:109 Again, I believe my best memory would be it would be Α 11:01:120 flat in the 47th. 11:01:201 With regard to the 47th district, is a 1 percent 0 change flat performance? 11:01:24 2 11:01:253 Again, both with the 26th and with the 47th, a 1 Α 11:01:454 percent change, that's on the bubble, I suppose. 11:02:025 It's hard for me to... 11:02:056 Is it clear if it's 2 percent? 0 11:02:017 That would be significant, in my mind. Α So for the 47th district, the statistic somewhere 11:02:118 0 11:02:169 between 1 and 2 percent is the variation between flat 11:02:220 performance and a significant performance change? 11:02:221 Object to form. MR. WONG: 11:02:222 THE WITNESS: Again, my -- I'm 11:02:423 having difficulty assigning point values to words. 11:02:524 MS. MELL: Okay.

THE WITNESS:

11:02:525

And so I -- I want to

11:02:531	make sure that I'm that I'm clear, and that
11:02:562	that just is hard. Since I hadn't have previously
11:03:013	done that, it's hard to

Q (By Ms. Mell) Let's do it this way.

Was a 2 percent change in the 47th district outside the scope of what you thought you were approving?

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

11:03:044

11:03:055

11:03:096

11:03:117

11:03:128

11:03:169

11:03:200

11:03:27.1

11:03:30 2

11:03:403

11:03:404

11:03:465

11:03:526

11:03:517

11:03:576.8

11:03:579

11:03:520

11:04:021

11:04:022

11:04:123

11:04:224

11:04:225

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.

One that I predominantly used when assessing legislative performance would have been the state treasurer's race from 2018, I believe.

- Q So when we were discussing the 44th, 28th, 26th, 15th, and 47th 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.

11:04:281

11:04:362

11:04:413

11:04:454

11:04:575

11:05:066

11:05:117

11:05:158

11:05:179

11:05:270

11:05:351

11:05:372

11:05:510.3

11:06:0104

11:06:045

11:06:116

11:06:147

11:06:178

11:06:219

11:06:220

11:06:221

11:06:322

11:06:323

11:06:424

11:06:425

- 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	Q	Well, isn't there the thing with the primary where
11:06:532		you have to pick a partisan side to vote versus the
11:06:563		final election where you can flip if you want to
11:06:584		you can pick your candidate of your choice so the
11:07:025		nexus between whether or not they track political
11:07:076		sides would be distinct from a primary and a final
11:07:117		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.
- 11:07:3**1**4 | Q Okay.
- 11:07:315 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 44th 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 28th, 26th, 15th, or 47th?
  - MR. WONG: Same objection.

11:08:125

11:07:128

11:07:17**9** 

11:07:190

11:07:2**1.1** 

11:07:2**1** 2

11:07:3**1.3** 

11:07:416

11:07:467

11:07:498

11:07:519

11:07:520

11:07:5**21** 

11:08:022

THE WITNESS: With regards to political performance, there would likely be different ways that those districts could be drawn.

Q (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.

11:08:201

11:08:222

11:08:313

11:08:354

11:08:565

11:08:596

11:09:027

11:09:058

11:09:079

11:09:090

11:09:131

11:09:172

11:09:183

11:09:284

11:09:325

11:09:416

11:09:497

11:09:548

11:10:019

11:10:020

11:10:121

11:10:222

11:10:233

11:10:294

11:10:225

WASHINGTON COALITION FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT VS STATE OF WASHINGTON Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 11:10:281 Were any of the past negotiations in public, or were they all in your dyads outside the public? 11:10:322 11:10:383 Well, a lot of the -- I mean, there were -- the Α 11:10:45 4 Democrats had issued second rounds of maps. And that 11:10:525 had definitely informed the process. 11:11:046 11:11:11**7** 11:11:198 11:11:269 11:11:3**10** commissioners. Was the second rounds of maps from the Democrats 11:11:311 0 11:11:46 2 11:11:4383 public meeting? 11:11:5**1.4** Α 11:11:5**15** meeting. 11:12:016

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

- presented in a public meeting and discussed in a
- They were -- they were talked about in a public 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.
- Okay. So with that understanding, then, let's go 0 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?

11:12:1**18** 11:12:169 11:12:220

11:12:1**17** 

- 11:12:221
- 11:12:322
- 11:12:323
- 11:12:324
- 11:12:425

11:12:441 Was there any expression as to geographical
11:12:472 boundaries in the framework you voted on?
11:12:503 A I don't recall if there were any specific

A I don't recall if there were any specific geographical boundaries that were brought up in the -- in any conversation on the 15th 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

11:13:094

11:13:195

11:13:236

11:13:27**7** 

11:13:388

11:13:449

11:13:5**10** 

11:14:0**4.1** 

11:14:052

11:14:0183

11:14:01/4

11:14:115

11:14:116

11:14:187

11:14:218

11:14:219

11:14:220

11:14:3**21** 

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 26th, 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 44th district that -- that was going to be moved out of the 44th district. And at the moment, I can't recall what that was. But I -- again --

Q Where's the 44th? Is that up north --

11:16:524

11:17:025

11:14:541

11:14:562

11:15:013

11:15:034

11:15:085

11:15:106

11:15:167

11:15:238

11:15:309

11:15:340

11:15:401

11:15:452

11:15:463

11:15:5104

11:15:525

11:16:016

11:16:117

11:16:118

11:16:259

	Fain, Jo	oe - January 12, 2022	Page 70
11:17:041	A	Snohomish County.	
11:17:072	Q	Snohomish County?	
11:17:093	A	Snohomish County, yeah.	
11:17:124	Q	Is it Lake Forest?	
11:17:135	A	I'm sorry. Which did you say? Lake Forest?	
11:17:166	Q	Yeah.	
11:17:167	A	I don't believe so.	
11:17:178	Q	Okay.	
11:17:259	A	I don't recall.	
<b>11:17:26</b> 0	Q	How about the 46th? Any splits in the 46th?	
11:17:211	A	I don't recall any specific conversation around th	ıe
11:17:312		46th district.	
<b>11:17:35</b> 3	Q	Can you think of any other city splits you were	
11:17:414		tracking?	
11:17:415	A	I would think that we were tracking, you know, all	L
11:17:416		city splits as a metric of 'cause it's one of t	he
11:17:5 <b>47</b>		criteria that is in the statute around redistricti	ing.
11:17:518		So limiting city splits, I think, was a value that	=
11:18:019		was held by me and was one that was communicated a	as a
11:18:120		value that other commissioners cared about.	
11:18:1 <b>2</b> 1	Q	Do you know what city splits you voted to approve?	?
11:18:222	A	At this time, I don't recall an exclusive	
11:18:323		exhaustive list of them.	
11:18:324	Q	Do you remember discussing any city splits with	

Commissioner Graves prior to the vote?

**11:18:32**5

11:18:391 A I don't recall.

11:18:402

11:18:463

11:18:584

11:18:585

11:19:016

11:19:037

11:19:058

11:19:089

11:19:120

11:19:151

11:19:182

11:19:183

11:19:214

11:19:225

11:19:216

11:19:367

11:19:388

11:19:389

11:19:420

11:19:421

11:19:422

11:19:523

11:20:024

11:20:025

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

in those.

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

11:20:482

**11:20:53**3

11:20:594

11:21:015

11:21:016

11:21:027

11:21:058

11:21:079

11:21:020

11:21:121

11:21:12:2

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.

I don't recall right THE WITNESS: now which cities were split in the final agreement.

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

Α Sorry.

Q

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

> Object to form. MR. WONG:

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

(By Ms. Mell) Okay. As you sit here today, you do Q not recall what -- when you voted, what you approved 11:21:291 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

LITIGATION SERVICES

11:23:2**24** 

11:23:3**25** 

11:21:33 2

11:21:37 3

11:21:47 4

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?
- I believe Wenatchee, from East Wenatchee. Again, Α 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.

When you voted on the legislative district on the 0 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?

- I don't recall. Α
- Did your vote contemplate eliminating a split in any Q particular city?
  - Α I don't recall at this time.

11:23:381

11:23:462

11:23:493

11:23:564

11:23:595

11:24:036

11:24:047

11:24:098

11:24:299

11:24:320

11:24:381

11:24:40 2

11:24:433

11:24:474

11:24:545

11:24:586

11:25:017

11:25:038

11:25:079

11:25:120

11:25:121

11:25:322

**11:25:32**3

11:25:424

11:25:425

1:26:071	Q	Is there any number of different ways that you can
1:26:152		draw a legislative district boundary to either
1:26:213		incorporate into an entire district a city or split a
1:26:264		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?
- 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 12th and the 13th 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

11

11

11

11:26:265

11:26:286

11:26:30**7** 

11:26:378

11:26:439

11:26:510

11:26:5**1.** 

11:27:0**1** 2

11:27:0**1** 3

11:27:1**1.4** 

11:27:2**15** 

11:27:2**1.6** 

11:27:287

11:27:318

11:27:3**19** 

11:27:4**20** 

11:27:421

11:27:522

11:27:52:3

11:27:5**24** 

11:28:025

11:28:051 Washington would come over to western Washington. Ι 11:28:102 don't know --11:28:103 Was there a nexus to I-90 with that? Q 11:28:144 I-90 was one of the -- was one of the options. Α 11:28:215 So what were the specifics in the framework proposal 0 11:28:246 with regard to the movement of that population? 11:28:277 Again, my recollection is, is that the population Α 11:28:328 needed to come over would come through that -- and, again, I apologize -- 12th or 13th district. 11:28:359 11:28:310 I -- I believe it's the 12th. But the one that 11:28:47.1 had previously held Chelan and Douglas Counties, that 11:28:472 that would be where the population would come over. 11:28:493 When Graves told you about the framework proposal on Q 11:28:544 the 15th, do you remember communicating with him 11:28:585 about that part of the proposal? 11:29:016 I don't -- I don't recall anything. Α 11:29:067 Do you remember hearing anything earlier where there 11:29:118 had been an agreement reached between Sims and Graves 11:29:179 on that point? 11:29:120 I don't recall when that element was brought to my Α 11:29:221 attention. 11:29:292 Do you remember throughout the negotiations hearing 0 11:29:323 from Graves what progress he and Sims were having on 11:29:324 the legislative districts and their negotiations?

Commissioner Graves and I discussed the number of

Α

11:29:425

- 11:29:481 proposals that had been a part of the -- his 11:29:572 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.
- Q 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

11:29:583

11:30:064

11:30:085

11:30:186

11:30:247

11:30:278

11:30:309

11:30:310

11:30:391

11:30:44 2

11:30:523

11:30:514

11:30:555

11:31:076

11:31:117

11:31:158

11:31:249

11:31:320

11:31:421

11:31:422

11:31:523

11:32:024

11:32:025

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

11:32:141 11:32:212 11:32:273 11:32:274 11:32:305 11:32:326 11:32:357 11:32:358 11:32:419 11:32:440 11:32:471 11:32:512 **11:32:54**3 11:32:574 11:32:595 11:33:016 11:33:027 11:33:148 11:33:189 11:33:220 11:33:221

11:33:322

11:33:423

11:33:424

11:33:425

	,	- January 12, 2022
11:33:501		about an hour and 15 minutes. Can we do a quick
11:33:532		break?
11:33:533		MS. MELL: Can we do it right on
11:33:554		the hour? 'Cause I've got some people I'm supposed
11:33:585		to meet with on the hour.
11:34:016		MR. WONG: Can we go off the record
11:34:027		for just a second to discuss this?
11:34:108		(Discussion off the record.)
11:34:109		(Pause in proceedings from
11:34:1100		11:38 a.m. to 11:43 a.m.)
11:43:411		
11:43:422	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So is it correct to say that on the
11:44:293		15th, outside the publicly viewable Zoom meeting, you
11:44:414		were aware of the status of the negotiations with
11:44:455		regard to the legislative districts by your
11:44:516		conversations with Commissioner Graves?
11:44:5 <b>9.7</b>	A	I would say that Commissioner Graves and I did
11:45:0 <b>18</b>		discuss elements of the legislative maps.
11:45:139	Q	And is it correct that there was one at one of
11:45:120		those conversations I'm going to say privately;
11:45:2 <b>2</b> 1		and when I say it in that context, I mean not in the
11:45:2 <b>2</b> 2		Zoom meeting that the public could view you
11:45:3 <b>2</b> 3		actually discussed a framework proposal that was
11:45:3 <b>2</b> 4		going to come before the commission during the action
11.45.405		

portion of the meeting?

11:45:425

11:45:421 A I think there are a couple of assumptions built into 11:45:522 that question, so I just want to make sure I unpack 11:45:563

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.
- Q 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.
- Q Okay. But you at least received information as to status of the negotiations on the legislative

11:45:564

11:45:595

11:46:036

11:46:107

11:46:158

11:46:189

11:46:270

11:46:231

11:46:352

11:46:410.3

11:46:45.4

11:46:495

11:46:516

11:46:527

11:46:598

11:47:029

11:47:020

11:47:121

11:47:122

11:47:223

11:47:224

11:47:325

.i.i.iii	11:47:35 1	districts?
----------	------------	------------

11:47:40 2

11:47:47 3

11:47:56 **4** 

11:47:58 5

11:48:036

11:48:05 7

11:48:08 8

11:48:11 9

11:48:1**10** 

11:48:1**11** 

11:48:16.2

11:48:19.3

11:48:2**1**4

11:48:2**15** 

11:48:3**16** 

11:48:3**17** 

11:48:4**18** 

11:48:49 9

11:48:520

11:48:521

11:49:022

11:49:023

11:49:224

11:49:225

- 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.

Q (By Ms. Mell) When you and -- well, how much time did you spend with Graves on the 15th in the suites on the second floor?

- I'd say we were in -- were together at some point on Α 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.
- More than five? 0

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

11:50:090

11:50:131

11:50:172

11:50:183

11:50:234

11:50:23 5

11:50:316

11:50:397

11:50:518

11:51:179

11:51:220

11:51:321

11:51:322

11:51:323

- I can't narrow it down that tightly, but several Α hours.
- Okay. And those several hours you were with 0 Commissioner Graves, did the two of you ever strategize negotiation tactics?

MR. WONG: Object to form.

I think we had THE WITNESS: 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 0 methods to reach consensus?
- The specific instance where I would reference would Α 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

offer a mediator's proposal. 11:52:031 Did she do that? 11:52:092 0 11:52:113 Α Yes. 11:52:134 What was her mediator's proposal? 11:52:175 Α I don't -- I don't know the details of the proposal, 11:52:216 I wasn't party to when they were -- when the itself. commissioners were presented with it. I had merely 11:52:257 been involved in asking Commissioner Augustine 11:52:308 11:52:329 whether or not she would consider playing that role 11:52:350 as a means of getting talks started again. 11:52:401 When you spoke to her, were any other commissioners Q 11:52:44 2 present? 11:52:453 Α No. 11:52:454 What generally do you know about the mediator's 0 11:52:515 proposal? 11:52:526 That it had to do with performance of -- there was Α 11:53:057 some disagreement over performance in some 11:53:0188 legislative districts, probably some of the 11:53:119 legislative districts that we previously mentioned, 11:53:120 and that she offered a suggestion of a type of 11:53:221 And, again, I don't know the details of -midway. of what that -- of what was offered. 11:53:222 **11:53:32**3 When you say "midway," are you talking about a Q 11:53:32:4 percentage point for those districts?

- would be modified and one wouldn't with regards to partisan performance.
- 11:53:473 Q It's your understanding that she made a mediator's suggestion and that broke the -- the distance?

MR. WONG: Object to form.

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?

THE WITNESS:

- 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

11:53:575

11:53:596

11:54:037

11:54:148

11:54:179

11:54:210

11:54:261

11:54:272

11:54:313

11:54:40.4

11:54:435

11:54:466

11:54:497

11:55:048

11:55:019

11:55:120

11:55:121

11:55:19.2

11:55:223

11:55:224

11:55:325

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.
- Q 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?

11:56:1**9**2 11:56:203

11:55:381

11:55:422

11:55:483

11:55:494

11:55:525

11:55:566

11:56:077

11:56:108

11:56:139

11:56:170

11:56:191

- \_\_\_\_\_
- 11:56:244
- **11:56:28**5
- **11:56:34**6
- 11:56:317
- 11:56:4108
- 11:56:519
- 11:57:020
- 11:57:021
- **11:57:02**2
- **11:57:12**3
- 11:57:124
- **11:57:22**5

- 11:57:231 A I did not have any conversation, the best of my
  11:57:272 recollection, with Commissioner Sims at this juncture
  11:57:333 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.

O 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

11:58:319 11:58:320 11:58:321 11:58:422 11:58:423

11:58:524

11:58:525

11:57:344

11:57:395

11:57:436

11:57:467

11:57:528

11:57:539

11:57:5**1**0

11:58:021

11:58:022

11:58:053

11:58:094

11:58:175

11:58:206

11:58:217

11:58:278



- 11:58:561 proposal that was shared with me was something that Commissioner Sims was aware of. 11:59:012
  - (By Ms. Mell) Do you know whether any other Q commissioner was aware of the framework proposed?
  - Α I don't.

11:59:043

11:59:124

11:59:175

11:59:276

11:59:377

11:59:428

11:59:449

11:59:5**%** O

12:00:011

12:00:122

12:00:11/3

12:00:214

12:00:225

12:00:316

12:00:327

12:00:518

12:00:5169

12:00:520

12:00:521

12:01:022

12:01:023

12:01:024

12:01:025

- All right. So what did you vote to approve with regard to the legislative districts relative to communities of interest?
- It was my belief that a final proposal included the Α 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.

- So when you were talking to Graves about the proposed Q framework, you knew that there was a disappointing split of the communities of interest in Chelan and Douglas County?
- Α I don't know if he -- I don't recall the conversation

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 16th 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
- 12:01:285 12:01:326 12:01:347 12:01:398 12:01:439 12:01:45O 12:01:51 12:01:582 12:02:013 12:02:044 12:02:045 12:02:086 12:02:107 12:02:128 12:02:149 12:02:120 12:02:221 12:02:222

12:02:223

12:02:324

12:02:425

	Fain, Jo	pe - January 12, 2022 Page 8
12:02:471		commission's collective intent would be to have the
12:02:502		maps completed?
12:02:523		MR. WONG: Object to form.
12:02:53 <b>4</b>		THE WITNESS: I would prefer to
12:02:59 <b>5</b>		have had the maps completed at the time of vote.
12:03:026	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that it's virtually
12:03:067		impossible to know what you collectively voted on
12:03:108		when there's no written proposal?
12:03:139		MR. WONG: Object to form.
12:03:1 <b>1.0</b>		THE WITNESS: Approving a framework
12:03:4 <b>1.1</b>		in the manner that the commission did does create
12:03:5 <b>12</b>		ambiguities that I think we've discussed already.
12:03:5183	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Would you agree it's not transparent?
12:04:014		MR. WONG: Object to form.
12:04:0 <b>125</b>		THE WITNESS: I think I've stated
12:04:0 <b>1/6</b>		publicly that I do not believe that this that the
12:04:1 <b>½7</b>		final hours of the commission were conducted in the
12:04:3 <b>18</b>		way that I wish they had been.
12:04:3169	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that they were not
12:04:3 <b>2</b> 0		transparent?
12:04:421		MR. WONG: Same objection.
12:04:4 <b>22</b>		THE WITNESS: I would I would
12:04:4 <b>23</b>		have I would have been far more it would have
12:04:5 <b>24</b>		been more transparent for for participants in the
12:05:0 <b>25</b>		public to have physical maps reviewed in advance of a

vote, yes.

(By Ms. Mell) Would you agree that it was not 0 transparent to be negotiating in caucuses outside the public meeting?

THE WITNESS:

MR. WONG: Same objection.

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.

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

> Object to form. MR. WONG:

I don't really know THE WITNESS: 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

12:06:424

12:06:425

12:05:111

12:05:112

public to review. That would have been a -- that
certainly would have been a more transparent end to
the commission's work.

Q (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.

12:07:084

- 12:08:461 Q (By Ms. Mell) Why do you say that?
- 12:08:512 A Maybe -- more specific?

12:08:583

12:09:044

12:09:105

12:09:176

12:09:197

12:09:248

12:09:269

12:09:3**11.0** 

12:09:3**1.1** 

12:09:372

12:09:393

12:09:414

12:09:445

12:09:5**116** 

12:09:5**1.7** 

12:09:5168

12:09:519

12:10:020

12:10:021

12:10:022

12:10:123

12:10:1**24** 

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.

12:10:251	A A	gain, my understanding, the, you know, official
12:10:402	v	otes and the and the formation of a majority
12:10:473	p	osition or of formation of the majority position is
12:10:554	s	omething that occurs in the public meeting as it
12:11:015	d	id. It's not my understanding that elements of
12:11:036	p:	roposals can't be discussed between commission
12:11:137	m	embers 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.

12:11:168

12:11:259

12:11:260

12:11:271

12:11:292

12:11:343

12:11:344

12:11:385

12:11:466

12:11:477

12:11:510.8

12:12:019

12:12:020

12:12:121

12:12:222

12:12:223

12:12:224

12:12:325

	Taili, 50e - Salidary 12, 2022
12:12:361	I'm not asking that correctly.
12:12:382	My question pertains to your use of the phrase "a
12:12:453	final decision."
12:12:474	Can a minority of the governing body meet in
12:12:515	sequence to communicate about, in this instance,
12:12:576	legislative and congressional district maps outside
12:13:037	the public view?
12:13:058	MR. WONG: Object to form.
12:13:06 <b>9</b>	THE WITNESS: It was not my it
12:13:0 <b>1 O</b>	was not my belief that conversations between various
12:13:1 <b>111</b>	commissioners constituted a breach of the Open Public
12:13:2 <b>12</b>	Meetings Act. Conversations that dealt with the
12:13:233	subject matter of redistricting (Videoconference
14	technical difficulties.)
15	THE REPORTER: "Subject matter"
16	It kind of got garbled there because you sped up.
17	Repeat that.
18	THE WITNESS: Sorry. I'll I'll
19	say it again.
12:13:3 <b>20</b>	It is not my belief that conversations pertaining
12:13:3 <b>21</b>	to the redistricting process that occur between
12:13:4 <b>22</b>	various commissioners at different times constitutes
12:13:4 <b>23</b>	a violation of the Open Public Meetings Act.
12:13:5 <b>2</b> 4	Q (By Ms. Mell) Would you characterize your
12:13:5 <b>2</b> 5	conversations with other commissioners on the 15th

- 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

12:14:194

12:14:285

12:14:36**6** 

12:14:43**7** 

12:14:468

12:14:559

12:14:5**120** 

12:15:091

12:15:1**12** 

12:15:1**13** 

12:15:164

12:15:2**15** 

12:15:316

12:15:4**3.7** 

12:15:5**168** 

12:16:0**19** 

12:16:020

12:16:1**21** 

12:16:1**22** 

12:16:2**23** 

12:16:2**24** 

12:16:325

	Fain, Jo	be - January 12, 2022	Page 9
12:16:361		counterproposals?	
12:16:392		MR. WONG: Object to form.	
12:16:45 <b>3</b>		THE WITNESS: You mean	
12:16:46 <b>4</b>		communicating proposals or counterproposals betwee	n
12:16:51 <b>5</b>		whom?	
12:16:516		MS. MELL: The voting	
12:16:537		commissioners.	
12:16:56 <b>8</b>		THE WITNESS: I was having	
12:16:59 <b>9</b>		conversations with Commissioner Walkinshaw about t	he
12:17:0 <b>10</b>		congressional maps, and there were in some cases	
12:17:0 <b>1.1</b>		draft maps that accompanied those conversations.	
12:17:0 <b>122</b>		I believe that similar conversations were goin	ıg
12:17:1 <b>13</b>		between Commissioner Graves and Commissioner Sims	on
12:17:1 <b>14</b>		the legislative maps, but I don't know I don't	
12:17:1 <b>15</b>		know anything other than what was shared with me b	Ϋ́
12:17:2 <b>16</b>		Commissioner Graves as a status update.	
12:17:217	Q	(By Ms. Mell) And Augustine, to the extent she wa	S
12:17:3108		mediating?	
12:17:3 <b>19</b>	A	I didn't talk with Commissioner Augustine really	
12:17:3 <b>20</b>		about the substantive about the substance of	of
12:17:3 <b>21</b>		any of the maps. I had merely asked her if I'd	l
12:17:4 <b>22</b>		asked her if she would be willing to participate b	Ϋ́
12:17:4 <b>23</b>		seeing if they could seeing if her involvement,	
12:17:5 <b>24</b>		and I encourage the conversation continue.	

12:18:0**25** 

- 12:18:051 evening -- and I can't recall what time it was. Late afternoon, early evening. At that juncture, it 12:18:082 12:18:123 didn't appear as though much progress was being made.
  - But you did also discuss how to do a mediator's 0 proposal, right? You talked with her about coming up with a middle ground?
  - I didn't talk to her about the substance of what Α factors were in play. I don't recall. 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.
  - Did you work with Commissioner Graves on preparing a 0 Republican proposal to the supreme court in the event there was no majority approval of the commissioners on any other proposal by midnight?
  - Throughout the process, there was discussion about Α 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. was -- but that was discussed, yeah.

12:18:164

12:18:225

12:18:266

12:18:277

12:18:328

12:18:419

12:18:440

12:18:51

12:19:012

12:19:103

12:19:164

12:19:215

12:19:256

12:19:287

12:19:348

12:19:410.9

12:19:520

12:20:021

12:20:022

12:20:123

12:20:224

12:20:225

- 12:20:271 Q And when you say, "That was discussed," who did you 12:20:302 discuss that with? Any commissioners?
  - A I discussed that with Commissioner Graves.
- 12:20:344 | Q Any other commissioners?
- 12:20:36**5** | A I don't recall.
- 12:20:426 Q Do you know whether or not your conversations with
  12:20:467 Graves about that were shared with any other
  12:20:488 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.

12:21:5**25** 

12:20:323

- 12:21:511 That would work where -- because each (By Ms. Mell) 0 of you had your own staff people. You and the 12:21:552 12:21:583 commissioners would talk in front of your staff, and 12:22:004 then your staff would go do the work to reflect what 12:22:045 they heard their representative commissioner saying 12:22:076 and share that to try to make sure they were -- well, to create an expression of where they thought those 12:22:107 12:22:138 conversations were at that moment, correct? 12:22:169
  - A At times, that would happen. That wouldn't happen all the time.
  - Q But that was happening on the 15th outside the public view?
  - A I believe that there were a number of different maps that were drawn up on the 15th 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?

LITIGATION SERVICES

12:23:025

12:22:1**10** 

12:23:161 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.

12:23:212

12:23:253

12:23:384

12:23:435

12:23:486

12:23:507

12:23:518

12:23:519

12:23:540

12:23:5**1** 

12:23:5322

12:24:013

12:24:094

12:24:125

12:24:146

12:24:177

12:24:218

12:24:249

12:24:280

12:24:321

12:24:392

12:24:323

12:24:424

12:24:525

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

12:24:561	don't believe it was customary to just hit "send" on
12:25:032	every, you know, conversation that we had and every
12:25:073	map proposal that we drafted up.
12:25:094	Q But that's what makes a good staff member, right?
<b>12:25:12</b> 5	They know how to gauge what you want communicated and
12:25:146	what you don't and translate that into work product?
12:25:197	MR. WONG: Object to form.
12:25:208	THE WITNESS: A lot of good things
12:25:269	make a good staff member.
<b>12:25:27</b> 0	MS. MELL: Okay. I had a question
<b>12:25:3</b> 1	in my mind. It just went out. Just a second here.
<b>12:25:47</b> 2	I lost it. Okay.
12:25:513	THE WITNESS: I've been there.
12:25:524	MS. MELL: Yeah.
<b>12:25:51</b> 5	Well, I hear that my guests are downstairs, so I
12:26:016	need to take a break.
12:26:037	MR. WONG: Can we go off the record
12:26:058	real quick?
<b>12:26:09</b> 9	MS. MELL: Yeah. Sure.
<b>12:26:12</b> 0	(Discussion off the record.)
12:26:121	(Pause in proceedings from
12:26:121 12:26:122	(Pause in proceedings from 12:26 p.m. to 1:14 p.m.)
<b>12:26:12</b> 2	

13:15:041	commissioners so that you would not trigger OPMA
13:15:122	while negotiating the legislative and congressional
13:15:163	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.
- Q 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

13:15:26 4

13:15:35**5** 

13:15:39**6** 

13:15:48**7** 

13:15:528

13:15:54**9** 

13:15:510

13:16:021

13:16:072

13:16:133

13:16:1**1.4** 

13:16:3**12.5** 

13:16:4**1**6

13:16:5**117** 

13:16:518

13:16:599

13:17:020

13:17:021

13:17:09.2

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.

13:19:12.2

13:19:233

13:19:224

13:19:225

13:17:271

13:17:342

13:17:413

13:17:454

13:17:475

13:17:506

13:17:507

13:17:548

13:17:589

13:17:590

13:18:041

13:18:092

**13:18:13**3

First, I'd say I THE WITNESS: 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 0 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.

I guess I'm being THE WITNESS: 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.

(By Ms. Mell) Okay. So in your mind, was there a

Q

13:19:301

13:19:382

13:19:443

13:19:514

13:19:555

13:19:596

13:20:037

13:20:088

13:20:119

13:20:140

13:20:161

13:20:192

13:20:263

13:20:294

13:20:325

13:20:366

13:20:417

13:20:448

13:20:489

13:20:420

13:21:021

13:21:022

13:21:123

13:21:124

13:21:225

	- uiii, 00	1 age 10
13:21:271		concern for you about open government implications if
13:21:322		there were three or more of you in the room
13:21:393		conversing about redistricting issues if you didn't
13:21:474		reach a consensus
13:21:505		MR. WONG: Object to form.
13:21:516	Q	(Continuing by Ms. Mell) or take some kind of
13:21:527		vote?
13:21:53 <b>8</b>	A	I would just say that we or that again,
13:21:58 <b>9</b>		speaking for myself, I avoided I avoided being in
13:22:0 <b>160</b>		a situation where there would be three or more voting
13:22:1 <b>111</b>		commissioners so that there, you know as I thought
13:22:1 <b>32</b>		that was the kind of the most black-and-white way
13:22:2 <b>1.3</b>		to ensure I was following my understanding of the
13:22:3 <b>14</b>		OPMA.
13:22:315	Q	Okay. So then what about, did you apply the same
13:22:316		standard to your e-mail communications?
13:22:3 <b>17</b>	A	Again, I think I asked answered that before. I
13:22:4 <b>18</b>		don't recall a time being on an e-mail thread, but I
13:22:5 <b>19</b>		don't I mean, there were quite a quite a few
13:22:5 <b>20</b>		e-mails sent throughout the throughout the process
13:22:5 <b>21</b>		to one another, and I have not had a chance to review

- Q Okay. Can you see any documents in your chat room right now?
- A Not yet.

them all.

13:23:0**22** 

13:23:0**2**3

13:23:124

13:23:1**25** 

- 13:23:161 Q Maybe I'll just do the share screen again. I think
  13:23:192 we decided that was a little bit better.
  13:23:213 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?

13:23:224

13:23:265

13:23:306

13:23:347

13:23:358

13:23:439

13:23:520

13:24:011

13:24:07/2

13:24:01/3

13:24:154

13:24:185

13:24:226

13:24:217

13:24:278

13:24:299

13:24:320

13:24:321

13:25:12.2

13:25:123

13:25:124

13:25:225

13:25:231 I do. Α 13:25:232 What is it? 0 13:25:243 It is a e-mail that -- with a memo attached that I Α 13:25:314 sent to members of the commission. 13:25:385 And how many members of the commission did you send 0 13:25:416 that to? Appears I sent it to the chair and copy to the 13:25:437 Α remainder of the commission. 13:25:538 13:25:549 So would you agree that this is a communication 0 13:26:010 between a majority of the voting commissioners? 13:26:041 Yes, I would. Α What were you asking -- or did you in this 13:26:052 0 13:26:123 communication ask the voting commissioners to do 13:26:154 anything? I would want to review. I don't recall all the 13:26:155 Α 13:26:216 details of this memo. 13:26:217 All right. It was produced to me in public records Q 13:26:328 separately, so I'll open it here. 13:26:349 Let me see. Did I get one that's Bates-numbered? 13:26:420 Yes, I did. Okay. 13:26:421 Let's look at this one, then. 13:26:482 MS. MELL: Let's mark the memo 13:26:423 portion of the e-mail exchange as Exhibit 42. 13:26:524 (By Ms. Mell) Showing you what's being marked as 0

Exhibit 42, what is that?

13:27:025

13:27:021 The memo that was attached to the e-mail that I'd Α sent commissioners. 13:27:042 13:27:073 How do you want me to do this so that you can answer Q 13:27:144 the prior question? Do you want me to scroll through this like this? 13:27:165 13:27:176 Yeah, if you'd scroll to the bottom. Α Scroll to the bottom. 13:27:207 0 13:27:238 Yeah. Α 13:27:259 Thanks. 13:27:4**5**0 Okay. 13:27:461 I believe the question was: What did you ask the 0 commissioners to do relative to this communication 13:27:50 2 **13:27:55**3 via e-mail? The sentence that uses the word "asks" relates to 13:28:014 Α 13:28:095 maintaining overall balance of competition, something 13:28:146 that had been primary priority for me throughout this 13:28:217 entire process and something I'd spoken about 13:28:218 frequently. 13:28:309 Why did you send this e-mail with this memo? 0 13:28:320 I had -- I did not sense that members had calibrated Α 13:28:521 their expectations in a way that would be productive. And by that I mean I wanted to be clear about what 13:29:022 13:29:123 prioritizing competitive -- a competitive -- a 13:29:124 competitive map would look like and how I viewed what

a competitive map would look like statistically.

13:29:225

- 13:29:311 Q Did you -- well, strike that. Let's start with this.
  13:29:392 Did you actually write Exhibit 42?
- 13:29:42**3 A I did.**

13:30:010

13:30:11/1

13:30:1**42** 

13:30:1**13** 

13:30:3**17** 

13:30:3**1.8** 

13:30:4**19** 

13:30:420

13:30:421

13:30:522

13:30:523

13:31:1**24** 

13:31:225

- 13:29:434 | Q Did you write it on November 13th, 2021?
- 13:29:485 A I wrote it in or around that date. I don't remember
  13:29:566 when the first draft was put together, but it was not
  13:29:597 something that I'd worked on over -- the memo
  13:30:028 portion, itself, I think, was written around that
  13:30:069 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.
- 13:30:214 Q November 13, if that's the Saturday or Sunday.

  13:30:215 Is that before you went to the Hampton is your

  13:30:316 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.

