

Exhibit P

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF ORANGE

ORAL CLARKE, ROMANCE REED, GRACE
PEREZ, PETER RAMON, ERNEST
TIRADO, and DOROTHY FLOURNOY,
Plaintiffs,

v.

Index No.

TOWN OF NEWBURGH and TOWN BOARD
OF THE TOWN OF NEWBURGH,
Defendants.

EF002460-2024

DEPOSITION OF

DR. BRAD LOCKERBIE

DATE: Wednesday, September 11, 2024
TIME: 11:07 a.m.
LOCATION: Remote Proceeding
Duncan, SC ZIP
REPORTED BY: Thea Popko
JOB NO.: 6903384

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS ORAL CLARKE, ROMANCE REED,
GRACE PEREZ, PETER RAMON, ERNEST TIRADO, AND DOROTHY
FLOURNOY:

SAMUEL DAVIS, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
Election Law Clinic, Harvard Law School
6 Everett Street, Suite 4105
Cambridge, MA 02138
sadavis@law.harvard.edu
(631) 807-2327

ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS ORAL CLARKE, ROMANCE REED,
GRACE PEREZ, PETER RAMON, ERNEST TIRADO, AND DOROTHY
FLOURNOY:

RUTH GREENWOOD, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
Election Law Clinic, Harvard Law School
6 Everett Street, Suite 4105
Cambridge, MA 02138
rgreenwood@law.harvard.edu
(202) 560-0590

Page 3

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (cont'd)

2 ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS ORAL CLARKE, ROMANCE REED,
3 GRACE PEREZ, PETER RAMON, ERNEST TIRADO, AND DOROTHY
4 FLOURNOY:

5 STEVEN STILL, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)

6 DAVID IMAMURA, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)

7 Abrams Fensterman, LLP

8 81 Main Street, Suite 400

9 White Plains, NY 10601

10 sstill@abramslaw.com

11 (914) 409-7340

12 dimamura@abramslaw.com

13 (914) 275-6132

14

15 ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS TOWN OF NEWBURGH AND TOWN
16 BOARD OF THE TOWN OF NEWBURGH:

17 MARY WEEKS, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)

18 Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP

19 600 Peachtree Street, Suite 3000

20 Atlanta, GA 30308

21 mary.weeks@troutman.com

22 (404) 885-3634

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S (cont'd)

ALSO PRESENT:

Veniece Miller, Harvard Election Law Clinic (by
videoconference)
Michael Rios, Expert (by videoconference)
Dr. Matt Barreto, Expert (by videoconference)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

EXAMINATION: PAGE

By Mr. Davis 9

E X H I B I T S

NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE

Exhibit 1 Expert Report of Brad Lockerbie, Ph.D. 17

Exhibit 2 Expert Report, Matt A. Barreto, Ph.D. 57

Exhibit 3 Barreto File Path 58

Exhibit 4 2021 Newburgh Election Results 92

Exhibit 5 2019 Newburgh Election Results 94

Exhibit 6 2013 Newburgh Election Results 95

Exhibit 7 2011 Newburgh Election Results 97

Exhibit 8 Imai Article Cited in Footnote 14 of Exhibit 1 121

Exhibit 9 Barreto Report Addendum 128

Page 6

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 THE REPORTER: Good morning,
3 everyone. My name is Thea Popko. I'm the
4 reporter assigned by Veritext to take the
5 record of this proceeding. We are now on
6 the record at 11:07 a.m.

7 This is the deposition of Dr. Brad
8 Lockerbie, taken in the matter of Oral
9 Clarke, et al. against the Town of
10 Newburgh, et al. on September 11, 2024, in
11 Duncan, South Carolina.

12 I am going to stipulate that I'm a
13 notary authorized to take acknowledgements
14 and administer oaths remotely. Parties
15 agree that I will swear in the witness
16 remotely.

17 Additionally, absent an objection on
18 the record before the witness is sworn,
19 all parties and the witness understand and
20 agree that any certified transcript
21 produced from the recording of this
22 proceeding:

23 - is intended for all uses permitted
24 under applicable procedural and
25 evidentiary rules and laws in the same

1 B. LOCKERBIE
2 manner as a deposition recorded by
3 stenographic means; and
4 - shall constitute written
5 stipulation of such.

6 So at this time, can I have everyone
7 in attendance please identify yourself for
8 the record, starting with the noticing
9 attorney?

10 MR. DAVIS: My name's Samuel Davis.
11 I'm an attorney for the plaintiffs with
12 the Harvard Election Law Clinic.

13 MS. GREENWOOD: My name is
14 Ruth Greenwood. I'm an attorney for the
15 plaintiffs with the Harvard Election Law
16 Clinic.

17 MR. IMAMURA: David Imamura, also
18 with the plaintiffs, Abrams Fensterman,
19 F-E-N-S-T-E-R-M-A-N, LLP, for the
20 plaintiffs.

21 MR. STILL: This is Steven Still,
22 also with Abrams Fensterman, LLP, and also
23 for the plaintiffs.

24 MS. WEEKS: Mary Weeks of Troutman
25 Pepper, counsel for the named defendants.

Page 8

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 MR. DAVIS: And I'll also just note
3 we have Veniece, who's here from the
4 Harvard Election Law Clinic, and then
5 Matt Barreto and Michael Rios, who are --
6 Matt is an expert in this case.

7 THE REPORTER: Okay. Thank you.
8 Hearing no objection, I will now swear in
9 the witness.

10 Dr. Lockerbie, could you please state
11 your name and spell it for the record?

12 DR. LOCKERBIE: Brad Lockerbie,
13 B-R-A-D, L-O-C-K-E-R-B-I-E.

14 THE REPORTER: Okay. Thank you very
15 much. And would you raise your right
16 hand?

17 WHEREUPON,

18 DR. BRAD LOCKERBIE,
19 called as a witness and having been first
20 duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole
21 truth, and nothing but the truth, was
22 examined and testified as follows:

23 THE REPORTER: Okay. You may
24 proceed, Counsel. Thank you.

25 MR. DAVIS: Thank you.

Page 9

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. DAVIS:

4 Q Good morning, Dr. Lockerbie. We
5 just met --

6 A Good morning.

7 Q -- but for the record, my name
8 is Sam Davis. I'm one of the attorneys
9 representing the Clarke Plaintiffs in this
10 case. I'm going to be asking you some
11 questions today. Can you hear me all
12 right?

13 A I can hear you.

14 Q Great. Have you ever been
15 deposed before?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay. So you may already know
18 this, but I'll just go over some ground
19 rules before we start, just so we all have
20 the same understanding of how this will
21 work.22 So I'll be asking you some
23 questions, and the court reporter is
24 transcribing everything we say. So the
25 court reporter is able to get everything

Page 10

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 in the record, please wait for me to
3 finish asking my question before you give
4 an answer, and I'll try and do the same so
5 that we're not talking over each other.
6 Does that make sense?

7 A Yes.

8 Q The court reporter can only
9 record verbal responses. So it's
10 important that your answer out loud with
11 words rather than nodding your head or
12 saying "uh-huh." Does that make sense?

13 A Yes.

14 Q If you don't understand a
15 question for any reason, or if I speak too
16 fast or mangle my words, please tell me,
17 and I'll try to clarify. But if you do
18 answer the question, I'm going to assume
19 that you understood what I was asking.
20 Does that make sense?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay. And we can take a break
23 anytime you feel you need one. I'll only
24 ask that you don't take a break while the
25 question is pending. Does that sound

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 good?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Do you understand that you're
5 under oath today?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Are you taking any medications,
8 or do you have any conditions that would
9 impair your memory?

10 A No.

11 Q Is there any reason why you
12 cannot give truthful answers to my
13 questions today?

14 A No.

15 Q Part of the oath you took was to
16 tell the whole truth, which means
17 providing full and complete answers to the
18 questions that I ask. Do you understand
19 that?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Is there any reason why you
22 cannot give full, complete, and accurate
23 testimony today?

24 A No.

25 Q In today's deposition I'll be

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 using terms "Hispanic" and "Latino"
3 interchangeably. Do you understand that
4 if I refer to Hispanic voters or to Latino
5 voters I'm referring to the same group?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And when I refer to White
8 residents, I'm referring to White
9 residents who do not identify as Hispanic
10 or Latino. Does that make sense?

11 A Yes.

12 Q I'll also be using the term
13 "Black" and "African American"
14 interchangeably. So if I refer to Black
15 voters or to African American voters, I'm
16 referring to the same group. Does that
17 make sense?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Okay. Is there anyone in the
20 room with you currently?

21 A No.

22 Q Do you have any documents or
23 papers in front of you?

24 A I have a copy of the report I
25 wrote.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q And that's the report you
3 prepared for this case; correct?

4 A Correct.

5 Q And do you have any other
6 documents in front of you?

7 A No.

8 Q Do -- sorry. Okay. Do you have
9 any other windows or tabs open on your
10 computer right now besides this video?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And what are those tabs or
13 windows?

14 A "Veritext" and "join
15 conversation" tab.

16 Q Do you have any email accounts
17 open on your computer?

18 A No.

19 Q Any instant messaging
20 applications on your computer currently?

21 A No.

22 Q Are you able to see incoming
23 text messages on either your telephone or
24 computer right now?

25 A I don't know if they'll show up

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 on my computer or not. My phone is turned
3 over.

4 Q Okay. I'll ask that you just
5 keep your phone off during questioning, if
6 that's okay?

7 A Yes. It's on airplane mode.

8 Q Great. Thank you. What did you
9 do to prepare for this deposition?

10 A I reviewed my report. I
11 reviewed Dr. Barreto's report. I talked
12 with the attorneys to get the logistics
13 squared away.

14 Q And which attorneys are you
15 referring to?

16 A I talked with Ms. Weeks and
17 Ms. Kent.

18 Q How long was that meeting,
19 roughly?

20 A Hour and a half.

21 Q Did you speak to anyone else
22 besides those attorneys in preparation for
23 this deposition?

24 A No.

25 Q You did not discuss this case

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 with any of your colleagues?

3 A No.

4 Q With any of your students?

5 A No. Other than to mention that
6 I -- no, actually, I didn't. Not at all.

7 Q Okay. And you said you reviewed
8 your report and the Barreto report. Is
9 that correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Did you review any other
12 documents to prepare for this deposition?

13 A I looked at -- yes.

14 Q What were those documents?

15 A I looked briefly at some of the
16 data that I'd looked at earlier.

17 Q And when you say "the data" you
18 looked at earlier, do you mean data you
19 relied on in your report?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. Did you review the expert
22 report prepared by Professor Critchlow in
23 this case?

24 A No.

25 Q Did you review the expert report

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 prepared by Professor Sandoval-Strausz in
3 this case?

4 A No.

5 Q Did you review any of the court
6 filings in this case?

7 A No.

8 Q Have you ever reviewed the
9 complaint in this case?

10 A No.

11 Q Have you ever looked at any
12 other court documents in this case?

13 A No.

14 Q About how long do you think you
15 spent preparing for this deposition?
16 Rough estimate is fine.

17 A Two to four hours.

18 Q Okay. I'm going to try and
19 introduce the first exhibit. So just bear
20 with me for one second. Okay. Do you see
21 a document in that folder?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Are you able to open the
24 document?

25 A Yes.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Okay. Do you recognize this
3 document?

4 A Yes.

5 Q What is it?

6 A My expert report.

7 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry to
8 interject. Do you want this marked as 1
9 or A or --

10 MR. DAVIS: Apologies. You can mark
11 this as Exhibit 1.

12 (Exhibit 1 was marked for
13 identification.)

14 THE REPORTER: Okay. Thanks.

15 MR. DAVIS: Thank you.

16 BY MR. DAVIS:

17 Q Okay, Dr. Lockerbie. Can we --
18 I'll have you scroll down to the ninth
19 page in the document, which has the header
20 "Brad Lockerbie Curriculum Vitae." Can
21 you let me know when you get there?

22 A I'm there.

23 Q Let me get there myself. Okay.
24 Do you recognize this document?

25 A Yes.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q What is it?

3 A It's my CV.

4 Q So there's no date on the CV.

5 Do you know roughly when it is from?

6 A Within the last year.

7 Q Is there anything missing from
8 your CV?

9 A Not that I'm aware.

10 Q Okay. No new --

11 A Excuse me. Yes. I have some
12 conference presentations that I had in the
13 last week or so.

14 Q Okay. What were those
15 conference presentations on?

16 A I was chair of a panel on
17 forecasting the presidential election.

18 I was scheduled to deliver a
19 paper on the election at a separate panel
20 but had to leave early, and then I was
21 scheduled to also serve as a discussant on
22 another panel where I couldn't make it to
23 that one, either, because of having to
24 leave early.

25 Q Okay. Do you have any new

Page 19

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 publications to add to your CV?

3 A No.

4 Q Have you written any
5 publications that relate to estimating the
6 voter preferences of racial or ethnic
7 groups?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Which publications are those?

10 A One of the early ones, the
11 Cambridge University Press book chapters
12 or book, depending on how it's listed on
13 the vitae -- they list it in multiple ways
14 at the publisher -- looking at race and
15 voting behavior in presidential elections.

16 Q Is that the only publication
17 relating to this topic?

18 A Yes, I believe so.

19 Q Okay. And sorry. Can you point
20 out specifically where in the CV that
21 publication is listed? I'll give you a
22 second.

23 A That would be under the section
24 labeled "Book Chapters."

25 Q And is it --

Page 20

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A The last two.

3 Q -- all of these -- oh, the last
4 two. Okay. So the one starting "United
5 States of America, with Arthur H. Miller,"
6 and then "Electoral Change and Social
7 Change"? Those two publications?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. Have you written any
10 publications that utilize a quantitative
11 methodology for estimating group voting
12 patterns?

13 A Could you rephrase the question,
14 'cause I want to make certain I answer it
15 clearly.

16 Q So, in any of your publications,
17 did you utilize a quantitative method for
18 estimating the voting patterns of
19 particular groups, such as racial or
20 ethnic groups?

21 A If I understand your question
22 correctly that race is an influence or
23 groups is an influence on voting behavior,
24 yes.

25 Q And which publications are

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 those?

3 A Those would be the ones that I
4 referenced just a minute ago. And could
5 you explain what you mean by "voting
6 patterns" to make certain I answer you
7 clearly -- or completely?

8 Q Yeah. So the behavior of voters
9 in elections at the group level. So who
10 they vote for or -- yeah -- who they vote
11 for?

12 A With regard to who they vote
13 for, I believe that's it.

14 Q Okay. Thank you. And those are
15 those same two publications at the end of
16 the heading "Book Chapters;" correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Thank you. And do you recall
19 what kind of data you used to estimate
20 voting preferences in those publications?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And what was the data, as you
23 recall?

24 A American National Election
25 Studies data.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q And were those peer-reviewed
3 publications?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Have you written any
6 publications that utilize a statistical
7 method called ecological inference for
8 estimating group voting patterns?

9 A Could you -- I didn't hear you
10 clearly at the beginning of the question.

11 Q I apologize. I'll restate the
12 question. Have you written any
13 publications that utilize a statistical
14 method called ecological inference for
15 estimating group voting patterns?

16 A No, I have not.

17 Q Have you written any
18 publications on the topic of race or
19 ethnicity?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Which publications are those?

22 A The same that we've been
23 referring to.

24 Q Okay. And, aside from those
25 two, have you written any other

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 publications on the topic of race or
3 ethnicity?

4 A There have been publications
5 where race was at least a variable in the
6 item, such as the 1994 piece at the
7 "American Journal of Political Science."

8 Q Okay. Have you --

9 A And also -- excuse me.

10 Q Sorry. Yes.

11 A And also 2013 piece, "Race and
12 Religion: Voting Behavior and Political
13 Attitudes," at "Social -- Social Science
14 Quarterly."

15 Q Okay. And that is listed on
16 your CV; correct?

17 A Yes, under "Articles." I
18 believe it's the sixth one down.

19 Q Thank you. And was that a peer-
20 reviewed publication?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Have you --

23 A If I'm correct, that would also
24 be one that did talk about specifically
25 race and voting behavior, but I forgot

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 about it for a second.

3 Q No problem. If you ever need to
4 correct, just let me know. Have you
5 written any publications that use precinct
6 level voting data in a quantitative
7 analysis or model?

8 A No.

9 Q Have you written any
10 publications that use a statistical method
11 called Bayesian Improved Surname
12 Geocoding, or BISG?

13 A No.

14 Q You're a professor in the
15 Department of Political Science at East
16 Carolina University; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q What courses do you teach?

19 A Intro to American Government,
20 Voting Behavior and Public Opinion,
21 Religion in American Politics, Research
22 Design and Statistics for the Social --
23 for Political Science.

24 Q Are you teaching all of those
25 this semester?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A Thankfully, no.

3 Q Which ones are you teaching?

4 A I am teaching enough of them.
5 American -- Intro to American Government,
6 Voting Behavior and Public Opinion, and
7 Religion in American Politics.

8 Q Sounds like you'll be busy.

9 A Yes.

10 Q Okay. Turning to your report,
11 if you go to page 1, paragraph 6, you
12 write that you've published over 30 peer-
13 reviewed articles on elections and public
14 opinion. Is that correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Is it fair to say you are an
17 expert on the topic of elections and
18 public opinion within your field?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Do you have any other expertise
21 in the field of political science?

22 A I have expertise in research
23 methods and statistics within political
24 science. And, more broadly speaking, I
25 have expertise in the area of religion in

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 American politics.

3 Q So is it fair to say you do not
4 have expertise in racial or ethnic
5 politics in the United States?

6 A No. That -- the race comes into
7 play with the Religion in American
8 Politics, and also, the earlier book
9 chapters I wrote with Arthur H. Miller.

10 Q But that's not a focus of your
11 research?

12 A Race and religion is.

13 Q Race and religion. Okay. You
14 said you have expertise in, I believe,
15 research methods and statistical methods.
16 Is that correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q What did you mean by that?

19 A That I have been trained very
20 well to make use of statistics in
21 political science analysis. I have been
22 selected to review statistics books for
23 major publishers.

24 Q Do you have any experience using
25 the software program "R" to perform

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 statistical analyses?

3 A Yes.

4 Q What is your level of experience
5 using the program "R"?

6 A I'm not certain what you mean by
7 "level of experience." How long I've used
8 it, or what?

9 Q Would you say you're an expert
10 in the software program "R"?

11 A Expert, no.

12 Q How frequently do you use the
13 software program "R"?

14 A At a minimum, weekly.

15 Q Have you ever published a peer-
16 reviewed article utilizing an analysis you
17 conducted with the software program "R"?

18 A Yes.

19 Q What are those publications?

20 A The most recent one -- go back
21 down to my CV. Excuse me.

22 Q No problem.

23 A That would be the last two
24 publications that I have there, the one
25 from "Polity" and the one from PS,

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 "Political Science and Politics."

3 Q And did you write any "R"
4 packages for those publications?

5 A No.

6 Q Have you ever written an "R"
7 package?

8 A No.

9 Q Do you know how to write an "R"
10 package?

11 A I could write small ones, but
12 I'm not somebody who's written a package
13 specifically within "R."

14 Q Fair enough. You said you
15 taught statistical methods for political
16 science. Is that correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q When was the last time you
19 taught that course?

20 A I believe it was two years ago.

21 Q And, prior to that, had you
22 regularly taught that course?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Have you taught any courses
25 where you discuss the use of ecological

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 inference methods in the context of

3 studying voting patterns?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Which courses?