13:31:321 Did you use it as a means of clearly communicating 0 13:31:392 what kind of plans you would approve? 13:31:443 Α Sorry. 13:31:504 I -- I used it as a means of sharing my 13:32:09**5** priorities and how I would -- one of the data points 13:32:126 I would use to -- in considering proposals. 13:32:227 Q Do you know how any of the commissioners use Exhibit 42? 13:32:258 I don't. 13:32:289 Α 13:32:290 Did Commissioner Graves speak to you about the 0 content of Exhibit 42 at any time? 13:32:321 I think I may have shared it with him in advance of 13:32:3**1.2** Α 13:32:4**1.3** sending it to the full commission. 13:32:514 Do you remember how -- how you shared it with him? 0 13:32:565 Is it the kind of thing where you are -- strike that. 13:32:526 Give me a picture of how you shared it with him. 13:33:047 Where were you when you shared it with him? 13:33:018 I don't remember how. But I believe it was Α 13:33:119 electronically. 13:33:12:0 So it's not the kind of thing that you were sitting 0 13:33:121 on the second floor, in the suite, looking at your 13:33:222 computer and talking about it? 13:33:223 No, I don't believe so. Again, I believe this was Α 13:33:2**24** largely drafted prior to that. But, again, I --

that's my recollection at the moment.

13:33:325

- 13:33:391 So then if your answer is that you e-mailed it Okay. 0 to him, did you also talk to him about it or did you 13:33:42.2 13:33:463 only communicate with him on e-mail? I guess is my 13:33:484 question. 13:33:49 5
  - Α I don't recall.

13:34:118

13:34:219

13:34:2**10** 

13:34:3**11** 

13:34:4**12** 

13:34:4**9**3

13:34:514

13:34:545

13:34:516

13:35:017

13:35:1108

13:35:1**19** 

13:35:220

13:35:3**21** 

13:35:422

13:35:423

13:35:424

13:35:525

- 13:33:586 How much of what's contained in Exhibit 42 was in the proposal you voted to affirm? 13:34:067
  - I don't have that analysis in front of me, so it's a Α 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.
  - Did you do that work, or did a staff person do that Q work for you?
  - For the final map? A staff person. Α
  - Before you approved a final map, did you have the Q analysis in front of you?
  - There were -- there were many versions of this Α 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. so I don't recall.
  - Is it correct that Exhibit 42 was a form of your Q method of keeping track of what your priorities were?

13:36:031 Object to form. MR. WONG: I think that I made 13:36:05**2** THE WITNESS: 13:36:13**3** no -- I made a very high priority of making 13:36:23**4** competitiveness an open and well-known goal of mine 13:36:325 through this process. And then this analytical tool 13:36:40**6** was one of the mechanisms used to evaluate whether different proposals -- how different proposals may 13:36:44**7** have performed along that priority. 13:36:478 13:36:539 (By Ms. Mell) Okay. Do you have any knowledge of 0 whether any commission staff received this Exhibit 42? 13:37:0100 13:37:0**11** Again, I recall Commissioner Augustine asking if she Α could share it with her staff. And I personally 13:37:2**1.2** 13:37:3**1.3** drafted much of it, but the charts and the final 13:37:4**14** formatting were done by my staff. So they would have had access to it as well. 13:37:4**15** 13:37:416 Did you permit your staff to share it with other 0 commissioners' staff? 13:37:597 I don't know if I explicitly did that. But I believe 13:38:0**10.8** Α they knew it was drafted to send to the commission. 13:38:0**19** 13:38:120 And so I -- if they shared it, that wouldn't surprise 13:38:1**21** But I don't have knowledge of that. me. 13:38:122 Did you use it to analyze whether or not the map 0 13:38:323 finally transmitted to the legislature or to the

supreme court integrated any of the concepts from

Exhibit 42?

13:38:324

13:38:425

13:38:451		MR. WONG: Object to form.
13:38:47 <b>2</b>		THE WITNESS: I asked staff to
13:38:52 <b>3</b>		prepare a chart similar to the one that's in this
13:38:58 <b>4</b>		document using the data from the final map so that I
13:39:08 <b>5</b>		could view that information after the work had been
13:39:11 <b>6</b>		done.
13:39:157	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Did staff prepare you a chart that
13:39:188		looked like this that had the color codes in it?
13:39:22 <b>9</b>	A	It's my recollection that they they did.
13:39:210	Q	What is Pellicciotti?
13:39:311		Oh. I don't even know if I said that right.
13:39:3162		"Pellicciotti"? I don't know.
13:39:3 <b>1.3</b>	A	It's not a commonly properly pronounced name. So
13:39:4 <b>14</b>		"Pellicciotti."
13:39:41/5	Q	So I badly butchered it? Is that what you're saying?
13:39:5 <b>116</b>	A	It's a typically butchered name. "Pellicciotti"
13:39:5 <b>1</b> 7	Q	Okay.
13:39:5 <b>18</b>	A	is my belief. And he is the current Washington
13:40:0 <b>119</b>		State treasurer.
13:40:020	Q	Oh. That's even worse. And it's an existing, living
13:40:021		human being in an elected official position. Wow.
13:40:0 <b>2</b> 2		Bad. Bad. Okay.
13:40:123		All right. So I don't understand, then, how is
13:40:124		that I don't know what it means in this context,
	1	

then.

13:40:225

- What's the reference? When it says "Draft\_ 13:40:252 Pellicciotti," what does that mean?

  The current Pellicciotti is the performance that
  - 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?
- 13:41:2**13 A** No.

13:40:354

13:40:42**5** 

13:40:446

13:40:49**7** 

13:40:588

13:41:019

13:41:0**10** 

13:41:01/1

13:41:18 2

13:41:254

13:41:405

13:41:416

13:41:427

13:41:5**18** 

13:41:5**19** 

13:41:520

13:42:021

13:42:022

13:42:123

13:42:2**24** 

13:42:2**25** 

- 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

- 13:42:371 formative tool. So I -- I, again, would have to look 13:42:412 and see what the chart actually reflected to see 13:42:433 whether or not it was more or less competitive than 13:42:514 the current map under these metrics. 13:42:555 How would I locate what your staff prepared for you? 0 13:43:016 I would have only received it over e-mail at some Α 13:43:117 point, so it would have been -- if it exists, which again I believe it was prepared for me, but, again, 13:43:188 13:43:249 this would have been in the early hours of the 16th 13:43:290 or -- you know, one of those -- one of those days. 13:43:351 So I'm not entirely sure, but I thought I recall them
- 13:43:513 Q Sorry. Just a minute. I'm just taking a quick
  13:43:514 review to see if anything strikes me as obviously
  13:44:015 being in the piles that I have.

producing one for me and e-mailing it to me.

- 13:44:016 A No problem.
- 13:44:017 Q Do you think it would have come in an Adobe form or 13:44:178 different kind of document?
- 13:44:189 A Sorry. I didn't -- what kind of form?
- 13:44:220 Q What kind of format would be used? Would it be an 13:44:221 Adobe document or something else?
- 13:44:222 A It could have been an Excel spreadsheet.
- 13:44:283 Q Okay.

13:43:392

- 13:44:224 A That's where they were originally created.
- 13:44:325 Q Yeah, I'm sorry. I don't see it. I don't see

13:44:451 anything that obviously would be it.

13:44:562

13:45:003

13:45:134

13:45:165

13:45:196

13:45:227

13:45:258

13:45:379

13:45:4**1.0** 

13:45:4**1.1** 

13:45:5**4.2** 

13:46:0**13** 

13:46:1**1.4** 

13:46:1**15** 

13:46:186

13:46:247

13:46:218

13:46:349

13:46:420

13:46:4**21** 

13:46:5**22** 

13:47:023

13:47:0**24** 

13:47:1**25** 

Did you make sure that this document was published to the public?

- A I don't recall if I ever made this document public.
- Q 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

like.

13:47:151

13:47:172

13:47:213

13:47:284

13:47:325

13:47:366

13:47:377

13:47:388

13:47:439

13:47:510 O

13:47:511

13:48:010.2

13:48:003

13:48:054

13:48:165

13:48:256

13:48:287

13:48:318

13:48:359

13:48:320

13:48:321

13:48:422

13:48:423

13:48:424

13:48:525

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.

- 13:48:571 Q I'm just asking you to actually authenticate the
  13:49:002 e-mail and say that -- and acknowledge that this is
  13:49:033 you communicating on that date and that time as set
  13:49:074 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?
- 13:50:323 A I don't believe we discussed the memo specifically.
  13:50:524 I don't believe so.
  - Q Did you discuss the e-mail, then the memo, or the

13:49:085

13:49:126

13:49:217

13:49:258

13:49:309

13:49:3**1.0** 

13:49:4**2.1** 

13:49:5**12** 

13:49:5**16.3** 

13:50:0**14** 

13:50:0**15** 

13:50:016

13:50:1**17** 

13:50:128

13:50:1**49** 

13:50:2**20** 

13:50:221

13:50:322

13:50:525

- 13:50:591 e-mail and the memo with April Sims?
- 13:51:032 A I don't believe I discussed the memo with 13:51:083 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.

13:51:094

13:51:15**5** 

13:51:176

13:51:22**7** 

13:51:258

13:51:29 9

13:51:3**1:0** 

13:51:311

13:51:362

13:51:3**1/3** 

13:51:40 4

13:51:45.5

13:51:486

13:51:527

13:51:5**48** 

13:51:51/9

13:52:020

13:52:021

13:52:09.2

13:52:123

13:52:224

13:52:225

- 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.

		5 Galladiy 12, 2022
13:52:261	Q	Do you recall your staff, during the negotiations on
13:52:362		the 15th off-line, off the off the public Zoom,
13:52:453		sharing with you what other commissioners were
13:52:484		thinking or asking for in the negotiations?
13:52:525		MR. WONG: Object to form.
13:52:53 <b>6</b>		THE WITNESS: Not to my
13:52:58 <b>7</b>		recollection.
13:52:588	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Do you remember during the course of
13:53:089		your negotiating the districts, what the other two
13:53:11/0		commissioners thought about the status of the
13:53:161		negotiations or any of the confines of the proposals?
13:53:2 <b>1.2</b>	A	Sorry. That was a had a bit of a hard time
13:53:3 <b>11.3</b>		following that.
13:53:314	Q	When you were negotiating the districts, at any time
13:53:41/5		did you know what the other two voting commissioners
13:53:426		thought about the negotiations?
13:53:5 <b>½7</b>	A	I guess I'm I guess I'm looking for a little bit
13:54:0 <b>18</b>		more specificity in the question.
13:54:0169	Q	What are you tripping up on?
13:54:020		THE REPORTER: What was that, Joan?
13:54:021		MS. MELL: I'm asking him what is
13:54:122		it that he's tripping up on, meaning:
13:54:123	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Where am I being ambiguous?
13:54:1 <b>24</b>	A	Is this a holistic sense of of the negotiations as

a whole that you're asking about, at which point I

13:54:2**25** 

		De - January 12, 2022 Page 1
13:54:231		really can't speak to the mind set of the other
13:54:272		participants, or is it specific to some element that
13:54:323		we might be discussing at any given time?
13:54:354	Q	Well, timing-wise, in my mind, I was asking the
<b>13:54:40</b> 5		question as to the 15th or anything post the memo.
13:54:436		So I suppose the 14th and 15th
13:54:477	A	Mm-hmm.
<b>13:54:49</b> 8	Q	timing-wise.
<b>13:54:51</b> 9		And beyond that, I'm asking: With respect to the
<b>13:55:02</b> 0		negotiations you were engaged in with one other
13:55:01		commissioner, at any time did you know I guess it
<b>13:55:11</b> 2		would have been just what Commissioner Sims thought
<b>13:55:19</b> 3		about your negotiations.
13:55:2 <b>14</b>	A	I don't have any insight into what Commissioner Sims
13:55:225		thought about anything during this time.
<b>13:55:34</b> 6	Q	So you were negotiating with Walkinshaw, correct?
13:55:3 <b>27</b>	A	That's correct.
<b>13:55:39</b> 8	Q	And you know that Graves knew what you were
<b>13:55:43</b> 9		negotiating about and his thought about it because
13:55:420		you were talking to Graves, correct?
13:55:421		MR. WONG: Object to form.
13:55:522		THE WITNESS: I don't know all of
13:55:523		his feedback on it. Again, it was more of a
13:55:5 <b>24</b>		communication about what was going on, less of

MS. MELL: Okay.

**13:56:02**5

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 123
13:56:031		THE WITNESS: a discussion.
13:56:032		So
<b>13:56:04</b> 3	Q	(By Ms. Mell) But you knew Graves' reaction to your
13:56:084		negotiations with Walkinshaw?
13:56:135	A	I didn't receive a lot of reaction from Commissioner
13:56:186		Graves on the congressional maps during these, to my
13:56:227		recollection, during these times. His focus was
13:56:258		predominantly on the legislative maps.
<b>13:56:28</b> 9	Q	Well, I don't think I asked you to quantify it. I
<b>13:56:31</b> 0		just asked if you had any sense of his sense that
13:56:3 <b>8</b> 1		he understood where your negotiations were with
<b>13:56:43</b> 2		Walkinshaw.
13:56:4 <b>1</b> 3	A	I what he understood I don't know.
13:56:4 <b>14</b>		What I communicated to him was the issues and
13:56:515		and elements that were still being that were being
13:56:5 <b>1</b> 6		discussed with Commissioner Walkinshaw on the
13:56:5 <b>½7</b>		congressional map.
13:57:0 <b>0</b> 8	Q	So I guess so okay.
<b>13:57:01</b> 9		So then with regard to your negotiations with
<b>13:57:02</b> 0		Walkinshaw, did you similarly have communications
<b>13:57:12</b> 1		with April Sims such that you know she knew something
<b>13:57:12</b> 2		about your negotiations with Walkinshaw?
<b>13:57:12</b> 3		MR. WONG: Object to form.
13:57:2 <b>24</b>		THE WITNESS: I don't recall having

very many conversations with Commissioner Sims or

13:57:225

	Fain, Jo	pe - January 12, 2022 Page 12
13:57:281		very much conversation with Commissioner Sims in
13:57:332		these final few days. So
<b>13:57:36</b> 3	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Did you have any I'm sorry.
13:57:394	A	Go ahead. What was your question?
<b>13:57:40</b> 5	Q	So did you have any communications with Sims such
13:57:436		that you knew what her what information she had
13:57:477		about your negotiations with Walkinshaw?
13:57:508	A	I can't recall anything specific at the moment.
13:58:109	Q	Did your staff say anything to you that would lead
13:58:210		you to believe that Commissioner Sims understood what
13:58:301		was happening or had information about what was
<b>13:58:31</b> 2		happening in the negotiations between you and
<b>13:58:31</b> 3		Walkinshaw?
13:58:424	A	Not to my recollection.
<b>13:58:41</b> 5	Q	I heard "not," and then I didn't hear what was after
13:58:486		that.
13:58:417	A	Not in my recollection.
13:58:5 <b>1</b> 8	Q	Can you give me a list of decisions made decisions
<b>13:59:13</b> 9		that you made on the 16th after the public meeting
<b>13:59:12</b> 0		concluded?
13:59:221		MR. WONG: Object to form.
13:59:222		THE WITNESS: I can't provide a
	1	

exclusive list of actions taken that -- in the early

13:59:323

13:59:531 I don't need an exclusive list. (By Ms. Mell) 0 13:59:562 need to know what you recall about the 16th after the 13:59:593 public meeting ended with respect to any decision you 14:00:044 made. Again, I'm not certain what in this case constitutes 14:00:15**5** Α 14:00:186 a decision or not. We had referenced previously the 14:00:21**7** conversation that Commissioner Walkinshaw and I had over the 9th congressional district and not 14:00:248 14:00:319 proceeding with any change to -- to the framework. 14:00:3**120** If you consider that a decision or not. I think 14:00:4**11** that's -- that's subjective. Let's break it down. Let's go piece by piece. 14:00:5702 0 14:00:5133 So when the public meeting -- I'll strike that. 14:00:594 Was it your decision to end the public meeting? 14:01:01.5 Α I don't believe so. 14:01:016 Did you -- was there a motion to affirm? 0 14:01:107 I mean, was there a motion to adjourn that you affirmed? 14:01:148 I don't recall. 14:01:1**19** Α 14:01:120 Do you know what your standard practice was with 0 14:01:221 regular business meetings? Would there be a motion 14:01:22.2 to adjourn? 14:01:223 My recollection is that the chair would just adjourn Α 14:01:3**24** the meeting.

Q

Okay.

14:01:325

- 14:01:341 A But I don't -- I don't recall in this instance.
- 14:01:372 Q Okay. So when the chair adjourned the meeting, you
- 14:01:413 made a decision to do something, correct?
- 14:01:464 MR. WONG: Object to form.
- 14:01:475 THE WITNESS: I did something
- 14:01:516 following the meeting.
- 14:01:557 Q (By Ms. Mell) And did you do that on your own
- 14:01:578 accord?
- 14:01:589 A Talking a little bit in -- we're a little vague right
- 14:02:010 here. I want to -- I guess I'm -- and I -- I'd said
- 14:02:121 that I -- you know, I think I went outside and got
- 14:02:112 some very, very cold fresh air. Those are decisions
- 14:02:213 I made immediately following the adjournment of the
- 14:02:214 meeting that I can recall.
- 14:02:295 Q And what did you do after getting some refreshing
- 14:02:326 | cold air?
- 14:02:317 A I don't know what immediately followed then.
- 14:02:458 | O What followed after you were outside?
- 14:02:519 A At one point I was in the event space that we
- 14:03:020 referred to before.
- 14:03:021 | Q Do you think you went from being outside to get fresh
- 14:03:022 air to the event room?
- 14:03:123 A I don't recall.
- 14:03:124 | Q Do you know why you went to the event room?
- 14:03:125 A There -- I think there was the -- the map

	rain, Jo	Page 12
14:03:361		reconciliation process, and I knew that there would
14:03:432		be individuals and and my staff would probably be
14:03:463		there, so I think it was a natural place to to go.
14:03:534	Q	When you got to the event room, who was in the event
<b>14:03:56</b> 5		room?
14:03:576	A	There were various people in and out of the event
14:04:027		room throughout the early hours of that day. I don't
14:04:058		know who was there at that exact time.
14:04:079	Q	When you arrived in the event room, were there any
14:04:110		other voting commissioners there?
14:04:1181	A	I don't recall.
<b>14:04:16</b> 2	Q	Was the chair there?
14:04:183	A	I believe she was there.
14:04:274	Q	Did you say anything to her?
14:04:3105	A	I did talk with the chair as well as other
14:04:5106		individuals from the time that the meeting ended to
14:04:5 <b>57</b>		the time that I left in the early hours of the
14:05:028		morning. So, yes, I did have conversations, and the
14:05:019		chair being one of them.
<b>14:05:02</b> 0	Q	What time did you leave the event room?
14:05:121	A	Sometime around 5, 5:30. I I don't know exactly,
14:05:122		but it was sometime in that ballpark.
<b>14:05:23</b> 3	Q	A.m.?
14:05:2 <b>24</b>	A	A.m., yes.

Do you know approximately when you got there?

**14:05:23**5

- 14:05:331 When I got to the event room or when I got to the Α 14:05:362 hotel? 14:05:363 The event room. Q 14:05:384 I don't recall. Again, sometime -- sometime after Α 14:05:455 midnight, obviously. 14:05:476 Before 1? 0 I would imagine, yes. 14:05:497 Α 14:05:518 Did you have pass cards to make your way around the 0 hotel? 14:06:029 14:06:010 Α Yes. 14:06:031 So you had to use a card to get into the event room? 0 I don't -- I don't recall if the event room -- yeah, 14:06:082 Α 14:06:213 the event room did have a lock on it. I remember 14:06:244 throughout the evening there was one or two times that I -- that it was closed, I believe. And I don't 14:06:25 14:06:236 think my key card opened it, or at least I never 14:06:317 tried to open it with my key card. There were other 14:06:3168 times when the event room door was just open. 14:06:409 So if you needed to get into the event room and the 0 14:06:420 door was closed, did you just ping your staffer 14:06:421 inside the room or knock on the door?
- 14:06:422 A I think I just -- I mean, I don't know if I had a 14:06:523 time that I needed to be in the event room when it 4:07:024 was closed. If it was closed and I came by, I 14:07:025 probably just kept going.

14:07:101 Did you have an opportunity to observe what Okay. 0 Chair Augustine was doing in the event room? 14:07:152 14:07:183 I spoke with her from time to time throughout -- and, Α 14:07:28**4** again, are we referring to after midnight or 14:07:325 throughout the day? 14:07:326 No, from the -- I just want to focus in this line of 0 14:07:357 questioning on the, I'm just going to call it a 12:30 to 5:30 time frame --14:07:428 14:07:449 Okay. Α 14:07:4**1**0 -- if that sounds like a fair approximation of when 0 14:07:451 you were in there. In the ballpark. 14:07:4**12** Α 14:07:483 Okay. Q I spoke with her a couple of times during that 14:07:4**9.4** Α 14:07:5**1.5** window. 14:07:5166 When you spoke with Chair Augustine, was your 0 14:08:0107 conversation limited to how your family was doing? 14:08:018 Α No. 14:08:159 What do you recall the topic of your conversations 14:08:120 with Chair Augustine during that 12:30 to 5:30 time 14:08:221 frame? I mean, we had a -- probably talked about a number of 14:08:2**22** Α 14:08:523 topics, including the status of -- of where the 14:09:0**24** redistricting process sat at that moment.

In each of your conversations with Chair Augustine,

Q

14:09:025

14:09:161 was anybody else within earshot?

### A I don't recall.

14:09:202

14:09:273

14:09:294

14:09:335

14:09:396

14:09:39**7** 

14:09:428

14:09:459

14:09:490

14:09:521

14:09:542

14:09:563

14:10:034

14:10:075

14:10:016

14:10:157

14:10:178

14:10:219

14:10:2**20** 

14:10:221

14:10:322

14:10:323

14:10:424

14:10:5**25** 

- 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.

- 14:10:511 | Q What next steps did you discuss?
- 14:10:562 A The context around this moment in time immediately
  14:11:063 following the meeting was certainly colored by the
  14:11:224 attorney general's or the deputy attorney general's
  14:11:265 e-mail with regards to jurisdiction of the
  14:11:316 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

14:11:327

14:11:348

14:11:369

14:11:370

14:11:411

14:11:412

14:11:473

14:12:0104

14:12:035

14:12:01/6

14:12:017

14:12:118

14:12:119

14:12:12:0

14:12:12:1

14:12:223

14:12:2**2**4

14:12:425

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."

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

14:14:123

14:14:124

14:14:12:5

14:12:421

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.

I think that that has MR. WONG: 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.

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

I think we're at the MS. MELL: point of, yes, let me ask the question again.

(By Ms. Mell) What was the content of your Q conversation with Chair Augustine about the attorney

14:14:171

14:14:20 2

14:14:213

14:14:294

14:14:315

14:14:346

14:14:387

14:14:398

14:14:439

14:14:450

14:14:491

14:14:50 2

14:14:523

14:14:544

14:14:5185

14:15:016

14:15:0**47** 

14:15:0188

14:15:129

14:15:120

14:15:121

14:15:222

14:15:22/3

14:15:224

14:15:225

14:15:31 | now had jurisdiction?

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:**121** 

14:16:072

14:16:093

14:16:104

14:16:115

14:16:**146** 

14:16:**1**67

14:16:**1**98

14:16:**129** 

14:16:**230** 

14:16:**271** 

14:16:**252** 

14:16:233

14:16:**274** 

14:16:215

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.

14:16:521 (By Ms. Mell) What did she say in response to your 0 comment that you had not finished the work of the 14:16:552 14:16:573 commission? 14:16:584 I don't recall. Α 14:17:055 And do I need to go through that whole litany of was 0 14:17:106 anyone else present, or just do your answers apply 14:17:127 similarly? I don't remember who or who wasn't. There was --14:17:128 Α again, to set the scene so that it's -- so that I'm 14:17:15**9** 14:17:1**10** not being unclear, there were times when there were 14:17:2**1.1** many people in the room. "Many" being, you know, of the dozen or so participants in -- in this. 14:17:2**12** But at 14:17:2**1.3** any given time, I couldn't tell you who was where or 14:17:3**14** anything like that. 14:17:375 And was any of what was happening in that room Q 14:17:416 recorded or conveyed publicly? 14:17:4**1.7** The maps were drawn and reconciled in that room, and Α those maps were released publicly. 14:17:5**18** How about the conversations? 14:17:579 0 14:17:520 I don't -- I don't have any knowledge of that. Α 14:18:121 Did you make the comment that now that the supreme 0 court had jurisdiction, OPMA did not apply or you 14:18:19.2 14:18:223 didn't need to worry about OPMA?

MR. WONG: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: I don't recall -- if

14:18:224

14:18:225

14:18:331 that was said or if that was something that I had 14:18:372 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.
- Q 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

LITIGATION SERVICES

14:18:383

14:18:414

14:18:465

14:18:496

14:18:557

14:18:598

14:19:039

14:19:0% O

14:19:141

14:19:182

14:19:273

14:19:314

14:19:325

14:19:4106

14:19:437

14:19:5768

14:20:019

14:20:020

14:20:121

14:20:232

14:20:223

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.

- Q (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 16th -- 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 16th that any of the decisions you did make didn't implicate OPMA because they were

14:20:421

14:20:442

14:20:453

14:20:48 4

14:20:565

14:21:026

14:21:06**7** 

14:21:098

14:21:129

14:21:190

14:21:2**11** 

14:21:3**1.2** 

14:21:4**11.3** 

14:21:5**1.4** 

14:21:5**18.5** 

14:22:0**16** 

14:22:0**17** 

14:22:0168

14:22:079

14:22:120

14:22:121

14:22:22.2

14:22:223

14:22:324

14:22:425

14:22:481 14:22:552 14:22:573 14:23:004 14:23:035 14:23:086 14:23:14**7** 14:23:248 14:23:269 14:23:280 14:23:311 14:23:332 14:23:383 14:23:42.4 14:23:495 14:23:496 14:23:567 14:24:038 14:24:019 14:24:120 14:24:121 14:24:22.2 14:24:2**23** 

14:24:2**24** 

14:24:325

0

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.

14:24:331 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 16th?
- 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

14:27:025

14:24:34 2

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 139
14:27:121		redistricting, and my my impression that they
14:27:142		weren't commenting on those factors.
<b>14:27:19</b> 3	Q	So would you agree that the supreme court has not
14:27:234		indicated to you that the actions of the commission
14:27:335		were consistent with open government standards?
14:27:396	A	I just don't feel comfortable speculating on a legal
14:27:567		conclusion like that.
14:28:008	Q	Okay. Let me ask it differently.
14:28:049		Do you feel like the supreme court has
<b>14:28:09</b> 0		communicated to you that open government standards
14:28:121		were met in your actions?
14:28:182	A	I don't recall any communications specifically
14:28:2103		referencing those that issue.
14:28:254	Q	Do you think that you met open government standards?
<b>14:28:3</b> 15		MR. WONG: Object to form.
14:28:3 <b>1</b> 6		THE WITNESS: In terms of and,
14:28:4 <b>17</b>		again, I I do not believe that I violated the Open
14:28:5 <b>1</b> 8		Public Meetings Act, if that's the question.
<b>14:28:5</b> 89	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Do you believe that you violated
<b>14:29:02</b> 0		commission rules specific to open government?
14:29:021		MR. WONG: Object to form.
14:29:022		THE WITNESS: Very particular rules
14:29:123		specifically that you're referencing?
14:29:124	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Taking action on a or acting on a

congressional or district plan privately.

**14:29:23**5

14:29:271	MR. WONG: Same objection.
14:29:28 <b>2</b>	THE WITNESS: I don't agree with
14:29:30 <b>3</b>	the characterization that it was acted upon
14:29:33 <b>4</b>	privately.
14:29:355	Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you take a secret vote?
14:29:38 <b>6</b>	A No.
14:29:397	Q Did you take a sham vote?
14:29:428	MR. WONG: Object to form.
14:29:43 <b>9</b>	THE WITNESS: I didn't hear what
14:29:4 <b>1.0</b>	that said.
14:29:451	Q (By Ms. Mell) Did you take a sham vote?
14:29:492	MR. WONG: Same objection.
14:29:5 <b>11.3</b>	THE WITNESS: We took a vote on a
14:29:5 <b>14</b>	framework agreement that was later translated into
14:29:5 <b>15</b>	maps at a time where the it was my belief that the
14:30:0 <b>16</b>	commission no longer had jurisdiction.
14:30:017	Q (By Ms. Mell) What is a secret vote to you?
14:30:158	MR. WONG: Object to form.
14:30:119	MS. MELL: I should say "mean" in
14:30:1 <b>2</b> 0	there.
14:30:1 <b>2</b> 1	Q (By Ms. Mell) What does "secret vote" mean to you?
	A Again, not wanting to comment or speculate to a legal
14:30:2 <b>22</b>	
14:30:2 <b>22</b> 14:30:3 <b>23</b>	standard, I will tell you that I avoided, you know,
	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

14:30:5**25** 

14:31:011 voting members prior to a vote in public. 14:31:082 Was there ever a point in time, to the best of your 0 14:31:133 knowledge, when at least three voting commissioners 14:31:164 knew your position prior to a vote in public on any 14:31:225 redistricting plan? 14:31:266 Not that I can recall. Α 14:31:367 MR. WONG: Joan, we've been going 14:31:378 about another hour and ten here. Do you mind taking 14:31:399 a short break? 14:31:400 MS. MELL: I don't. I usually go 14:31:411 for two hours before I take a break, so --14:31:442 MR. WONG: You have more stamina 14:31:453 than I do, then. We'll take 14:31:464 MS. MELL: That's fine. 14:31:475 a break. 14:31:526 (Pause in proceedings from 14:31:527 2:31 p.m. to 2:42 p.m.) 14:42:578 14:42:579 (By Ms. Mell) Training. What was your OPMA 0 14:43:020 training, if any? 14:43:021 The -- a deputy attorney general held a presentation Α 14:43:122 during one of the early commission meetings on the 14:43:123 OPMA. 14:43:124 Is that your complete training with respect to OPMA? 0

I was trying to remember if I had received any OPMA

Α

14:43:225

14:43:361 training, you know, years earlier when I was with the
14:43:442 King County Council, but I couldn't remember having
14:43:493 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.

- Q (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.

- Q 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

14:43:494

14:43:515

14:43:546

14:43:567

14:44:038

14:44:109

14:44:120

14:44:131

14:44:162

14:44:193

14:44:234

14:44:275

14:44:326

14:44:417

14:44:418

14:44:419

14:44:420

14:44:521

14:44:522

14:44:523

14:45:024

14:45:025

### 14:45:141 that was set now. 14:45:172 Suffice it to say, since that was -- since 0 Okav. 14:45:213 you -- strike that. 14:45:224 What were your thoughts on training when you 14:45:255 became a commissioner relative to open government? 14:45:326 Can you be more specific about what you're Α 14:45:367 necessarily asking? Did you have any knowledge that there was an 14:45:378 0 14:45:429 expectation that you receive OPMA training when you 14:45:490 became a commissioner? 14:45:5101 I -- let me phrase it that way. I mistakenly Α 14:46:012 believed that the requirement for training was 14:46:013 applied to local governments and that it -- and --14:46:124 and I didn't -- I didn't recall that that obligation was on state volunteer commissions as well. So if 14:46:175 14:46:286 that answers. 14:46:297 Did you ask for meetings to be held in Federal Way? Q 14:46:318 Not to my recollection. Α

14:46:369 Q 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.

Q (By Ms. Mell) Are you aware that there's any reference in the commission's rules as to where the

14:46:421

14:46:422

14:46:423

14:46:424

14:46:525

- 14:46:541 meetings should be convened?
- 14:46:562 A I don't recall.

14:47:015

14:47:176

14:47:21**7** 

14:47:238

14:47:269

14:47:2**1**0

14:47:3**1.1** 

14:47:4**1:2** 

14:47:4**13** 

14:47:5**1).4** 

14:48:015

14:48:016

14:48:0**17** 

14:48:0**18** 

14:48:0**19** 

14:48:0**20** 

14:48:121

14:48:12.2

14:48:223

14:48:2**24** 

14:48:425

- 14:46:573 Q Did you ever read the commission rules as a 14:47:014 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

14:48:571 still operated under the face mask -- had a "face I don't recall. 14:49:072 mask" sign up. 14:49:093 Is it correct that you -- the work done between 12:30 Q 14:49:134 and 5:30 in the event room was maskless? 14:49:185 MR. WONG: Object to form. 14:49:196 Again, I -- I don't THE WITNESS: recall. 14:49:267 14:49:268 (By Ms. Mell) Were your conversations with 0 14:49:349 Commissioner Graves maskless? 14:49:410 O I believe so. Α 14:49:411 Were your conversations with Commissioner Walkinshaw 0 14:49:482 maskless? 14:49:510.3 I don't recall each and every conversation, whether Α 14:49:594 it was maskless or not. Wouldn't want to guess. 14:50:055 Did you stay more than six feet away from any other 14:50:186 person during those negotiations? 14:50:207 MR. WONG: Object to form. 14:50:218 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't have -- I don't have a recollection of how much 14:50:319 14:50:320 distance was between individuals other than, in 14:50:421 general, we were all keeping more distance between 14:50:422 ourselves, even in casual conversation, these days. 14:50:523 (By Ms. Mell) How about when working with staff or Q 14:51:024 the maps?

Again, are we talking about the -- those two days in

Α

14:51:025

14:51:071 Federal Way or beyond that? 14:51:092 No, those days in Federal Way. 0 14:51:123 Again, I recall times when individuals were wearing Α 14:51:184 masks and times when they were not. 14:51:215 I was asking the distance requirement. 0 14:51:236 Between 12:30 and 5:30 on the 16th, when you were working with staff and Commissioner Walkinshaw on 14:51:277 14:51:308 finalizing the maps, were you at all times six feet 14:51:359 away from them? 14:51:370 Object to form. MR. WONG: 14:51:391 I -- I can't say with THE WITNESS: 14:51:472 all assurance that we were always six feet apart from 14:51:513 one another. 14:52:074 (By Ms. Mell) Did you have --0 14:52:015 Α 14:52:096 0 -- any markers? 17 THE REPORTER: Sorry, Joe. "From 18 one another, "what? 19 THE WITNESS: I think that was the 20 end of what I said. (By Ms. Mell) And then my question was: 21 Did you Q 14:52:122 have any markers? 14:52:123 Not in all of the spaces that we occupied during that Α 14:52:224 time.

Do you recall any markers in any of the space?

Q

14:52:225

	Fain, Jo	pe - January 12, 2022 Page 14
14:52:241	A	There may have been markers in the check-in area by
14:52:322		the lobby.
<b>14:52:45</b> 3	Q	Did we complete the exchange of information between
14:52:474		you and Chair Augustine with respect to the point in
<b>14:52:52</b> 5		time when you had the conversation over the supreme
14:52:556		court having jurisdiction?
14:52:577		Is there anything else you recall that we haven't
<b>14:52:59</b> 8		already discussed about that point, that
14:53:019		conversation?
14:53:0 <b>1</b> 0	A	Again, I'm sure there were multiple conversations
14:53:0181		throughout the evening on a variety of topics, so
14:53:11.2		I I can't I don't want to say that that was the
14:53:1133		entirety of the conversation.
14:53:1 <b>9</b> 4	Q	As you sit here today, can you think of any other
<b>14:53:23</b> 5		subjects you communicated on with Chair Augustine
<b>14:53:25</b> 6		between 12:30 and 5:30 on the 16th?
14:53:310.7	A	Again, I don't recall the timing, but I believe there
14:53:318		was a draft of a of a statement that would be
14:53:41.9		released by the commission floating around at some
14:53:420		time around there.
<b>14:53:42</b> 1	Q	That you discussed with Chair Augustine?
14:53:422	A	I don't know how much of that was discussed
14:53:523		one-on-one and how much of that was conversed over
14:53:5 <b>24</b>		e-mail. I actually don't remember.