6 A The statistics class, as well as

7 Voting Behavior and Public Opinion.

8 Q In the statistics -- let's start

9 with the statistics class. So you said

10 the last time you taught that was two

11 years ago; correct?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And what was the nature of your

14 discussion of the use of ecological

15 inference techniques in that class?

16 A I discussed how to use

17 ecological regression as a way of

18 estimating voting patterns of various

19 groups in a community.

20 Q Okay. Did you use any other

21 methods beside -- or strike that. Did you

22 discuss other methods of ecological

23 inference besides ecological regression?

24 A I believe I did mention

25 ecological inference that Gary -- Gary

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 King wrote the package for.

3 Q Okay. And how extensive was
4 your discussion in that class?

5 A Of which technique or both?

6 Q Let's start with the ecological
7 regression?

8 A I spent probably 30 minutes
9 talking about it.

10 Q Okay. Throughout the semester?

11 A It would've been a component of
12 one class session. So a total of 30
13 minutes, yes.

14 Q Okay. And you said the last
15 time you taught that was about two years
16 ago; right?

17 A Correct.

18 Q Thank you. And I apologize.
19 What was the other class you said you
20 taught ecological inference in?

21 A I referenced ecological
22 inference in the Voting Behavior and
23 Public Opinion class.

24 Q Thank you. When was the last
25 time you taught that class?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A I am currently teaching it.

3 Q Okay. And what's the nature of
4 your discussion of ecological inference in
5 that class?

6 A The nature of the discussion is
7 to look at racial voting patterns, discuss
8 how they have changed over time, not
9 changed over time.

10 Q And what methodologies have you
11 discussed in that class or plan to discuss
12 in that class?

13 A I have used -- I have discussed
14 or plan to discuss ecological regression
15 and ecological inference.

16 Q Okay. Is it fair to say roughly
17 in the same terms as you discuss them in
18 your other class?

19 A Correct.

20 Q Do you teach students how to
21 code -- or strike that. Do you teach
22 students how to conduct ecological
23 inferences using "R" in either of those
24 classes?

25 A I have taught students how to

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 conduct ecological regression within "R."

3 Q Okay. Is that a regular feature
4 of your classes?

5 A I started -- well, in my recent
6 classes, yes.

7 Q When you say "recent," what time
8 period, roughly?

9 A The last four to five years.

10 Q And you said you've taught "R"
11 to conduct ecological regression; correct?

12 A Correct.

13 Q But not ecological inference;
14 right?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Have you ever presented a paper
17 at a conference on the use of ecological
18 inference methods in the analysis of
19 voting behavior in American elections?

20 A No.

21 Q Okay. Let's turn back to your
22 report, and if we could look at paragraph
23 7 on the first page. If you just let me
24 know when you're there?

25 A I'm there.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Okay. You state that you have
3 been retained as an expert in relation to
4 four court cases. Is that correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Is that a complete list of the
7 cases you've been involved with?

8 A No.

9 Q What other cases have you been
10 involved with as an expert?

11 A I was involved in one as an
12 expert witness in Arkansas, dealing with
13 racial polarization.

14 And in terms of testimony or
15 deposition, I was an expert in the court
16 case -- I can't remember the exact name of
17 it, but it was the Georgia Trial Lawyers,
18 I believe, versus the State of Georgia, on
19 a ballot proposition item.

20 Q Is the Arkansas case Arkansas
21 NAACP verse Arkansas Board of
22 Apportionment?

23 A I believe that is.

24 Q Okay. Are you currently
25 involved with a case in Nassau County on

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Long Island?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Is that Coads v. Nassau County
5 and New York Communities for Change, the
6 County of Nassau?

7 A I believe so.

8 Q Okay. Were you involved in a
9 case called Faith Rivera, et al. v. Scott
10 Schwab and Michael Abbott?

11 A That sounds familiar.

12 Q Okay.

13 A Could you tell me where it was
14 or what it is?

15 Q Believe that was in Kansas.

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay. I'm just going to go
18 through each of these cases. Let's go one
19 by one. So let's start with Agee v.
20 Benson or Agee v. Benson. Who were you
21 retained by in that case?

22 A The attorneys representing the
23 plaintiffs against the Commission, as I
24 recall.

25 Q And what was the subject of your

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 consulting?

3 A I was asked to evaluate levels
4 of racial polarization and racial animus
5 in the -- the area under consideration.

6 Q Did you file an expert report?

7 A Yes, I did.

8 Q Were you deposed?

9 A I believe so.

10 Q Did you testify at trial?

11 A Yes.

12 Q I guess you'd remember that.

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay. Moving on to Nielsen v.
15 DeSantis, who were you retained by in that
16 case?

17 A A law firm representing the
18 State.

19 Q The State of Florida?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And what was the subject of your
22 consulting in that case?

23 A Looking at the ability to vote
24 by -- via drop boxes and US Postal
25 Service.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Did you file an expert report?

3 A Yes, I did.

4 Q Were you deposed?

5 A I believe so.

6 Q And did you testify at trial?

7 A No.

8 Q Okay. Then moving on to Trump
9 v. Boockvar, who were you retained by in
10 that case?

11 A I was retained by a law firm for
12 the president.

13 Q Referring to Mr. Trump?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And what was the subject of your
16 consulting in that case?

17 A Looking at drop boxes and
18 signature assessment.

19 Q Okay. And did you find --

20 A -- and --

21 Q Apologies.

22 A My apologies, too.

23 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I didn't
24 catch the end of what you said there,
25 Dr. Lockerbie.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 THE WITNESS: Oh, I said I was
3 retained to comment on the provision of
4 additional drop boxes and the canceling of
5 the signature matching assessment on
6 absentee ballots.

7 BY MR. DAVIS:

8 Q I'll try and follow my own rule.
9 Did you file an expert report in that
10 case?

11 A I can't recall if it was an
12 expert report or just a report to the
13 attorney's office.

14 Q The attorneys who retained you;
15 correct?

16 A Correct.

17 Q Were you deposed?

18 A I don't believe so.

19 Q And did you testify at trial?

20 A No.

21 Q Okay. Who were you retained by
22 in North Carolina Alliance for Retired
23 Persons v. State Board of Elections?

24 A The defendants.

25 Q The State Board of Elections?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A The attorneys representing --
3 the attorneys representing the defendants.

4 Q Okay. And what was the subject
5 of your consulting in that case?

6 A I believe, though I'm not
7 certain, that it was looking at absentee
8 ballot regulations.

9 Q Did you file an expert report?

10 A I don't think I did.

11 Q Were you deposed?

12 A No.

13 Q Did you testify at trial?

14 A No.

15 Q Okay. I think we mentioned
16 the -- or we discussed the Arkansas case,
17 which I'll represent was Arkansas NAACP v.
18 Arkansas Board of Apportionment. Do you
19 recall who you were retained by in that
20 case?

21 A That was the State.

22 Q The State of Arkansas?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And what was the subject of your
25 consulting in that case?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A An examination of racial
3 polarization and crossover voting.

4 Q And did you file an expert
5 report in that case?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Were you deposed?

8 A I believe so.

9 Q Did you testify at trial?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Okay. And then in the Kansas
12 case, the Faith Rivera case, who were you
13 retained by there?

14 A A law firm that was hired to
15 represent the State of Kansas.

16 Q And what was the subject of your
17 consulting there?

18 A Looking at racial polarization.

19 Q Okay. And did you file an
20 expert report?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Were you deposed?

23 A I don't recall.

24 Q And did you testify at trial?

25 A Yes.

Page 40

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Okay. I think this is the last
3 one. Who were you retained by in Coads v.
4 Nassau County, the Nassau County case?

5 A Law firm representing the
6 County, as I recall.

7 Q Who are the defendants in that
8 case; correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And what was the subject of your
11 consulting in that case?

12 A To review reports and do
13 analysis on racial polarization.

14 Q Did you file an expert report?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Were you deposed?

17 A No. I will be shortly.

18 Q And I take it, then, there
19 hasn't been a trial yet. Is that correct?

20 A That is correct.

21 Q Did you conduct an ecological
22 regression analysis in that case?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Which method did you use?

25 A The one you just specified,

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 ecological regression.

3 Q So you did not do ecological
4 inference technique -- other ecological
5 inference techniques in that case?

6 A That is correct.

7 Q Did you write the code for --
8 oh, strike that. Did you use a software
9 program to conduct your ecological
10 regression analysis in that case?

11 A Did I use a statistical
12 regression -- or statistical program?
13 Yes.

14 Q Which program?

15 A "R."

16 Q Did you write the code for that
17 "R" software?

18 A No. I -- make certain we're
19 clear here. I did write the -- if we're
20 calling "code" basically asking the
21 computer to run the regression, yes. And
22 the recodes, yes. Did I write the code
23 for regression itself? No, that's baked
24 into the system.

25 Q Thank you for that

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 clarification. What do you mean when you
3 say "baked into the system"?

4 A There is a pre-existing package
5 to run regression analysis.

6 Q Okay. Do you recall what
7 package you used for the ecological
8 regression?

9 A I believe it was "lm."

10 Q Okay. Do you know the
11 difference between ecological regression
12 and ecological inference?

13 A Yes.

14 Q What's the difference?

15 A The main difference is that
16 ecological inference makes assumptions
17 about the individual precincts and uses
18 the method of bounds.

19 Ecological regression is a
20 technique in which you take the dependent
21 variable, vote share, and regress it upon
22 race or any other aggregate data that you
23 wish to.

24 Q Why did you choose to use
25 ecological regression in the Nassau County

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 case rather than ecological inference?

3 A One, it is easier to understand
4 and run that analysis. Two, the
5 ecological inference technique from
6 Gary King was not available on the CRAN
7 server, as it had been deemed in -- I
8 forget the exact wording -- but not in
9 compliance.

10 Q Do you know how to run an
11 ecological inference analysis?

12 A Yes. With my code book, or with
13 my book at hand.

14 Q Fair enough. You may have
15 referred to this previously, but are you
16 familiar with the method of ecological
17 inference called "R by C"?