Do you know whether or not the commissioners

**14:54:02**5

- collectively weighed in on that?
- 14:54:072 A I don't know what their input would have been if they
  14:54:113 had their own conversations with Chair Augustine.
  - Q What was your input to Chair Augustine?
- That we be definitive in that we did not meet the 14:54:17**5** Α 14:54:27**6** deadline and that the jurisdiction had been transferred to the court. But because we had reached 14:54:31**7** an agreement in principle, that we would continue --14:54:368 that we had continued our work to draft maps that we 14:54:419 14:54:4**%** O would then be submitting to the court for their 14:54:5**11** consideration amongst the other various individuals and organizations that would also likely be 14:54:5**12** 14:54:5**13** 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.

14:54:031

14:54:144

14:55:0164

14:55:095

14:55:1**16** 

14:55:1**17** 

14:55:1**18** 

14:55:2**1.9** 

14:55:220

14:55:221

14:55:32.2

14:55:323

14:55:324

14:55:425

Q Was a statement, a public statement communicated to you for purposes of approval?

14:55:491 There -- I believe there was a draft of a public Α statement that might have been circulating on the --14:55:522 14:55:553 would have been whatever that Tuesday morning is. And, again, I -- I don't recall as to the timing. 14:55:574 14:56:065 Did you approve the form that was submitted to the --0 14:56:106 I'm confusing them and conflating them. I'm sorry. 14:56:127 Did you approve the form of the press statement 14:56:158 or public statement that was publicized? I don't recall. 14:56:189 Α 14:56:190 Any other conversations with Chair Augustine that you 0 14:56:301 recall for the 12:30 to 5:30 time frame? 14:56:31.2 I can't recall -- I can't recall the content of any Α 14:56:5323 of the other conversations right now. I'm sure there 14:57:024 were some conversations of a personal nature as well. 14:57:045 Between 12:30 and 5:30, did you make a decision about Q 14:57:486 publication of the maps? 14:57:527 I guess I'll just say my position was I wanted the Α maps to become public when they were -- when 14:58:128 commission staff had completed their work. 14:58:159 14:58:120 How did you know when commission staff completed 0 14:58:221 their work? 14:58:222 I was gone by the time that occurred. So I don't Α 14:58:323 remember exactly what form it took. I might have 14:58:324 received an e-mail from Lisa later in the day with

files attached. I don't recall.

14:58:325

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 14:58:401 Was it your position that the commission staff would 0 14:58:452 have completed its work after you approved the 14:58:473 version of the map presented to you by staff? 14:58:514 Object to form. MR. WONG: 14:58:52**5** THE WITNESS: I don't think I 14:58:55**6** anticipated additional involvement at that stage. 14:59:007 Q (By Ms. Mell) To be clear, you did not anticipate 14:59:088 any further involvement at what stage? Once the commission staff had the shape files, I 14:59:099 Α 14:59:1**1.0** didn't -- I didn't anticipate being reached out to 14:59:2**11** for further feedback. 14:59:252 So explain to me your involvement in getting to the 0 14:59:3103 shape files. Were you making choices -- strike that. 14:59:364 When the staff at -- how did you know when the 14:59:445 staff's shape files were complete? 14:59:416 Α

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.

15:00:5**25** 

15:00:561 Q Had you looked at any configuration of the legislative map between 12:30 and 5:30?

15:01:153 A During their drafting of a few of the dist

15:01:24**4** 

15:01:29**5** 

15:01:36**6** 

15:01:387

15:01:428

15:01:499

15:01:550

15:02:0**11** 

15:02:2**1.2** 

15:02:3**43** 

15:02:3**24** 

15:02:4**4.5** 

15:02:4**3.6** 

15:02:497

15:02:528

15:02:599

15:03:020

15:03:021

15:03:122

15:03:123

15:03:224

15:03:225

- 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?

LITIGATION SERVICES

- 15:03:271 I don't recall that, no. I should say, I don't Α 15:03:332 recall that being the case, no.
  - When you left, did you have any expectation that you Q would see a legislative map and look at it to ascertain whether or not it reflected what you thought you voted on?
  - Α I don't recall that being the case.
  - Did you -- when you left, was Commissioner Walkinshaw 0 still there?
- 15:04:010O I don't recall. Α

15:03:363

15:03:394

15:03:455

15:03:476

15:03:487

15:03:548

15:03:599

15:04:111

15:04:152

15:04:213

15:04:254

15:04:23 5

15:04:326

15:04:327

15:04:408

15:04:439

15:04:420

15:04:521

15:04:522

15:05:023

15:05:124

15:05:125

And let me get the context of my leaving. 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 Q matter at that point?

> Object to form. MR. WONG:

I was in the mind set THE WITNESS: 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

- 15:05:241 commission that didn't have jurisdiction any longer but that -- but I still, you know, believed that it --15:05:272 15:05:293 that it was important.
  - (By Ms. Mell) Who was doing the mapping? 0
- 15:05:375 Can you refresh me on the -- the name of Commissioner Α 15:05:546 Sims' staff person?
  - Q Sims' staff person? No.
- 15:06:018 Campos? No?
- 15:06:039 Commission -- so Campos was doing drafting on the --Α 15:06:1**1**0 on the congressional map along with, I believe Ali 15:06:111 from Brady's staff. And I think Anton was doing drafting on the legislative map along with --15:06:212
- **15:06:24**3 Osta? Q

15:05:334

15:05:557

15:06:347

15:06:518

15:06:549

15:07:020

15:07:121

15:07:122

15:07:123

15:07:124

15:07:125

- 15:06:254 Osta, yeah. Α
- **15:06:27**5 Okay. So how did the staff know what the framework 15:06:356 was?
  - The staff had probably been involved in as many Α conversations about the maps as the -- as the members 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.

Were you commissioners there so that you could answer Q

15:07:251 15:07:26**2** 15:07:32**3** 15:07:384 15:07:445 15:07:486 15:07:51**7** 15:08:028 15:08:05**9** 15:08:1**10** 15:08:1**1.1** 15:08:2**1** 2 15:08:2**4.3** 15:08:2**9.4** 15:08:3**1.5** 15:08:3**16** 15:08:31/27 15:08:428 15:08:41/9 15:08:420 15:08:4**21** 

15:08:5**22** 

15:08:5**23** 

15:09:0**24** 

15:09:0**25** 

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 9th 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

- 15:09:111 maps, and nothing is -- I don't recall. I don't 15:09:182 recall.
- 15:09:193 Q (By Ms. Mell) Do you have any reason to believe that
  15:09:244 Ali O'Neil's account of the events during that time
  15:09:275 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?
- 15:09:411 A Yes. But it's been -- yes, I have. I think I -- I
  15:09:412 think I -- I think I've reviewed it recently as well,
  15:09:513 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.

15:09:286

15:09:297

15:09:368

15:09:439

15:09:440

15:10:024

15:10:055

15:10:446

15:10:467

**15:11:04**8

15:11:079

15:11:120

15:11:121

15:11:122

15:11:423

15:11:424

MR. WONG: Joe, are you able to see it on your screen, or are you waiting for her to share screen?

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 15
15:11:471		THE WITNESS: I'm waiting for her
15:11:482		to share screen.
<b>15:12:09</b> 3		MS. MELL: Here we go.
15:12:104	Q	(By Ms. Mell) You good?
15:12:115	A	Yep.
<b>15:12:12</b> 6	Q	Okay. Just tell me your pace, if you want to just
15:12:157		say "'kay, 'kay" or whatever, however you want to
15:12:208		communicate, "scroll, scroll, scroll."
15:12:309	A	Is there a specific question that you have about any
15:12:320		of the statements?
15:12:31 <sup>1</sup>	Q	I'm wanting to know if you disagree with her
<b>15:12:37</b> 2		representations in this memo in any regard.
15:12:413	A	I probably more helpful to be able to highlight a
15:12:514		specific contention and then discuss that. I don't
15:12:5 <b>1</b> 5		want to
<b>15:12:5</b> €6	Q	You don't want to just go through? Okay.
15:13:0 <b>1</b> 07	A	Well, I don't want to be in a situation where I don't
15:13:0 <b>1</b> 8		object to something that's said because I missed it
15:13:019		as I'm trying to read through here and that's
15:13:020		interpreted as me
15:13:0 <b>2</b> 1	Q	Okay.
15:13:0 <b>2</b> 2	A	agreeing to it, so
<b>15:13:12</b> 3	Q	Okay. I don't think there's any dispute that you
15:13:12:4		agree there were no congressional or legislative maps
	1	

voted on at the eleventh-hour vote on Monday,

**15:13:12**5

15:13:211 November 15th? That's correct. 15:13:21**2** Α 15:13:213 Undisputed. Q 15:13:224 You don't dispute that they were not finalized at 15:13:265 the time of the vote? 15:13:28**6** That's correct. Α 15:13:287 Q Is it correct that the vote was simply an agreement 15:13:338 on political metrics in the maps with perhaps one or 15:13:369 two geographic specifics? 15:13:3**1**.0 I don't know about the use of the term "one or two," Α 15:13:4**1.1** but as I've characterized it before, the vote was an agreement on a framework that involved communities of 15:13:4**3**2 15:13:5**13** interests, political metrics, and some geographic 15:13:5**14** boundaries. 15:13:5**15** So I don't wish -- I don't want to quibble about it, but that's -- I want to make sure how I phrased 15:13:5**1**6 15:14:0**17** it. Do you believe it is correct that her team was told 15:14:018 0 15:14:01/9 that the new maps would be drawn to fit the agreement 15:14:120 on political metrics prior to the vote? 15:14:121 MR. WONG: Object to form. 15:14:1**22** THE WITNESS: Can you highlight 15:14:1**23** what area you're referring to? 15:14:224 MS. MELL: She says, "My

understanding what our team was told is that the new

15:14:225

15:14:241 maps would be drawn to fit the agreement on political 15:14:27.2 metrics." 15:14:31**3** THE WITNESS: I can't comment on 15:14:32**4** what her understanding was. I can tell you that the 15:14:35**5** framework agreement did involve political metrics. 15:14:426 (By Ms. Mell) Did you communicate to staff that 15:14:447 there was an agreement on political metrics that would be mapped out after the vote? 15:14:518 I think we've kind of asked and answered that one. 15:14:53**9** Α 15:14:5**16.0** We've established that the mapping took place after 15:14:5**%**1 the vote and that components of that involve 15:15:0**12** political metrics. 15:15:023 Do you agree that all commissioners would be able to Q 15:15:094 review and give final sign-off on those maps prior to any transmittal? 15:15:165 15:15:1**16** That was not my understanding. Α 15:15:127 Did you hear anyone discuss that? Q I don't recall. 15:15:2**1).8** Α Do you have any recollection of Commissioner 15:15:229 15:15:320 Walkinshaw taking the position that he -- his vote 15:15:321 was conditional on review of the final maps? I don't recall hearing him say that. 15:15:3**22** Α 15:15:323 Was your vote conditioned on being able to give final 0 15:15:424 approval on maps?

15:15:511 and that's not what happened. Best of my 15:15:542 recollection. Did you ever tell staff that the commissioners would 15:15:553 Q have the opportunity to review and provide final 15:16:064 **15:16:09**5 approval of the maps before they were transmitted? 15:16:116 I don't recall. Α 15:16:137 Q Were you involved in any -- strike that. 15:16:218 Is it correct that before there was any public 15:16:279 communication of the maps, that the commissioners 15:16:290 would have an opportunity to review them? 15:16:3**1** Again, I don't -- I don't recall. I don't -- I don't Α believe I've reviewed the maps from the commission 15:16:432 15:16:473 staff prior to them being made public. But, again, I 15:16:514 don't recall specifically. **15:16:51**5 And you certainly weren't upset about that, because Q 15:16:586 you didn't believe that that was an agreement? 15:17:0107 I don't recall that being an agreement. Α 15:17:038 Do you remember a conversation about taking down the 15:17:099 congressional map from the website? 15:17:120 Are you referencing something in writing here? Α 15:17:121 I'm looking at you. No. No. 0 I don't -- I don't think I remember anything 15:17:222 Oh. Α 15:17:223 like that.

15:17:324

15:17:325

		e · January 12, 2022
15:17:361		discussion between the 12:30 and certainly between
15:17:392		the 12:30 and later time frame that the congressional
15:17:453		map had been published and the commissioners didn't
15:17:484		want that publication at that point in time. And
15:17:515		they asked to have it taken down.
15:17:55 <b>6</b>	A	I again, operating on very little sleep and with a
15:18:02 <b>7</b>		big event coming up ahead of me, I I don't recall
15:18:06 <b>8</b>		that at this time.
15:18:219	Q	That next paragraph, she seems to be timing when
15:18:310		draft legislative maps were made available.
15:18:3 <b>1</b> 1		Do you have any knowledge that her statement
15:18:312		there would be incorrect?
15:18:3 <b>1.3</b>	A	Are you referring to the paragraph starting, "While
15:18:4 <b>1.4</b>		Commissioner Walkinshaw"?
15:18:43/5	Q	Correct.
15:18:416		MR. WONG: Object to form.
15:18:4 <b>1.7</b>		THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you repeat
15:18:5 <b>188</b>		your question again?
	1	
15:18:599	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Did you share maps with any staff,
15:18:5 <b>½</b> 9 15:19:0 <b>2</b> 0	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Did you share maps with any staff, legislative maps with staff prior to 10:48 on Monday,
	Q	
15:19:020	Q <b>A</b>	legislative maps with staff prior to 10:48 on Monday,
15:19:0 <b>2</b> 0 15:19:2 <b>2</b> 1		legislative maps with staff prior to 10:48 on Monday, since the time of the meeting?

substantive mapping discussion about certain

15:19:325

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

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 16th?
- 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?

LITIGATION SERVICES

15:21:225

15:20:03**7** 

15:20:168

15:20:239

15:20:250

15:20:3**11** 

15:21:331		MR. WONG: Object to form.					
15:21:35 <b>2</b>		THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm actually					
15:21:36 <b>3</b>		confused by the question.					
15:21:414	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Was there an impasse in the					
15:21:435		negotiations at any time because you weren't					
15:21:466		negotiating around partisanship numbers?					
15:21:49 <b>7</b>	A	Again, is this referencing a particular part of her					
15:21:53 <b>8</b>		statement here so that I can?					
15:21:569	Q	Well, not really. I'm creating					
15:21:5 <b>% 0</b>	A	Oh, okay.					
15:22:011	Q	based					
15:22:0 <b>12</b>	A	Oh, I apologize.					
15:22:013	Q	on what I understand her to be saying.					
15:22:014		But the statement here is, "Commissioner Sims					
15:22:01/5		told us repeatedly throughout the final days that she					
15:22:016		wanted to finalize the negotiations around					
15:22:117		partisanship numbers before moving to any mapping."					
15:22:1 <b>1</b> 8		Was it your observation that there were					
15:22:169		negotiations around partisanship numbers before					
15:22:1 <b>2</b> 0		moving to any mapping?					
15:22:2 <b>21</b>	A	There was both again, there was both mapping work					
15:22:3 <b>22</b>		regularly being done and discussion over partisan					
15:22:4 <b>23</b>		performance regularly happening throughout this					
15:22:4 <b>24</b>		throughout this entire process.					
	I						

Q Was there a point in time where there was an impasse

15:22:425

15:22:531 reached because the negotiations around partisanship numbers had not been finalized? 15:22:582 15:23:02**3** The time that I referenced previously where I Α suggested that Chair Augustine consider a mediator's 15:23:06**4** 15:23:12**5** proposal could fit that description. 15:23:266 Do you have any personal knowledge about whether or 15:23:287 not the SDC team -- I'm assuming that's Senate 15:23:348 Democratic Caucus team -- were forced to compromise 15:23:379 on stated priorities and at this -- and at times 15:23:410 disregard what was shared with the commission during 15:23:41/1 the months of gathering public input when finalizing 15:23:48 2 the maps? 15:23:4**1**.3 The commission received thousands of pieces of input, Α 15:23:5**14** many of which were contradictory with one another. 15:24:0**15** So by definition, the final maps would have to --15:24:1**16** would have to favor some input over others in order 15:24:1**4.7** to -- in order to complete the work. So I guess I'm 15:24:2**18** a little confused at that statement. 15:24:259 Sounds like you -- it sounds like you agree that it Q 15:24:220 happened, but you're not necessarily certain that 15:24:3**2**1 that was to be unexpected? 15:24:32.2 MR. WONG: Object to form. 15:24:3**23** I would say that THE WITNESS: 15:24:4**24** every -- again, not speaking for other participants.

Because I as a participant in the process went into

15:24:5**25** 

15:24:561 the process assuming that I wasn't going to get everything I wanted and that folks who came to 15:24:592 15:25:043 testify before the commission were going to have people who disagreed with them, and by definition, 15:25:064 15:25:115 they wouldn't all get what they wanted either, which 15:25:146 I think is the nature of governing in this case. So 15:25:177 I'm -- I don't see much in that statement that's 15:25:218 surprising. 15:25:229 Did Ali O'Neil repeatedly voice her (By Ms. Mell) 0

- 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.

LITIGATION SERVICES

Q (By Ms. Mell) Were you aware that there were offers exchanged via text message and in-person meetings?

15:25:549

15:25:520

15:26:021

15:25:260

15:25:281

15:25:31 2

15:25:313

15:25:384

**15:25:41**5

15:26:421 Is there a specific passage that you're referring to Α there?

> There have been various concepts and proposals that have been shared at each stage of this process, and sometimes those included maps.

Would you agree that proposals were being exchanged in person and via text message on both of the maps among the voting commissioners?

> Object to form. MR. WONG:

Say there were THE WITNESS: 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.

- (By Ms. Mell) And among -- and between dyads, 0 correct?
- I don't know what would -- what -- I can't speak to Α 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 Q

15:26:442

15:26:553

15:26:594

15:27:025

15:27:106

15:27:177

15:27:238

15:27:259

15:27:210

15:27:351

15:27:38.2

15:27:453

15:27:474

15:27:515

15:27:516

15:27:587

15:27:588

15:28:019

15:28:020

15:28:021

15:28:122

15:28:223

15:28:224

15:28:225

15:28:331 proposal you had as mediator with Commissioner 15:28:37.2 Augustine would be that she would convey the 15:28:413 negotiation terms between the commissioners? 15:28:454 Object to form. MR. WONG: 15:28:47**5** THE WITNESS: No, I don't -- I 15:28:50**6** don't -- I don't -- wouldn't characterize that -- I 15:28:54**7** wouldn't say that characterization is accurate. I've said previously, I had approached Commissioner 15:28:56**8** Augustine to see if she would be willing to offer 15:28:59**9** 15:29:0**1:0** mediator proposal on one of the items that seemed to 15:29:0**9.1** me part of the conversation that had led to limited progress if she had agreed to do so. 15:29:1**1.2** 15:29:2**13** At that point, I believe she met with 15:29:2**1.4** Commissioner Graves and Commissioner Sims, but I wasn't involved in that --15:29:2**1.5** 15:29:296 (By Ms. Mell) And Graves --0 15:29:297 THE REPORTER: "I wasn't involved..."? Sorry? 15:29:298 15:29:2**19** I wasn't involved THE WITNESS: 15:29:3**20** with that beyond that point -- sorry -- is how I 15:29:3**21** finished. So in terms of your understanding of 15:29:39.2 (By Ms. Mell) 0 15:29:423 Augustine's mediation tactics, was she mediating 15:29:424 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

15:29:525

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

15:29:541

15:30:002

15:30:033

15:30:04**4** 

15:30:09**5** 

15:30:18**6** 

15:30:22**7** 

15:30:258

15:30:28**9** 

15:30:3**1.0** 

15:30:4**1.1** 

15:30:44 2

15:30:473

15:30:514

15:30:575

15:31:0**16** 

15:31:0**1.7** 

15:31:1**1.8** 

15:31:1**19** 

15:31:1**20** 

15:31:2**21** 

15:31:3**22** 

15:31:3**23** 

15:31:32:4

15:31:3**25** 

15:31:391 then my involvement in that ended there. 15:31:43 2 Okav. And I just want to understand what you know 0 **15:31:45**3 about who she was doing the mediator's proposal with. 15:31:494 Who was Chair Augustine doing the mediator's **15:31:56**5 proposal with? Who was she communicating her 15:31:596 proposal to? I believe she communicated it to Commissioners Sims 15:32:007 Α 15:32:038 and Graves. 15:32:069 And then did she communicate it back to you? 0 15:32:100 I don't recall her talking to me about it, no. Α 15:32:121 Do you remember Graves talking to you about it? 0 15:32:162 I believe he mentioned it, yes. Α **15:32:22**3 And you don't know what Sims and Walkinshaw Okay. Q 15:32:274 talked about? 15:32:285 Α I don't. 15:32:296 Okay. So that's pretty consistent with -- her last 15:32:407 bullet on Page 2 is consistent with what you're 15:32:438 saying, correct? 15:32:419 Α No. 15:32:420 Did you say "yes" or -- did you say "no"? 0 15:32:421 Yeah, the -- what it reads here is Commissioner Α Augustine conveyed a proposal on behalf of the 15:32:522 15:32:523 Republicans on partisan metrics to Commissioner Sims, 15:32:524 but it was rejected.

I don't -- this was -- again, my understanding,

15:33:025

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.
- Q 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

15:34:220

15:34:221

15:34:222

15:34:323

15:34:424

15:34:425

15:33:287

15:33:308

15:33:389

15:33:400

15:33:431

15:33:46 2

**15:33:49**3

15:34:501		plan	as	being	both	a c	ong	res	ssiona	al a	and	legis	lative
15:34:532		map.											
<b>15:34:53</b> 3	0	Did y	70u	change	your	mi	nd	on	that	at	any	time	prior

- Did you change your mind on that at any time prior to your vote?
- Sorry. I'm a little, again, unclear about the question.

## I changed my mind about what exactly?

- Whether or not the statutory requirement that you 0 adopt a plan meant both a congressional and a legislative district.
- Again, my recollection is later in the process, I Α settled on the belief that -- that both were required and that I wasn't prepared to do one without the other.
- And I think what I'm asking is, did you maintain that Q position through the time of the vote?
- I -- again, I -- I don't necessarily -- so I don't Α 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

ITIGATION SERVICES

253.627.6401

15:34:574

15:35:035

15:35:146

15:35:147

15:35:178

15:35:219

15:35:230

15:35:211

15:35:312

15:35:313.3

15:35:4**7**4

**15:35:48**5

15:35:516

15:35:5**2**7

15:36:118

15:36:310.9

15:36:320

15:36:321

15:36:581 care of -- of one map that might be important to some 15:37:042 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.
- 15:38:013 | Q She didn't invite a vote on a plan, correct?
- 15:38:014 A That's correct.

15:37:053

15:37:114

15:37:185

15:37:216

15:37:277

15:37:318

15:37:359

15:37:440

15:37:511

15:38:010.2

15:38:197

15:38:424

15:38:525

- 15:38:015 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.
- 15:38:218 Q Do you remember any conversation about how the action 15:38:219 items should move through the process?
- 15:38:220 A I don't recall.
- 15:38:321 Q Whether they should be individualized or consolidated into a plan?
- 15:38:323 A I don't recall.

Again, this was a very chaotic time, and there was certainly nothing scripted about how the voting

	Fain, Jo	pe - January 12, 2022 Page 17
15:38:551		process took place.
<b>15:38:58</b> 2	Q	Do you recall a strategy being deployed to break the
<b>15:39:02</b> 3		impasse in the late hours of the 15th?
15:39:064	A	I don't recall that.
<b>15:39:24</b> 5	Q	Do you have a recollection of why you were at the
15:39:266		do you have any recollection about any events that
15:39:297		preceded moving into the action item that would
<b>15:39:34</b> 8		explain the timing of moving into the action item of
<b>15:39:40</b> 9		the agenda?
15:39:410	A	Again, I I don't recall the chronology as how
15:39:5 <b>1</b> 1		things came together at that time.
<b>15:39:56</b> 2	Q	Do you recall any last-minute deals or negotiations,
<b>15:40:01</b> 3		compromises?
15:40:024	A	Again, I as I previously said, Commissioner Graves
15:40:015		had relayed to me the substance of the con the
15:40:116		last conversation that he had with Commissioner Sims
15:40:1 <b>17</b> 7		and
15:40:188	Q	Did you
15:40:1 <b>19</b> 9	A	Go ahead.
15:40:220	Q	And then did you do the same with respect to the
<b>15:40:22</b> 1		congressional district plan you'd been negotiating?
<b>15:40:22</b> 2		You shared that with Graves?
15:40:323	A	I believe so.
15:40:324	Q	And at the time that conversation occurred, was it

**15:40:42**5

moments before midnight?

- 15:40:421 A I don't remember what time that was.
- 15:40:442 Q Did you feel a sense of urgency at the time you were
- 15:40:483 | communicating with Graves?
- 15:40:504 A I can say I felt a sense of urgency throughout the
- 15:40:585 entire evening and a sense of exhaustion and urgency
- 15:41:056 as the time approached midnight.
- 15:41:077 | Q Was there an agreement on when a plan needed to be
- 15:41:158 submitted in order to take a vote or a proposal even
- 15:41:189 needed to be submitted before taking a vote -- in
- 15:41:210 order to take a vote?
- 15:41:211 A Can you re-ask the question for me? I want to make
- 15:41:212 sure I understand what you're saying.
- 15:41:273 | Q Did you have an understanding that there was a
- 15:41:314 deadline set to complete your negotiations by 5:00 on
- 15:41:365 the 15th?
- 15:41:316 A I don't know of any specific time. I know that there
- 15:41:417 was some conversation from staff that -- that they
- 15:41:518 needed a certain amount of time in order to go
- 15:41:519 through that process that I described earlier to put
- 15:42:020 a shape file into a final -- into the final format
- 15:42:021 that some of commission staff believed it needed to
- 15:42:122 be in.
- 15:42:123 | Q Did you ever participate in any conversations about
- 15:42:124 changing that time?
- 15:42:125 A I don't -- I don't know if it was -- I don't think it

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?
- 15:44:022 A No, I don't recall that. Again, I don't --
- 15:44:023 | Q Did you --
- 15:44:024 A Go ahead.

15:42:281

15:42:352

15:42:373

15:42:404

15:42:425

15:42:526

15:42:557

15:43:018

15:43:059

15:43:100

15:43:131

15:43:152

**15:43:21** 3

15:43:224

15:43:245

15:43:216

15:43:287

15:43:468

15:43:489

15:43:520

15:44:021

15:44:025 Q Did you attend a meeting scheduled by Justin Bennett

- 15:44:101 or an invite to a meeting? Did you accept an invite 15:44:12.2 to a meeting by Justin Bennett? 15:44:15**3** I don't recall -- I don't recall that meeting invite. Α 15:44:20 **4** I'm not saying I didn't receive it. I just don't 15:44:23**5** recall it. 15:44:236 Was there --0 15:44:25**7** Α What was that? 15:44:268 Was there a final map verification meeting? 0 I don't know. Again, the -- wasn't -- I didn't 15:44:30**9** Α 15:44:3**160** participate in any meeting like that, and I don't 15:44:3**91** believe I talked with Justin Bennett at any point 15:44:4**12** during the process. 15:44:463 If Ali O'Neil witnessed one commissioner pass by two Q 15:45:0104 other commissioners who were discussing something in 15:45:015 the hallway, do you have any reason to believe that 15:45:016 one of those three was you? 15:45:1**1.7** Again, I don't -- I don't know what she is alleging Α 15:45:1**168** there. Walking through the hallway doesn't seem ... 15:45:279 Certainly you were in the hallway, talking with --Q 15:45:2**20** Yeah. Α
- 15:45:221 Q -- other commissioners at times. I think you've said
  15:45:322 that, right?

  That Is correct. Yeah. And if a -- again in a
- 15:45:323 A That's correct. Yeah. And if a -- again, in a
  15:45:324 situation, again, not referencing what she may or may
  15:45:325 not be referencing there, so I don't know what she

15:45:411 did or did not see. But if -- I do recall being in the hallway where I was talking with a commissioner 15:45:442 15:45:463 and if another commissioner came within earshot or that that commissioner immediately turned around or, 15:45:524 15:45:575 you know, the conversation was stopped until that 15:45:596 commissioner had gotten where they needed to go so that we would continue to avoid having three voting 15:46:047 15:46:088 commissioners in any conversation.

- Did you ever get instruction to join the public 0 meeting more frequently and give more detailed updates on what you were discussing?
- I'm waiting for my counsel on that one. Α

MS. MELL: Oh.

Yeah, I mean, I'll MR. WONG: 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.

Yeah, I quess I'm THE WITNESS: 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

15:46:099

15:46:240

15:46:261

15:46:232

**15:46:41** 3

15:46:434

**15:46:44** 5

15:46:476

15:46:497

15:46:518

15:47:019

15:47:020

15:47:021

15:47:022

**15:47:12** 3

15:47:211 anyone other than legal counsel to join the public 15:47:242 meeting more frequently and give more detailed 15:47:273 updates on what you were discussing? 15:47:294 MR. WONG: You can answer that 15:47:315 question. 15:47:316 THE WITNESS: If my knowledge was -- okay. 15:47:36**7** Yeah, I would -- I would still see -- I would 15:47:5**38** 15:47:56**9** still see this communication as attorney-client 15:47:**180** privilege, myself. And so, but again, I may be 15:48:**121** misinterpreting things. So, Joe, I think the 15:48:032 MR. WONG: 15:48:043 question is a yes-or-no question that was asked is --15:48:**144** THE WITNESS: Okay. 15:48:045 MR. WONG: -- how I --15:48:**146** THE WITNESS: Okay. 15:48:047 THE REPORTER: "Is how I," what? A yes-or-no question as 15:48:118 MR. WONG: 15:48:119 I heard it asked. And certainly Ms. Mell can correct me if that's incorrect. But I think she was framing 15:48:250 it very carefully, and I heard it as a yes-or-no 15:48:271 15:48:202 question. 15:48:203 THE WITNESS: Okay. 15:48:214 MR. WONG: That's something you

If you want to read it back, John,

could answer.

15:48:225

15:48:241 perhaps that may be helpful. 15:48:242 (Pertinent question read by 15:48:243 the reporter.) 15:49:104 15:49:10**5** THE WITNESS: Yes. (By Ms. Mell) Who was that? 15:49:116 15:49:147 MR. WONG: You can answer this 15:49:158 question too as to who it was. Commissioner 15:49:17**9** THE WITNESS: 15:49:1**10** Augustine. 15:49:191 (By Ms. Mell) How did you respond to her 0 instruction? 15:49:21.2 15:49:2**13** I had been -- I had been in my -- in the public Α 15:49:4**1.4** sessions, already attempting to communicate about the 15:49:5**12.5** issues that seem to be a part of -- about the overall 15:50:1**16** redistricting -- the redistricting issues that 15:50:1**4.7** were -- that seem to be pertinent, and so there's a -- I think a number of times on different meetings, 15:50:2**18** 15:50:2**19** I don't remember exactly where I either refer to 15:50:2**20** different parts of the state or asked questions about 15:50:3**21** different elements of the -- of the negotiation. 15:50:322 So I heard your answer to be that you felt like you 0 15:50:42:3 had already been sharing. 15:50:4**2**4 So did you do anything differently after your

conversation with Chair Augustine?

15:50:525

15:50:531 I think I just continued to have open conversations Α in the -- in the live meeting on some of the 15:51:112 15:51:183 substantive issues that were part of the process. 15:51:234 Did you ever share with the public that there had 0 15:51:435 been a framework reached -- a proposed framework 15:51:496 reached? Sorry. Could you repeat the question? 15:51:537 Α Did you ever communicate to the public that there had 15:51:558 15:51:579 been a proposed framework reached prior to the action 15:52:010 portion of the meeting? 15:52:021 No, I don't believe so. I don't believe there was Α a -- there wasn't an agreement -- there wasn't an 15:52:132 15:52:19.3 agreement reached prior to the meeting because there 15:52:224 hadn't been communication between the members. Ι 15:52:245 didn't know what the members would be on the 15:52:216 proposal. 15:52:277 But there was a framework in existence prior to the Q 15:52:318 action portion of the agenda for both the 15:52:359 congressional and legislative districts, correct? 15:52:320 There was a framework that was communicated to me, Α 15:52:421 yes, but I don't know who -- I don't know which of the commissioners, what their level of support for 15:52:422 15:52:423 various -- there was a lot of frameworks that were 15:52:524 generated during these -- during this lengthy

11-month process or ten-month process, and I didn't

15:52:525

know if this was a framework that had enough support to be adopted.

Right. Q

15:52:581

15:53:042

15:53:063

15:53:074

**15:53:09**5

15:53:196

15:53:207

15:53:238

15:53:269

15:53:290

15:53:311

15:53:40.2

15:53:43.3

15:53:5**1**0.4

15:53:5**4**5

15:53:526

15:54:017

15:54:0168

15:54:109

15:54:120

15:54:221

15:54:322

**15:54:32**3

15:54:324

15:54:425

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.

I would distinguish THE WITNESS: 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.

In terms of -- well, how to parse (By Ms. Mell) Q 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?

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.

15:54:501

15:54:552

15:55:013

15:55:084

15:55:145

15:55:206

15:55:237

15:55:298

15:55:359

15:55:410

15:55:461

15:55:510.2

**15:55:52**3

15:55:564

15:55:515

15:55:586

15:56:017

15:56:068

15:56:019

15:56:120

15:56:221

15:56:27.2

**15:56:32**3

15:56:324

15:56:325

- 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.

15:56:401 And to the best of your knowledge, you and Okay. 0 Graves had a common understanding of frameworks going 15:56:492 15:56:593 into the action portion of the meeting? 15:57:03**4** To the best of my knowledge, I had -- I understood Α 15:57:10**5** what the proposed framework was. 15:57:136 And was it your expectation that the same kind of conversation had happened between the Democrats as 15:57:207 15:57:248 occurred between you and Graves? 15:57:25**9** I had no expectation about any communications that I Α 15:57:2**10** wasn't a party to. Do you have reason to believe that the same kind of 15:57:321 Q conversation occurred between Sims and Walkinshaw? 15:57:39 2 15:57:4**1**.3 Again, I don't mean to be difficult, but I don't want Α 15:57:5**1.4** to speculate on something that I wasn't witness to. I did witness them have a conversation in and 15:57:5**12.5** 15:58:0**16** around this late time period but not one that I was 15:58:0**1** 7 able to hear or was a party to. 15:58:118 Okay. So where did you observe that conversation 0 15:58:11/9 occur? 15:58:120 I believe there's a reference to it in her document Α 15:58:2**21** where she said she believes it was Senator Fain or --"Senator," excuse me -- Commissioner Fain that 15:58:2**22** 15:58:323 communicated down from the second floor. So I -- it 15:58:4**24** would have been later than that.

Q

Keep going.

15:58:425

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

15:58:551

15:58:572

15:59:043

15:59:064

15:59:075

15:59:106

15:59:147

15:59:198

15:59:249

15:59:320

15:59:341

15:59:40.2

15:59:423

15:59:45.4

15:59:485

15:59:516

16:00:047

16:00:088

16:00:129

16:00:120

16:00:121

16:00:222

16:00:233

16:00:324

16:00:325

	airi, oc	rage 10-
16:00:411		chair was what how the chair was going to
16:00:452		proceed once we were all on the call. And, you know,
16:00:513		obviously we did not have actual maps in front of us.
16:01:034	Q	So you did know, moving into the action portion of
<b>16:01:06</b> 5		the agenda, that if you were taking a vote on
16:01:086		anything, it would be in concept, not with actual
16:01:107		maps?
16:01:118	A	Yes. In the framework. We use a number of different
16:01:219		words. I don't want to use a lot of words to
16:01:220		describe it. It was a
11	Q	It was the extent
12	A	framework proposal.
13	Q	of it?
14		THE REPORTER: "It was a," what?
15		Sorry, Mr. Fain?
16:01:216		THE WITNESS: It was a frame the
16:01:2 <b>9</b> 7		framework proposal that that we voted on.
<b>16:01:32</b> 8	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Well, now that you made me go way
<b>16:01:41</b> 9		beyond the last bullet I was on.
16:01:420	A	Sorry.
16:01:421	Q	So we'll see if we can get through this.
<b>16:01:49</b> 2		I think we're kind of getting laboriously into
<b>16:01:42</b> 3		this. Let's try to have the bullet points that
16:01:5 <b>2</b> 4		are that you would know something about. So I'm

just going to quickly look for your name and see if I

**16:01:52**5

16:01:561 got -- I think we were around 7, right? Yeah, we 16:02:082 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.
- 16:03:1**14** | **A** Okay.

16:02:093

16:02:224

16:02:285

16:02:306

16:02:317

16:02:368

16:02:479

16:02:4**10** 

16:02:5101

16:02:5**3.2** 

16:03:013

16:03:2115

16:03:246

16:03:257

16:03:3108

16:03:379

16:03:4**20** 

16:03:4**21** 

16:03:5**22** 

16:03:5**23** 

16:03:5**24** 

16:03:525

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 45-second break?

Q Sure.

16:03:571 A Is that all right? Apologize
--

16:03:592

16:04:013

16:04:014

16:04:015

16:04:016

16:04:037

16:04:038

16:04:039

16:06:270

16:06:271

16:06:292

16:06:313

16:06:394

16:06:425

16:06:456

16:06:517

16:06:568

16:07:009

16:07:020

16:07:021

16:07:022

16:07:023

16:07:024

16:07:125

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

| that will --

16:07:111

16:07:122

16:07:133

16:07:164

16:07:185

16:07:236

16:07:257

16:07:278

16:07:309

16:07:130

16:07:**3**71

16:07:**3**82

16:07:**4**13

16:07:**4**34

16:07:**47**5

16:07:506

16:07:5*2*7

16:07:58

16:07:**189** 

16:07:5290

16:07:5291

16:07:592

16:08:0213

16:08:0214

16:08:0225

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

through it quickly.

16:08:04 1

16:08:07 2

16:08:093

16:08:12 4

16:08:155

16:08:20 6

16:08:22 7

16:08:25 8

16:08:26 9

16:08:2**10** 

16:08:2**9**1

16:08:29.2

16:08:48.3

16:08:5**1**4

16:08:58.5

16:09:0**16** 

16:09:0**17** 

16:09:1**18** 

16:09:119

16:09:220

16:09:221

16:09:28.2

16:09:223

16:09:324

16:09:325

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- --

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

16:09:451

16:09:482

16:09:573

16:10:034

16:10:065

16:10:116

16:10:127

16:10:168

16:10:179

16:10:210

16:10:241

16:10:282

**16:10:30**3

16:10:314

16:10:315

16:10:316

16:10:407

16:10:418

16:10:439

16:10:420

16:10:521

16:10:522

16:10:523

16:11:024

16:11:025

- 16:11:191 10:45, received an updated congressional map 16:11:22.2 proposal? 16:11:23**3** I don't recall. Α 16:11:294 So in this first bullet on Page -- whatever page I'm 16:11:525 on -- 5, it says, "On multiple occasions Commissioner 16:11:586 Augustine was communicating to the commissioners that 16:12:007 they needed to be prepared to take a vote before the commission lost jurisdiction at midnight." 16:12:028 16:12:059 Is that a correct statement from your 16:12:090 perspective? 16:12:1**1.1** I don't recall any specific direction from Α 16:12:1**122** Commissioner Augustine. I can share that she 16:12:2**13** communicated the desire that she had that the 16:12:3**14** commission complete its work in time. 16:12:405 Do you remember a suggestion that the commissioners 16:12:476 should vote on the transmittal letter without any 16:12:517 maps ready to approve? Again, I don't recall any of those -- any 16:12:5**168** Α 16:12:5**12.9** conversation along that. The final -- again, I don't 16:13:020 recall a conversation about it. 16:13:021 Did you execute a resolution with placeholder blank Q
- 16:13:123 A I don't recall if there were placeholder blank lines.

  16:13:224 I hadn't reviewed that resolution for several weeks

  16:13:225 at minimum back to, I think, the time that it was

16:13:122

lines in it?

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

16:13:291

16:13:402

16:13:433

16:13:524

16:14:015

16:14:056

16:14:137

16:14:208

16:14:239

16:14:250

16:14:291

16:14:322

16:14:313

16:14:364

16:14:405

16:14:416

16:14:427

16:14:528

16:14:519

16:15:020

16:15:021

16:15:022

16:15:023

16:15:12:4

16:15:125

	- a, oc	1 ago 151
16:15:231		for several weeks up to the time of the final
16:15:272		commission meeting, and I don't think I've looked at
16:15:293		it since.
16:15:324	Q	Do you have a recollection of as to whether what
<b>16:15:36</b> 5		form the transmittal letter was in when you signed
<b>16:15:40</b> 6		it?
16:15:417	A	Can you be more specific about what form?
<b>16:15:45</b> 8	Q	Was the form that you signed exactly the same as what
16:15:529		was transmitted?
16:15:5 <b>1</b> 0	A	I didn't review the document, again, at the time that
16:15:5 <b>½</b> 1		I electronically signed it. There was a Internet
16:16:0162		outage, and Zoom went our Zoom connection went
16:16:1103		down. And it was 11:59 or midnight, and I just it
16:16:174		was a it was chaos.
<b>16:16:23</b> 5	Q	Do you remember signing the final resolution before
<b>16:16:30</b> 6		it was moved?
16:16:317	A	I don't recall doing it before it was moved, but if
16:16:318		you have time stamps that say otherwise.
<b>16:16:43</b> 9	Q	Well, the time stamp I'm looking at on this document
<b>16:16:42</b> 0		says November 15th, 2021, 23:59.
16:16:5 <b>21</b>	A	Okay.
<b>16:16:52</b> 2		MR. WONG: Are you sharing a
<b>16:16:52</b> 3		document on your screen, Joan? I'm not seeing one.
16:16:524		MS. MELL: I'm looking at it in my

hands because I think it's back in a exhibit that has

**16:16:52**5

16:17:031 not yet been marked. Hold on. 16:17:442 Mr. Court Reporter, can we mark this as whatever 16:17:483 number we're up to exhibit, this document that says 16:17:564 "Final Resolution Letter 11.15.21 - signed"? 16:20:555 (Discussion off the record.) 16:21:286 16:21:287 Q (By Ms. Mell) So do you know when the resolution was moved? 16:21:348 16:21:369 I -- I don't. I -- no. Α 16:21:4% 0 Are you aware of a timeline of any kind that reflects 0 16:21:541 the commission's position on the timing of the motions? 16:21:562 16:21:5**13** I'm sorry. I didn't quite follow the question. Α 16:22:01/4 Have you approved a timeline of the motions? 0 16:22:0125 Have I approved the timeline of the motions? Α 16:22:126 0 Correct. 16:22:1**17** Sorry. Still don't follow what you're -- what you're Α asking. 16:22:1**18** 16:22:179 Have you approved any representation of the timeline 0 16:22:220 of the 15th and 16th? 16:22:2**21** I have not. Α 16:22:22.2 Did you ever authorize Chair Augustine to Okav. 0 16:22:323 speak on behalf of the commission to the supreme 16:22:324 court?

I don't believe a question of authorization came

Α

16:22:325

		, , ,
16:22:421		before the commission.
16:22:432	Q	Did you as a commissioner have the opportunity to
<b>16:22:51</b> 3		make any decisions about the communication from the
16:22:534		supreme court requesting a timeline?
16:22:585	A	No. My recollection was that the she as the chair
16:23:056		was the one that was being charged with responding,
16:23:087		not the commission as a whole.
<b>16:23:09</b> 8	Q	And was that based on anything other than legal
16:23:159		advice?
16:23:110	A	I mean, I think that was what the order was, what the
16:23:211		order said.
<b>16:23:21</b> 2	Q	It was directed to her?
16:23:243	A	My my best recollection of the order from the
16:23:3104		supreme court was that the chair was to was to
16:23:315		provide this
<b>16:23:31</b> 6	Q	Okay.
16:23:3 <b>1</b> 7	A	yeah.
16:23:318		THE REPORTER: "Was to provide,"
16:23:319		what?
16:23:420		THE WITNESS: Was to provide a
16:23:421		timeline as well as a statement.
<b>16:23:42</b> 2	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So opening up Exhibit 45, I will
<b>16:23:52</b> 3		represent to you that that's the timeline that's been
16:23:524		provided to me in the public records requests. So
<b>16:23:52</b> 5		I'm going to scroll down to see.

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022	Page 1
16:24:141		Looks like the representation in the timeline	at
16:24:182		Exhibit 45 is that the chair asks Maria to send the	ne
16:24:233		resolution at 11:59:50 p.m.	
16:24:254		Do you see that there?	
16:24:26 <b>5</b>	A	I'm sorry. Which what line are you referring	to
16:24:33 <b>6</b>		again?	
16:24:33 <b>7</b>		Yes, I see that.	
16:24:348	Q	Do you have any reason to believe that that is	
16:24:379		incorrect?	

16:24:3**10** Α I don't.

16:24:391

16:24:44 2

16:24:4**18.3** 

16:24:5**1.4** 

16:25:0**1.5** 

16:25:016

16:25:137

16:25:188

16:25:2729

16:25:220

16:25:321

16:25:322

16:25:3**23** 

16:25:4**24** 

16:25:425

- Do you remember the motion, or the -- there being a Q motion on the resolution prior to midnight?
- Again, I don't recall -- I don't -- I don't recall Α the specific mechanics of the meeting. I'm relying on the document that you have here.
- Okay. So showing you what's been marked as -- I O didn't mark that one. Shoot. Or else the label didn't change. Let me close this and get it open There we go. Okay. again.

Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 44, do you recognize that document to be the final resolution?

- Based on the time stamps below, I assume it's the Α final one.
- Okay. And do you see your signature on that Q

16:25:451		document?
16:25:46 <b>2</b>	A	I do.
16:25:463	Q	Do you have any reason to believe that the date and
16:25:494		time below your signature is incorrect?
16:25:54 <b>5</b>	A	I don't.
16:25:556	Q	Based on the time reflected there, did you execute
16:26:007		the resolution prior to it being moved?
16:26:08 <b>8</b>	A	Again, can you go and see what the
16:26:119	Q	Should we do a side-by?
16:26:1 <b>40</b>	A	Yeah, that might be helpful. I don't have
16:26:1111	Q	Where did the that's the memo. Where did it go?
16:26:21/2		There we go.
16:26:21/3		Let me see if I can get them so we can lookie-loo
16:26:3114		at exactly what it says.
16:26:315		Sorry. Tired. Fat fingers.
16:26:3 <b>16</b>	A	I understand.
16:26:3167	Q	Then you. Okay.
16:26:4108		Can you see them there?
16:26:4 <b>19</b>	A	Mm-hmm.
16:26:4 <b>2</b> 0	Q	Okay. Motion to approve is at 11:59:57.
16:26:5 <b>21</b>	A	Okay.
16:26:5 <b>2</b> 2	Q	I guess we don't know because the date/time isn't
16:27:0223		specific enough, right?
16:27:0 <b>24</b>	A	Yeah, I would probably yeah, it doesn't seem to
16:27:2 <b>25</b>		include a milliseconds, and also I wouldn't want to

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 19
16:27:251		vouch for the whatever chronometer was being used
16:27:282		to create either one of those stamps when we're
16:27:323		talking about a matter of possibly milliseconds but
16:27:364		certainly seconds.
<b>16:27:38</b> 5	Q	Okay. With regard to Exhibit oh, strike that.
<b>16:27:49</b> 6		Did you have anything to do with the preparation
<b>16:27:52</b> 7		of this timeline in Exhibit 45?
16:27:548	A	No.
<b>16:27:55</b> 9	Q	And you don't know where these times came from?
16:27:530	A	I don't have actual knowledge of where those came
16:28:011		from.
<b>16:28:01</b> 2	Q	And you don't have any independent knowledge as to
<b>16:28:01</b> 3		what the correct times are for any of these noted
16:28:134		events?
16:28:1 <b>4</b> 5	A	I don't.
<b>16:28:14</b> 6	Q	And do you have any way to ascertain what the correct
16:28:1 <b>5</b> 7		times are, to the best of your knowledge?
16:28:138	A	Again, I think the time stamp on the document that
16:28:219		you're showing there would be one way, and another
16:28:320		would be to use the time index on the TVW recording.
16:28:4 <b>21</b>		Those would be the two places that I would look if I
16:28:422		needed to verify. I don't
<b>16:28:49</b> 3	Q	Okay. So scrolling back through the resolution, do
	I	

you see the file? Is this a file path, in your

opinion?

16:28:524

**16:28:52**5

16:28:581 A Appears to be a file path.

16:29:164

16:29:245

16:29:326

16:29:357

16:29:368

16:29:399

16:29:440

16:29:451

16:29:512

**16:29:55**3

16:30:014

16:30:015

16:30:126

16:30:127

16:30:208

16:30:259

16:30:320

16:30:421

16:30:422

16:30:523

16:31:024

16:31:125

- 16:29:022 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

- an interested member of the public.
- 16:31:182 Q There was a -- what did you say? There was a what?
- 16:31:223 A Said I don't have any recollection of any discussion
- 16:31:264 about naming conventions for the -- for these files
- 16:31:305 other than a bit of public testimony from a random
- 16:31:376 member of the public who -- who came during public
- 16:31:447 testimony once and shared his thoughts about cyber
- 16:31:488 security and -- and naming conventions.
- 16:31:529 O Okay. Do you know whether or not the metadata on the
- 16:32:100 maps that were finally transmitted would accurately
- 16:32:151 reflect the final iteration in terms of date and
- 16:32:212 time?

16:31:151

- 16:32:213 A Sorry. I don't quite understand your question.
- 16:32:254 O So if the maps that were finally transmitted contain
- 16:32:305 in the metadata a date and time, do you know how that
- 16:32:316 date and time in the metadata on the maps that were
- 16:32:407 transmitted correlate to when the maps were
- 16:32:448 finalized?
- 16:32:419 A I can't speak to what metadata might accompany a file
- 16:32:520 that I wasn't a party to creating.
- 16:32:521 Q Okay. So you were not party to any discussions about
- 16:32:52 how to label or -- label the files in final form or
- 16:33:023 whether or not the metadata links to any time clock
- 16:33:124 that is contemporaneous to the date and time?
- 16:33:225 A I don't recall any discussion or presentation during

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.

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

Did you ask -- did you ask to seek out any AG's

You can answer to the extent if you -- as to "yes" or "no" whether you did contact the attorney

advice sought or provided.

16:35:325

16:33:311

16:33:352

16:35:351 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?

16:37:225

16:35:37.2

16:35:393

16:35:45**4** 

16:35:47**5** 

16:35:50**6** 

16:35:53**7** 

16:36:008

16:36:029

16:36:140

16:36:181

16:36:232

- 16:37:311 A No personal knowledge.
- 16:37:352 If I may, what time are we at about right now?
- 16:37:383 Q Oh, the real time? Real time I have is --
- 16:37:404 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.
- 16:37:498 A Oh. Okay.

16:37:466

16:37:497

16:37:499

16:38:040

16:38:041

16:38:012

16:38:01/3

16:38:114

16:38:405

16:38:456

16:38:497

16:38:528

16:39:039

16:39:020

16:39:121

16:39:17.2

16:39:223

16:39:224

16:39:225

(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.

- Q (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.
- Q 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 7th and 9th congressional district border, especially with Normandy Park."

	airi, 50	e - January 12, 2022
16:39:281		I recollect that's consistent with what you said
16:39:322		earlier. Do you disagree?
16:39:32 <b>3</b>	A	Just put the context around it that that was a very
16:39:35 <b>4</b>		brief conversation that that we kind of
16:39:39 <b>5</b>		collectively agreed was not worth the bother. So
16:39:466	Q	Would you agree that you looked at extending the
16:39:497		eastern border down along the edge of Lake Washington
16:39:528		to balance the population?
16:39:54 <b>9</b>	A	We did briefly look at what would be necessary for
16:39:5 <b>10</b>		that to occur and quickly concluded that it was
16:40:0 <b>11</b>		not it was not again, not worth the not
16:40:0 <b>322</b>		worth the effort.
16:40:113	Q	Do you agree at approximately this time you were
16:40:154		probably one of the two commissioners here agreeing
16:40:195		to send the congressional map file to the commission
16:40:216		staff?
16:40:2 <b>1.7</b>	A	I was still present at the at the event room at
16:40:3 <b>118</b>		that time. And since it was the my staffer that
16:40:3 <b>1.9</b>		sent the file, I was likely present for that.
16:40:320	Q	And you don't disagree that that occurred?
16:40:4 <b>21</b>	A	Again, I don't have clear recollection of that
16:40:4 <b>22</b>		happening, but though I believe Paul had sent the
16:40:5 <b>23</b>		file at some point, so
16:40:524	Q	Do you remember a discussion about hurrying up and

finishing the maps before the reporters woke up?

16:40:525

- 16:41:021 | A Where are you referencing?
- 16:41:112 Sorry. Am I looking for your cursor or something
- 16:41:143 else?
- 16:41:154 | Q Oh. Right here.
- 16:41:165 A Yeah, I don't remember any specific conversation
- 16:41:176 around that. I know that I personally wanted the --
- 16:41:227 I wanted to have the maps completed quickly so
- 16:41:288 that -- so that they were out there.
- 16:41:339 Q Do you remember communications that are consistent
- 16:41:370 with this bullet point?
- 16:41:391 "At around 5:30 or 6 a.m., Commissioner Fain left
- 16:41:432 the Hampton Inn. Soon after this, Commissioner
- 16:41:473 Graves received a phone call, which I believe was
- 16:41:504 from Commissioner Fain."
- 16:41:515 A I don't recall a conversation at that time, but
- 16:41:516 that's not -- I don't -- I can't say that one didn't
- 16:42:017 occur.
- 16:42:018 O Did you have a conversation with Commissioner Graves
- 16:42:079 about the questionable legality of what happened and
- 16:42:120 communicate that to the commissioners?
- 16:42:121 A Again, I don't recall the conversation. But, again,
- 16:42:222 not to say it did or did not happen. I think we were
- 16:42:223 operating on very little sleep at that point or no
- 16:42:2**2**4 sleep.
- 16:42:325 Q Were she says, "The vote" -- "and the vote should be

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 20
16:42:351		portrayed to the public," do you know what that
16:42:382		means?
16:42:38 <b>3</b>	A	I don't want to put words in her mouth. I know
16:42:43 <b>4</b>		what I think we had discussed earlier about what I
16:42:46 <b>5</b>		communicated to Chair Augustine was what I you
16:42:52 <b>6</b>		know, what I thought needed to be communicated.
16:42:597	Q	And is that the point about that they were not
16:43:108		complete?
16:43:12 <b>9</b>	A	I had communicated earlier in the evening with Chair
16:43:1 <b>10</b>		Augustine that my position that the commission did
16:43:2 <b>11.1</b>		not based on the attorney general's e-mail, the
16:43:2 <b>16.2</b>		commission had not completed its work
16:43:2183	Q	Okay.
16:43:2 <b>3.4</b>	A	in time and that that that should be
16:43:3 <b>25</b>		communicated.
16:43:4106	Q	Okay. So I think, then, at this stage in her
16:43:457		recitation, commissioners must necessarily exclude
16:43:4188		you because you were gone by that time since the call
16:43:519		had come from you right around then.
16:43:520		So I doubt you're going to have any firsthand
16:43:5 <b>2</b> 1		knowledge about any of this stuff.
16:44:1 <b>2</b> 2		I think I asked you whether or not you agree not
16:44:1223		to post the maps before the 10 a.m. press conference.
16 44 16 1		

16:44:225 A Yeah. And I don't recall any conversation around

Did I?

16:44:124

#### 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?

# **16:45:15**3

16:45:142

16:44:241

16:44:252

16:44:393

16:44:424

16:44:455

16:44:486

16:44:517

16:45:018

16:45:039

16:45:030

16:45:101

16:46:114

**16:46:25** 5

**16:46:29**6

**16:46:30** 7

**16:46:31**8

**16:46:31**9

**16:46:32**0

16:46:421 16:46:422

**16:46:42**3

16:46:5**2**4

16:47:025

		<u> </u>
16:47:031		MR. WONG: As long as the court
16:47:052		reporter can follow it and we get a final set of
16:47:083		exhibits properly marked, I don't have any heartburn
16:47:10 <b>4</b>		over that.
16:47:115		MS. MELL: Okay. I think I just
16:47:126		need to go up to that number, so there we go. All
16:47:157		right.
16:47:168		Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 43a
16:47:239		let's move it back over here. I don't know why it's
16:47:2 <b>%</b> O		doing that.
16:47:4701		(Discussion off the record.)
16:47:5162		
16:47:5163	Q	(By Ms. Mell) And Adam Smith. Do you know which day
16:47:5 <b>½</b> 4		this text message reflects with regard to your
16:48:0 <b>1</b> 5		communications with Adam Smith?
16:48:126		Would that be Tuesday the 16th at 7:58?
16:48:1 <b>17</b>	A	I think that's a fair assumption. Because just
16:48:2 <b>18</b>		inferring based on whether or not the commission was
16:48:2 <b>16.9</b>		going to release maps, 'cause he would have if it
16:48:3 <b>20</b>		was later, he would have known that it had.
16:48:321	Q	I don't know why these aren't scrolling.
16:48:4 <b>22</b>	A	Might be the end of the text.
16:48:4 <b>2</b> 3	Q	Oh. Is it? Okay.
16:48:4 <b>24</b>	A	(Videoconference technical difficulties.)
	1	

THE REPORTER: What was that there,

16:48:425

	aii, 50	e - January 12, 2022
16:48:491		Mr. Fain?
16:48:50 <b>2</b>		THE WITNESS: I said that could be
16:48:51 <b>3</b>		the end of the text. She asked why it was not
16:48:53 <b>4</b>		scrolling. That was my
16:48:555	Q	(By Ms. Mell) Do you remember telling Adam Smith in
16:48:566		the follow-up phone call that you did not reach a
16:48:597		deal?
16:49:00 <b>8</b>	A	I don't remember I don't remember if we even had a
16:49:08 <b>9</b>		phone call at this point.
16:49:120	Q	With regard to Exhibit No. 45a, this appears to be a
16:49:21/1		text to is this a text to you? You're receiving
16:49:212		via text Sarah Augustine's communication to the chief
16:49:31/3		justice; is that correct?
16:49:3 <b>14</b>	A	It appears that that is what this document is.
16:49:315	Q	And do you recall whether or not this was a done deal
16:49:426		at the time or whether or not you were approving it?
16:49:4 <b>17</b>	A	Again, I don't believe I had any approval authority
16:49:5 <b>11.8</b>		for this for this.
16:49:5 <b>1</b> 9	Q	Okay. I think this just generally was procedural
16:50:2 <b>2</b> 0		talk with the chair about publicizing map proposals.
16:50:2 <b>2</b> 1		Do I have that correct?
16:50:2 <b>22</b>	A	Yeah, that was in the previous month. That was about
16:50:3 <b>23</b>		a month before the final deadline.
16:50:324	Q	Okay. Okay. Do you know what this means, document?

Based on the time, my -- and I'm not a hundred

Α

16:50:5**25** 

16:50:591		percent sure, but I am more sure than not that it is
16:51:032		the memo that we've gone over earlier.
<b>16:51:06</b> 3	Q	Okay. Okay. And I don't see the time stamp. Can
16:51:134		you do you know when that was?
16:51:155	A	It would have been sometime the morning, I believe
16:51:226		sometime in the morning of well, this is with
16:51:307		reference to the draft, so I'm not entirely certain
16:51:358		at what the time stamp is.
<b>16:51:37</b> 9	Q	Okay. And I don't need to have this whole
16:51:40 O		conversation on the record, but just make note that
16:51:421		we need to make sure you don't destroy any of your
<b>16:51:44</b> 2		texts and that we ultimately get a metadata version
<b>16:51:48</b> 3		so that these times are reflected.
16:51:4 <b>%</b> 4	A	Okay.
<b>16:51:59</b> 5	Q	And am I correct that you're the one making these
<b>16:52:02</b> 6		screenshots?
16:52:017	A	Yes, that's correct.

- 16 70 070
- 16:52:018 | Q Did you delete any texts before you made screenshots?
- 16:52:0**1**9 A I don't believe so.
- 16:52:120 Q In this communication, "We were walking back together he will be on in 2," what does that mean?
- 16:52:222 A 6:06 p.m.

16:52:323

16:52:424

16:52:525

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

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 210
16:52:551		a bite to eat, but I think she was ready to meet, and
16:52:592		so Paul was headed back to meet with her.
<b>16:53:01</b> 3	Q	And why didn't you go with Paul to meet with her? Is
16:53:104		that because you were assigned to the different
<b>16:53:12</b> 5		negotiations?
16:53:136	A	This was a issue that she was working with between
16:53:167		April and Paul. Really didn't involve me. I had
16:53:228		just suggested that she might offer some assistance.
16:53:249	Q	Okay. I don't think this one tells us anything more.
16:53:310	A	I think that's a similar screenshot.
16:53:411	Q	Nothing new here, it doesn't look like, either.
<b>16:53:45</b> 2		I thought there'd be something further down. Let
<b>16:53:58</b> 3		me just look here.
16:53:594		Okay. All right. So here's a text thread
<b>16:54:02</b> 5		between you, Paul, and Sarah; is that correct?
16:54:0 <b>1</b> 6	A	Yes.
16:54:0 <b>4</b> 7	Q	One in which you didn't participate?
16:54:118	A	It doesn't appear so.
<b>16:54:11</b> 9	Q	When it says, "When are you ready to come back to our
<b>16:54:22</b> 0		meeting?" what did that mean?
16:54:2 <b>2</b> 1	A	I again, I assume it means the come back to the
16:54:322		Zoom meeting.
<b>16:54:32</b> 3	Q	The public meeting?
16:54:3 <b>24</b>	A	Correct.

Q What does -- when Sarah is saying, "Staff think that

16:54:325

16:54:451 if we have a shape file and a resolution that will be enough, " what did you do with that information? 16:54:48.2 16:54:51**3** I don't think I did anything with that information. Α 16:54:594 It's correct that you never had a shape file on the 0 16:55:025 15th? 16:55:04**6** I'm sorry. What was your -- what did you just say Α 16:55:06**7** there? 16:55:078 It is correct that you never had a shape file on the 0 16:55:109 15th for --16:55:1**10** That's correct. Α 16:55:161 Okay. 0 16:55:162 "For," what, Joan? THE REPORTER: 16:55:173 MS. MELL: I think I got halfway 16:55:184 through the word "for presentation," but I think he 16:55:215 assumed that that's what I meant. 16:55:2166 (By Ms. Mell) Any correction there, Commissioner? 0 16:55:2**17** We did not have a shape file on the 15th for any Α 16:55:3**1/8** final maps. 16:55:319 Repeat. 0 16:55:420 I don't know why these got repeated like that. 16:55:521 I mean, when you were doing screenshots, were you 16:55:522 sometimes overlapping just to make sure you got the 16:55:523 whole conversation and not verifying for sure that it 16:56:024 was du- -- okay.

Yeah, so they're -- usually the last conversation

Α

16:56:025

- will be part of the first and the next.
- 16:56:192 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.
- Q 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

16:56:041

16:56:295

16:56:336

16:56:347

16:56:388

16:56:459

16:56:480

16:56:541

16:56:582

16:56:513.3

16:57:044

16:57:03.5

16:57:146

16:57:187

16:57:258

16:57:289

16:57:320

16:57:321

16:57:422

**16:57:52**3

16:57:524

16:58:025

- 16:58:051 can't see the right half. I'm going to --
- 16:58:082 | Q Which way? My right? This way?

16:58:123

16:58:144

16:58:185

16:58:206

16:58:237

16:58:278

16:58:319

16:58:360

16:58:311

16:58:47 2

**16:58:54**3

16:58:574

16:58:59.5

16:59:016

16:59:017

16:59:128

16:59:149

16:59:120

16:59:221

16:59:222

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?
- 16:59:223 A I don't recall. But this was at a time when we were
  16:59:324 discussing the -- you know, we had had regular
  16:59:325 conversations about the congressional maps during

#### these times.

16:59:361

16:59:372

**16:59:47** 3

16:59:514

16:59:565

17:00:066

17:00:087

17:00:118

17:00:159

17:00:210

17:00:251

17:00:292

17:00:323

17:00:3**4**4

17:00:375

17:00:416

17:00:447

17:00:498

17:00:520

17:01:021

17:01:122

17:01:133

17:01:124

17:01:125

- 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 sec-I'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?
- 17:00:519 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

17:01:471 back-and-forth with regards to the congressional map. 17:01:532 I don't know what -- what specific questions do you 17:01:553 have? 17:01:564 My specific question is: Does -- did -- was there --0 17:02:055 was there an exchange around this time of maps that 17:02:076 were reflective of the terms you guys were 17:02:107 negotiating? 17:02:118 I mean, I think there were draft maps that went back Α 17:02:179 and forth frequently, and then there was the 17:02:1**9**0 conversation that we held together with our staff in 17:02:211 the lobby. So I think they sort of all -- all fit 17:02:282 together as part of the process. 17:02:323 I don't think that's new. Q 17:02:424 Joan, we're a little bit MR. WONG: 17:02:455 after 5:00 right now. You said you had a meeting. 17:02:496 And we've been going since 9 a.m. So if we could 17:02:537 wrap it up, please. 17:02:538 MS. MELL: We've got seven more to 17:02:559 go. 17:02:520 MR. WONG: Okay. Expedite it. 17:03:021 That'd be appreciated. 17:03:122 MS. MELL: These are all August, 17:03:123 August, August. 17:03:224 Looking for the one, but this was -- okay.

(By Ms. Mell) So here's you sending your letter, so

Q

17:03:225

17:03:201 that is the Adobe document. I see that. 17:03:312 That's to Paul? Did you agree?

> I did, yes. Α

17:03:443

17:04:056

17:04:117

17:04:158

17:04:219

17:04:2**1:0** 

17:04:2**5**1

17:04:312

17:04:343

17:04:354

17:04:395

17:04:4106

17:04:5107

17:04:518

17:04:569

17:05:0**20** 

17:05:0**21** 

17:05:022

17:03:444 Okay. This is the one I've been looking for. Okay. 17:03:595 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?

- I believe it is -- I believe the blue-colored box Α inside the gray box is me.
- And Paul Graves communicated to you, "And I think I 0 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?

> Object to form. MR. WONG:

THE WITNESS: I believe that is a text message from Paul.

- (By Ms. Mell) To that effect? 0
  - Did you tell Walkinshaw that Graves was a hard "no" on the congressional map without a legislative

- 17:05:171 A I think as we talked about before, I expressed my
  17:05:232 position that it was a plan involved both a
  17:05:323 legislative and a congressional map, or my position
  17:05:364 at the time. And I actually don't recall whether or
  17:05:385 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.
- 17:06:081 Q Do you have any reason to believe you did not do 17:06:132 that?
- 17:06:113 A I just am stating from my recollection. I'm not
  17:06:114 certain that I did. But I -- that is my text
  17:06:215 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?

17:07:1**3**1 Q Yep.

17:05:456

17:05:527

17:05:598

17:06:029

17:06:010

17:06:296

17:06:317

17:06:418

17:06:419

17:07:1**2**0

- 17:07:122 A Okay. Thanks.
- Yep, that's what it appears that I'm texting -17:07:224

  I'm sorry. This is to April Sims, is the recipient
  07:07:225

  of this.

17:07:311		MR. WONG: Can you scroll to the
17:07:322		top of this one, Joan, just so he can see the name?
17:07:35 <b>3</b>		THE WITNESS: Yeah.
17:07:364		MR. WONG: Thank you.
17:07:385	Q	(By Ms. Mell) So you invite, "Would u like a visit
17:07:486		from the congressional visit fairy?"
17:07:507		Did that mean you?
17:07:52 <b>8</b>	A	I assume I was referencing myself.
17:07:559	Q	Okay. And April's negotiating back and saying, if
17:08:0 <b>1</b> 0		you say "yes" to the legislative district proposal,
17:08:0161		then she would be free to talk about congressional
17:08:092		districts?
17:08:1 <b>1.3</b>	A	I interpret that as her making a joke there.
17:08:154	Q	Meaning what's the joke?
17:08:1 <b>25</b>	A	The joke is
17:08:2 <b>1</b> 6	Q	I mean, don't you think I'm sorry.
17:08:2 <b>1.7</b>	A	Go ahead. I'm sorry. What were you going to say?
17:08:298	Q	April Sims was serious that she wanted you to agree
17:08:319		to the legislative district proposal so that she
17:08:320		could talk to you about congressional districts,
17:08:3 <b>2</b> 1		correct?
17:08:3 <b>22</b>	A	You would have to
17:08:4 <b>2</b> 3		MR. WONG: Form.
17:08:4 <b>24</b>		THE WITNESS: Excuse me.

You would have to ask her what her intention was.

17:08:4**25** 

- 17:08:441 What I read in that was that it -- I read that as 17:08:492 being a joke. 17:08:493
  - (Clarification by reporter.)
- 17:08:565 (By Ms. Mell) Meaning she's ribbing you, that she Q 17:08:596 would --
- 17:08:597 Α Yes.

17:08:544

17:09:255

17:09:216

17:09:520

17:09:521

- -- still talk to you, but she wasn't serious? Okay. 17:09:008
- I think, yeah, both joking. And then I don't believe 17:09:059 Α 17:09:0% O we had a follow-up conversation there, so I think it 17:09:111 was her way of -- again, how I interpreted her way of saying, "I'm focused on the LD maps," and then giving 17:09:162 17:09:2103 me a little poke like, "You do everything we want 17:09:224 and, sure, I'd be happy to chat," which is like a
  - Okay. What's the, "Or you can call Brady," mean? 0
- 17:09:317 I think it's exactly what it says, which is if you Α 17:09:418 want to work on the congressional district maps, should continue working with Brady. 17:09:489
  - She would continue working with Brady, or you could 0 call Brady?
- That I should call Brady. 17:09:522 Α

ribbing to your point.

- **17:09:52**3 Oh, that you should. I get it. Okay. I get it now. 0 17:10:024 All right. I'm getting tired.
- 17:10:025 Okay. Let's see. Don't care about your lattes.