18 A Yes.

19 Q What is the R by C method?

20 A Rows and columns. It allows for
21 multiple candidates and multiple ethnic
22 groups.

23 Q So is it fair to say that R by C
24 would allow for an analysis of an election
25 with multiple candidates rather than an

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 election with just two candidates?

3 A Multiple -- yes. It would work
4 that way. Under -- I assume you're asking
5 about a single race with multiple
6 candidates.

7 Q Correct. Yes. Yes.

8 A And a single winner?

9 Q To your knowledge, has a court
10 ever relied on your testimony in reaching
11 conclusions about a case?

12 A I don't know.

13 Q Have you ever used the
14 .eiCompare R. package?

15 A No.

16 Q Okay. Besides the cases we've
17 discussed, have you served as an expert in
18 any other legal proceeding?

19 A No.

20 Q Have you ever worked with a
21 state legislature to draw a legislative
22 redistricting plan?

23 A No.

24 Q Have you ever worked with a
25 local government to draw a redistricting

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 plan?

3 A No.

4 Q Excuse me. Have you ever worked
5 with an independent commission to draw a
6 redistricting plan?

7 A No.

8 Q Have you ever been appointed by
9 a court to draw a redistricting plan?

10 A No.

11 Q Have you ever drawn a district
12 that's been adopted by a court to remedy a
13 redistricting violation?

14 A No.

15 Q How did you first learn about
16 this case?

17 A From the attorneys.

18 Q Do you mean --

19 A Troutman Pepper.

20 Q When did they contact you about
21 serving as an expert?

22 A I believe it was originally over
23 a year ago, and then they didn't know if
24 the case was going to go forward. So it
25 was in hiatus for -- for lack of a better

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 word. And then, more recently, in the
3 last few months.

4 Q So they initially contacted you
5 to just explain what the case was. Is
6 that correct?

7 A To mention there would be -- or
8 may be a case coming up, and would I be
9 available.

10 Q And then more recently, they
11 reached back out to say your services were
12 needed?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Is that when you were retained
15 as an expert witness?

16 A I believe so.

17 Q Do you know why you were
18 approached to serve as an expert in this
19 case?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Why was that?

22 A I believe I was recommended by
23 others.

24 Q Do you know who recommended you?

25 A I'm not certain.

Page 47

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q You have a guess?

3 MS. WEEKS: Object to the --

4 THE WITNESS: Excuse me?

5 MS. WEEKS: Object to the form, for
6 the record.

7 THE WITNESS: Should I still answer?

8 MS. WEEKS: Yes.

9 THE WITNESS: I believe Adam Kincaid
10 and/or Sean Trende, but I'm not certain of
11 either of those.

12 BY MR. DAVIS:

13 Q Have you worked with Mr. Kincaid
14 or Mr. Trende previously?

15 A Yes.

16 Q In what context?

17 A Mr. Trende and I were experts in
18 the case in Michigan. I don't know if we
19 were both experts on any other cases or
20 not. With Mr. Kincaid, I worked with him
21 when he was a student of mine at the
22 University of Georgia.

23 Q Do you know --

24 A On academic matters, not
25 consulting matters.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Do you know if the attorneys
3 from Troutman Pepper contacted anyone else
4 to serve as an expert in this case?

5 A I believe so.

6 Q Do you know who those
7 individuals were?

8 A No.

9 Q Do you know what the Gingles
10 Prongs are?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Did you discuss the Gingles
13 Prongs with anyone in relation to this
14 case?

15 A No.

16 Q Did you sign a retainer
17 regarding your work in this case?

18 A I don't know if I would call it
19 a retainer, but I signed an agreement.

20 Q An agreement to retain you to
21 provide expert --

22 A An agreement for me to provide
23 services to them, yes. Forgive me if I'm
24 trying to be specific here. I just want
25 to make certain the terms are mutually

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 understood.

3 Q Specific is good if -- feel free
4 to ask for clarification. What is your
5 scope of work in this case?

6 A I report.

7 Q Anything else?

8 A Not that I recall.

9 Q So is it fair to say that your
10 report reflects the totality of your work
11 in this case?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Have you submitted any invoices
14 regarding your work in this case?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Who did you submit those
17 invoices to?

18 A Troutman Pepper.

19 Q Roughly how many invoices have
20 you submitted so far?

21 A One or two.

22 Q And I assume those were over the
23 last couple months, after you were
24 retained?

25 A Yes.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Have your invoices been paid?

3 A One is outstanding. One has
4 been paid.

5 Q Your rate is \$600 per hour in
6 this case; correct?

7 A Correct.

8 Q Will you be billing for your
9 time spent in this deposition?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Will that be at the same rate as
12 for all of your time, \$600 per hour?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Is there a cap on your fees in
15 this case?

16 A No.

17 Q Roughly how many hours have you
18 spent working on this case so far?

19 A Approximately 10 to 20.

20 Q Who was the attorney who
21 initially reached out to you about this
22 case?

23 A I believe it was Misha, and I
24 can't pronounce his last name, Tseytlin.

25 Q From Troutman Pepper?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A Yes.

3 Q I think we know who you were
4 referring to. Roughly when was that
5 outreach, as you recall?

6 A The original outreach was maybe
7 a year ago, but I'm not certain as to
8 that.

9 Q So maybe August, September of
10 last year?

11 A I think so, but I'm not positive
12 on that by any stretch of the imagination.

13 Q Understood. Have you ever
14 spoken with members of the Newburgh Town
15 Council?

16 A Not that I'm aware of.

17 Q Have you ever spoken with any of
18 the other experts in this case?

19 A I don't know who the other
20 experts are, but I haven't talked with any
21 other experts about this case.

22 Q Have you spoken with
23 Dr. Barreto?

24 A No.

25 Q Have you spoken with

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Professor Critchlow?

3 A No.

4 Q Have you spoken with
5 Professor Sandoval-Strausz?

6 A No.

7 Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to
8 Exhibit 1, to your report. Do you have
9 that in front of you?

10 A Yes, it's still here.

11 Q Did you provide any code or data
12 that you relied on in preparing this
13 report to defendants' counsel?

14 A I don't believe so.

15 Q So I'll represent to you that
16 counsel said you did not provide any code
17 or data. Is that a fair statement?

18 A That's a fair statement.

19 Q So is it fair to say that all of
20 the citations you relied on are
21 included -- or strike that. All of the
22 sources that you relied on are included in
23 citations within the report itself?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And there is nothing else you

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 relied on to prepare your report?

3 A Other than my expertise and
4 general knowledge, no.

5 Q No other sources or publications
6 or data, anything like that?

7 A That is correct.

8 Q Did you write any code as part
9 of preparing this report?

10 A I don't believe so. If any, it
11 would've been in Excel files, to basically
12 do calculations.

13 Q So we previously talked about
14 "R." You didn't use "R" in preparing this
15 report?

16 A I used "R" in the sense that I
17 used the program Quarto originally, to
18 type it up, but ...

19 Q And did you rely on any code as
20 part of your preparation for this report?
21 Excuse me.

22 A Could you clarify the question?

23 Q So I had initially asked did you
24 write any code. Did you rely on any
25 analyses performed using code as part of

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 your report?

3 A I think I know what you're
4 asking, and I'll do my best to address it.
5 I made use of the program Excel, which has
6 code built into it, and I used it to
7 calculate averages or total up votes.

8 Q No other sources like that,
9 though?

10 A No other software packages other
11 than, like I said, the use of Quarto
12 within "R" Studio and Excel, as I recall.

13 Q Thank you. Did you write this
14 report?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Every word of it?

17 A No.

18 Q What portions didn't you write?

19 A Some of the typos were corrected
20 by the law firm, and some of the legal
21 citations were corrected.

22 Q Besides correcting typos and
23 correcting citations, did anyone else
24 write any other portion of this report?

25 A I don't believe so, no.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q It sounds like --

3 A I might have been asked for -- I
4 might have been asked for clarifications,
5 and then I rephrased some things.

6 Q Who asked you for
7 clarifications?

8 A I believe it would have been
9 Misha.

10 Q Did you review Dr. Barreto's
11 report before you started writing your
12 report?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay. I'm going to mark -- or
15 try to mark Dr. Barreto's report as an
16 exhibit so that we can refer back to it
17 later. Give me one second. And I'll
18 refer to that as Exhibit 2.

19 Did you review the report
20 prepared by Dr. Sandoval-Strausz before
21 you started writing your report?

22 A No.

23 Q Are you aware that Dr. Barreto
24 produced the code and data he relied on in
25 his report to defendants' counsel?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A I don't recall.

3 Q I will represent to you that he
4 did. Do you have any reason to dispute
5 that?

6 A No. I think --

7 Q Have you --

8 A -- one thing that might help
9 clarify is when you keep referring to
10 "code," it sometimes can be unclear as to
11 whether you're talking about just to go
12 into the -- the software package and
13 asking it to do things, or writing the
14 actual internal code of the program, or
15 the program that was used.

16 Q I will try to be more precise
17 going forward. But if I'm not, please
18 feel free to keep correcting me.

19 A Not a correction, but more just
20 a clarification.

21 Q Absolutely. Can you pull up
22 what I marked as Exhibit 2? Let me know
23 when you have it.

24 A Yes, I will let you know. I
25 believe it is up now.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Do you recognize this document?

3 (Exhibit 2 was marked for
4 identification.)

5 A It appears to be the report of
6 Dr. Barreto.

7 Q And is this the report you
8 reviewed in preparing your report?

9 A I believe so.

10 Q Have you seen a copy of any of
11 the files identified as material that
12 Dr. Barreto relied on in producing his
13 report?

14 A I don't think so, other than
15 what I also found independently.

16 Q So you didn't review the actual
17 files that Dr. Barreto relied on; correct?

18 A I don't know. Some of them may
19 have been the -- duplicates of what he
20 had, and I got the same thing from a --
21 the same source independently, if that
22 makes sense.

23 Q So -- yeah. So what you're --
24 to clarify, what you're saying is it's
25 possible in you doing your research in

1 B. LOCKERBIE
2 preparation for the report you came across
3 the same sources that Dr. Barreto relied
4 on, but you did not look at the files that
5 Dr. Barreto produced to defendants'
6 counsel?

7 A I don't believe so. Point of
8 clarification, unless they provided them
9 to me, and I was unaware that they came
10 from Dr. Barreto.

11 Q Understood. And if you reviewed
12 something, it would appear in your
13 footnotes or citations; correct?

14 A I believe so, yes.

15 Q Okay. I am going to mark
16 another exhibit, if you'll just give me
17 one second. And I believe this will be
18 Exhibit 3. And if you'll just let me know
19 when you are able to access the exhibit.

20 A I believe I have it up and
21 running.

22 Q Do you recognize this document?
23 (Exhibit 3 was marked for
24 identification.)

25 A It looks similar to data that I

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 was able to obtain.

3 Q What do you mean by that?

4 A I see what looks to be files
5 labeled as PDFs that have official
6 election returns, and I looked at similar
7 information, perhaps identical.

8 Q You're referring to the PDF file
9 names that appear in the third column;
10 correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And so you believe you may have
13 reviewed some of those files, because
14 they're the same sources that you relied
15 on in your report; correct?

16 A I believe so, yes.

17 Q But you did not --

18 A I apologize for the overlap.

19 Q That's okay. But you did not
20 receive this list of files from
21 defendants' counsel, as far as you recall?

22 A I don't believe so.

23 Q Can we scroll down to the second
24 page? Let me know when you're there.

25 A Would it be the very short page

Page 60

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 labeled "Barreto Data"?

3 Q Yes.

4 A Then I'm there.

5 Q Okay. And you see it's the blue

6 highlighting on "Name Dictionaries;"

7 correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And then two RDS files in the
10 third column?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Did you review these files in
13 preparing your report?

14 A I don't believe so.

15 Q Okay. And then, on I guess what
16 we will call page 3, the other small
17 screenshot on page 3?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And it has blue highlighting
20 around the folder called "Voter Files"?

21 A Maybe if I switch the screens
22 around. I'm using a laptop as opposed to
23 a bigger monitor today in the midst of the
24 move. I believe I see what you're
25 referring to.

Page 61

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 One caveat I will put on it,
3 when you refer to it by color, I have to
4 sometimes make guesses, as I am somewhat
5 colorblind. Blue and purple are the same
6 color, as far as I'm concerned.

7 Q Fair enough. I will distinguish
8 if we get into blue purples. But the
9 highlighted folder, "Voter Files," you see
10 that?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And then, in the third column,
13 there are various files that end with
14 ".csv;" correct?

15 A Correct.

16 Q Did you review those files while
17 you were preparing your report?

18 A I don't believe so.

19 Q Okay. And then, do you see --
20 it's on both page 2 -- well, I guess on
21 each page there is a file called
22 "Newburgh.R"?

23 A I see that.

24 Q And have you previously reviewed
25 that file?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A I don't believe so.

3 Q And why didn't you review that?

4 A I don't recall having them made
5 available to me.

6 Q Okay. Before writing your
7 report, did you discuss Dr. Barreto's
8 report with anyone?

9 A I don't believe so.

10 Q Did you get any assistance in
11 creating your report?

12 A Other than having the -- the law
13 offices look at what I had done, no.

14 Q But no research assistance?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Did anyone review your
17 calculations or conclusions?

18 A I can't recall if it was from
19 this case or another case, but somebody
20 did check my calculations -- with the law
21 firm, I believe.

22 Q Someone at the law firm checked
23 your calculations, either in this case or
24 in a different case?

25 A Correct.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q But none of your colleagues or
3 students checked your calculations;
4 correct?

5 A That is correct.

6 Q And you said the attorneys from
7 Troutman Pepper reviewed your report
8 before you submitted it; correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Do you recall -- going back to
11 the last question, do you recall, whether
12 it was on this case or another case, who
13 it was that reviewed your calculations?

14 MS. WEEKS: Object to the form.

15 A I don't recall the name of the
16 person who did that.

17 Q Okay. And this report, which is
18 marked as Exhibit 1 and dated July 9,
19 2024, does that contain a complete
20 statement of your opinions in this case?

21 A Yes.

22 Q We're about an hour in. I'm at
23 a breaking point, if you want to take a
24 five-minute break?

25 A Okay.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 MR. DAVIS: Counsel, is that okay?

3 THE REPORTER: Okay.

4 MR. DAVIS: Sorry. I --

5 THE REPORTER: Oh --

6 MR. DAVIS: That's okay.

7 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

8 MS. WEEKS: That's okay.

9 THE REPORTER: Then we can go off the
10 record now at 12:07 p.m.

11 (Off the record.)

12 THE REPORTER: Okay. We're back on
13 the record now, 12:14 p.m.

14 BY MR. DAVIS:

15 Q Dr. Lockerbie, you understand
16 that you're still under oath; correct?

17 A Correct. Yes.

18 Q You said previously that you
19 were retained by defendants' counsel
20 lawyers from Troutman Pepper to prepare a
21 report. Is that correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q What were you asked to do by the
24 attorneys?

25 A To --

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 MS. WEEKS: I would just object to
3 the extent that it goes to invading the
4 privilege.

5 MR. DAVIS: Understood. Yeah.

6 THE WITNESS: I was asked to review
7 the report of Dr. Barreto.

8 BY MR. DAVIS:

9 Q Were you asked to determine
10 whether racially polarized voting exists
11 in Newburgh Town Council elections?

12 A No.

13 Q Did you draw any conclusions
14 about whether racially polarized voting
15 exists in Newburgh Town elections while
16 you were preparing your report?

17 A I reviewed what Dr. Barreto said
18 about it, and I assume that his
19 calculations are accurate. But I have not
20 reviewed his data analysis there.

21 Q So, just to confirm, you did not
22 draw any independent conclusions about
23 whether racially polarized voting exists
24 in Newburgh Town elections?

25 A That is correct.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Okay. I want to turn to
3 paragraph 11 on page 2 of your report.
4 Can you let me know when you have that in
5 front of you?

6 A I am there.

7 Q Okay. And in paragraph 11 on
8 page 2, you state: "I examined elections
9 in the Town of Newburgh to determine
10 whether minorities have a reasonable
11 opportunity to elect candidates of their
12 choice.

13 "That is, are minority
14 candidates usually defeated? Regardless
15 of whether minority-preferred candidates
16 are defeated, are the races competitive?"
17 Did I read that correctly?

18 A Yes.

19 Q What do you mean by the term
20 "minorities" as you use it in this
21 paragraph?

22 A Racial and ethnic minorities.
23 African Americans and Hispanics.

24 Q So when you refer to the term
25 "minorities," you mean Blacks and Latinos

1 B. LOCKERBIE
2 in the Town of Newburgh or generally;
3 correct?

4 A Correct.

5 Q And you are not including other
6 minorities, such as Asian Americans;
7 correct?

8 A I don't recall that I
9 specifically looked at them, no.

10 Q Why did you decide to determine
11 whether minorities have a reasonable
12 opportunity to elect candidates of their
13 choice?

14 A I'm confused by the question.
15 Could you rephrase it or repeat it?

16 Q Yeah. So in this paragraph you
17 say "I examined elections in the Town of
18 Newburgh to determine whether minorities
19 have a reasonable opportunity to elect
20 candidates of their choice." Correct?

21 A Correct.

22 Q Why did you do that in your
23 report?

24 A To assess whether -- at least
25 one prong of the test, to see if there is

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 election law that is discriminatory or has
3 a discriminatory effect.

4 Q And when you say "the test," are
5 you referring to -- strike that. When you
6 say "the test," what are you referring to?

7 A The Gingles test. The Senate
8 factors.

9 Q Okay. And --

10 THE REPORTER: Could -- could you
11 rephrase that? I'm sorry. "The Gingles
12 test" or the what?

13 THE WITNESS: Senate factors.

14 BY MR. DAVIS:

15 Q Okay. Then you state next "That
16 is, are minority candidates usually
17 defeated?" Correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q So why did you assess whether
20 minority candidates are usually defeated?

21 A Two points. That should read
22 "minority-favored candidates." Second, to
23 look at -- again, if trying to ascertain
24 whether minority-favored candidates have a
25 chance of victory, or are they out of

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 luck, have no chance of victory.

3 Q Okay. I just want to clarify.

4 So you -- when in paragraph 11 you say

5 "Are minority candidates usually

6 defeated," you actually mean "are

7 minority-preferred candidates usually

8 defeated?"

9 A Correct.

10 Q Is there a difference between

11 minority candidates and minority-preferred

12 candidates?

13 A Yes.

14 Q What's the difference?

15 A Well, minority candidates would

16 be those candidates who are one of the

17 aforementioned minorities. Minority-

18 favored candidates are those, regardless

19 of their race or ethnicity, that may or

20 may not be favored by a minority group.

21 Q Okay. So to confirm, you did

22 not specifically assess the performance of

23 candidates who themselves are minorities;

24 correct?

25 A That is correct.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q The sole way of answering that
3 question was by looking at minority-
4 preferred candidates?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And so the reference to
7 "minority candidates" is a typo?

8 A That is a charitable way of
9 putting it, yes.

10 Q Okay. Okay. Then, still in
11 paragraph 11, you state "Regardless of
12 whether minority-preferred candidates are
13 defeated, are the races competitive?" Did
14 I read that correctly?

15 A Yes.

16 Q What do you mean by the term
17 "competitive"?

18 A Whether it is plausible for
19 either side to have won the race, given
20 the conditions.

21 Q What conditions are you
22 referring to?

23 A The current electoral conditions
24 in that political community.

25 Q And what did you mean by -- I

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 think you said "if it's plausible" to win
3 the race? What did you mean by
4 "plausible?"