1 am, 50e - Sandary 12, 2022				
17:10:171		This is the same.		
17:10:232		More duplication than I recall.		
17:10:403		Okay.		
17:10:45 <b>4</b>	A	And again.		
17:10:465	Q	And again.		
17:10:466		MS. MELL: All right. Thank you.		
17:10:507		I've done what I can do in the time frame we've got		
17:10:558		allotted here.		
17:10:559		MR. WONG: And, Mr. West, do you		
17:10:5 <b>6</b> 0		plan on asking any questions? If so, I'd ask that		
17:10:591		they be very brief, because we are over time.		
17:11:0222		MR. WEST: I do plan on asking some		
17:11:01/3		very brief questions, if that's okay.		
17:11:054		MR. WONG: Let's just wrap it up		
17:11:015		right now and get it done. But please do keep them		
17:11:106		brief, I request.		
17:11:1 <b>1</b> 7		MR. WEST: Okay.		
17:11:128				
17:11:129				
17:11:1 <b>2</b> 0		EXAMINATION		
17:11:12:1		BY MR. WEST:		
17:11:12:2	Q	Mr. Fain, do you recall at around 12:38 a.m. on the		
17:11:1 <b>2</b> 3		16th, a point where all the staff and the		
17:11:2 <b>24</b>		commissioners gathered in that main meeting or event		
	I			

room on the first floor of the Hampton Inn hotel?

17:11:225

17:11:321 Commissioners and staff were in and out of the event Α room throughout the early morning hours of -- of, I 17:11:422 17:11:483 guess that'd be Tuesday morning. So I recall being 17:11:534 there during those hours. 17:11:545 Do you recall a point where all the commissioners and Q 17:11:586 staff gathered in the meeting room? 17:12:017 I don't recall a -- the time when they were all Α 17:12:078 gathered in a -- not to -- not to parse words. want to -- there is a time when all the commissioners 17:12:179 17:12:210 O and staff may have been in the event room. But in 17:12:211 terms of gathered around a central point in conversation, if that was the insinuation, I don't 17:12:262 17:12:310.3 recall a time where that occurred. 17:12:314 Do you recall a time when they were all in the event Q **17:12:35**5 room? 17:12:316 Not specifically. But, again, commissioners and Α 17:12:427 staff were coming in and out rather frequently, so it 17:13:118 would be --17:13:139 To the extent that all --0 20 THE REPORTER: Sorry. "Rather frequently, so it would be, "what? Mr. Fain. Sorry. 21 22 THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. What 23 was the ...? 24 THE REPORTER: "Not specifically. 25 But, again, commissioners and staff were coming in

and out rather frequently... "Was there more after 1 2. that? THE WITNESS: I don't know what 4 else I would have said. 5 THE REPORTER: Okay. 6 THE WITNESS: Sorry. No problem. 7 THE REPORTER: Sorry, Mr. West. Go ahead. 8 17:13:159 (By Mr. West) Extent that four commissioners may 17:13:160 have been present in that room at the same time, is 17:13:211 it fair to say you wouldn't recall that? 17:13:2**1.2** I don't recall -- can you -- can you restate the Α 17:13:3**13** question? I want to make sure I'm answering it clearly. 17:13:3**14** 17:13:345 To the extent that all four commissioners may have 17:13:316 been present at the same time in that event room, is 17:13:4007 it fair to say that you would not recall that? 17:13:4**1/8** I cannot -- I will not categorically say that there Α 17:13:5**19** was no time, that all four commissioners were not 17:13:5**20** located somewhere in that event room at the same time. 17:14:0**21** 17:14:02.2 Okav. So do you recall a time when they were all 0 there together? 17:14:023 17:14:0**24** Α I don't specific --

0

All in the event room.

17:14:125

- 17:14:101 A Yeah, I don't specifically recall a time when all the
  17:14:152 commissioners were in the room together, but I'm not -17:14:193 I'm not stating that that may not have occurred. It
  17:14:224 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

17:14:23 5

17:14:25 6

17:14:27 7

17:14:30 8

17:14:31 9

17:14:310

17:14:3**f.1** 

17:14:39.2

**17:14:40** 3

17:14:44 4

17:14:46.5

17:14:516

17:14:567

17:15:008

17:15:019

17:15:120

17:15:1**21** 

17:15:222

17:15:223

17:15:324

17:15:325

17:15:361		don't			
<b>17:15:36</b> 2	Q	Okay.			
17:15:403	A	recall specifically.			
17:15:414	Q	Do you recall the commissioners agreeing to send the			
<b>17:15:44</b> 5		congressional map files to commission staff?			
17:15:496	A	I don't recall a time where there were more than			
17:15:57 <b>7</b>		Commissioner Walkinshaw and I reviewing anything to			
17:16:048		do with the congressional maps in that time frame. I			
17:16:109		don't recall.			
17:16:1 <b>1</b> 0		Go ahead.			
17:16:11 1	Q	Okay. Is your memory perfect during this period of			
<b>17:16:18</b> 2		time?			
<b>17:16:18</b> 3		MR. WONG: Object to form.			
17:16:2104		THE WITNESS: It's a very late			
17:16:215		very late, slash, very early hour without a lot of			
17:16:216		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.

17:16:277

17:16:308

17:16:319

17:16:320

17:16:321

17:16:522

17:16:523

17:17:024

17:17:025

17:17:06 <b>1</b>	And to my recollection, that was the only other
17:17:082	time that I had a conversation with another
17:17:113	commissioner other than Commissioner Walkinshaw about
17:17:144	the congressional maps

- Q Is it possible --
- A -- during that time frame.
- 17:17:167 | 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.

LITIGATION SERVICES

THE WITNESS: I don't recall.

17:17:386 17:17:417 17:17:458 17:17:499

17:17:145

17:17:156

17:17:168

17:17:189

17:17:200

17:17:27.1

17:17:232

17:17:283

17:17:324

**17:17:35**5

17:17:520

17:17:5**21**17:18:0**2**2

**17:18:02**3

17:18:024

17:18:025

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 17:18:101 Do you recall any communications with (By Mr. West) 0 one or more commissioners about that? 17:18:152 17:18:19 **3** Can you specify what "that" is in the subject? Α 17:18:234 "That" being subject of finishing up the maps quickly 17:18:275 or -- and/or getting them done before the reporters 17:18:316 woke up. 17:18:32**7** I don't recall anything in reference to a specific Α 17:18:39**8** time that we were trying to reach. I personally did 17:18:43**9** not anticipate that that process would take as long 17:18:4**1.0** as it did. 17:18:5101 Do you recall any communications with the other Q commissioners about finishing up the maps? 17:18:552 17:19:0**13** Had conversations with -- I mean, I've already Α 17:19:0**14** referenced conversations with Commissioner Walkinshaw 17:19:1**1.5** with regards to the -- the work that was done after 17:19:1**16** midnight with regards to the congressional maps. 17:19:157 Do you recall any conversations involving -- serial Q or otherwise -- involving more than one other 17:19:198 17:19:239 commissioner about finishing up the maps? 17:19:220 Object to form. MR. WONG: Yeah, I'm a little 17:19:2**21** THE WITNESS: confused at what the question is. 17:19:3**22** I think I've 17:19:3**23** previously expressed the -- previously described the 17:19:4**24** activities that I was involved in during this time

frame.

17:19:4**25** 

	Fain, Jo	e - January 12, 2022 Page 22
17:19:491	Q	(By Mr. West) Okay. Do you recall any time during
17:19:572		that period where you discussed with either
17:20:013		serially or at one point with more than one other
17:20:05 <b>4</b>		commissioner finishing up the maps?
17:20:095		MR. WONG: Object to form.
17:20:10 <b>6</b>		THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry. I
17:20:15 <b>7</b>		don't I don't fully understand the question.
17:20:20 <b>8</b>		I worked with Commissioner Walkinshaw on the
17:20:25 <b>9</b>		completion of the of the congressional maps during
17:20:2 <b>% O</b>		that time.
17:20:291	Q	(By Mr. West) Do you recall any period where you had
17:20:31 2		any discussions with more than one commissioner
17:20:313		concerning finishing up the maps?
17:20:414		MR. WONG: Objection; asked and
17:20:425		answered.
17:20:4 <b>1</b> 6		Mr. West, this is going to be
17:20:457		MR. WEST: I think he's been
17:20:418		evading this question. There's a yes-or-no question.
17:20:499		If he wants to say "yes" or "no" to that, I'd be
17:20:5 <b>2</b> 0		happy to hear that answer.
17:20:5 <b>2</b> 1		MR. WONG: I disagree, Mr. West.
17:20:5 <b>2</b> 2		I'm lodging my objection for the record.
17:20:5 <b>2</b> 3		MR. WEST: Okay.
17:20:5 <b>24</b>		MR. WONG: The witness can answer.

It's been asked and answered now already.

17:21:025

17:21:041 Is that "yes" or a "no"? MR. WEST: 17:21:052 I have not heard a "yes" or "no" to that. 17:21:06**3** I apologize. THE WITNESS: 17:21:08**4** I was trying to understand what you were asking. I don't recall a time when I was involved with a 17:21:10**5** 17:21:16**6** conversation with more than one other voting 17:21:24**7** commissioner with regards to the substance of -- of 17:21:318 the -- of the maps. (By Mr. West) Okay. Are you sure that that didn't 17:21:339 0 17:21:350 happen? Object to form. 17:21:31/1 MR. WONG: Again, I think I've 17:21:4**12** THE WITNESS: 17:21:4**1.3** answered that question. To the best of my 17:21:4**1.4** recollection, I don't recall. 17:21:495 (By Mr. West) Okay. Your recollection during these 17:21:516 events, because you were so tired because it was so 17:21:517 chaotic, is admittedly not perfect? 17:22:0**18** I'm not representing my recollection as being Α 17:22:0**19** perfect. 17:22:02:0 Okay. So for the record, then, your recollections of 0 17:22:021 this -- of these events during the 12:30 to 5:00 or 17:22:182 so when you left are imperfect? 17:22:123 Very good. 17:22:124 THE REPORTER: Sorry. Can I get an

answer there?

17:22:1**2**5

17:22:171		MR. WONG: Mr. West, can we please		
17:22:302		wrap this up? This is going on longer		
17:22:343		MR. WEST: I have just a couple		
4		more questions.		
5		MR. WONG: Okay. Thank you.		
6		THE REPORTER: So I didn't get the		
7		last answer from you, Mr. Fain.		
8		THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm a bit		
9		lost here. I don't even know what we're		
17:23:0 <b>%</b> O		MR. WEST: Apparently Mr. Fain does		
17:23:0181		not recollect the last question.		
17:23:112	Q	(By Mr. West) Do you recall leaving the Hampton Inn		
17:23:11/3		at some point in the morning?		
17:23:1 <b>94</b>	A	Yes.		
17:23:2105	Q	Do you recall what time you left?		
17:23:21/6		MR. WONG: Objection to form.		
17:23:2 <b>1.7</b>		THE WITNESS: As previously stated,		
17:23:2 <b>18</b>		it's my recollection that I left sometime between 5		
17:23:3 <b>19</b>		and 5:30.		
17:23:3 <b>2</b> 0	Q	(By Mr. West) Okay. And did you make any phone		
17:23:3 <b>2</b> 1		calls on your way home?		
17:23:3 <b>22</b>	A	As we've discussed before, I don't recall making a		
17:23:4 <b>23</b>		phone call, but I'm not I don't I can't		
17:23:5 <b>24</b>		categorically say that I didn't.		
1				

17:23:525 | Q So it's possible you made a phone call, but you do

17:23:541		not recall now?				
17:23:55 <b>2</b>	A	That's possible.				
17:23:573	Q	Thank you. Very good.				
17:24:074		Generally, do you have any medical or physical				
17:24:145		problems that would impair your memory or subject you				
17:24:176		to amnesia?				
17:24:227		Are you in good health?				
17:24:23 <b>8</b>	A	To your first question, not to my knowledge.				
17:24:29 <b>9</b>		To your second question, I'm in fair health.				
17:24:3 <b>%</b> O		MR. WEST: Thank you very much.				
17:24:39 1		I'm done with this witness.				
17:24:4 <b>1.2</b>		THE WITNESS: Thank you.				
17:24:4 <b>1</b> 3		MS. MELL: I don't need to go back				
17:24:4 <b><u>6</u>4</b>		on the record.				
15		(Signature reserved.)				
16		(Deposition concluded at				
17		5:24 p.m.)				
18		(Exhibit Nos. 41 through 43,				
19		43a, 44, 44a, 45, 45a, and				
20		46 through 65 marked for				
21		identification.)				
22						
23						
24						
25						

1	AFFIDAVIT
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	I, Joe Fain, hereby declare under penalty of perjury
8	that I have read the foregoing deposition and that the
9	testimony contained herein is a true and correct transcript
10	of my testimony, noting the attached corrections.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	Joe Fain
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Date:
21	
22	
23	
24	
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON ) I, John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR, ) ss a certified court reporter			
2	County of Pierce ) in the State of Washington, do hereby certify:			
3	neresy ceretry.			
4				
ı	That the foregoing deposition of JOE FAIN was taken			
5				
5	before me and completed on January 12, 2022, and thereafter			
_	was transcribed under my direction; that the deposition is a			
6	full, true and complete transcript of the testimony of said			
_	witness, including all questions, answers, objections,			
7	motions and exceptions;			
8	That the witness, before examination, was by me duly			
	sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but			
9	the truth, and that the witness reserved the right of			
	signature;			
10				
	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel			
11	of any party to this action or relative or employee of any			
	such attorney or counsel and that I am not financially			
12	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;			
13	That I am herewith securely sealing the said deposition			
	and promptly delivering the same to Gregory J. Wong.			
14				
	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand			
15	this 26th day of January, 2022.			
16				
17	A )			
18	John M& Rutolla			
19	John M.S. Botelho  John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR			
	John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR			
20	Certified Court Reporter No. 2976			
	(Certification expires 05/26/22.)			
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

B&A Litigation Services 2208 North 30th Street, Suite 202 Tacoma, WA 98403 253.627.6401

Date: January 26, 2022

To: Gregory J. Wong
Pacifica Law Group

1191 Second Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98101-3404

Case: Washington Coalition for Open Government v. State of Washington

Cause No.: 21-2-02069-34
Deposition of: Joe Fain

Date Taken: January 12, 2022

The above transcript must be read and the Correction Sheet signed within 30 days of this notice or before the trial date. If the Correction Sheet is not signed within that time period, signature will be deemed waived for all purposes.

Please contact the witness and arrange a convenient time and place for reading and signing.

After the Correction Sheet is signed, please retain the signed original Correction Sheet.

Reporter: John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR

License No.: 2976

cc: brian.rowe@atq.wa.gov, joan@3brancheslaw.com, awestaa@gmail.com

B&A Litigation Services  2208 North 30th Street, Suite 202  Tacoma, WA 98403  253.627.6401				
	(	CORRECTION SHEET		
Instructions: Please carefully read your deposition and on this correction sheet make any changes or corrections in form or substance that you feel should be made. You may add additional sheets, if necessary. After completing this form, please sign your name in the space provided. Please do not mark the transcript. Thank you.				
PAGE #	LINE # COR	RECTION	REASON FOR CORRECTION	
			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
<del></del>			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
<del></del>				
<del></del>			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
= <u></u>			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
= <u></u>			<del></del>	
= <u></u>			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
			<del></del>	
SIGNATURE OF WITNESS:				

Exhibits	0	62:8 64:5 65:24 68:5 76:14 77:12,15 79:13 81:24 87:11 90:18 94:25 95:18,21 99:11,14 120:2 121:5,6 157:1 161:13 172:3 173:15 192:20 193:20 211:5,9,17	
<b>Fain Exhibit 41</b> 4:8 106:19,24 117:14 119:24	<b>08.12.21</b> 191:4		
Fain Exhibit 42 4:9 107:23,25 109:2 110:8,11 111:6,24 112:10,25	1	<b>16th</b> 23:15,21,24 24:8 26:10 30:17, 21,24 31:2,4,7 32:16,20,23 33:11,13	
Fain Exhibit 43 4:12	<b>1</b> 22:16 24:2,6 27:4,5,11,18 60:15	39:25 40:5,9 42:10,12,13 43:16 46:4,22,24 47:7 50:10 88:8 115:9	
Fain Exhibit 43a 4:13 207:8	61:21,24 62:2,11,13,19 63:9,12,16 127:6	123:19 124:2 136:20,24 138:8 146:6	
Fain Exhibit 44 4:15 195:20	<b>10</b> 205:23 213:12 214:12	147:16 161:13 193:20 207:16 220:23	
Fain Exhibit 44a 4:16	<b>10:10</b> 42:5	<b>17th</b> 46:18	
Fain Exhibit 45 4:18 194:22 195:2	<b>10:13</b> 214:3,17	<b>1:14</b> 101:22	
197:7	<b>10:21</b> 42:5	<b>1st</b> 20:19,25 21:7,8,11 22:6,22 23:7,	
Fain Exhibit 45a 4:19 208:10	<b>10:45</b> 190:1	8,17 24:9,13 29:4 31:17	
Fain Exhibit 46 4:21	<b>10:48</b> 160:20	2	
Fain Exhibit 47 4:22	<b>11</b> 66:15 69:10		
Fain Exhibit 48 4:24	<b>11-15</b> 186:17	<b>2</b> 22:16 24:2,6 62:16,19 63:5 155:14	
Fain Exhibit 49 5:3	<b>11-16</b> 186:17	168:17 209:21	
Fain Exhibit 50 5:4	11-month 78:19 179:25 11:38 79:10 11:43 79:10 11:59 192:13	<b>2008</b> 12:3	
Fain Exhibit 51 5:6		<b>2011</b> 13:1	
Fain Exhibit 52 5:7		<b>2018</b> 13:1 64:3,7	
Fain Exhibit 53 5:9		<b>2021</b> 8:25 13:16 109:4 192:20	
Fain Exhibit 54 5:10	<b>11:59:50</b> 195:3	<b>2022</b> 7:2	
Fain Exhibit 55 5:12	<b>11:59:57</b> 196:20	<b>206 409-9418</b> 8:1	
Fain Exhibit 56 5:13	<b>12</b> 7:2	<b>23:59</b> 192:20	
Fain Exhibit 57 5:15	<b>12:01</b> 130:12	<b>26th</b> 57:13,23 58:17 61:3,5,21 62:13 64:4 65:24 69:16	
Fain Exhibit 58 5:16	<b>12:26</b> 101:22	<b>28th</b> 57:13,23 58:17 60:1,5,12 64:4	
Fain Exhibit 59 5:18	<b>12:30</b> 128:7,20 135:5 136:23 145:3	65:24	
Fain Exhibit 60 5:19	146:6 147:16 149:11,15 151:2	<b>2:31</b> 141:17	
Fain Exhibit 61 5:21 216:8	160:1,2 228:21	<b>2:42</b> 141:17	
Fain Exhibit 62 5:22	<b>12:38</b> 202:7 220:22	<b>2nd</b> 20:19,25 21:7,8 22:6,22 23:7,8,	
Fain Exhibit 63 5:24	<b>12th</b> 46:18,25 47:1 75:13,14 76:9,10	17 24:10,13 29:4 31:17	
Fain Exhibit 64 6:3	<b>13</b> 109:14	4	
Fain Exhibit 65 6:4	<b>13th</b> 46:25 47:1,5 75:14 76:9 109:4	<del>-</del>	
	<b>14th</b> 46:25 47:2,5 121:6	<b>40</b> 57:11	
	<b>15</b> 79:1	<b>41</b> 106:19,24 117:14 119:24 230:18	
<b>-driven</b> 109:25	<b>15th</b> 13:10,16 15:15,18 17:18 31:2 37:9,11 38:22 40:6,8 42:12 46:23 47:6,21 50:15 54:24 56:17 57:13,21,	<b>42</b> 107:23,25 109:2 110:8,11 111:6, 24 112:10,25 119:24	
	23 58:17,22 59:16 60:6,18,20 61:5	<b>43</b> 206:23 230:18	

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 236Index: 43a..Ag's

43a 207:8 230:19 44 195:20 230:19 44a 230:19 44th 57:13,23 58:17 59:15,21 64:4 65:18 69:22,23,25 45 194:22 195:2 197:7 206:24 230:19 45- 185:23

**45a** 208:10 230:19

**46** 230:20 **46th** 70:10,12

**47th** 13:7 57:14,23 58:17 62:5,10,11, 13,18 63:5,9 64:5 65:24

**49** 29:7 **4:04** 186:9

**4:06** 186:9

**4:30** 46:21

**4:37** 223:17

4:46 206:16

5

**5** 46:21 126:21 190:5 223:25 229:18

**5:00** 173:14 215:15 228:21

**5:24** 230:17

**5:30** 126:21 128:8,20 135:5 136:24 145:4 146:6 147:16 149:11,15 151:2 204:11 223:25 229:19

6

**6** 204:11

**61** 216:8

**65** 230:20

6:06 209:22

**6:30** 174:9

7

**7** 152:15 174:20 185:1 202:22

**705** 7:20

**7:30** 174:9

7:58 207:16

**7th** 202:23

8

**8** 24:17.23

8:45 188:13

**8th** 20:20 24:19 25:3,5,8,9,11,19,23 26:8 29:4 31:17

9

9 189:7 215:16

98166 7:21

9:05 7:2

9:30 189:7

**9th** 33:17 34:2,3,6,13 35:5,7,12 36:16 42:9 124:8 154:12 202:23

Α

**a.m.** 7:2 42:5 79:10 126:23,24 152:15 204:11 205:23 215:16 220:22 223:17

ability 116:12 223:12

**absent** 137:6

absolutely 216:13

accept 174:19 175:1

accepted 137:18

**access** 8:10 44:20,21 49:2,3 112:15 151:13

101.10

accommodate 41:4,5

accompanied 96:11

accompany 199:19

accompanying 15:23

accomplish 22:22 24:5 161:21

accomplishing 22:15

accord 125:8

account 32:12,20 155:4

accurate 166:7

accurately 199:10

achieve 23:16 27:3 135:25

achieving 74:1

acknowledge 118:2

act 94:12,23 102:5 139:18 144:18

167:6 186:13

acted 140:3

acting 104:12 139:24

**action** 50:13,22,23 51:1,2,5,12 79:24 93:22 97:21 139:24 171:9,18 172:7,8 179:9,18 180:9,25 182:3

183:18,24 184:4

actionable 136:5,10

actions 54:4 123:23 139:4,11

active 103:10 129:15 167:7

activities 48:8 226:24

activity 48:5 189:1

**actual** 17:11 21:20 38:23 41:17 161:2 164:12 184:3,6 197:10

**Adam** 207:13,15 208:5

**add** 187:3

addition 45:19

additional 23:8 133:10 142:16

150:6 198:11 212:15

**address** 7:19 45:12

adjourn 124:17,22,23

adjourned 46:10 125:2

adjournment 125:13

admittedly 228:17

Adobe 115:17,21 216:1

adopt 53:19,23 170:9

adopted 31:2 180:2 198:5

advance 89:25 90:25 110:12

advice 131:2 194:9 200:18,23

affirm 111:7 124:16 188:4

affirmed 124:18

affirming 57:22

afternoon 97:2

**AG's** 130:16 200:17

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 237Index: age..August

age 60:24

**agenda** 172:9 179:18 183:18,24 184:5

**agree** 13:14 14:5 88:24 89:6,13,19 90:2,17 91:4,6 107:9 139:3 140:2 156:24 158:13 163:19 164:15 165:6, 25 186:19 187:11 202:16 203:6,13 205:22 216:2 218:18 223:14

agreeable 17:6

**agreed** 80:18 84:18 166:12 167:25 180:9 203:5 223:15

agreed-to 100:3

agreeing 156:22 203:14 224:4

**agreement** 9:20 22:14 56:22 57:1 68:11,13,14 72:12,18 76:18 81:20 116:13 140:14 148:8 157:7,12,19 158:1,5,7 159:16,17 173:7 179:12, 13 180:4,24 188:21,24

**ahead** 18:18 33:20 123:4 160:7 172:19 174:24 218:17 222:8 224:10

air 37:25 125:12,16,22

**Ali** 31:24 32:2 33:5,7,21 34:8,10 35:5,8 153:10 155:4 164:9 174:12 175:13 201:11

alleging 175:17

allotted 220:8

allowed 49:2 165:23

allowing 131:12

ambiguities 89:12

ambiguous 120:23

amenable 131:11

amnesia 230:6

**amount** 27:2 32:13 33:17 60:11 82:3 173:18 174:3

amounts 32:12

analysis 111:8,18

analytical 111:20 112:5

**analyze** 112:22

analyzes 43:23

and/or 114:15 226:5

answering 59:12 222:13

answers 104:12 134:6 143:16

anticipate 150:7,10 226:9

anticipated 150:6

**Anton** 153:11

**apologize** 7:23 19:20 22:17 23:3 34:4 57:11 76:9 86:10 162:12 186:1 228:3

Apparently 229:10

appeared 7:3 82:19,20

**appears** 107:7 187:14,15 198:1 208:10,14 214:25 217:23

applicable 64:10

application 176:21

applied 135:9 143:13

**apply** 105:15 134:6,22

appointed 17:8

appreciated 19:16 215:21

approached 166:8 173:6

**approval** 97:16 148:25 158:24 159:5 208:17

**approve** 15:15,18,25 16:3,11,14 43:1,2 57:20 62:6,8 70:21 73:6 74:19 87:6 110:2 148:14 149:5,7 190:17 196:20

**approved** 60:16 72:8,24 85:4 111:17 150:2 171:5 193:14,15,19

**approving** 28:22 59:16 60:5 61:4 63:7,10 89:10 148:20,22 208:16

approximately 41:3 126:25 203:13

approximation 128:10

**April** 119:1 122:21 210:7 212:18,24 213:10 217:24 218:18

April's 218:9

area 36:4 104:7 147:1 157:23

areas 73:20

argument 131:11

arises 186:19

arrange 102:10

**arrangements** 43:9,11,12,13

arranging 213:21

arrived 46:23 126:9

art 39:18 167:17

articulate 27:14 73:13 116:14

articulated 17:21 22:6

articulating 116:22

**ascertain** 44:9 104:14 152:5 197:16 198:18

asks 108:14 176:15 195:2

**aspect** 93:12

asserting 131:9

assessing 64:1 114:23

assigned 8:9 100:18 210:4

assigning 62:23

assistance 210:8

assistant 132:10 142:18

assume 33:19 195:23 210:21 218:8

assumed 33:21 64:13 211:15

assuming 163:7 164:1 201:24

assumption 33:22 207:17 213:14

assumptions 80:1

assurance 146:12

**attached** 8:17 107:3 108:1 117:16 118:22 149:25

attempt 73:15

attempting 178:14

attend 51:5 52:21 174:25

attention 57:17 76:21 152:14

**attorney** 130:4 131:8,18 132:10,24 133:15 141:21 142:18 200:22,25 201:6 205:11

attorney's 133:8

**attorney-client** 130:20 131:10 176:15,21 177:9

attorneys 201:5

attributable 188:4

attribution 78:11

Auburn 73:23

**August** 215:22,23

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 238Index: Augustine..butchered

**Augustine** 20:14 51:14 82:25 83:8 96:17,19 112:11 128:2,16,20,25 129:4,13,21,23 130:13,16 132:24 133:8,13,20 147:4,15,21 148:3,4 149:10 163:4 165:25 166:2,9 167:19 168:4,22 171:10 178:10,25 183:5 190:6,12 193:22 205:5,10

**Augustine's** 148:18 166:23 167:9 208:12

authenticate 118:1

authentication 186:18

**authority** 136:11 137:1,5,6,21,24 138:4.7 208:17

authorization 191:14 193:25

authorized 98:10

Autobound 202:16

avoid 101:25 102:21 103:16 176:7

avoided 102:14 105:9 140:23

**aware** 45:25 67:6 79:14 84:21,23 87:2,4 142:25 143:22,24 164:24 193:10

В

**back** 16:19 18:19 21:1 34:12 42:13 47:10,18 59:4 62:1 66:4,14 67:20 68:24 75:12 80:17 85:8 95:17 106:4 166:25 168:9 171:6 174:10 177:25 190:25 192:25 197:23 200:12 207:9 209:20 210:2,19,21 212:18 215:8 218:9 223:5 230:13

back-and-forth 215:1

background 38:15 161:17

backtrack 77:21

**bad** 113:22 130:14

**badly** 113:15

**Bain-** 69:16

**balance** 108:15 203:8

ballpark 126:22 128:12

banquet 39:25

base 36:7 133:21 213:16

**based** 43:1 131:12 162:11 187:15 188:20,23 191:13,18 194:8 195:23

196:6 205:11 207:18 208:25 214:2

basically 152:25

**basis** 81:17

**Bates** 106:11

Bates-numbered 107:19

**bear** 206:6

behalf 168:22 169:6 193:23 201:8

**belief** 52:11 53:1 60:10 86:4 87:9 92:19 94:10,20 113:18 133:21 136:4 140:15 170:12

**believed** 36:15 52:14 53:12 57:21 58:4 69:15 86:25 102:7 143:12 152:21 153:2 173:21

**believes** 182:21

Bellevue 12:16

Bellingham 73:22

beneficial 164:23

Bennett 174:25 175:2,11

bifurcated 171:15

big 40:8,22 69:5 160:7

**bigger** 144:19 191:10

**bit** 31:9 46:9 75:13,19 92:10 103:7 106:2 120:12,17 125:9 170:21 198:25 199:5 206:5 212:8 215:14 229:8

bite 210:1

black-and-white 105:12

blank 190:21.23 191:6

**blend** 48:21

**blower** 71:10

blue-colored 216:10

bluster 170:21 212:8

blustered 212:10

**body** 93:18,20,22,24 94:4 95:10 191:4

**bold** 201:20

booths 50:4

border 21:10 202:24 203:7

**BOTELHO** 7:3

**bother** 203:5

**bottom** 108:6,7 114:5

boundaries 9:2,7,8,11,13,14,15,18, 23 10:2,6,9,25 11:3,8,21 14:12 15:14 21:20 22:14,21 24:12 27:9,10 30:3 31:15 32:3,16 34:6 44:18 60:23 65:18 66:10,11 67:25 68:2,4 74:3 75:7,22 157:14

**boundary** 23:22 24:5 25:18,22 26:5 27:14 33:14,16 44:10 45:5,6 74:5 75:2,9

**box** 216:10,11

Boy 201:14

**Brady** 118:22 212:19,23 213:7,8 214:3,6,8,21,23 219:16,19,20,21,22

**Brady's** 153:11

**breach** 94:11

**break** 17:14 31:10 39:5 42:3 56:20 79:2 86:11 91:18,19 101:16 124:12 141:9,11,15 161:23 172:2 185:24 186:11

breakout 51:20

**Bremerton** 69:16 73:18

briefly 19:12 21:1 42:19 203:9

**bring** 16:22 95:10 181:12

bringing 180:12

broad 92:16 95:15

**broadly** 33:22

**broke** 84:4

**broken** 84:21

**brought** 35:11 56:17 68:4 76:20 77:22.24

**bubble** 62:14

built 22:11 55:25 69:9 80:1

**bullet** 168:17 169:8 183:1 184:19,23 190:4 200:14 201:11 202:6,19,21 204:10

**Bureau** 144:20

**business** 8:3 12:1 13:15 38:21 50:14 103:2,18 104:9,13 124:21

butchered 113:15,16



C

C-O-L-E-W-O-O-D 7:20

calculation 27:13 calendar 185:3

calibrated 108:20

**call** 80:15 116:10 128:7 167:22 183:14 184:2 204:13 205:18 208:6,9 219:16,21,22 229:23,25

called 14:24 34:20 40:1

**calling** 39:21,23 **calls** 130:20 229:21

camera 51:21 92:18,22 95:1

**Campos** 31:23 36:17 153:8,9

189:11 223:20

Canadian 21:10

candidate 64:17 65:4 114:4

candidates 65:8 capable 40:22

card 127:11,16,17

cards 127:8

care 171:1 219:25

cared 70:20

carefully 23:4 155:21 177:21

carry 185:19

**Cascades** 75:9,11

**case** 31:23 90:15 92:20 124:5 131:4 152:2,7 155:20 164:6 187:18

**cases** 31:19 45:10 58:20 71:23 74:2 96:10 98:23

cast 180:14

casual 145:22

**categorically** 29:24 30:5 222:18 229:24

category 28:25 73:14

**caucus** 13:9,19 91:19 98:11 150:22 163:8 167:1 189:12

caucused 13:15

**caucuses** 90:3 91:5,7 92:4

caucusing 48:16 49:13

cautious 23:5

**Census** 144:20

**center** 42:14

central 21:9 221:11

**CEO** 12:16

certainty 80:7

Certified 7:3,11

**chair** 48:20 51:14 53:6,7,10,19 107:7 124:23 125:2 126:12,15,19 128:2,16,20,25 129:4,13,21,23 130:13,16 132:24 133:7,12,20 147:4,15,21 148:3,4,18 149:10 163:4 168:4 171:10 178:25 181:10 184:1 193:22 194:5,14 195:2 205:5, 9 208:20

chair's 167:23,25

chairs 41:1,2,6,8

Chamber 12:16

**chance** 105:21

**change** 9:2,21 26:4 27:2,11,18 28:11,12,14 29:24 30:5 35:21,22 55:12 59:15 60:4 61:16,18,21,24 62:2,12,14,20 63:5,9 106:8 124:9 136:4 170:3 195:18

**changed** 8:25 9:9,12,13,15 25:23 60:23 84:19 138:7,11,12 170:7 214:21

changing 144:13 173:24

**chaos** 192:14

**chaotic** 18:6 52:3 100:16 164:16 171:24 181:8 228:17

characteristic 28:14

**characterization** 30:25 78:17 92:15.16 140:3 166:7 212:6

**characterize** 78:22 80:12 88:10 94:24 166:6 167:8,13 212:7

**characterized** 62:4 68:19,20

157:11

**charged** 98:24 100:12 194:6

**chart** 111:10 113:3,7 114:7,16,18 115:2 117:18

charts 112:13 114:7

chat 105:23 155:20 219:14

check 47:19 206:15

**check-in** 147:1

Chelan 25:10 75:15 76:11 87:17,23

**chief** 208:12

choice 62:2 65:4

**choices** 150:13

**choose** 138:2

**chose** 118:10

chronology 46:4 172:10

chronometer 197:1

circulating 149:2

circumstance 176:22

**cite** 68:25

cities 69:3,13 71:25 72:6,8,12,17,21,

22 73:13,24 74:7

citizen's 152:25

**city** 69:21 70:13,16,18,21,24 71:21 72:8,25 73:3,6,11,19,21,22,23 74:4, 5,11,13,20,24 75:3,4

**clarification** 19:7,17 34:16 46:6 63:14 219:3

**clarify** 56:7 119:6

clarifying 66:24

clean 35:2

cleaned 206:4

**clear** 62:16 63:1 64:25 72:14 108:22 150:7 189:5 203:21 212:13

clearer 31:11

**clock** 199:23

**close** 71:8 88:1 118:16 195:18 206:3

closed 127:15,20,24

closely 30:20 64:21

**codes** 113:8

cold 125:12,16

Colewood 7:20

colleague 116:10

colleagues 116:9



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 240Index: collective..conclusionary-type

collective 89:1 104:15 180:8

collectively 89:7 148:1 203:5

**color** 113:8

colored 130:3 216:8

Colville 69:18

combined 15:7

**comfortable** 97:10,12 104:22 139:6 167:20

**comment** 32:4 67:8,16 133:20 134:2,21 135:4 138:15 140:22 158:3 174:15 185:22

commenting 139:2

comments 29:6 67:17

Commerce 12:17

**commission** 8:3 9:5 13:9,14 43:18 45:24 51:8 79:24 89:11,17 90:7 93:6 97:20 103:3,18 104:8,13 107:4,5,8 110:13 112:10,19 117:10 133:22,23 134:3 135:16 136:6,18 137:5,21 138:10,20 139:4,20 140:16 141:22 142:19,24 144:3,11,13 147:19 149:19,20 150:1,9 153:1,9 159:12 163:10,13 164:3 173:21 174:8 187:10 190:8,14 192:2 193:23 194:1,7 200:1,3 203:15 205:10,12 207:18 223:16,20 224:5