5 A If it is considered plausible
6 that a candidate could -- basically, if
7 the fight, the race is competitive. If
8 either candidate is spending their time
9 wisely by campaigning.

10 Q And why is the competitiveness
11 of a race relevant to the question of
12 whether minorities have a reasonable
13 opportunity to elect candidates of their
14 choice?

15 A Reasonable opportunity would
16 imply that they don't -- the minority-
17 favored candidates don't have to win, but
18 they have to have a plausible chance of
19 victory.

20 Q Is there any peer-reviewed
21 literature you can point to that uses
22 competitiveness to answer the question of
23 whether a minority community can elect
24 candidates of their choice?

25 A Not of which I'm aware.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Are you aware of any court cases
3 or court decisions where a court answers
4 the question of whether minority
5 communities can elect candidates of their
6 choice by looking at competitiveness?

7 A Not of which I'm aware.

8 Q Did someone instruct you to look
9 at whether races were competitive?

10 A No.

11 Q That was your methodological
12 choice; correct?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Okay. Moving to paragraph 12,
15 you write: "I have also examined the data
16 to see if the Town of Newburgh is likely
17 to vote for the candidate favored by
18 minorities.

19 "I employed the same assumption
20 as Barreto that the candidate favored by
21 minorities is the Democratic candidate, as
22 we know that African Americans typically
23 vote for the Democratic candidate." Did I
24 read that correctly?

25 A Yes.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q And is it safe to assume that
3 when you say "minorities," you're using it
4 in the same way you used it in the
5 preceding paragraph?

6 A In the way I meant to use it in
7 the preceding paragraph, yes.

8 Q Understood. Understood. What
9 did you mean when you wrote that you
10 looked to "see if the Town of Newburgh is
11 likely to vote for a minority-preferred
12 candidate"?

13 A Could you repeat the question?
14 I didn't hear you clearly.

15 Q What did you mean when you said
16 you "looked to see if the Town of Newburgh
17 is likely to vote for a minority-preferred
18 candidate"?

19 A I meant that I would look at the
20 election data to see if candidates favored
21 by minorities either were victorious or
22 were in competitive races.

23 Q And why did you decide to look
24 at the performance of minority-favored
25 candidates?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A Because I assumed that's what
3 this case was all about.

4 Q Did someone instruct you to look
5 at the performance of minority-favored
6 candidates?

7 A If I understand your question
8 correctly, that was part of the reason I
9 was hired was to look at this.

10 Q But did anyone explicitly
11 instruct you to look at the performance of
12 minority-favored candidates?

13 A I don't recall if those words
14 were specifically used. But when I
15 review -- I was asked to review
16 Dr. Barreto's report, and that informed
17 the choices that I made.

18 Q Understood. You write that you
19 "employed the same assumption as Barreto,
20 that the candidate favored by minorities
21 is the Democratic candidate." Is that
22 correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q I'd like to go back to the
25 Barreto report for a second, which I

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 believe is marked Exhibit 2. Can you just
3 let me know when that's up?

4 A Okay.

5 Q You have it in front of you?

6 A I do.

7 Q Can you show me where in
8 Dr. Barreto's report he states that he
9 assumes that the candidate favored by
10 minorities is the Democratic candidate?

11 A No.

12 Q Does he state that in his
13 report?

14 A Explicitly, I don't recall.

15 Q Is there a difference between
16 assuming that minorities support a
17 Democratic candidate and conducting an
18 analysis to determine what candidates a
19 minority community supports?

20 A That is plausible, yes.

21 Q Okay. Let's turn back to your
22 report. In paragraph 11, you write that
23 you "examined elections in the Town of
24 Newburgh to determine whether minorities
25 have a reasonable opportunity to elect

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 candidates of their choice." Did I read
3 that correctly?

4 A I hadn't had the report pulled
5 up when you started reading there.

6 Q I apologize.

7 A Paragraph 11, you said?

8 Q Paragraph 11. I'll do my best
9 to check to make sure you have it in front
10 of you. Apologies. I'll read it again.
11 So do you have the report in front of you?

12 A I do have it.

13 Q Okay. So then, in paragraph 11,
14 you state, quote -- or do you state that
15 you "examined elections in the Town of
16 Newburgh to determine whether minorities
17 have a reasonable opportunity to elect
18 candidates of their choice"? Did I read
19 that correctly?

20 A Yes, I believe so.

21 Q How did you do that?

22 A I looked at the election returns
23 from the Town of Newburgh -- or the voting
24 behavior in the Town of Newburgh and
25 assessed whether minority-preferred

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 candidates, as I assumed the Democratic
3 candidate, given my knowledge of American
4 politics, to see how often they would win
5 and how often the races were indeed
6 competitive.

7 Q So, essentially, you looked at
8 whether who you assumed to be the
9 minority-preferred candidate prevailed and
10 then whether the elections were
11 competitive. Is that correct?

12 A Correct.

13 Q Did you do anything else to
14 reach your conclusions as to whether
15 minorities had a reasonable opportunity to
16 elect candidates of their choice?

17 A I don't believe so.

18 Q Did you conduct any analysis to
19 determine which candidates Black and
20 Latino voters actually preferred in
21 Newburgh elections?

22 A I don't believe so.

23 Q I want to go back to the concept
24 of competitiveness. Can you explain why
25 in a competitive race minorities have a

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 reasonable opportunity to elect candidates
3 of their choice?

4 A It is more of a comparative
5 situation, in that if a race is close,
6 everybody running has a plausible or
7 reasonable chance of victory.

8 If a race is 90 percent for one
9 candidate, 10 percent for the other
10 candidate, the candidate at 10 percent
11 probably doesn't have a plausible chance
12 of victory.

13 Q Or some other conditions that
14 diminish that candidate's vote share that
15 are not reflected in the vote share but
16 are out there, presumably?

17 A My point is that the candidate
18 who's at 10 percent is not competitive for
19 a variety of reasons of which I'm unaware.

20 Q Understood. So is it fair to
21 say, you know, a candidate -- let's say a
22 candidate wins 10 percent in five straight
23 elections. It's fair to say that
24 candidate doesn't have a plausible
25 opportunity to win that election; correct?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A That is reasonable, yes.

3 Q And it doesn't matter --

4 A Barring -- excuse me. Barring
5 any changes in the political environment.

6 Q So competitiveness might not be
7 static from year to year; correct?

8 A That is correct.

9 Q And so, in the circumstance
10 where there's a candidate who's
11 consistently winning 10 percent, would you
12 say it's fair that it doesn't matter if
13 that candidate runs a really good campaign
14 or does a lot of get-out-the-vote, that
15 candidate probably doesn't have a chance
16 of success?

17 A That would be reasonable, yes.

18 Q I want to give you a different
19 example. So imagine that we have ten
20 years of elections, and in those
21 elections, the minority-preferred
22 candidate always garners 48 percent of the
23 vote, but in every one of those elections,
24 the White preferred candidate wins with 52
25 percent of the vote.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Do you understand that

3 hypothetical?

4 A If I hear you clearly, several
5 elections, 48-to-52, consistently across
6 the board?

7 Q Correct. Would you describe
8 that as competitive?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Would you describe those
11 elections as one -- strike that. Would
12 you say that minority-preferred candidates
13 have a reasonable opportunity to get
14 elected in those elections?

15 A Assuming they're the ones at 48
16 percent, yes.

17 Q Even if they are persistently
18 losing at 48 percent?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Let's turn back to paragraph 12.
21 Do you have that in front of you?

22 A I have that.

23 Q You state that "We know that
24 African Americans typically vote for the
25 Democratic candidate." Did I read that

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 correctly?

3 A Yes, sir.

4 Q Who is the "we" in that
5 statement?

6 A Observers of American politics.
7 Political scientists, newspaper reporters.
8 It is a truism.

9 Q Did you review any facts or data
10 to support that conclusion?

11 A To specifically go in and
12 reference that conclusion, no. It came
13 from my long-term understanding of
14 American politics.

15 Q Do you know of any peer-reviewed
16 publications that support that conclusion?

17 A The exact citations, off the top
18 of my head, no. But I have read
19 innumerable peer-reviewed articles that
20 state that African Americans vote for
21 Democrats.

22 Q Is that true everywhere in the
23 United States?

24 A I don't know.

25 Q Is that true in every election?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A I don't know about every
3 election.

4 Q Is it fair to say that you did
5 not analyze the actual voting patterns of
6 Black or Latino voters in Newburgh to
7 determine which candidates they preferred
8 in a given election?

9 A That is correct.

10 Q You looked at whether Democrats
11 were able to get elected; correct?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And then you assumed that the
14 minority-preferred candidate was the
15 Democratic candidate in every one of those
16 elections; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And then you looked at whether
19 races in which Democrats ran were
20 competitive, as you've defined that;
21 correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Is that the extent of your
24 analysis with respect to the performance
25 of minority-preferred candidates or what

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 you deemed to be minority-preferred

3 candidates in the Town of Newburgh?

4 A I believe I looked at both
5 whether they were competitive races and
6 whether minority-preferred candidates were
7 victorious.

8 Q The election results generally?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Understood. And just to
11 confirm, in paragraph 12, you state, as
12 we've discussed, that you have an
13 assumption that African Americans
14 typically vote for the Democratic
15 candidate.

16 I don't see anything in
17 paragraph 12 about how Latinos vote. Is
18 that correct?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q Did you conduct any analysis of
21 how Latinos vote in the Town of Newburgh?

22 A No.

23 Q Did you conduct any analysis of
24 how Latinos vote in general in the United
25 States?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A For this report, no.

3 Q So it's fair to say you did not
4 analyze the actual voting patterns of
5 Latino voters for this case, specifically?

6 A That is correct.

7 Q And did you also assume that
8 Latinos prefer the Democratic candidate?

9 A I believe so.

10 Q And what is that assumption
11 based on?

12 A Historical voting patterns.

13 Q From where?

14 A The nation, the United States.

15 Q So it's fair to say you assumed
16 that the Democratic candidate in every
17 election was the preferred candidate of
18 both Latinos and Black voters in the Town
19 of Newburgh?