**commission's** 89:1 91:3 143:19,25 193:11

Commission- 185:4

commissioner 17:6,23 18:4,8 19:3, 13,24 20:1,3,5,7,10,12,13,14 33:23 34:7,12 35:4,8,10,13 36:7,9 37:4,14, 23 38:5 40:11 41:15 42:7,19,20 49:2,14 50:1,8,24 54:20 66:6,12 67:18 68:6 70:25 76:25 77:18.19.24 78:10,11 79:16,17 80:10,14 81:2,7, 15 82:9,20,21,25 83:8 84:14 85:1,3, 4,5,10,20,21,23 86:2,4,5,12,14,17, 19,22 87:2,4 95:4,6 96:9,13,16,19 97:11,14 98:3,21 99:5 100:14 101:24 103:12 106:23 110:10 112:11 119:3,15,17,22 121:11,12,14 122:5,16,25 123:1,10 124:7 143:5, 10 144:4 145:9,11 146:7 152:8 153:5 158:19 160:14 161:8,11,19 162:14 165:20,21,23,25 166:1,8,14 167:9,19 168:21,23 169:4,9,11,14, 25 172:14,16 174:11,12,18,19 175:13 176:2,3,4,6 178:9 181:4,19,

21 182:22 183:5,6,7,8 185:7,8 188:2 189:7,9 190:5,12 194:2 204:11,12, 14,18 211:16 223:16 224:7,19,23,24 225:3 226:14,19 227:4,8,12 228:7

commissioners 37:7 43:10 45:25 49:19 66:18 67:10 70:20 83:7,11 84:17,20 91:23 92:17 94:11,22,25 96:7 97:16 98:2,4,8 99:3,20,22 100:9,11 102:1,4,9,12,15,23 103:2, 11,13,15,17,22 104:4,16 105:11 107:10,13 108:2,12 110:7 116:7,21 117:15 119:12,20,23 120:3,10,15 126:10 141:3 144:21 147:25 153:25 154:2,4 158:13 159:3,9 160:3 165:8, 14 166:3 168:7 175:14,21 176:8 179:22 180:18.19 183:2 190:6.15 191:16 202:22 203:14 204:20 205:17 212:16 220:24 221:1,5,9,16, 25 222:9,15,19 223:2,6,14 224:4 225:15,22 226:2,12

commissioners' 112:17

**commissions** 136:15 143:15 144:14,17

common 118:15 182:2

**commonly** 113:13

**communicate** 8:19 16:21 20:4 80:17 94:5 99:25 100:19 111:3 117:15 119:22 156:8 158:6 167:15 168:9 178:14 179:8 185:8,18 204:20

**communicated** 17:12 18:4 20:2 54:20 70:19 81:16 101:5 116:20 122:14 132:16 135:10 139:10 147:15 148:21,24 165:14 168:7 169:14,24 179:20 180:23 181:19,22 182:23 188:15 190:13 205:5,6,9,15 216:12

**communicating** 68:6 76:14 86:17 95:25 96:4 98:10 102:11,13 110:1 118:3 168:5 173:3 190:6 217:16

communication 17:25 102:19 103:3 107:9,13 108:12 116:17 117:23 119:24 121:24 130:10,11 132:1,25 159:9 164:15 177:9 179:14 181:16 194:3 208:12 209:20 212:2, 18 213:7

**communications** 101:25 102:10, 22 103:11,24 105:16 122:20 123:5 129:3,13,21,23,24 136:1 139:12 182:9 183:16,22 185:17 200:21 204:9 207:15 212:6,24 216:9 226:1, 11

**communities** 11:21 58:6,24 66:9 69:6.18 87:8.23 157:12

community 35:11 69:21 87:16

comparative 63:22

compared 144:14

comparison 63:22 114:14

competing 161:1

competition 108:15

**competitive** 28:1 29:25 30:1,2 60:21 108:23,24,25 109:25 115:3 117:8 118:12

**competitiveness** 28:24 30:9 112:4 116:23,25 118:12

**complete** 52:13 141:24 147:3 150:15 163:17 173:14 190:14 205:8 225:20

**completed** 43:10,17 89:2,5 138:20 149:19,20 150:2,20,22,24 204:7 205:12

completing 135:17 137:13

completion 227:9

compliance 138:15

complied 138:10 142:5

comply 142:20,21

component 23:14 43:25

components 55:10 158:11

composition 30:6,8

compromise 117:19 163:8

compromises 172:13

computer 110:22 151:15

con- 172:15

**concept** 13:23 14:13 77:22,23 119:8,11 183:16 184:6 214:9

**concepts** 21:3 78:21 80:21 112:24 114:17 119:20,23 165:3,11

concern 92:9 104:17 105:1

concerns 117:17 164:10 201:11

concluded 123:20 203:10 230:16

conclusion 91:14 139:7

conclusionary-type 92:10



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 241Index: condition..Council

condition 158:25 conditional 158:21

conditioned 53:5 158:23

conduct 8:2

conducted 89:17 90:7

conducting 49:22

confer 186:19

conference 39:19 40:17 205:23

configuration 151:1

confines 120:11

conflating 149:6

conflicted 180:16

**conform** 152:22

**confused** 17:10 59:11,13 129:7 162:3 163:18 226:22

confusing 149:6

congressional 9:17 10:2,6 14:5 15:1,7,16,19 16:14,17,23,25 20:20 29:8,10 31:15 32:1,25 37:3,10,21,24 38:5,9 42:9,16 43:15 44:1,14 46:16 49:23 50:1,6,10 53:11,20 55:25 77:10 94:6 95:2,7 96:10 98:13 100:15 102:2 122:6,17 124:8 139:25 150:16,23 153:10 154:9,13,25 156:24 159:19 160:2 161:7 169:9, 12,16 170:1,9 171:11 172:21 179:19 189:9 190:1 202:24 203:15 212:14 213:25 214:4 215:1 216:14,18,24 217:3,9,17 218:6,11,20 219:18 223:15 224:5,8,22 225:4 226:16 227:9

connected 11:21

connecting 49:6

connection 192:12

consensus 11:17 82:17 97:20

105:4

consequences 88:2

consideration 148:11

considerations 23:10

**considered** 11:18 61:23 69:11

132:6 169:22 174:7

**consistent** 27:4 139:5 151:9 168:16,17 203:1 204:9

consolidated 171:21

constituted 94:11 95:21

constitutes 15:8 94:22 124:5

constituting 93:19

constitution 136:14

construct 18:7 22:1

contact 132:11 200:25

contacted 201:5

**contained** 32:14 68:11,13 69:7

74:11 111:6 119:6 198:6

contemplate 74:23

contemplated 26:3

contemporaneous 199:24

**content** 11:2 20:16 24:21 84:24 85:18 103:23 110:11 119:20 131:17

132:23 149:12 188:3 201:10

contention 133:9 156:14 212:13

contested 69:1

**context** 14:16 15:4 79:21 113:24 130:2 152:11 159:24 191:11 203:3

contextually 144:11

continually 180:16

**continue** 73:25 95:24 96:24 148:8

176:7 219:19,20

**continued** 73:21 118:13 148:9

179:1

continuing 61:11 105:6

contradictory 163:14

contributed 164:16

controlling 56:12

convened 144:1

conventions 198:22,24 199:4,8

conversa- 69:4

**conversation** 17:23 20:12,14 33:23,25 34:6,7 35:7,15 38:4,8 41:14 42:18 56:15 57:7 58:2,9,23

68:5 69:2,5 70:11 71:6 75:17,21 77:8 78:22 80:12,14,22 81:7,13 82:20 85:20 86:1 87:25 92:17 95:5 96:24 101:2 123:1 124:7 128:17

129:15,19,22 132:24 145:13,22 147:5,9,13 154:12 159:18 165:22

166:11 169:3 171:18 172:16,24 173:17 176:5,8 178:25 181:2,6,20, 23 182:7,12,15,18 187:13 189:18 190:19,20 203:4 204:5,15,18,21 205:25 209:10 211:23,25 215:10 219:10 221:12 225:2 228:6

**conversations** 33:14 42:11 50:2,11 58:25 64:13 68:22 75:24 77:2,15 78:18 79:16,20 82:13 84:23 91:23 92:21 94:10,12,20,25 95:4,19 96:9, 11,12 98:6,11,22 99:8,19 100:14 102:4,8 119:19 122:25 126:18 128:19,25 134:19 135:23 145:8,11 147:10 148:3 149:10,13,14 153:18 160:23 161:16 165:11 173:23 174:16 179:1 213:25 226:13,14,17

conversed 147:23

conversing 99:23 105:3

converts 43:23

convey 166:2 167:7

**conveyed** 85:14,24 134:16 168:22

201:10

conveying 131:16 133:15

convinced 35:16

copy 107:7

corner 50:4

**correct** 8:12,24 15:16,17,19 19:22 21:14 22:4,13 23:15 25:18 26:11 28:19 29:15 30:17 31:5 33:12,21 52:17 58:14 65:16 72:18,25 79:12, 19 86:20 88:16 99:8 100:1,10 11:24 114:10 117:14 119:12,13,18 121:16,17,20 125:3 130:9 135:21 145:3 154:19 157:2,6,7,18 159:8 160:15 165:17 168:18 171:13,14 174:9 175:23 177:19 179:19 180:25 181:17,25 183:15 188:5 190:9 193:16 197:13,16 201:25 208:13,21 209:15,17 210:15,24 211:4,8,10

correction 211:16

212:5,7 217:18 218:21

correctly 42:22 94:1 191:17

correlate 199:17

corridors 11:23

coughed 7:23

Council 12:21 142:2



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 242Index: counsel..disappointed

**counsel** 131:3 133:11 136:7 176:12, 17 177:1

counsel's 10:22 counterpart 14:1

counterproposals 96:1,4

Counties 75:16 76:11

**county** 12:21,22 25:9 70:1,2,3 74:6 87:17,24 142:2

**couple** 38:24 39:12 80:1 128:14 151:14 229:3

**court** 7:3,11 9:6 97:15,22,23 106:17 112:24 114:15 130:8,18 131:13 132:25 134:22 135:11,18,22 136:1 137:2,14,19,24 138:9,11,14,22 139:3,9 147:6 148:7,10,13,15,17 152:24 193:2,24 194:4,14 206:7 207:1

**COVID** 144:15,18

**create** 10:3,6,25 11:2 37:9,11 89:11 99:7 129:9 137:17 154:11 197:2

**created** 23:18 56:9 115:24 154:6 169:1

**creating** 114:24 137:13 150:19 162:9 199:20

creation 154:8

criteria 22:22 26:19 70:17

**cross** 75:11 **crossing** 75:9

**current** 21:8 25:9,11 60:21 68:21 113:18 114:3.6 115:4 169:3

**cursor** 204:2

customary 101:1

**cut** 212:25 **cyber** 199:7

D

**data** 11:10,12,14,16 65:11 109:25 110:5 113:4 135:18 144:20

**date** 109:5,9 118:3 196:3 199:11,15, 16,24

date/time 196:22

dates 191:9,13,18

**day** 47:19,20,21 48:21 82:2 109:19 114:20 126:7 128:5 149:24 189:3 198:25 200:3 207:13

**days** 39:12 46:20 48:20 115:10 117:17 123:2 145:22,25 146:2 161:13 162:15 200:10

**deadline** 17:4 54:1 117:20 133:24 138:10 148:6 173:14 208:23

deal 58:23 68:17 208:7,15

deals 172:12

dealt 94:12 95:6 206:8

decided 35:19 71:9 106:2

**decision** 54:3 93:21,25 94:3 124:3, 6,10,14 125:3 138:23 149:15

decision-making 135:12

**decisions** 23:16 24:1 31:3,7,14 32:15 53:16 123:18 125:12 135:8 136:12,24 194:3

declined 42:23,24 138:21,22 224:25

deemed 137:20

define 11:1

defined 137:1

definite 22:21

definition 93:17 163:15 164:4

169:22

definitive 148:5

**delay** 144:19

delete 209:18

deliberations 135:19

Democrat 114:9

**Democratic** 59:20,23 60:11 114:4

163:8

**Democrats** 41:23 67:4,11 72:4

182:7

depend 64:23 65:8

depending 27:25 45:10

deployed 161:13 172:2

deposed 7:12

deposition 15:1 186:14 230:16

depositions 39:9,11,17 71:15

deputy 130:4 141:21

**describe** 26:19 38:11 39:7,19 64:5

184:10

describing 86:21 100:7

**description** 15:13 43:24 44:10,14, 18 163:5

designations 167:1

**desire** 190:13

**destroy** 209:11

detailed 176:10 177:2

**details** 83:5,21 107:16 154:23

181:20,23 189:23

determine 131:3,4

determining 35:18

develop 36:20 97:22

developed 111:20

**Devices** 186:17

diagnostic 114:25

difference 64:22 90:13 154:14

differences 154:17

differently 65:22 139:8 178:24

difficult 182:13

difficulties 7:22 10:12 39:13 94:14

207:24

difficulty 62:23 164:10

**digital** 102:18

direct 98:22 188:5

directed 188:22 194:12

**direction** 28:10,11 100:25 114:11 133:3 153:22 187:12 190:11 201:3

directive 188:19

disagree 156:11 203:2,20 227:21

disagreed 95:8 164:4 disagreement 83:17 disagreements 154:10 disappeared 155:16

disappointed 88:8,12,16



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 243Index: disappointing..effort

disappointing 87:16,22

disappointment 88:11 90:23

disclosing 133:5 discretion 137:19

**discuss** 37:23 79:7,18 82:16 95:9 97:4 98:2 118:25 130:1 156:14 158:17 186:20 189:9 214:4 217:17

**discussed** 17:5 20:1 29:4 38:4 49:25 50:9 66:11 67:12 76:25 79:23 85:8 89:12 93:6 97:25 98:1,3 118:21,23 119:2,10 122:16 147:8, 21,22 164:11 189:24 205:4 214:18 227:2 229:22

**discussing** 29:8 64:4 70:24 77:3 78:13 103:18 104:8 118:7,15 121:3 167:19 169:12 175:14 176:11 177:3 186:12 213:24 224:18

**discussion** 79:8 80:8,16 97:18 101:20 106:21 119:15,16 122:1 160:1,25 162:22 193:5 198:24 199:3,25 203:24 206:13 207:11

**discussions** 42:8 135:23 199:21 227:12

dispassionate 212:8

**dispute** 156:23 157:4 201:25

disputed 34:19

disputing 186:18

disregard 163:10

dissemination 116:6

distance 84:4 145:20,21 146:5

distinct 65:6

distinguish 41:13 48:7 180:11

district 8:24 9:2,11,13,14,15,17,23 10:2,6,9,25 11:24 13:6 14:6,11 16:1, 3 20:19,21 21:8,11,20 22:21 24:10, 13,19 25:6,19,23 28:8,9,13,14,18 29:25 30:1,6,9 31:15 32:15,25 33:17 34:14,20 35:6,8,12 36:4 37:3,11 42:10,16 43:15 44:1,14,19 45:5 53:11,20,23 55:16,22 58:16,23 59:21,23 60:6,20,21,24 61:5,21 62:5,11,18 63:5,9 64:18,22 65:17 66:13 69:8,19,22,23 70:12 74:16,20 75:2,3,7,8,13,15,22 76:9 77:11 83:25 87:10,13 88:3 94:6 95:2 98:13 102:3 114:6 124:8 139:25 154:13 170:10 171:11 172:21 202:24

217:18 218:10,19 219:18

districts 9:9 11:22 16:25 21:24 22:16 23:7,11 24:2,6 27:24,25 28:1, 4,21,24 29:2,7,8,10,14,16,23,24 30:4,20 31:16 54:6 55:12,13 56:24, 25 57:6,10,16,21,25 58:4,5,9 59:17 60:19 61:12 62:8 66:3,7 74:19 76:24 79:15 81:1 83:18,19,24 87:7,14 109:25 114:5 117:9 120:9,14 151:3 165:13 179:19 218:12,20

dividing 198:22

doctor 12:1

**document** 56:2 71:3 106:20,25 113:4 115:18,21 116:2,4,13,22 118:4 182:20 185:6 191:12,13,15, 20,25 192:10,19,23 193:3 195:15,21 196:1 197:18 202:5 208:14,24 216:1

**documents** 9:7,10 56:5,9,11,12 105:23 187:8 191:17 200:4

**door** 48:23 49:6,7,8 71:9 127:18,20,

double 23:1

doubt 205:20

**Douglas** 75:16 76:11 87:17,24

downstairs 101:15

dozen 134:12

dozens 78:21

**draft** 35:13 96:11 109:6 114:1,6 144:10 147:18 148:9 149:1 160:10 164:20 209:7 215:8

**drafted** 23:24 33:4 101:3 110:24 112:13,19 152:21 191:1 200:4

**drafting** 23:25 24:7 98:24 100:3 151:3,7 153:9,12 161:7

drag 155:18

**draw** 21:23 24:5 32:3 65:17,22 75:2,

**drawing** 27:15 45:22 46:1 88:3 100:13 137:25 138:7 161:2

**drawn** 22:12 23:21 24:9 25:19 30:4 31:2,21 32:10 66:3 88:9 99:14 100:6,17 134:17 157:19 158:1

draws 92:10

drew 11:5,6 46:2

**drive** 10:9

**driving** 11:16

**Ds** 167:2

du- 211:24

due 16:5 61:8 202:9

**duly** 7:10

duplicated 206:23

duplication 220:2

**dyad** 90:7 98:14 99:22 100:12 116:18

**dyads** 67:2 91:7 92:4 165:15,16 180:8

Ε

**e-mail** 8:15,16 102:22 103:1 105:16, 18 106:20 107:3,23 108:1,13,19 111:3 115:6 117:14 118:2,5,16,22, 25 119:1,21 130:5,7,17 132:4,8,25 133:17 147:24 149:24 205:11

e-mailed 111:1

**e-mailing** 115:12

e-mails 105:20 118:14

**earlier** 48:17,19 68:24 76:17 100:2 142:1 154:13 173:19 189:17 203:2 205:4,9 209:2

early 97:2 115:9 123:23 126:7,17 141:22 154:3 169:21 221:2 224:15

earphones 217:19

earshot 129:1,19 176:3

easier 31:11 106:3

**East** 74:8

eastern 75:25 203:7

eat 210:1

**edge** 10:14,24 11:8,9 43:17 45:14, 16,18 46:2 202:17 203:7

education 11:25

effect 216:22

effectuate 22:11 73:12

efficiency 161:15

effort 203:12

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 244Index: elected..familiar

elected 13:3 113:21

**election** 65:3,13

**electronically** 110:19 191:16

192:11

element 22:15 76:20 121:2 138:23

**elements** 20:22 21:5 31:8 55:14,24 56:8,19 66:5 67:20,22 68:7,9 69:9 77:5 79:18 80:15 81:2,16 90:11 93:5 95:7 122:15 165:22 178:21

95:7 122:15 165:22 178:2

eleventh-hour 156:25

eliminating 74:23

else's 78:12

encompass 15:10

encounter 102:16

encourage 96:24

**end** 13:1 28:2,3 80:10 81:3 82:15 91:2 118:14 124:14 146:20 207:22 208:3

**ended** 84:16 124:3 126:16 132:9 168:1

engaged 121:10

ensure 105:13 154:5,9

enter 49:10 117:17

entered 51:23

entire 75:3 108:17 162:24 164:14

173:5 189:3

entirety 37:1 56:16 147:13

environment 100:16

envision 201:19

equalization 26:3 74:2

established 158:10

**evading** 227:18

evaluate 112:6

evaluating 114:8

**evening** 36:21,23 50:20 81:16,18 82:3 85:1 97:1,2 127:14 147:11 173:5 189:15 205:9 214:17

**event** 40:1,2,3,7,13,18 41:10,20 42:14 46:15 48:18 49:1 50:6 97:15 116:14 125:19,22,24 126:4,6,9,20 127:1,3,11,12,13,18,19,23 128:2 145:4 150:18 152:12 160:7 189:2

203:17 212:15 220:24 221:1,10,14 222:16,20,25 223:4

**events** 46:4 103:20 155:4 164:16 172:6 197:14 228:16,21

eventually 81:3 95:9

Everybody's 133:17

**exact** 10:7 46:22 59:18 68:23 126:8

201:1 213:17

**EXAMINATION** 7:15 220:20

examine 103:8

examples 68:25

**Excel** 115:22

exception 69:18

**exchange** 107:23 147:3 214:2

215:5 216:7

exchanged 164:25 165:6

exchanges 214:23

**exclude** 205:17

**exclusive** 55:19,20,21 69:14 70:22

123:23 124:1

excuse 32:7 182:22 183:12 218:24

execute 190:21 196:6

executed 191:6

exhaustion 173:5

exhaustive 57:4 70:23 73:3,15

**exhibit** 106:19,24 107:23,25 109:2 110:8,11 111:6,24 112:10,25 117:14 119:24 155:14 187:4 191:2 192:25 193:3 194:22 195:2,20 197:5,7 206:5,12 207:8 208:10 216:8 230:18

exhibits 207:3

exist 198:14

existed 84:11 100:5

existence 179:17

existing 31:20 113:20

**exists** 115:7

expect 212:17 214:2

expectation 43:14 88:21 100:18,21

143:9 152:3 182:6,9 200:7,9

expectations 108:21

expected 91:24

expedite 187:22 188:6 215:20

experience 12:18,20

explain 63:20 150:12 172:8

explained 66:6

explicitly 88:1 112:18

**express** 86:18 88:25 100:20,22

116:17 181:13

**expressed** 22:23 55:23 56:9 85:24

86:6,13 118:6 119:21 217:1 226:23

expressing 77:19

**expression** 68:1 99:7

expressly 88:5

**extend** 167:11

extending 203:6

**extent** 96:17 130:19 131:4,9,16

132:14 133:4 176:15 184:11 187:3,7 188:2 200:20,24 221:19 222:9,15

F

188:2 200:20,24 221:19 222:9,15 223:6 224:17

face 144:22,24 145:1

facilitate 109:21

fact 92:13 114:24 132:13 151:17

217:5

factors 11:18,19 55:13 97:8 139:2

165:13

facts 201:17

**failure** 116:15

Fain 7:4,10,18 19:11,13 39:15 40:11 42:7 101:24 106:23 169:9 182:21,22 184:15 186:16 187:12 188:2 189:9

200:20 202:22 204:11,14 208:1

220:22 221:21 229:7,10

**fair** 21:18 30:12,25 52:17 78:17 128:10 207:17 212:5 222:11,17

224:19 230:9

**fairly** 167:12

fairy 218:6

fall 22:15 73:14

familiar 44:4



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 245Index: family..futzed

family 128:17

**Fat** 196:15

favor 163:16

Federal 38:10 48:1 143:17 146:1,2

feedback 32:13,14 80:23 95:17

121:23 150:11

feel 139:6,9 173:2

feet 145:15 146:8,12

fellow 117:15 144:21

felt 97:10 135:22 169:16 173:4

178:22

feverishly 189:4

figure 47:10 129:12 176:24

**file** 8:17 44:20,21,23,25 45:3,11 150:19,23,25 155:16 173:20 191:23 197:24 198:1,3,10,19 199:19 200:2 203:15,19,23 211:1,4,8,17 223:15

**files** 43:23 149:25 150:9,13,15 198:11,13,15,16 199:4,22 200:8 224:5

final 32:14,22 57:17 59:24 60:8 64:24 65:3,6 68:15 72:12,17,21 74:10,11 80:9 87:9 88:20,22 89:17 93:21,25 94:3 111:10,11,16,17 112:13 113:4 114:14 116:12 117:17 123:2 137:13,20 151:23 154:11 158:14,21,23 159:4 162:15 163:15 165:24 173:20 175:8 181:2 188:14 190:19 191:24 192:1,15 193:4 195:21,24 198:20 199:11,22 200:9, 10 207:2 208:23 211:18

finalize 137:17 161:9 162:16

**finalized** 30:21,23 157:4 163:2 199:18

finalizing 43:25 146:8 163:11

finally 30:23 112:23 199:10,14

find 212:16

finding 95:8 117:19

fine 141:14

fingers 196:15

finish 39:4 225:15

finished 133:23 134:2 166:21

finishing 203:25 213:10 226:4,12,

19 227:4,13

firsthand 205:20

fit 157:19 158:1 163:5 215:11

five-minute 186:3

fix 213:3

flat 61:14,15 62:4,10,12,19 69:15

flip 65:3

**floating** 147:19

**floor** 39:20 40:8,17 48:13,15,18 49:4 77:4 81:25 82:2 110:21 182:23

220:25

focus 65:12 122:7 128:6

**focused** 37:24 219:12

folder 155:17 186:16

folders 186:16

folks 164:2

**follow** 137:10 193:13,17 207:2

follow-up 21:6 72:14 208:6 219:10

font 201:19

**force** 11:16

forced 163:8

Forest 70:4,5

forget 39:21

forgetting 39:22

**form** 9:24 10:17 13:11,17 14:13,15 15:11,20 17:9,16 18:11 21:4,21 22:9 23:19 26:1 27:19 28:6 30:7,10 32:6, 24 35:25 43:3 44:2 46:5 48:4 49:24 50:7 52:8 55:6 56:6 62:21 63:13 65:20 72:10,19 73:1,8 75:5 77:13 78:15 81:9,21 82:11 84:5 85:16 86:24 88:17 89:3,9,14 90:20 91:9,11 93:10 94:8 96:2 98:17 101:7 103:25 104:19 105:5 111:24 112:1 113:1 115:17,19 117:6 120:5 121:21 122:23 123:21 125:4 134:24 135:14 136:2 137:3,22 139:15,21 140:8,18 142:6 143:21 145:5,17 146:10 149:5,7,23 150:4 152:19 154:20 155:6 157:21 160:16 162:1 163:22 164:18 165:9 166:4 167:3 174:14 180:10 183:19 192:5,7,8 199:22 216:19 218:23 223:9 224:13 225:10, 18,24 226:20 227:5 228:11 229:16

**forma** 52:7,10

formal 43:11 137:5,6,20

format 115:20 173:20 214:22

formation 90:8 93:2,3 95:9 140:24

formative 115:1

formatting 112:14

forms 102:18

formulating 18:10,14 151:8

**forum** 102:12

**forward** 117:12 118:6,15 180:12

**found** 66:18

founded 54:4

**frame** 128:8,21 135:4,5,13 149:11 155:5 160:2 184:16 188:13 220:7

224:8 225:6 226:25

framed 34:25 78:5

framework 14:7 16:22 17:5,9,17,22 18:1,3 19:3,23 20:1,2,5,8,11,15 22:1,5,11,16,20 23:6 24:22 25:3 26:7 29:22 31:8,10 54:10,12,14,16 55:10,15,22,24 58:5,10,14 66:5,13 67:20,22 68:2 73:10 75:18 76:5,13 79:23 81:20 84:18 85:24 86:5,13,14, 15,18,20 87:4,22 88:20 89:10 98:12 124:9 140:14 152:22 153:15 157:12 158:5 179:5,9,17,20 180:1,7,12,25 181:1,11 182:5 184:8,12,17

frameworks 26:20 165:11 179:23 180:8 181:13 182:2 183:17,23 188:14

**framing** 177:20

free 218:11

**frequently** 108:18 176:10 177:2 215:9 221:17,21 222:1

fresh 125:12,21

friendly 118:9

**front** 35:5,8 51:3 99:3 111:8,18 181:11 184:3

full 95:10 110:13 186:5

fully 151:12 169:21 227:7

function 144:14

futzed 206:22

G

**gain** 64:20

games 170:25

garbled 94:16

gathered 220:24 221:6,8,11

gathering 163:11

gauge 101:5

gave 142:18

**general** 65:13 131:18 132:10 133:15 141:21 142:18 145:21 201:5 225:19

**general's** 130:4 132:25 200:22 201:1,6 205:11

generalized 114:21 155:8

**generally** 46:13 83:14 187:7 208:19 230:4

generated 15:23 179:24

**geographic** 14:10 26:23 27:14 66:10,11 157:9,13

**geographical** 11:20 15:14,22 27:9, 10 67:24 68:1,4,8

geographies 68:25

geography 45:2

get all 57:9

giggling 38:14,16

**give** 20:17 33:7 46:4 55:14,18 60:13 69:14 73:16 80:20 110:16 123:18 142:9 152:13 158:14,23 176:10 177:2 189:5 206:25 213:12 214:11

**giving** 57:4,25 189:20 212:3 219:12

glad 23:4

go-between 167:7,13,14

goal 74:13 112:4

**good** 39:5 101:4,8,9 156:4 228:23 230:3,7

good-bye 118:18,19

governing 93:18,20,24 94:4 164:6

**government** 12:18,20 93:15 104:18 105:1 139:5,10,14,20 143:5

governments 11:22 143:13

grab 41:6 209:25

**Grave-** 183:8

Graves 18:8 19:24 20:3,5,13 37:19, 23 38:5 41:15,17 42:19,20 49:3,5, 12,14 50:24 54:20 66:6,12 68:6,16 70:25 71:6 75:17 76:13,18,23,25 77:18 78:10 79:16,17 80:10 81:2,7, 13,15,24 82:9,21 84:14 85:1,3,15,20 86:5,13,17 87:21 95:11,12 96:13,16 97:11,14 98:3,7 110:10 121:18,20 122:6 145:9 165:21 166:14,16 168:8,11 169:4 172:14,22 173:3 174:11 180:5,20,24 181:19,22 182:2,8 183:6 185:7,17 187:4 204:13,18 216:12,16,17,23 224:24

Graves' 122:3

gray 216:11

great 32:13 58:23

greater 57:7

**Greg** 98:15

ground 97:6

**grows** 74:15

**guess** 22:3 23:22 24:3 27:5,6 29:2 30:13 52:24 78:2,6,23 88:10 92:9 98:23 104:20,22 106:14,15 111:3 117:24 120:17 121:11 122:18 125:10 145:14 149:17 163:17 176:19 191:7 196:22 201:23 221:3

guests 101:15

guidance 132:5

guys 39:22 215:6

Н

half 213:1

**halfway** 211:13

**hallway** 49:11 50:3 104:3 175:15, 18,19 176:2

**Hampton** 38:10 39:20 40:18 47:25 48:2 109:11,15,18,22 144:23 204:12 220:25 229:12

handful 10:7

hands 21:17 130:8 192:25

**happen** 66:21 97:19 99:9 204:22 228:10

**happened** 46:11,12 50:19 53:14 91:24 154:18 159:1 163:20 182:7 185:20 188:17 204:19

**happening** 52:5 91:18 99:11 123:11,12 134:15 162:23 203:22

happy 188:6 219:14 227:20

**hard** 62:15 63:2,3 71:10 111:9 120:12 216:14,17,23 217:8

hard-and-fast 100:23

**head** 59:25 75:14 87:19 129:8 153:24

headed 210:2

health 230:7,9

**hear** 26:15 60:25 101:15 123:15 140:9 158:17 160:23 161:8 182:17 217:20 227:20

**heard** 99:5 123:15 159:25 174:18 177:19,21 178:22 201:10,14 228:2

**hearing** 71:11 76:17,22 158:22 164:13

heartburn 206:25 207:3

**held** 70:19 75:15 76:11 141:21 143:17,20 213:11 215:10

**helpful** 17:15 156:13 178:1 185:21 196:10

high 112:3

highest 11:25

highlight 71:25 156:13 157:22

**highlights** 117:16 201:20

Historic 11:23

historical 44:12

**historically** 73:25 90:12

hit 101:1

hold 106:10 170:24 193:1

holder 44:6

**holed** 38:19

holistic 120:24

home 38:7 229:21

hope 117:18 137:10

horizontal 21:17

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 247Index: host..involve

host 152:12

hosting 40:22

**hotel** 38:12,17,20,21,23 41:18,23 46:17,20 47:24 48:12 127:2,9 144:25 189:11 213:8 220:25 223:22,

**hotels** 39:8

hour 39:3 79:1,4,5 141:8 224:15

**hours** 47:14,17 82:4,7,8 89:17 115:9 123:24 126:7,17 136:23 141:11 154:3,5,19 172:3 202:17 221:2,4

Hovering 151:19

human 113:21

**hunched** 151:14

hundred 40:23 41:3 208:25

hung 52:24 hurry 225:15

hurrying 203:24

hypothetical 171:7

ı

**I-90** 75:18,23 76:3,4

idea 53:10 78:12

ideas 66:17

identification 230:21

identified 186:16 identifies 133:18

identify 44:18 45:4 191:24

idly 14:3

illustrating 109:24

imagine 24:11 40:25 127:7

**immediately** 46:13 125:13,17 130:2

176:4

impact 84:7

**impair** 230:5

impasse 84:9,10,12,16,21 161:23

162:4,25 167:14 172:3

imperfect 228:22

implicate 135:13 136:25

implications 104:18 105:1

implying 91:13

**important** 64:14 66:20 67:9 153:3

171:1

impossible 74:15 89:7

impression 137:12 139:1 200:7

improvement 59:20,22 60:11 65:19

in-person 102:16 164:25

inaccurate 117:23 188:13

inappropriate 38:17 91:22

include 77:18 133:10 196:25

**included** 23:11 32:18 34:14 35:12 36:16 44:15 58:16 73:11 85:12 87:9, 13 91:20 114:22 144:8 165:5

including 30:19 80:21 128:23

165:12

inclusive 54:14 55:19

inclusively 56:10

inconsistent 151:24

incorporate 75:3

incorrect 155:5 160:12 177:20 187:14 195:9 196:4 213:14

independent 169:5 197:12

index 197:20

indicating 130:17 142:19 212:23

individual 85:10 98:21 174:2

individualized 171:21

individuals 37:16,18 126:2,16 145:20 146:3 148:11 189:16

inferred 88:6

inferring 207:18

informal 43:12,13

**information** 11:7 23:8 43:23 80:20, 24 95:12 113:5 123:6,11 130:24 133:5,9,11 147:3 151:12 211:2,3

214:7

**informed** 24:10 36:16 53:25 66:19

67:5 165:22 183:13

informing 32:11

initially 72:3

**Inn** 38:10 39:20 204:12 220:25

229:12

**input** 10:25 11:1 32:16,19,20 33:7, 10,12 90:14 148:2,4 163:11,13,16

inquired 209:23

inquiry 10:22

inside 127:21 129:8 216:11

insight 121:14

insinuation 221:12

**instance** 64:19 74:5 82:18 94:5 102:25 103:5 104:23 125:1 167:10

instant 8:19 102:19,22

instruct 130:22 200:19

instructed 32:4 176:16

instruction 176:9,25 178:12

instructions 189:20

integrate 32:3

integrated 112:24

Integration 114:16

intend 16:21 116:5

intended 212:19

intent 89:1 103:9

intention 116:9 218:25

intentionally 101:25

interactive 151:15

**interest** 58:6,24 66:9 87:8,16,23

interested 17:7 169:11 199:1

interests 157:13 171:2

Internet 192:11

interpret 218:13

interpretation 27:1 138:12

interpreted 156:20 219:11

interrupt 38:1

interruption 16:5 61:8 202:9

**invite** 53:10 171:13,16 175:1,3

185:3 218:5

invited 53:19 171:10

involve 100:11 158:5,11 210:7

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 248Index: involved..legislative

involved 31:23 38:8 58:5 83:8 98:21 100:4,9 103:15 153:17 157:12 159:7 166:15,18,19 212:14 217:2 226:24 228:5