20 A Correct.

21 Q Okay. Moving to paragraph 13,
22 do you have that in front of you?

23 A I do.

24 Q You state that you "included
25 those elections where one Democrat and one

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Republican contested the office." Did I
3 read that correctly?

4 A Yes.

5 Q So, to confirm, that means you
6 did not analyze any primary elections for
7 your report here; correct?

8 A Correct.

9 Q And that also means you did not
10 analyze elections for the Town Council in
11 the Town of Newburgh; correct?

12 A I've referenced them, but I did
13 not analyze them.

14 Q And that is because they are not
15 elections where there is one Democrat and
16 one Republican contesting one seat;
17 correct?

18 A Correct.

19 Q So, in your report, do you offer
20 any opinions about voting patterns by race
21 or ethnicity in local Town Council
22 elections in Newburgh?

23 A No.

24 Q And why did you choose not to
25 include an analysis of town or primary

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 elections in your report?

3 A I did not include the Town
4 Council races where there were multiple
5 candidates vying for multiple seats
6 simultaneously, because I found it
7 difficult, if not impossible, to say, if
8 we have four candidates contesting for two
9 seats, did Candidate A compete -- let's
10 say A and B win. Did A compete against
11 loser C or loser D?

12 Q Okay. I'm going to -- we'll
13 address primaries, and then we'll address
14 kind of the multi-candidate issue. So
15 with respect to primaries, is it possible
16 that minority voters prefer different
17 candidates than White voters in primary
18 elections?

19 A Yes.

20 Q If the question is whether
21 minorities are able to elect their
22 candidate of choice, isn't it relevant
23 whether minority voters' preferred
24 candidates prevail in primaries?

25 A That would be one thing to look

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 at.

3 Q Okay. And then is it possible
4 that minority voters prefer different
5 candidates than White voters in town
6 elections?

7 A Could you repeat the question,
8 please?

9 Q Apologies. Is it possible that
10 minority voters prefer different
11 candidates than White voters in Town
12 Council elections?

13 A It is possible, yes.

14 Q And again, if the question is
15 whether minorities are able to elect their
16 candidate of choice, isn't it relevant
17 whether their preferred candidates prevail
18 in Town Council elections?

19 A It is relevant.

20 Q Is it possible to analyze which
21 candidate in a multi-candidate race is the
22 candidate of choice of voters from a
23 racial or ethnic group?

24 A I imagine it is.

25 Q Do you know how to do it

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 yourself?

3 A Off the top of my head, no,
4 other than doing a survey of minority
5 voters and asking them who was their
6 preferred candidate.

7 Q You did not do such a survey in
8 this case; correct?

9 A [No audible response.]

10 Q And you did not perform any
11 other kind of analysis that could answer
12 that question; correct?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q We discussed earlier the RXC
15 method of ecological inference. Do you
16 recall?

17 A I recall talking about it, yes.

18 Q Are you aware that you can use
19 that methodology to analyze multi-
20 candidate races?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Did you consider doing that in
23 this case?

24 A No.

25 Q Why not?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A In part, because I was not
3 looking at levels of racial polarization
4 in my report.

5 Q So the question that an R by C
6 analysis would answer was outside the
7 scope of your report. Is that fair?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. And moving down then to
10 paragraph 14, you wrote that you "excluded
11 candidates where the voter was allowed to
12 vote for more than one candidate, because
13 such contests are not one-on-one." Did I
14 read that correctly?

15 A Other than the first word
16 where -- or the second -- or third word,
17 where you said "candidates," I have
18 "contests" --

19 Q I have "contests."

20 A -- your --

21 Q I have "contests," too. I'll
22 read it again just for -- we're on the
23 same page. "Excluded contests where the
24 voter was allowed to vote for more than
25 one candidate, because such contests are

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 not one-on-one." Did I get that right?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And what did you mean by that?

5 A That there is a race with a
6 single victor, and there is not a major
7 party candidate for both parties on the
8 ballot.

9 Q And the question in this case
10 was whether minority voters have a
11 reasonable opportunity to elect candidates
12 for Town Council in Newburgh. Is that
13 correct?

14 A I don't know that it's limited
15 to Town Council, but yes.

16 Q As you understood the -- strike
17 that. Okay. Would you agree that the
18 most probative elections to look at to
19 determine if Black and Latino voters are
20 able to elect candidates of their choice
21 to Town Council would be Town Council
22 elections?

23 A "Most probative," I would be
24 uncertain as to whether I'd make that
25 stipulation.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q You would agree that they are
3 probative; correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. In paragraph 14, you also
6 state "It is difficult, if not impossible,
7 to match up two candidates as opposing
8 each other" in a multi-candidate election.
9 Is that correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q What did you mean by that?

12 A As I said a minute ago, if we
13 have candidates A, B, C, and D vying for
14 two seats, A and B win in this
15 hypothetical. Did A oppose C or D?

16 We don't know the answer to that
17 question. It's not available to us. We
18 just know that the four candidates were
19 vying for the two seats.

20 Q But you are aware that there are
21 methods for conducting that analysis;
22 correct?

23 A To ascertain who's opposing who,
24 no.

25 Q But to ascertain who the

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 minority-preferred candidate is?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Okay. Let's move on to
5 paragraph 15. Do you have that in front
6 of you?

7 A Yes, I do.

8 Q Okay. In paragraph 15, you
9 refer to Orange County 2019 election
10 results; correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Excuse me. Strike that. Let's
13 start with 2021. So in Footnote 2, you
14 refer to the Orange County 2021 election
15 results. Is that correct?

16 A Yes, I believe so.

17 Q Okay. I'm going to mark an
18 exhibit. Bear with me. I believe this is
19 marked Exhibit 4. Dr. Lockerbie, if you
20 can just let me know when you're able to
21 view this exhibit?

22 A I view -. I have it up.

23 (Exhibit 4 was marked for
24 identification.)

25 Q Do you recognize this document?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A I don't recall if I saw it in
3 this form, but ...

4 Q Can you tell me what it is?

5 A It looks like the results of
6 elections from the County -- or the Town.

7 Q Okay. If we can scroll down to
8 paragraph -- excuse me, page 45. I'll
9 give you a second because that's pretty
10 far down there. Just let me know when
11 you're there?

12 A I believe I'm on page 45.

13 Q Do you see where it says --
14 there's a little star, and then it says
15 "Newburgh Town Councilman (Vote for Two)"?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And then it shows that the two
18 Republican candidates won that election;
19 correct?

20 A Yes, I believe so.

21 Q Okay. And then, where I jumped
22 to initially, if we go back to your
23 report, paragraph 15, Footnote 3, you
24 refer to Orange County 2019 election
25 results; correct?

Page 94

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A Correct.

3 Q Okay. I'm going to mark another
4 exhibit. Let me know when you can see
5 that. I believe it's marked as Exhibit 5.

6 A I believe it is up.

7 Q Do you recognize this document?
8 (Exhibit 5 was marked for
9 identification.)

10 A It appears to be election
11 returns from the Town of Newburgh.
12 Whether it's one I reviewed before -- the
13 specific format I've reviewed, I don't
14 know.

15 Q In paragraph 15, you state that
16 in 2019 there were three candidates for
17 these two positions, referring to the
18 Newburgh Town Council election. Is that
19 correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. Could you scroll down to
22 page 27 of Exhibit 5 and just let me know
23 when you get there?

24 A I am there.

25 Q You beat me. Okay. And on page

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 27, you see a star, and then it says

3 "Newburgh Town Councilman (Vote for any
4 two), Vote for Two." Do you see that?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And it reflects that two
7 Republican candidates won those seats;
8 correct?

9 A Correct.

10 Q Okay. Then, in paragraph 15,
11 Footnote 4, you reference Orange County's
12 2013 election results; correct?

13 A I believe so, yes.

14 Q Okay. Bear with me. I'm going
15 to introduce another exhibit. This will
16 be marked Exhibit 6. If you can just let
17 me know when you see it?

18 A I believe I have it up.
19 (Exhibit 6 was marked for
20 identification.)

21 Q Thank you. And if you could
22 scroll down to what is marked in the
23 bottom right corner page 37?

24 A I believe I have that up, though
25 it's mice type right here.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Yeah. I had to make it a little
3 bigger. But it says at the top -- or the
4 subheader says "General Election,
5 Newburgh, Newburgh Town, Town Councilman."
6 Correct?

7 A Correct.

8 Q These results indicate that the
9 two Republican candidates won Town Council
10 seats in this election; correct?

11 A I'm going to have to expand it a
12 little bit here to actually see.

13 Q I'll give you a second.

14 A I believe that's what it shows.

15 Q Okay. And then, one more. In
16 paragraph 15, Footnote 5, you refer to
17 Orange County 2011 election results;
18 correct?

19 A Footnote 5?

20 Q Yes.

21 A My Footnote 5 has Gary
22 Jacobson's citation.

23 Q Are you reading off of --

24 A The hard copy I have here. I
25 can go back and look at the one that you

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 sent me here.

3 Q If you don't mind. There might
4 just be a slight -- maybe it's a version
5 discrepancy.

6 A Okay. Let me go back here.
7 Yes, I have that there.

8 Q Okay. I will mark one more
9 exhibit, and this will be Exhibit 7. Let
10 me know when you are able to access
11 Exhibit 7?

12 A I have Exhibit 7.
13 (Exhibit 7 was marked for
14 identification.)

15 Q Do you recognize this document?

16 A It appears to be the election
17 results. Yes.

18 Q From Orange County, 2011;
19 correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Can you scroll down to what is
22 marked in the bottom right corner as page
23 190?