**involvement** 96:23 150:6,8,12 168:1

involving 119:16 226:17,18

isolated 167:10 isolation 66:22

issue 102:17 139:13 186:19 210:6

issued 67:4 138:9

**issues** 85:7 90:9 95:8 105:3 122:14 136:16 138:24,25 178:15,16 179:3

item 172:7,8 180:9,25

items 136:6,10 166:10 171:19

183:18

iteration 181:5 199:11

**iterations** 9:22 10:1,5,10 24:9 25:16 30:3 32:9 65:17

J

January 7:2

**JD** 12:6

**Joan** 39:2 78:25 120:20 132:20 141:7 192:23 206:15 211:12 215:14 218:2

**job** 12:15 17:7 225:20

**Joe** 7:4,10,18 146:17 155:23 177:12

**John** 7:3 18:20 177:25

join 176:9 177:1

joint 12:7

joke 218:13,14,15 219:2

**joking** 219:9

**joy** 71:14

juncture 55:18 86:2 96:25 97:2 119:9 137:25

Junior 11:22

juris 12:1

juris- 138:21

**jurisdiction** 130:5,14,17 132:9 133:1,18,25 134:22 135:6,12,17,20,

22 136:8 137:14 138:22 140:16 147:6 148:6 153:1 190:8

jurisdiction's 130:8

jurisdictional 137:1

justice 208:13

Justin 174:25 175:2,11

Κ

kay 156:7

keeping 111:25 145:21

Kent 73:22

**key** 90:13 127:16,17

kids 38:7

**kind** 10:24 14:21 27:22 38:13 51:10 68:10,21 77:7 90:7 94:16 102:20 105:6,12 110:2,15,20 115:18,19,20 131:23 158:9 181:9 182:6,11 184:22 193:10 201:19,20 203:4

kinds 92:21

**King** 12:21,22 25:9 142:2

**knew** 20:7,10 53:12 87:22 88:2 112:19 121:18 122:3,21 123:6 126:1 140:25 141:4 180:4 183:11,12

knock 127:21

**knowing** 95:22,23 116:18

knowledge 27:12 84:15 85:23 112:9,21 119:14 134:20 141:3 143:8 160:11 163:6 177:6 182:1,4 197:10, 12,17 198:21 201:24 202:1,13 205:21 230:8

L

label 187:15 195:17 199:22

labeled 187:9 191:3 laboriously 184:22

lack 55:12 58:21 130:13 164:15

Lake 70:4,5 203:7

Lane 7:20

language 54:7,15 198:7

**laptop** 51:7,8,9,10 189:19

laptops 189:22

**large** 25:5 38:12,18 39:19 40:17,21 150:18 152:12 223:4

largely 53:6 110:24 151:11

last-minute 172:12

**lasted** 84:12

**late** 17:3 18:6,21 81:15 85:1 97:1 172:3 182:16 224:14.15

latest 181:5

**Latinx** 60:24 61:1 87:10

latitude 45:4 lattes 219:25 laundry 66:4

law 12:13 21:8 25:13 60:21

LD 219:12 lead 123:9 leading 200:10

lean 60:22

learn 151:16

leave 9:20 35:20 126:20 151:21

leaves 61:19

leaving 91:6 151:11 152:11 229:12

led 154:12 166:11

**leeway** 61:19

**left** 29:13 46:22 48:25 50:22 126:17 151:21 152:3,8 200:15 204:11 223:21,23 228:22 229:15,18

leg 216:15,18 217:9

**legal** 91:13 104:17 139:6 140:22 177:1 194:8 200:22

legalities 200:18

legality 204:19

legislative 8:24 9:2,7,8,11,17 10:2, 5 15:1,8,16,19 16:1,3,12 37:24 53:23 54:6,11,12 55:11,15,22 56:24, 25 57:6,21 58:16 59:17,23 60:6,18 61:5,12 62:8 64:2 66:7,12 69:8,19 74:16,18 75:2 76:24 77:10 79:15,18 80:25 83:18,19 87:7,12 94:6 95:2 96:14 98:12 102:2 122:8 150:25 151:2,7,23 152:4 153:12 154:22 156:24 160:10,20 169:12,15 170:1,



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 249Index: legislature..mark

10 179:19 180:19 212:14 216:24 217:3 218:10.19

**legislature** 9:6 12:24,25 13:2 15:10 25:25 59:24 112:23 114:16 137:2

lengthy 66:16 179:24

lens 109:25

**letter** 190:16 191:7,23 192:5 215:25

Letter 11.15.21 193:4

**Letter\_plansubmittal\_draft** 191:4

level 11:25 153:20 179:22

liberated 135:23

licensed 12:8,11

light 78:1

**limited** 26:23,25 27:1 99:17 103:12 116:6 128:17 166:11

limiting 70:18

**lines** 21:17 23:22 24:7 25:19,22 26:5 33:15,16 35:18 161:3 190:22,23

**linking** 102:21

links 199:23

**Lisa** 149:24

**list** 55:19,20,21 57:4,25 66:5 69:14 70:23 73:3,15 123:18,23 124:1

**listed** 114:5

**litany** 134:5

litigable 138:25

live 179:2

living 113:20

load 24:16,22,25

**lobby** 50:3 144:25 147:2 183:11 189:11,17 215:11

local 11:22 143:13

locate 115:5

located 222:20

location 44:9 45:5

locations 48:13,15 50:2

lock 127:13

lodging 227:22

log 51:18,23

logged 53:8 77:17

logging 53:18

**long** 20:4 21:8 22:17 133:10,14 207:1 214:15 226:9

**longer** 84:11 133:24 135:7 136:8 140:16 153:1 229:2

lonaitude 45:5

**looked** 111:10 113:8 151:1 169:2 183:9,10 192:2 203:6

lookie-loo 196:13

lose 137:10

loss 64:20

lost 101:12 135:17 190:8 229:9

**lot** 8:18 28:17 37:25 67:3 86:7 90:14 91:17,19,20 95:20,22,25 101:8 118:14 122:5 151:17 152:14 154:22 179:23 184:9 224:15

М

**M.S.** 7:3

ma- 188:25

Macbook 51:11

**made** 11:20 24:1 31:4,7,14 43:9 53:15,16 62:8 74:15 84:3,10 97:3 112:2,3 116:4 123:18,19 124:4 125:3,13 131:8 135:4 137:1 159:13 160:10 184:18 209:18 229:25

magnitudes 90:16

main 40:17 220:24

**maintain** 25:20 30:4 31:16 32:5 170:15

maintained 27:16

maintaining 25:23 108:15

**majority** 47:20 60:23,25 87:10 93:2, 3 97:16 107:10 142:14,23

**make** 16:11,14,16,24 17:2 23:16 32:15 53:19 54:1 60:23 63:1 67:21 80:2 99:6 101:9 116:2 118:11 127:8 131:19,25 133:2 134:21 136:12,22, 25 149:15 155:8 157:16 170:24 173:11 189:20 191:16 194:3 209:10, 11 211:22 212:13 222:13 225:21

229:20

makes 28:25 101:4

**making** 91:16 112:3 131:11 150:13 158:25 209:15 218:13 229:22

**mandate** 143:19

manner 89:11 136:13 188:6

map 14:9,10 15:8,16 16:17,23 26:7 32:1,14 35:13 36:15,19 37:3,11,21, 22 42:16,23,24 43:5,7,10,15 44:1,14 45:2 46:16 50:6,10 53:20,23 54:13 55:16,22,25 59:24 60:21 72:5,21 95:7 98:12,13 100:3,13,15 101:3 108:24,25 111:16,17 112:22 113:4 114:14 115:4 122:17 125:25 137:13, 24 138:7 150:3,16 151:2,23 152:4 153:10,12 154:9 159:19 160:3 161:7 169:9,16 170:2 171:1,2,6 174:6 175:8 180:19 189:9,19,21 190:1 198:15,20 200:18 201:12 203:15 208:20 214:12 215:1 216:14,15,18, 24,25 217:3,9 223:15 224:5,23

**mapped** 23:13 44:10 111:10 158:8 161:17

**mapping** 22:8 26:11 42:10 137:13 151:9 153:4 158:10 160:25 161:10 162:17,20,21 188:20,23 189:1,4,6 198:16 225:20

maps 14:6,8 15:22 21:4,5 22:11 23:17,20,23,25 27:15 30:18,19,21 31:1,4,20 32:10,22 33:1 37:9,13,24, 25 38:5,9 45:23 46:1,2 49:23 50:1, 10 54:11 55:16 56:1,14 60:8 67:4,11 71:24 74:10 77:23 79:18 88:8,23 89:2,5,25 90:24 94:6 95:2 96:10,11, 14,21 98:23 99:13,18 100:5 102:3 111:11 122:6,8 134:17,18 136:13 137:17,20 140:15 145:24 146:8 148:9 149:16,18 151:8 153:18 154:6,10,11,22 155:1 156:24 157:8, 19 158:1,14,21,24 159:5,9,12 160:10,19,20 163:12,15 164:12,21 165:5,7 169:12,13 171:5 180:16 183:17,23 184:3,7 185:11,12 189:22 190:17 199:10,14,16,17 203:25 204:7 205:23 207:19 211:18 213:25 214:4 215:5.8 217:18 219:12.18 224:8 225:4,16,21 226:4,12,16,19 227:4,9,13 228:8

Maria 195:2

mark 106:18 107:22 193:2 195:17



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 250Index: marked..misinterpreting

**marked** 106:18,24 107:24 117:13 155:14 191:3 193:1 195:16,20 207:3,8 230:20

markers 146:16,22,25 147:1

**mask** 144:24 145:1,2

maskless 145:4,9,12,14

masks 144:22 146:4

master's 12:1,2

match 111:13

matched 30:20 111:12

**matter** 94:13,15 151:17 152:18 197:3 224:18

matters 138:25

meaning 15:3 28:9 49:2 92:24 118:11 120:22 129:19 135:24 218:14 219:5

**means** 21:11 28:18 63:12,20 67:8 83:10 110:1,4 111:13 113:24 205:2 208:24 210:21

**meant** 33:21 170:9 181:3 198:15 211:15

measure 74:17

measured 82:4

measures 28:13

measuring 116:25

mechanical 174:5

mechanics 195:14

mechanism 17:12

mechanisms 112:6

medi- 167:22

mediating 96:18 166:23 167:1

mediation 166:23

mediator 166:1,10 167:8,22

**mediator's** 83:1,4,14 84:3,10 97:4 163:4 167:14 168:3,4 209:24

medical 230:4

**meet** 14:1 54:1 79:5 93:20,24 94:4 148:5 189:8 210:1,2,3 213:13,21,22 214:17

**meeting** 13:15,16 16:9 46:10,13 47:22 50:14,18 51:1,6,13,18,20,24

52:1,21 54:22 67:12,13,15 77:16,17 79:13,22,25 90:4 91:4,6,24 93:4 102:5,16 103:4,19 123:19 124:3,13, 14,24 125:2,6,14 126:16 130:3 135:24,25 144:12 154:5 160:21 171:9 174:25 175:1,2,3,8,10 176:10 177:2 179:2,10,13 180:9 182:3 183:6,7 192:2 195:14 200:1 210:20, 22,23 212:22 213:8 214:14 215:15 217:17 220:24 221:6

**meetings** 93:9,12,15 94:12,23 117:10 124:21 139:18 141:22 143:17.20 144:1 164:25 178:18

**Mell** 7:16 10:1,19,24 13:14,19 14:18, 25 15:15,25 16:11 18:14,17,20,25 19:2,21,22 21:25 22:13 23:25 26:6 27:21 28:17 30:8,12 32:15,25 33:6 34:18,23 35:4 36:3 39:6,9,18 40:2,7, 13,16 42:2,7 43:6 44:8 46:10 48:7, 14 50:5,13 52:11 55:7 56:8 61:11 62:24 63:4,19 65:23 66:4 71:17 72:13,23 73:5,16 75:8 77:16 78:24 79:3,12 81:12,23 82:16 84:9 85:22 87:3 88:24 89:6.13.19 90:2.17 91:4. 10 92:1,12 93:14,23 94:24 96:6,17 99:1 101:10,14,19,24 104:10,25 105:6 106:17.23 107:22.24 112:9 113:7 117:13 120:8,21,23 121:25 122:3 123:3 124:1 125:7 130:25 131:21 132:7,21,23 133:12 134:1 135:3,21 136:9 137:9 138:1,5 139:19,24 140:5,11,17,19,21 141:10,14,19 142:9 143:24 144:21 145:8,23 146:14,21 150:7 153:4 155:3,10 156:3,4 157:24 158:6 160:19 162:4 164:9.24 165:16 166:16,22 167:12 174:17 176:13,23, 25 177:19 178:6,11 180:21 183:22 184:18 186:2,7,11,21,23 187:2,13, 21,24 188:11,12 192:24 193:7 194:22 201:2,9,18,23 202:15,16 206:17,20 207:5,13 208:5 211:13,16 215:18,22,25 216:22 218:5 219:5 220:6 230:13

Mell's 187:16

member 13:2 101:4,9 199:1,6

**members** 38:25 42:17 93:7,19 107:4,5 108:20 140:25 141:1 153:18 179:14,15 189:3,15

**memo** 107:3,16,22 108:1,19 109:7, 10 117:16 118:22,23,25 119:1,2,6, 10,21 121:5 156:12 196:11 200:12 209:2

memorializing 117:2,4,8

memory 62:9 224:11 230:5

mentioned 83:19 168:12 216:13

**message** 51:15 118:8 132:13 164:25 165:7 185:19 207:14 212:19 216:21 217:6,10,15

messages 186:12,15 206:6

messaging 8:19 102:19,22 185:18 212:18

messy 181:8

**met** 139:11,14 166:13 212:23 214:3, 5

metadata 199:9,15,16,19,23 209:12

method 111:25

methods 82:17

**metric** 9:21,22 27:5 61:20 64:7,10, 14 70:16 111:11 114:23 116:23,24

**metrics** 14:4 27:2,7,25 63:22 64:15 72:4 73:12 115:4 116:24 157:8,13, 20 158:2,5,7,12 168:23

middle 7:23 97:6

**midnight** 97:17 100:3 127:5 128:4 133:24 172:25 173:6 189:2 190:8 192:13 195:12 200:16 226:16

midway 83:21,23

mike 19:10

million 25:7

milliseconds 196:25 197:3

mind 27:21 35:21,22 53:15 56:12 62:17 64:6 73:4 101:11 102:6 103:23 104:14,25 121:1,4 129:9,10, 11 141:8 152:17,20,23 170:3,7 185:5 212:20

minds 84:19

mine 112:4

minimize 74:13

minimum 190:25

minority 93:18,19,20,24 94:4

minute 106:13 115:13

minutes 35:18 50:23 79:1 186:5

misinterpreting 177:11

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 251Index: missed..objection

missed 156:18

mistaken 35:16,23 36:2,14

mistakenly 143:11

misunderstand 25:1

misunderstanding 154:16

mixed 75:14

**Mm-hmm** 26:12 38:3 41:16 60:2 121:7 196:19 213:5

modest 60:10.13

modified 84:1

modify 201:3

**moment** 52:3 53:17 66:14 69:23 77:21 99:8 110:25 123:8 128:24 130:2 151:5 185:13 201:1 213:18

moments 17:3 172:25

**Monday** 47:6 48:25 156:25 160:20 214:3,6

Monday's 117:19

month 66:15 138:16 208:22,23

months 57:3 69:10 85:8 163:11

**morning** 46:23 123:24 126:18 149:3 152:13 154:3 209:5,6 214:6 221:2,3 229:13

**motion** 15:25 16:3,10,11,14,17,18, 24 17:2 53:11,19 54:1,5,8,14,15 57:20 59:17 60:6,18 61:6 62:7 74:18 124:16,17,21 171:11,15,16 195:11, 12 196:20

motions 181:10 193:12,14,15

mountains 88:3

mouth 138:18 205:3

**move** 28:24 35:24 41:7 53:22 75:25 131:14 171:19 206:3,6 207:9 212:11

**moved** 28:15 69:23 192:16,17 193:8 196:7

movement 63:17 76:6

**moving** 161:10 162:17,20 172:7,8 183:17,24 184:4

**multiple** 25:18 26:6 33:9 38:24 41:25 75:6 147:10 189:22 190:5

multiples 69:20

Ν

names 200:2

naming 198:21,24 199:4,8

narrative 15:22

narrow 82:6

narrowly 78:23

natural 11:20 126:3

nature 28:12 132:3 149:14 164:6

necessarily 27:20 35:21 44:22 45:4 66:21 78:10 80:5,15 114:24 116:24 143:7 161:20 163:20 170:17,18 205:17

necessitated 26:4

necessity 44:13 74:1

**needed** 43:19 51:17 52:12 75:25 76:8 127:19,23 144:14 173:7,9,18, 21 176:6 190:7 197:22 205:6

negatives 23:1

negotiate 91:7 95:14 116:18

**negotiating** 18:15 50:5 90:3 92:3 99:23 102:2 120:9,14 121:16,19 161:24 162:6 172:21 214:24 215:7 218:9

**negotiation** 82:10,13 117:18 166:3 178:21 212:9

negotiations 49:22 67:1 76:22,24 77:11,20 78:14 79:14 80:21,25 85:15 90:18 95:1 98:13 109:10,22 114:12 116:7 117:5 120:1,4,11,16, 24 121:10,13 122:4,11,19,22 123:7, 12 144:22 145:16 161:9,24 162:5, 16,19 163:1 172:12 173:14 210:5 212:4 213:9

neighbor 71:9

neighborhood 34:15

nexus 65:5 76:3 81:6,11

night 37:25 58:25

noes 26:17

noise 38:15

**Normandy** 7:21 36:5,6,8,11,16 202:25

north 21:12 69:25

north-south 21:12

**Nos** 230:18

not-competitive 30:1

note 64:14 66:20 209:10

**noted** 197:13

noticeable 61:24

**November** 13:10,16 15:15,18 109:4,14 144:23 157:1 192:20

**number** 7:25 8:2,4,5,9 10:8 11:9 24:16 28:4,15 29:20 50:19 58:5 59:19 60:13 63:21 64:12 65:8 66:16 72:5 73:13,24 75:1,7 76:25 85:7 99:13 106:11 128:22 138:25 167:6 178:18 184:8 191:2 193:3 206:11 207:6

**numbers** 74:2 75:12 161:10,25 162:6,17,19 163:2 164:11 188:20,23 198:3 206:5,22,23

0

**O'NEIL** 164:9 174:12 175:13 200:13 201:11

O'Neil's 155:4 189:19

**O-P-M-A** 103:21

**object** 9:24 10:17 13:11,17 14:15 15:11,20 18:11 19:5 21:21 22:9 23:19 26:1 27:19 28:6 30:7,10 43:3 44:2 46:5 48:4 49:24 50:7 52:8 55:6 56:6 62:21 63:13 65:20 72:10,19 73:1,8 75:5 77:13 78:15 81:9,21 82:11 84:5 85:16 86:24 89:3.9.14 90:20 91:9 93:10 94:8 96:2 98:17 101:7 103:25 104:19 105:5 112:1 113:1 117:6 120:5 121:21 122:23 123:21 125:4 130:19 134:24 135:14 136:2 137:3,22 139:15,21 140:8,18 142:6 143:21 145:5,17 146:10 150:4 152:19 154:20 155:6 156:18 157:21 160:16 162:1 163:22 164:18 165:9 166:4 167:3 174:14 176:15 180:10 183:19 200:19 216:19 223:9 224:13 225:10,24 226:20 227:5 228:11

objecting 86:15

**objection** 19:15 32:6,24 35:25 48:10 65:25 86:18 88:17 89:21 90:5 91:10,14,16 92:7 93:16 131:8 133:3



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 252Index: objections..percent

140:1,12 227:14,22 229:16

objections 85:25 86:6

objectives 135:25

obligation 142:16 143:14

observation 162:18

observe 128:1 182:18

occasionally 14:2

occasions 190:5

occupied 48:19 146:23

occur 92:18 94:21 182:19 189:13

203:10 204:17

**occurred** 30:17 34:7 149:22 172:24 182:8,12 189:1,2 203:20 214:16

221:13 223:3,19

occurring 99:19 161:7

occurs 93:4

odd 144:11

off-line 55:4 90:18 95:1 120:2

offer 83:1 95:16 131:7 166:9 210:8

offered 83:20,22 174:20

offering 167:21

offers 164:24 174:10

office 12:23 44:5 200:22 201:1,6

official 93:1 113:21 132:5

oftentimes 64:18 74:14

**Olympia** 143:20

on-camera 50:18

one-and-one 119:16

one-on-one 102:8 119:19 147:23

ongoing 64:13

**open** 44:25 45:3,11 93:15 94:11,23 102:5 104:18 105:1 107:18 112:4 127:17,18 139:5,10,14,17,20 143:5

169:23 179:1 195:18 214:20

**opened** 127:16

opening 194:22

**operate** 136:15

operated 145:1

operating 133:21 160:6 204:23

opining 138:24

**opinion** 40:21 138:5 142:4 151:8

197:25

**OPMA** 92:14 102:1,17 103:21,23 104:6,18 105:14 134:22,23 135:4,13 136:25 138:15 141:19,23,24,25

142:5,22 143:9

**opportunity** 43:7 86:23 128:1

151:22 159:4,10 194:2

**opposed** 119:16

option 52:20,22

options 76:4

oral 17:19

orally 26:13

**order** 31:4,15 68:9,10 69:15 138:9,

17,19 163:16,17 173:8,10,18

194:10,11,13

organizations 148:12

original 223:5

originally 115:24

Osta 153:13,14

**outage** 192:12

**outcome** 138:13

overlapping 211:22

overlay 23:12 45:2

overnight 46:20 47:21

overspoke 19:12

Ρ

**p.m.** 101:22 141:17 174:9 186:9 189:7 195:3 209:22 230:17

**pace** 156:6

Pacific 7:2

painstakingly 161:17

paper 51:2

paragraph 160:9,13 167:5

pardon 75:12

Park 7:21 36:5,6,8,11,16 202:25

parse 136:21 180:21 221:8

**part** 30:18 34:19 47:4 50:3 52:11 56:15 57:5 69:2,4,5,11 76:15 77:1 85:19 88:19,20 100:1,13 162:7 166:11 170:19,20 174:16 178:15 179:3 200:8,9 212:1,25 215:12

partial 21:4

participant 129:15,18 163:25

participants 89:24 121:2 134:12

163:24

participate 82:25 96:22 173:23

175:10 210:17

participating 97:13

participation 90:14

parties 44:7

**partisan** 13:2 14:1 23:11,12 25:2,4, 20,24 26:8,23 27:9,17,23 28:9,11,13 29:18 60:7 61:16,18 63:18,19,23,24

65:2 73:12 84:2 162:22 168:23

**partisanship** 161:10,25 162:6,17, 19 163:1 164:11 188:20,23

parts 25:9 38:22 178:20

party 13:3,4 59:20,23 60:11 65:9

83:6 182:10,17 199:20,21

pass 127:8 175:13

passage 165:1 214:11

passed 133:19 136:16

**passive** 129:18

past 39:9 67:1 90:16 104:3

path 117:19 197:24 198:1,3,19

paths 191:24 198:10

**Paul** 31:23 32:2 33:4,7,21 34:8,10 35:5,8 36:16,17 58:10 82:24 189:11 203:22 209:25 210:2,3,7,15 216:2,

12,16,21 217:6,7 223:20

**Paul's** 217:5

pause 19:14 42:4 79:9 101:21

104:17 141:16 186:8

Pellicciotti 113:10,12,14,16 114:2,

3,9

people 25:7 40:23 41:10 63:23 79:4

99:2,15 126:6 134:11 164:4

percent 27:4,5,11,18 60:15 61:21,

24 62:2,11,14,16,19 63:5,9,10,12,16

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 253Index: percentage..presenting

209:1

**percentage** 9:21 27:11 28:15 29:18 64:20 83:24,25

percentages 64:5

perception 136:23

perfect 111:13 224:11 228:17,19

perform- 63:24

**performance** 20:20 23:11,12 24:16, 23 25:2,5,20,24 26:8,24 27:9,17,23 28:10,12 29:18 55:11,12 56:23 57:1, 22 58:7,16,20,21 59:15 60:4,7,17 61:4,14,15,16,18 62:4,7,12,20 63:18,20,25 64:2,16,18 66:2,8 69:16 73:12 83:16,17 84:2 114:3 162:23 165:12

**performed** 8:25 9:3 43:15 112:8 136:19

performing 137:17

**period** 144:5 182:16 224:11 227:2,

permissible 104:7,8 185:23

permit 112:16

permutations 21:23

**person** 111:14,16 129:14,18 145:16 153:6,7 165:7 174:13

**personal** 8:10 51:8,9 149:14 163:6 186:17 201:23 202:1

**personally** 10:7 45:25 46:2 112:12 204:6 226:8

perspective 135:11 190:10

**pertaining** 94:20 **pertains** 94:2 200:20

pertinent 18:22 178:2,17

**phone** 7:25 8:2,5,8,9 204:13 208:6,9 229:20,23,25

phrase 94:2 143:11

phrased 52:15 157:16

**physical** 8:8 15:13,22 21:4,5 37:22 45:6 89:25 90:24 230:4

physically 51:15 pick 30:16 65:2,4

picking 19:9

picture 110:16 129:9

picture's 129:10

piece 47:11 124:12 137:10

pieces 78:20 163:13

piles 115:15

ping 127:20

pivot 152:14

**place** 42:11 84:24 104:5 126:3 155:19 158:10 172:1

placeholder 190:21,23

**places** 197:21

**plan** 14:14,23 15:2,3,6,8,19 16:1,12, 15 44:6 116:25 135:17 139:25 141:5 169:15,22 170:1,9 171:13,16,22 172:21 173:7 191:24 212:14 217:2 220:10.12

plans 95:3 110:2 114:23,24

play 95:7 97:8,21 161:2 170:25

playing 83:9 97:10

point 22:12 31:3 35:1 46:14 53:16 54:22,23 59:19,22 60:14 62:23 65:18 76:19 81:15 82:1 83:24,25 84:16 85:13 111:9 115:7 120:25 125:19 131:7 132:22 135:18 137:6 138:6,7 141:2 147:4,8 151:23 152:18 160:4 162:25 166:13,20 169:18 174:17 175:11 183:1 185:4 187:16 188:19,22 200:14 201:11 203:23 204:10,23 205:7 208:9 219:15 220:23 221:5,11 224:20 225:14 227:3 229:13

point-by-point 46:12

points 50:19 110:5 184:23

**poke** 219:13

**political** 9:20,22 11:12,14,16 14:4 20:20 55:11 56:23 57:1,22 58:6,16, 19,21 59:15 60:4,17 61:4 62:7 64:6, 10 65:5,11 66:2,8 69:15 157:8,13,20 158:1,5,7,12

**population** 11:10 26:4 27:3 60:24 74:2,15 75:25 76:6,7,12 87:10 88:4, 5 203:8

**portion** 34:13 50:14,22,23 51:1,6, 12,18 79:25 107:23 109:8 171:9 179:10,18 182:3 183:18,24 184:4

portrayed 205:1

**position** 66:18 93:3 113:21 116:14, 17 117:3,4 140:24,25 141:4 149:17 150:1 158:20 170:16,19,23 174:7 180:13 185:8 193:11 205:10 217:2, 3,5

positions 217:8 possibilities 53:5

possibility 17:5 53:3,12,13

**possibly** 51:14 57:23 58:18 118:20 197:3

post 121:5 205:23

posted 67:15 225:16

potentially 161:1

power 136:17

practice 12:8,11,13 44:12 124:20

**pre-** 56:14

preceded 172:7

precise 29:20,21 44:9

precluded 102:7

predominantly 10:13 11:10 64:1 122:8

prefer 89:4

preferable 164:20

preference 13:3,4

premarked 206:21

preparation 197:6

prepare 97:24 113:3,7

**prepared** 53:14 115:5,8 116:13 170:13 180:14 190:7

preparing 97:14

presence 11:23 160:24

**present** 55:2 71:6 83:12 99:21 129:6 134:6 150:16,17,18,22,24 153:20 154:2 189:12,16 201:9 203:17,19 222:10,16

**presentation** 17:17 141:21 142:19, 20 199:25 211:14

**presented** 9:10 67:12 83:7 150:3 152:24 164:21 181:1

presenting 169:6

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 254Index: president..question

president 12:16

press 67:7 149:7 205:23

pressure 151:17 212:15

**pretty** 39:5 66:15 144:11 152:12

168:16

**previous** 21:1 24:9 29:6 30:18 32:9, 18 33:3 34:14,15 36:15,18,19,23 37:2 55:25 56:14 58:2 69:10 104:12 144:14,16,17 208:22

**previously** 31:21 63:2 73:20 74:21 76:11 83:19 100:5 124:6 163:3 165:21 166:8 172:14 223:19 226:23 229:17

primarily 65:12

primary 64:24 65:1,6,9 108:16

principle 148:8

**prior** 19:4 20:8,11 48:20 50:12 54:22 56:10 58:11 70:25 84:22 108:4 109:12,17,20 110:24 116:21 141:1,4 157:20 158:14 159:13 160:20 164:21 170:3 179:9,13,17 180:9,25 181:17 183:17,23 195:12 196:7 214:17

**priorities** 110:5 111:25 117:16 161:1,2 163:9

prioritized 74:4

prioritizing 108:23

**priority** 85:9 108:16 109:24 112:3,8 117:8 118:12

private 91:23 119:14

**privately** 55:1,2 79:20 102:3 119:12 135:24 139:25 140:4

**privilege** 130:21 131:4,10,17 133:13 176:16,21 177:10

privileged 130:23 133:5,9

**pro** 52:6,10

problem 115:16 222:7

problems 230:5

procedural 208:19

proceed 131:6 132:18 184:2

proceeding 124:9

**proceedings** 7:6 42:4 79:9 101:21 141:16 186:8

process 24:11 33:11,12 43:19,20 57:18 63:21 66:16 67:5 71:23 77:6 78:19 84:8 86:3 90:7,10,15 91:25 94:21 95:24 97:18 98:20 100:3,6,10 102:6 105:20 108:17 111:21 112:5 126:1 128:24 130:6 131:13 135:16 137:25 138:13 142:15 144:6 151:13 162:24 163:25 164:1 165:4 169:21 170:11 171:19 172:1 173:19 175:12 179:3,25 180:17 200:11 202:18 212:12 215:12 226:9

processing 202:17

produced 106:14,16 107:17 114:20

producing 115:12

product 30:22 32:17 101:6

productive 108:21 151:18,19

**program** 8:5,7,9 11:8,9 12:7 43:22

**progress** 68:7 76:23 82:22 97:3 166:12

progressing 169:13

pronounced 113:13

proper 88:25

properly 113:13 207:3

**proposal** 14:12 17:11 23:23 25:24 26:2 31:1,5 54:10,12,16 55:10,15, 22,24 56:17 58:14 66:6,13 67:20 68:15 69:12 75:18 76:5,13,15 79:23 81:3,17 83:1,4,5,15 84:7,10,13,25 85:2,6,19 86:16,22 87:1,9 89:8 95:10 97:5,15,17,23 101:3 111:7 114:8 163:5 165:24 166:1,10 167:15,24,25 168:3,5,6,22 169:1,6, 10 173:8 179:16 184:12,17 190:2 209:24 218:10,19

**proposals** 14:7 27:14 32:10,18 34:14,15 36:21 56:1 72:2 77:1,6,15 78:1,9 90:8 93:6 95:25 96:4 98:24 110:6 112:7 117:11 120:11 154:18 165:3,6 174:20 189:10 208:20 214:9

**proposed** 16:22 17:9,17,22 18:1,3 19:2,23 20:15 21:3 22:1,5,16,20 23:6 24:22 26:7,20 29:22 31:8,10 32:22 85:19 86:13 87:4,21 98:12 179:5,9 180:24 182:5 188:14

prosecutor's 12:23

protected 132:6,16

protecting 131:25

protective 132:3

**provide** 33:10 123:22 159:4 161:18 191:11 194:15,18,20 214:7

**provided** 8:6 33:12 84:13 194:24 200:23

providing 80:23 95:16

**public** 30:19 32:4,12,13,14,16,19,20 51:18 66:17 67:1,2,8,12,13,14,16,17 77:12,16,17 78:20 79:22 84:18 89:25 90:4,14 91:1,6 92:4,25 93:4 94:7,11,23 99:11 102:5,11 103:18 107:17 116:3,4,5 120:2 123:19 124:3,13,14 139:18 141:1,4 148:24 149:1,8,18 159:8,13 163:11 176:9 177:1 178:13 179:4,8 183:7 186:13 187:8 194:24 198:25 199:1,5,6 205:1 210:23 225:21

publication 149:16 160:4

publicized 135:25 149:8

publicizing 208:20

**publicly** 36:25 55:4 79:13 89:16 117:11 119:12 132:13 134:16,18 164:21

**publish** 116:12

**published** 116:3 160:3

**Puget** 21:9

pull 155:14

**purely** 169:2

purpose 44:24 191:8

**purposes** 148:22,25 154:4 186:14 191:7

**put** 11:2 34:19 48:14 109:6 116:9 117:11 138:18 155:19 173:19 201:19 203:3 205:3 206:24 212:15

Q

qualifiers 57:9

qualifying 24:17

quantify 122:9

**question** 9:1 10:4 11:4 14:17,20 15:5 17:1 18:21,22 19:1,20 21:2,6 22:3,17 34:24 35:1 42:11 44:24 48:11 52:23 59:1,13 60:3 66:24,25 67:24 68:24 78:5 80:2 86:9 90:22



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 255Index: question's..referred

91:15 92:3,5 94:2 101:10 103:7 108:4,11 111:4 120:18 121:5 123:4 129:7 130:23 132:3,4,20,22 139:18 146:21 156:9 160:18 162:3 169:23 170:6,18 173:11 176:20 177:5,13, 18,22 178:2,8 179:7 183:21 188:8 193:13,25 198:8 199:13 213:5 215:4 222:13 223:5,11,24 225:18 226:22 227:7,18 228:13 229:11 230:8,9

question's 31:9

questionable 204:19

questioning 39:4 128:7

**questions** 22:25 86:7 154:1 178:20 187:16 215:2 220:10,13 229:4

quibble 157:15

quick 71:8 79:1 101:18 115:13

**quickly** 35:19 152:14 184:25 188:1 203:10 204:7 225:16 226:4

**quo** 9:21 20:21 26:20,21 27:4,7,8, 16,22 28:5,18,21 29:17,22 30:5 31:16 32:5

R

race 64:3,7,12,24 65:7

random 199:5

range 28:2

ranges 27:25

rationale 97:24

RC003040 106:19

re-ask 173:11

re-reviewed 142:25

**reach** 82:17 97:20 105:4 208:6 226:8

**reached** 76:18 81:20 148:7 150:10 163:1 179:5,6,9,13 180:8

reaction 122:3,5

**read** 18:22 39:9 138:16 144:3 155:10 156:19 161:4 167:4,5 174:1 177:25 178:2 198:20 219:1

reads 44:22 168:21

**ready** 152:15 190:17 200:8 210:1,19 213:17

real 52:24 101:18 202:3

reality 88:15

realized 51:17

**reason** 65:15 117:22 155:3 175:15 182:11 187:13,14,17 188:12 195:8 196:3 217:11

reasoning 54:2

reasons 116:16

recall 10:7 13:20.22.24 16:20 20:6 23:10 32:1,21 33:2,8 37:12,17,20,22 40:14 41:9 42:18,22 43:11,13 44:15 46:12,22 47:10 48:17 49:8,18,21 50:11,25 51:16,19 54:7,15 55:9,17 56:13 57:2,10 58:25 59:18 60:9 68:3,23 69:24 70:9,11,22 71:1,7 72:11,21,24 73:2,17 74:22,25 75:24 76:16,20 80:22 81:22 86:17 87:25 97:1,8 98:5 99:15 102:25 103:5,14 104:2 105:18 107:15 109:21 111:5, 9.11.23 112:11 114:18 115:11 116:4,8,11 120:1 122:24 123:8 124:2,19 125:1,14,23 126:11 127:4, 12 128:19 129:2,16,17,20 134:4,25 135:2,9 136:3 139:12 141:6 142:18 143:14 144:2,7,24,25 145:2,7,13 146:3,25 147:7,17 148:16 149:4,9, 11,12,25 150:20 152:1,2,7,10 154:24 155:1,2 158:18,22,25 159:6, 11,14,17 160:7,22 161:4,6,11 164:13 168:10 171:10,20,23 172:2, 4,10,12 174:22 175:3,5 176:1 183:25 185:17 188:25 189:23 190:3, 11,18,20,23 192:17 195:13 198:6,23 199:25 201:4 204:15,21 205:25 208:15 213:23 217:4 220:2,22 221:3,5,7,13,14 222:11,12,17,22 223:1,18,23 224:3,4,6,9,20,22 225:9,12,14,22,25 226:1,7,11,17 227:1,11 228:5,14 229:12,15,22 230:1

recalling 129:3

receive 122:5 143:9 175:4 176:25

received 57:17 58:1 67:16,17 80:24 112:10 114:4 115:6 130:11 132:5 133:11 136:6 141:25 149:24 163:13 186:13 190:1 198:25 204:13

receiving 131:2 142:11 144:20 208:11

recently 142:24 155:12

recipient 217:24

recitation 205:17

recognize 106:24 195:21

recollect 31:18 203:1 229:11

recollection 9:16 15:13 20:17,18 28:23 35:6,14 61:14 69:21 71:3,18, 20 76:7 84:12 86:2 97:9 109:16,17 110:25 113:9 114:21 119:25 120:7 122:7 123:14,17 124:23 130:12 135:3 142:24 143:18 145:19 150:21 158:19 159:2 170:11 171:17 172:5,6 183:2 185:16 188:3,16 191:5,19 192:4 194:5,13 199:3 200:14 201:7 203:21 217:13 225:1 228:14,15,18 229:18

recollections 228:20

recommendation 152:25

reconciled 50:11 134:17 154:11,18

reconciliation 100:4 126:1

reconciling 31:19 32:17,18 46:16

record 19:15 21:15,16 35:2 63:12 72:13 79:6,8 101:17,20 106:21 131:14 181:13,18 183:3 193:5 206:13 207:11 209:10 227:22 228:20 230:14

recorded 134:16

recording 197:20

**records** 107:17 186:13 187:8 194:24

redis- 14:23

redistricting 8:20 14:18,23 15:8 16:12,15 44:6 54:13 70:17 77:6 90:10 94:13,21 95:2 105:3 128:24 130:6 136:15,18 138:13 139:1 141:5 142:14 178:16 214:18

**refer** 178:19

refer- 161:20

**reference** 27:5 82:18 114:1 143:25 182:20 200:2 209:7 226:7

**referenced** 20:12 100:2 124:6 154:13 163:3 189:16,17 224:21 226:14

**referencing** 64:6 139:13,23 159:20 162:7 175:24,25 204:1 218:8 224:22

referred 48:17,19 125:20



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 256Index: referring..reviewing

**referring** 17:11 39:25 40:18 48:6 77:8 128:4 157:23 160:13 165:1 187:13 195:5

**refers** 15:9

**reflect** 9:7 23:23 31:1,5 32:3 56:16 99:4 114:16 186:21 198:20 199:11 214:23

**reflected** 56:2 85:14 88:22 99:16 115:2 117:11 152:5 196:6 209:13

reflective 51:2 215:6

reflects 193:10 202:20 207:14

**refresh** 71:2,17,20 153:5 191:5 200:13

refreshed 74:9 114:19

refreshes 185:16

refreshing 35:6 125:15

regard 16:24 20:15 23:5,6 25:4 27:17,23 29:22,23 31:14 43:14 44:13 54:5 61:11 62:5,11 65:24 66:7,12 76:6 77:19 79:15 80:8 87:7 90:10 93:8 102:18 103:8,20 122:19 136:1 138:6 156:12 167:13 180:19 188:13 197:5 200:15,22 207:14 208:10

regular 13:15 50:14 103:2 124:21 213:24

regularly 77:5 162:22,23

reject 188:5

rejected 137:18 168:24

rejoining 54:22

rel- 144:18 relate 81:2

related 42:15

relates 77:23 108:14

**relative** 24:22 29:3 32:16 64:17 75:9,22 87:7 93:15 108:12 143:5 165:12

relayed 84:25 85:3 172:15 174:12

relaying 80:13 release 207:19

released 134:18 147:19

relevant 28:16

**relive** 171:7

relying 36:10 195:14

remainder 107:8

remaining 28:23 29:2,3,13,14,16,23

remember 34:11 48:20 54:5 55:7 56:18 58:8 66:8 70:24 71:5 76:14, 17,22 80:11 102:14 109:5,18 110:14,18 120:8 127:13 134:8 141:25 142:2 147:24 149:23 151:12 159:18,22 161:12,23 168:11 171:18 173:1 174:17 178:19 185:4,7 190:15 191:21 192:15 195:11 203:24 204:5, 9 208:5,8 223:8

### **REMEMBERED** 7:1

**repeat** 10:4 22:19 86:9 94:17 160:17 179:7 198:8 211:19 213:5

repeated 211:20

repeatedly 162:15 164:9

rephrase 142:13

report 15:9,10

reporter 7:3,12 10:15,18,21 16:5 18:23 19:7,11,17 34:16 39:14 46:6 61:8 63:14 94:15 106:17 120:20 144:16 146:17 166:17 177:17 178:3 184:14 193:2 194:18 202:9 206:7 207:2,25 211:12 219:3 221:20,24 222:5,7 228:24 229:6

reporters 203:25 225:17 226:5

reports 95:20

represent 57:3 194:23 198:15

representation 14:11 45:6 155:8 193:19 195:1

representations 156:12

representative 99:5

represented 181:4 187:10

representing 228:18

**Republican** 13:5 60:22 97:15 189:12

**Republicans** 168:23 169:2 174:20

request 13:8 186:13 187:8 220:16

requested 87:12 requesting 194:4

requests 194:24

**require** 161:16

required 22:5 27:2 170:12 191:23

requirement 143:12 146:5 170:8

requirements 44:4 142:21

reservations 69:6 87:11

reserved 230:15

reserving 43:2

**resolution** 35:19 190:21,24 191:6, 23 192:15 193:4,7 195:3,12,22 196:7 197:23 198:2,4,9,14 211:1 212:16

**respect** 14:5 26:8 43:9 57:20 58:15 60:18 121:9 124:3 141:24 142:5 147:4 172:20

respective 99:20

respond 104:24 178:11

responded 213:16

responding 194:6

responds 10:21

response 134:1 186:13

responsibility 169:17

restack 21:19 24:2

restacked 23:9 24:13

restacking 20:19,25 21:7,10,25 22:5,16,22 23:7,13,16 24:6

**restate** 222:12

rested 136:17

result 85:14 86:21

**results** 65:13

retained 69:19

retroactively 138:11

revealed 36:25

review 91:1 97:23 105:21 107:15 115:14 151:23 158:14,21 159:4,10 192:10

**reviewed** 9:5,10 32:17 60:7 89:25 114:20 144:6 155:12 159:12 183:4 190:24 191:25 198:4

reviewing 167:20 224:7

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 257Index: ribbing..similarly

ribbing 219:5,15

road 45:4

**role** 83:9 97:10,21 148:19,20 167:7,

9

roles 98:20

**room** 18:9 38:11,12,20,21 39:19,25 40:1,2,3,7,8,13,17,18,19,21,22 41:2, 6,8,11,13,14,17,20 42:13,14 46:14, 15 48:17,19,22,23,25 49:1,5,6,12,15 50:6,12,24 51:20 82:4 105:2,23 125:22,24 126:4,5,7,9,20 127:1,3, 11,12,13,18,19,21,23 128:2 134:11, 15,17 145:4 150:18 155:20 183:10 203:17 220:25 221:2,6,10,15 22:10,16,20,25 223:2,7

rooms 38:9,17,24 39:7 40:12 42:1

49:4,16,20 50:16 **roughly** 25:7

rounds 67:4,11

**Rs** 167:2

rubric 116:20 119:7

rule 100:23

rule-making 144:6

**rules** 137:8 139:20,22 143:19,25 144:3,9,10

run 214:15

rushed 18:6

S

**Sarah** 208:12 210:15,25

sat 128:24

satisfied 68:9 85:7

Saturday 47:2,4,5,9,15,18 109:14

scenarios 202:23

scene 134:9

scheduled 50:15 174:25

**scope** 63:6

**screen** 106:1,4,7,8 155:24,25 156:2 192:23 212:25

screenshot 210:10

screenshots 209:16,18 211:21

scripted 171:25

**scroll** 108:4,6,7 155:21 156:8 188:7 194:25 218:1

**scrolling** 197:23 206:2 207:21 208:4

scrutiny 58:1

**SDC** 163:7

search 45:12

seating 41:3

Seattle 12:5 33:18 206:16

sec- 213:12 214:11

**second-floor** 50:16 55:8

second-to-the-last 183:1

seconds 197:4

secret 140:5,17,21

secretary 44:5

SECURED 191:5

security 199:8

seek 200:17 201:2

selected 30:23

**Senate** 31:24 163:7 189:11

Senator 182:21,22

**send** 101:1 107:5 108:19 112:19 169:9 195:2 203:15 214:9 223:15

224:4

sending 110:13 215:25

**sense** 11:20 29:1 52:6 56:4 92:22, 23 108:20 120:24 122:10 131:19 152:14 173:2,4,5 189:5 225:19

sentence 33:19 108:14 202:21

separate 49:4

separately 107:18

**sequence** 93:20,25 94:5

serial 93:8,12,15 226:17

serially 227:3

session 84:18

sessions 178:14

**set** 41:1,4,5 48:3,8 103:10 118:3 121:1 134:9 143:1 152:17,20,23

173:14 207:2 216:7

**sets** 11:10

**settled** 170:12

severals 30:16

**sham** 140:7,11

**shape** 43:23 44:20,21,23,25 45:2,3, 11 150:9,13,15,19,23,25 173:20

211:1,4,8,17

**share** 19:2 37:13 55:17 57:2 99:6 106:1,4,5,6 112:12,16 132:7 155:25

156:2 160:19 179:4 190:12

**shared** 14:7 18:7 19:23 37:3,6,14, 15,22 66:17 72:5 80:11 87:1 90:24 92:9 96:15 98:7 100:24 110:12,14, 16,17 112:20 119:9,11 163:10

165:4,19 172:22 199:7

**sharing** 95:13 110:4 116:21 120:3 130:20,23 131:19 178:23 192:22

shift 135:22

**Shoot** 195:17

**short** 141:9 198:24

shortly 189:10 223:21

**showing** 106:23 107:24 109:23 117:13 191:3 195:16,20 197:19

207:8

**Sick** 38:7

side 45:8 65:2

side-by 196:9

**sides** 65:6

**sign** 145:2 191:16

**sign-off** 158:14

**signature** 191:18 195:25 196:4

230:15

signed 192:5,8,11 193:4 198:2,9

Signed.pdf 191:5

significance 103:24

**significant** 61:16,18,22,25 62:17,20

64:21

**signing** 191:17 192:15 198:12,14,17

similar 96:12 113:3 210:10

similarity 81:12

similarly 122:20 134:7

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 258Index: simply..staying

**simply** 157:7 187:3

Sims 20:7 68:18 76:18,23 77:19 78:11 80:14 81:19 82:21 84:14 85:4, 5,15,21,23 86:2,5,14,19,23 87:2 96:13 97:11 119:1,3 121:12,14 122:21,25 123:1,5,10 161:8,11,20 162:14 165:20,23 166:14 168:7,13, 23 169:4 172:16 174:11,18,19 180:5,20,24 181:5,21 182:12 183:8 217:17,24 218:18

Sims' 153:6,7

simultaneous 16:6 61:9 202:10

single 38:19 56:2

sit 14:2 72:23 73:5 147:14

**sitting** 18:9 72:7 91:21 110:20 117:22 129:3

situation 105:10 156:17 175:24

situations 103:16

size 41:4 106:8

skinny 21:9

slash 224:15

sleep 46:17 160:6 204:23,24 224:16

slightly 60:22

Smith 207:13,15 208:5

**Snohomish** 70:1,2,3

softphone 8:5,7

software 11:8,9 44:22 45:10,13,15,

18

sole 138:6

**solely** 138:3

sort 212:10 215:11

sought 200:23

**Sound** 21:9

sounds 128:10 163:19

Southwest 7:20

**space** 48:18 125:19 146:25 150:18

189:2 223:4

**spaces** 38:13 146:23

**sparks** 185:5

**speak** 54:3 110:10 116:10 121:1 135:16 154:7 165:18 180:15 188:17,

18 193:23 199:19 200:6

speakers 16:6 61:9 202:10

**speaking** 86:4 105:9 129:5 163:24

170:20

**specific** 42:9 44:18 45:8 46:9 50:20 58:3 68:3 70:11 75:18,19 77:7 82:18 92:2 93:12 103:5 104:23 118:11 121:2 123:8,25 139:20 143:6 153:22,23 156:9,14 165:1 173:16 180:22 185:12,13 188:3 190:11 192:7 195:14 196:23 204:5 215:2,4 222:24 226:7

**specifically** 14:23 60:9 78:3 93:11 99:15 102:14 118:23 139:12,23 159:14 221:16,24 223:1 224:3

specificity 120:18

**specifics** 76:5 144:8 157:9

speculate 36:12 104:21 140:22

171:4 182:14

speculating 139:6

speculation 82:14

sped 94:16

spend 48:12,25 49:1 81:24

spent 35:18 82:3 95:22

**split** 69:4,17,20 71:25 72:8,12,17,21 73:6,19,20,21,25 74:19,20,21,23

75:3 87:15,23

**splits** 70:10,13,16,18,21,24 71:21 72:25 73:3,11 74:11,13

**spoke** 17:21 35:4 83:11 128:3,14,16

spoken 108:17 117:10

spreadsheet 115:22

stacked 21:23 24:9

**staff** 8:22 31:18,22,24 37:14,15 38:25 42:17 43:17,18 46:15 49:3,5, 17 55:2 98:10,11,15,19,20 99:2,3,4, 14,20,23 100:18,19,24 101:4,9 111:14,16 112:10,12,14,16,17 113:2,7 115:5 120:1 123:9 126:2 144:22 145:23 146:7 149:19,20 150:1,3,9,14,19,22,24 151:7,11,18, 20 153:6,7,11,15,17 154:1,17 158:6 159:3,13 160:19,20,23,24 161:8 173:17,21 174:3 188:19,22 189:3, 15,25 191:15 198:22 202:22 203:16 210:25 214:8 215:10 220:23 221:1,

6,10,17,25 223:16,20 224:5 225:15,

staff's 150:15

staffer 127:20 203:18

**staffers** 151:14

**stage** 150:6,8 165:4 205:16 212:9

**stamina** 141:12

stamp 192:19 197:18 209:3,8

stamps 192:18 195:23 197:2

standard 105:16 124:20 140:23

standards 139:5,10,14

standpoint 85:9

**start** 17:16 19:21 29:2 34:21,23 56:22 109:1 188:20,23

started 13:16 52:1 83:10

starting 160:13

starts 206:11

**state** 7:17 8:6 12:9,23 14:11 64:2,7 68:21 69:1 113:19 143:15 169:3 178:20 225:11

**state's** 44:5

**stated** 88:1,6 89:15 163:9 164:22 165:21 223:19 229:17

**statement** 92:11 147:18 148:14,16, 21,24 149:2,7,8 155:10 160:11 162:8,14 163:18 164:7 190:9 194:21

statements 67:7 155:9 156:10

**static** 20:19 24:16,22 25:2,4,20,23

26:8

**stating** 138:9 212:11 217:13 223:3

statistic 27:22 62:18 statistically 108:25

**status** 9:21 20:21 26:20,21 27:4,7,8, 16,21 28:5,18,21 29:17,22 30:5 31:16 32:5 79:14 80:25 82:13 95:20 96:16 120:10 128:23 212:3 213:9

**statute** 14:24 15:7,9 70:17 136:14 142:5

statutory 17:4 170:8

stay 46:14 47:21 145:15 154:5,7

staying 47:24

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 259Index: stays..there'd

**stays** 64:18

step 18:18 66:14 135:16

steps 103:10 129:24 130:1

stipulated 186:15 201:17

stipulation 186:24 187:9

stopped 176:5

straddle 74:6

strategic 185:8

strategically 212:11

strategize 82:10

strategizing 95:14

strategy 161:12,14 172:2

stretch 21:9

**strike** 18:1 32:21 74:17 78:6 81:5 91:5 93:25 109:1 110:15 117:3 118:9 124:13 130:14 136:20 137:15

143:3 150:13 159:7 197:5 198:18

**strikes** 115:14

structure 17:11

struggling 31:12 78:4 92:12,15,16

stuff 131:24 151:16 152:15 205:21

213:20

subject 67:16 94:13,15 226:3,4

230:5

subjective 124:11

**subjects** 147:15

submitted 149:5 173:8.9

**submitting** 148:10,13

subsequent 72:3 97:21

substance 96:20 97:7 98:22 131:17 132:1 136:12 172:15 200:21 228:7

substantial 32:19

substantially 138:20

substantive 96:20 138:24 160:25

179:3

substantively 138:10

**success** 82:15

Suffice 143:2 144:9

**sufficient** 142:8,21

suggest 92:13 217:6

suggested 82:23,24 163:4 210:8

suggestion 83:20 84:4,8 167:21

169:5 190:15

suggestions 148:13

suggests 213:13

suite 38:19,23 41:18,23 55:8 77:4

110:21

**suites** 81:24

**sum** 60:10

Sun- 47:8

**Sunday** 47:6,9,15,19,20 109:14

support 151:20 179:22 180:1

supporting 85:6

suppose 17:23 62:14 121:6 138:11

supposed 19:20 79:4

**supreme** 9:6 97:15,22,23 112:24 114:15 130:8,17 132:25 134:21

135:11,18,22 136:1 137:2,14,18,24 138:6,9,14,16 139:3,9 147:5 148:15,

17 193:23 194:4,14

surprise 112:20

surprising 164:8

switching 217:19

**sworn** 7:10

**system** 8:11,15,18 10:14,24 43:18

Т

tactics 82:10,23 166:23

takeaway 42:25

takes 202:18

taking 51:3 52:6 88:24 104:12,16 114:11 115:13 139:24 141:8 158:20

159:18 170:25 173:9 184:5

talk 37:20 61:13 63:24 68:16 96:19 97:7 98:15 99:3 100:21 111:2 126:15 130:13,16 208:20 212:23

213:8,22 218:11,20 219:8

**talked** 67:14 77:5 97:5 128:22

168:14 175:11 202:15.19 217:1

talking 10:20 14:25 25:11 29:14

33:22 36:18 40:4.5 41:17 64:19 68:14 71:19 77:10 78:9 83:23 87:21 110:22 121:20 125:9 129:8 130:7 142:10 144:15 145:25 168:10,11 175:19 176:2 183:10 197:3

talks 83:10

targets 27:3

taxing 11:22

team 157:18,25 163:7,8

technical 7:22 10:12 39:13 94:14

174:5 207:24

technology 8:10 51:5

tedious 187:25

telecommunications 8:11

televised 135:24

telling 51:15 95:16 208:5 213:11

217:7

tells 210:9 214:7

ten 25:14 29:11 41:12 141:8

ten-month 179:25

tense 118:9

term 95:15 157:10 167:17

term-of-art 14:20

terms 9:6 17:17 21:19 39:18 58:3

60:16 72:25 82:3 86:14 139:16 153:22 166:3,22 171:3 180:21 181:3

199:11 214:24 215:6 221:11

test 191:14

testified 7:13

**testify** 164:3

testimony 58:12 78:20 159:25

198:25 199:5,7

text 51:15 102:19,21 103:1,10,14 164:25 165:7 185:17,21 186:12,15

206:6 207:14,22 208:3,11,12 210:14 212:2 213:7 214:23 216:7,21 217:6,

10,14

texting 217:23

texts 186:16 209:12.18

that'd 215:21 221:3

there'd 210:12

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 260Index: thing..typically

**thing** 65:1 95:11 102:20 110:15,20 131:7 189:4

**things** 8:14 11:20 17:13 21:5 48:14 55:19,20 67:9 87:19 91:18,19 101:8 103:4 104:10 144:12 161:16 172:11 174:5 177:11 212:11

thinking 29:21 120:4 129:4 131:1

third-party 167:21

**thought** 29:8 34:13 35:11,17,22,23 40:7 60:5 63:6,10 67:22 81:14 99:7 105:11 115:11 120:10,16 121:12,15, 19 137:11 151:9,24 152:6 169:18 205:6 210:12

thoughts 143:4 199:7 thousand 22:7 30:12

thousands 21:19 78:19 163:13

thread 103:1,12,14 105:18 210:14

threads 102:19,21 Three-quarters 25:7

thrown 63:23 78:21

tightly 82:6

time 7:2 10:4 13:9 15:23 18:5,17 29:9 34:9 35:24 37:25 39:5 41:11 43:2 46:10.15.17.22.24 47:12 48:12 49:1 50:12,18,25 51:23 52:1 57:5 58:8 59:18 61:23 66:19 69:10 70:22 71:10 73:4 74:25 81:23 82:3 84:13. 16 85:13,23 86:10 88:12 89:5 90:25 91:15 95:18,21,22,25 97:1 99:10 102:13,24 103:6 104:2,5 105:18 110:11 111:22 114:8 116:8,11 118:3,10 119:7,19 120:12,14 121:3, 11,15 126:8,16,17,20 127:23 128:3, 8,20 130:2,10 132:14 133:8 134:13 135:4,5,9,12 136:15 140:15 141:2 142:7,9,11,23 144:5,6,7,11,25 146:24 147:5,20 149:11,22 150:17, 20 155:4 157:5 160:2,4,8,21 162:5, 25 163:3 164:14 169:10,16,18,24 170:3,16 171:17,24 172:11,24 173:1,2,6,16,18,24 174:1,3,17 181:9 182:16 183:14 185:11 186:19 188:13,16,22 189:14,15 190:14,25 192:1,10,18,19 195:23 196:4,6 197:18,20 198:12,14,16 199:12,15, 16,23,24 201:6,9 202:2,3,4,13,14 203:13,18 204:15 205:14,18 206:15, 16 208:16,25 209:3,8 213:23 214:5, 11 215:5 217:4 220:7,11 221:7,9,13, 14 222:10,16,19,21,22 223:1,7,18, 23 224:6,8,12,21 225:2,6,13 226:8, 24 227:1,10 228:5 229:15

**timeline** 193:10,14,15,19 194:4,21, 23 195:1 197:7 200:12

times 33:6,9 40:12 49:14 93:7 94:22 99:9 102:5 103:4 122:7 127:14,18 128:14 129:4 134:10 144:24 146:3, 4,8 163:9 175:21 178:18 180:16 188:18 197:9,13,17 209:13 214:1 225:8

**timing** 88:11 147:17 149:4 160:9 172:8 193:11

timing-wise 121:4,8

tired 196:15 219:24 228:16

**titled** 186:16 **titles** 187:8

**today** 38:7 72:7,23 73:5 117:22 147:14

**told** 51:14 68:17 76:13 133:12,15 136:7 157:18,25 162:15 189:8 213:18 217:7

tone 118:9

tool 111:20 112:5 114:23,25 115:1

**top** 21:11 28:2,3 59:25 74:3 87:19 153:23 218:2

topic 128:19

topics 128:23 147:11

total 82:3 137:24

touch 213:16

track 47:12 64:15,21 65:5 111:25

tracking 70:14,15 71:23

traded 174:10

Traditional 11:21

traditionally 75:15

traffic 8:18

**training** 141:19,20,24 142:1,4,12, 17,21 143:4,9,12

tran- 191:22

transcript 16:19 38:16

transcripts 39:11

transferred 135:6 148:7

transitory 213:20

translate 99:24 101:6

translated 27:10 140:14

translating 164:10

transmit 200:8

**transmittal** 137:19 158:15 190:16 191:7,22 192:5

**transmitted** 9:5 25:25 59:24 112:23 114:15 137:18 148:15 159:5 192:9 199:10.14.17

transmitting 10:19

transparency 164:16

**transparent** 89:13,20,24 90:3,19 91:2,8,13 92:4,6,18

transpired 164:17

**Transportation** 11:23

travel 33:17

treasurer 113:19 114:4

treasurer's 64:3,7,12

treated 171:6

**tribal** 69:6,17

trigger 102:1,17 103:23

triggering 103:20 136:4 137:7

trip 206:5

tripping 120:19,22

trouble 171:8

true 22:10 188:5

trusting 42:25

Tuesday 47:7 149:3 207:16 221:3

turned 176:4

Turning 200:12

**TVW** 197:20

two-page 106:20

type 83:20

types 67:8

typically 27:15 113:16 114:7

Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 261Index: uh-hum..Walkinshaw

U

uh-hum 26:15 ultimately 209:12

**unable** 97:19

unclear 11:4 15:5 23:3 52:4 134:10

170:5

uncompetitive 28:9,13

understand 9:1 13:13 17:1 22:3 36:10 40:16 44:24 63:23 78:4 85:13 92:24 95:19 99:21 113:23 131:24 136:22 162:13 168:2 173:12 196:16 198:13 199:13 227:7 228:4

understand- 78:6

understanding 15:6 36:8 41:22,25 43:22 67:19 78:8 84:3 85:2 86:12 93:1,5,8,14,23 104:6 105:13 117:24 136:19 137:16 138:14,19 151:22 153:20 157:25 158:4,16 166:22 168:25 171:8 173:13 182:2 186:22 198:19

**understood** 58:11 86:20 103:21 122:11,13 123:10 182:4

Undisputed 157:3 unexpected 163:21

unfulfilled 142:16 unintended 65:12

uniquely 144:10

University 12:5,22

unpack 80:2

unsure 78:2

unwilling 174:19

**update** 96:16 212:8

updated 190:1

updates 176:11 177:3 212:3

**upload** 202:17 **uploaded** 106:19

**upset** 159:15

urgency 173:2,4,5 225:20

urging 225:15,22

٧

vacant 50:3

vague 31:9 69:21 125:9

validity 201:24 values 62:23

variation 28:17,19,21 62:19

variety 147:11

varying 98:15 99:14

venture 30:13

**verbal** 17:20,25 18:3 19:2,22 37:21

verbiage 39:7

verification 175:8

verify 197:22

verifying 211:23

vernacular 14:21

versa 181:22

**version** 33:3 36:15,18,19,24 37:2,13 111:22 150:3 209:12

**versions** 14:7 31:20 36:20 37:10 56:1.14 71:24 111:19 154:15

**versus** 65:2 78:12

vertical 21:17

vet 86:23

vetting 90:8

vice 181:22

**videoconference** 7:4,22 10:11 39:13 94:13 207:24

view 79:22 92:25 94:7 99:12 113:5

viewable 79:13

**viewed** 88:19 108:24 135:15 169:15,25

**viewing** 109:24

violated 92:14 139:17,19

violation 94:23

**virtually** 89:6 152:13

visible 90:24 visit 218:5,6 **voice** 164:9

voicing 201:11

volume 67:7

voluminous 32:12

volunteer 143:15

vote 15:18,24 18:5 19:4,25 20:4,8,11 29:17 52:7,10,12 53:1,4,25 56:17 57:19 64:9 65:2 70:25 73:7 74:19,23 80:4,6 81:4,8,18 84:17,22 87:6 88:21,24 89:5 90:1,25 104:12,16 105:7 140:5,7,11,13,17,21 141:1,4 151:25 156:25 157:5,7,11,20 158:8, 11,20,23 164:21 165:24 169:19 170:4,16 171:3,13 173:8,9,10 180:14 181:4,17 184:5 190:7,16 200:9,18 204:25

**voted** 22:1,20 24:14 25:24 26:7 28:20 54:9,10,17 55:15 56:5,12 57:19,20 59:17 60:6,17 61:5 67:22 68:2 69:12 70:21 72:9,24 73:4,6,10 74:16,18 75:10 84:25 89:7 111:7 151:10,24 152:6,22 156:25 184:17

voted-on 68:15

voter 45:9

votes 93:2

voting 29:19 58:4,15 60:24 62:6 64:11 81:14 87:10 96:6 101:25 102:12,15,23 103:1,15,17 104:4,15 105:10 107:10,13 119:11,15,17,20, 22 120:15 126:10 140:25 141:1,3 165:8 171:25 176:7 181:17 183:16, 23 200:15 201:12 228:6

**vouch** 197:1

W

wait 106:12

**waiting** 91:21 95:20 155:24 156:1 176:12

waive 131:10

waived 131:12

walk 176:24

walked 209:25

walking 104:3 175:18 209:20

**Walkinshaw** 17:6,24 18:5 19:4,24 20:1,13 33:24 34:7,12 35:5,9,10,13



Fain, Joe - January 12, 2022 Page 262Index: wanted..Zoom

36:7,9 37:4,14 42:8,17 50:1,6,9 95:5,6 96:9 100:15 118:22 121:16 122:4,12,16,20,22 123:7,13 124:7 145:11 146:7 152:8 158:20 160:14 165:20 168:13 169:11,14,25 174:13 180:6 181:24 182:12 183:9 185:9, 18,19 189:8 202:22 212:3 216:16,23 217:7 224:7 225:3 226:14 227:8

wanted 42:22 49:9 108:22 116:13, 16,19 149:17 154:7 161:9 162:16 164:2,5 170:24 202:5 204:6,7 218:18 224:24

**wanting** 11:6 38:17 131:5 140:22 156:11 206:18

**Washington** 12:12,22,23 76:1 113:18 203:7

**ways** 21:19 22:7 26:6 66:3 67:7 75:1,7

wear 144:22

wearing 144:24 146:3

website 67:15 159:19

Wednesday 7:1

**weeks** 57:17 58:2 190:24 192:1 198:5 200:3

weighed 148:1

well-known 112:4

Wenatchee 74:8

**West** 220:9,12,17,21 222:8,9 223:13,14 224:17 225:14 226:1 227:1,11,16,17,21,23 228:1,9,15 229:1,3,10,12,20 230:10

western 76:1

window 71:9 128:15

wishes 100:20,22

wit 7:6

withdraw 151:25

witnessed 175:13

witnesses 71:5

woke 203:25 225:17 226:6

wondering 19:19 77:9

**Wong** 9:24 10:11,15,17 13:11,17 14:15 15:11,20 18:11 19:5,9,13 21:21 22:9 23:19 26:1 27:19 28:6 30:7,10 32:6,24 35:25 39:2,24 40:4,

10 43:3 44:2 46:5 48:4.10 49:24 50:7 52:8 55:6 56:6 62:21 63:13 65:20,25 71:14 72:10,19 73:1,8 75:5 77:13 78:15,25 79:6 81:9,21 82:11 84:5 85:16 86:24 88:17 89:3,9,14,21 90:5,20 91:9,12 92:7 93:10,16 94:8 96:2 98:17 101:7,17 103:25 104:19 105:5 112:1 113:1 117:6 120:5 121:21 122:23 123:21 125:4 130:19 131:15,23 132:12,19 133:2,14 134:24 135:14 136:2 137:3,22 139:15,21 140:1,8,12,18 141:7,12 142:6 143:21 145:5,17 146:10 150:4 152:19 154:20 155:6,23 157:21 160:16 162:1 163:22 164:18 165:9 166:4 167:3 174:14 176:14 177:4. 12,15,18,24 178:7 180:10 183:19 186:11,25 187:11,20,22 192:22 200:19 201:16 206:15,18 207:1 215:14,20 216:19 218:1,4,23 220:9, 14 223:9 224:13 225:10,24 226:20 227:5,14,21,24 228:11 229:1,5,16

**word** 14:9,10,12,14 16:4,9,16 18:15 24:4,18,24 40:3,13 62:1 69:2 80:8 91:13 108:14 181:8 201:14 211:14

words 16:2 17:21 62:23 68:23 117:21 118:10 138:18 167:6,18 184:9 205:3 221:8

work 8:20,25 9:3 12:18 14:18 26:10 30:16,22 32:11 38:13 42:25 43:1,15 86:21 91:3 97:14 99:1,4 101:6 104:15 106:16 111:14,15 113:5 118:17 131:13 133:23 134:2 136:19 137:13,16 138:21 145:3 148:9 149:19,21 150:2,21 162:21 163:17 190:14 198:16 205:12 219:18 226:15

worked 12:21 109:7 227:8

**working** 12:20 38:25 41:24 99:22 145:23 146:7 210:6 219:19,20

worry 132:10 134:23

worse 113:20

worth 203:5.11.12

Wow 113:21

wrap 206:19 215:17 220:14 229:2

write 66:10 109:2,4,10 144:9

writing 17:19 55:23 109:21 117:2

159:20

written 20:23 34:1 43:24 44:10,13,

17 89:8 109:8,19 116:17 117:9

wrote 24:16 25:1 26:21 109:5,17,23

Υ

years 25:14 142:1

yes-or-no 92:5 177:13,18,21 227:18

yeses 26:17

yesterday 187:5 216:13

Ζ

**Zoom** 51:18,20,23 54:22 71:14 79:13,22 102:15 120:2 183:6,13 192:12 210:22