24 A I'm there.

25 Q And do these results reflect

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 that two Republican candidates won Town
3 Council seats in this election?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Thank you. Is it fair to say
6 that Republican candidates have won every
7 election for a seat on the Newburgh Town
8 Council since 2011?

9 A It appears to be the case.

10 Q Okay. Going back to your
11 report, paragraph 15, you state -- or
12 excuse me. Let me know when you have it
13 in front of you?

14 A Let me pull up the transmitted
15 copy here. I'm at paragraph 15.

16 Q Okay. And you write "One should
17 note, in the 2011 election Barreto
18 included MacEntee, who did not have a
19 major party nomination." Did I read that
20 correctly?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And what did you mean by that?

23 A That he was neither a Democrat
24 nor a Republican for the purposes of the
25 ballot, as the election returns showed.

Page 99

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q And why was that relevant?

3 A I was looking at major party
4 nominations, major party candidates, and
5 not minor party candidates.

6 Q Do you believe it is possible to
7 analyze voter preferences for minority
8 candidates in elections?

9 A If I understand your question,
10 it sounds like one that might have been
11 asked earlier. Yes, I think it's
12 possible.

13 Q Okay. And you stated earlier
14 you did not look at the underlying code
15 for the ecological inference analysis that
16 Dr. Barreto did for this election;
17 correct?

18 A Could you explain "underlying
19 code"?

20 Q Absolutely. So in the files and
21 data that Dr. Barreto provided to your
22 counsel, he included the coding for the EI
23 analysis he did in the 2011 election. Did
24 you review that code?

25 A No.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Why would you exclude minor
3 party candidates when you are analyzing
4 voter preferences?

5 A It is a convention to include
6 the major candidates for office, that our
7 knowledge of minor parties is much less
8 developed than major party candidates.

9 Q When you say a "convention," is
10 that a convention within the field of
11 political science?

12 A When looking at voting behavior,
13 yes.

14 Q Do you know of any peer-reviewed
15 literature to support that assertion?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Can you identify it?

18 A Certainly. Most of the
19 literature of which I'm aware on
20 forecasting elections or aggregate
21 explanations of elections references the
22 two-party vote.

23 If one looks at individual
24 models of voting behavior, one sees the
25 two-party vote with great regularity, such

1 B. LOCKERBIE
2 as, say, for example, at most -- arena
3 that you -- hopefully I can remember
4 exactly what I said there.

5 THE REPORTER: "For example," what?
6 I'm sorry.

7 THE WITNESS: For example, at studies
8 of individual level voting behavior, one
9 sees the use of the two-party races as
10 opposed to including minor party
11 candidates in -- in a good -- a good bit
12 of the literature.

13 It helps to explain -- if we're
14 looking at the election that's coming up,
15 I doubt we're going to spend too much time
16 looking at Jill Green -- or Jill Stein,
17 excuse me.

18 BY MR. DAVIS:

19 Q Jill Stein, Green Party; right?

20 A Yeah. Or Cornel West.

21 Q Cornel West. Yeah. So when
22 you're talking about literature, do you
23 mean presidential forecasting, generally?

24 A That and other literature
25 looking at other voting choices that

Page 102

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 voters make -- U.S. Senate, U.S. House,
3 state legislature, and so on. We
4 typically look at the two-party vote.

5 Q Is there literature addressing
6 this question in the local context that
7 you're aware of?

8 A Not that I'm aware of.

9 Q Okay. I have maybe one more
10 short section that's, like, probably 10 to
11 15 minutes. Maybe we can do that and then
12 break for lunch. Does that sound okay,
13 Dr. Lockerbie?

14 A That works for me.

15 Q Okay. Thank you. Let's turn to
16 page 3 of your report and look at
17 paragraph 16. Can you let me know when
18 you're there?

19 A I'm there.

20 Q Okay. And you state that -- or
21 you refer to Gary Jacobson's assumption
22 that a competitive seat is anything where
23 a candidate wins with less than 60 percent
24 of the vote. Is that correct?

25 A Yes. You reframed it from

Page 103

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 "safe" to "competitive," but yes.

3 Q Let me just read it so that
4 we're on the same page. So: "Gary
5 Jacobson argues that safe House seats are
6 won with 60 percent or more of the vote.
7 He uses this higher threshold, as the
8 swings from one election year to the next
9 have increased."

10 Did I read that correctly?

11 A Yes, you did.

12 Q And the Jacobson article you
13 refer to in Footnote 7, that is from 1987;
14 correct?

15 A Correct.

16 Q And that analyzes U.S. House of
17 Representative races between 1952 and
18 1982; correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Does that paper analyze local
21 elections?

22 A None of which I'm aware.

23 Q Okay. And going back to
24 paragraph 16, you say that Jacobson "uses
25 this higher threshold, as the swings from

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 one election year to the next have
3 increased." Did I read that right?

4 A Yes.

5 Q What did you mean when you said
6 "the swings from one election year to the
7 next have increased"?

8 A That the vote shares won by the
9 parties has changed -- can change
10 dramatically from one election to the
11 next.

12 Q And that is what I assume
13 Professor Jacobson found when he published
14 his article in 1987; correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Do you know if the same dynamic
17 regarding partisan swings between
18 elections holds true today?

19 A No, I do not.

20 Q Is it possible that the dynamic
21 of how much partisan swing there is
22 between elections might be different today
23 than it was in 1987?

24 A I don't know how the -- or I
25 don't know if they would be different or

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 not.

3 Q But it's possible it could be
4 different?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. And then, in Footnote 7,
7 still referring to Jacobson, you write
8 that Jacobson "argues that victors with
9 over 60 percent are not as safe as they
10 used to be." Correct?

11 A That is correct.

12 Q And again, that's reflecting
13 what Jacobson found when he published his
14 article in 1987; correct?

15 A Correct.

16 Q And do you know if that same
17 dynamic holds true today?

18 A No, I do not know.

19 Q And it's possible that dynamic
20 has changed; correct?

21 A It is possible.

22 Q Okay. And then, looking at
23 paragraph 18, you write "If we use the
24 more demanding 55-percent threshold."
25 Correct?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A Correct.

3 Q And what did you mean by "the
4 more demanding 55-percent threshold"?

5 A Meaning that you would have it
6 be more demanding to say that a seat was
7 safe. Or excuse me, let me rephrase.
8 More demanding that it is competitive,
9 that a winner with 55 percent or less
10 would still be in a competitive race.

11 Q Okay. Let me make sure I
12 understand. So a candidate who won with,
13 let's say, 58 percent of the vote, that
14 would be competitive under Jacobson but
15 not competitive under this more modern
16 approach; right?

17 A I would largely agree to -- I
18 don't know that I would use the modifier
19 "modern," in part because the 55-percent
20 threshold had been used both before and
21 after Jacobson.

22 Q Fair enough. Let me use your --
23 the more demanding threshold.

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. And you cite two

1 B. LOCKERBIE
2 articles, and that's in Footnote 9. And
3 those are the articles -- the first one by
4 Carson and Roberts, and the second one by
5 Carson, Sievert, and Williamson. Is that
6 correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Do those articles address
9 federal legislative elections?

10 A My recollection is yes.

11 Q Are you aware of any peer-
12 reviewed scholarship indicating that a
13 definition of competitiveness used in
14 federal races is also relevant in local
15 races?

16 A No.

17 Q Do you have any other facts or
18 data to support the conclusion that
19 federal elections would be relevant in
20 assessing the competitiveness of local
21 elections?

22 A If I understood you correctly --
23 and this is your opportunity to correct me
24 if I'm misunderstanding you -- do I have
25 any other source to say that local races

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 would be competitive in a similar manner
3 as U.S. House races and such? Other than
4 reading literature of political
5 commentators and political analysts, no.

6 Q Okay. And then, in paragraph
7 19, you state that in the races you
8 analyzed "Minority-favored candidates have
9 won 34 percent of the time." Correct?

10 A Correct.

11 Q And just to confirm, when you
12 say "minority-favored candidates," you
13 mean Democratic candidates; right?

14 A Correct.

15 Q Okay. And, as we discussed
16 before, this dataset does not include Town
17 Council elections; correct?

18 A That is correct.

19 Q Okay. And let's assume for the
20 sake of this question that Democratic
21 candidates are minority-favored
22 candidates.

23 Is it fair to say that, under
24 your definition, no minority-preferred
25 candidate has won a Town Council election

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 since 2011?

3 A Assuming I've got all the Town
4 Council elections in my report, yes.

5 Q At least in all the Town Council
6 elections that we reviewed previously;
7 correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. So is it fair to say
10 that, under your definition of minority-
11 favored, the actual success rate of the
12 candidates preferred by Black and Latino
13 voters in Newburgh is less than 34
14 percent?

15 A If I heard your question
16 correctly, yes. Their chances of -- they
17 won less than 34 percent.

18 Q Okay. If you're up for it, we
19 can do one more very short section and
20 then maybe break. Is that okay? I'm
21 happy to break down --

22 A One more short section would be
23 okay.

24 Q Okay. I got -- it's still on
25 paragraph 19. That's the only reason.

Page 110

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Okay. So then, looking at paragraph 19 --
3 so we just discussed that 34 percent
4 statistic.

5 You then write "In even years,
6 the minority-favored candidates win almost
7 50 percent of the time." Is that -- did I
8 get that right?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Why did you look at the win rate
11 of Democratic candidates in even years?

12 A I had been informed that the law
13 had changed in New York to move these
14 elections to even years.

15 Q Are you aware that groups have
16 challenged the constitutionality of that
17 law requiring jurisdictions to conduct
18 even-year elections?

19 A I'm aware that there were
20 challenges to it. Whether they were
21 constitutional challenges or not, I don't
22 know.

23 Q Fair enough. But there are
24 challenges that could lead to the
25 invalidation of that law?

Page 111

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A As I understand it, that
3 challenges are pending.

4 Q Okay. So let's say,
5 hypothetically, one of those challenges is
6 successful, and the Town of Newburgh
7 continues conducting odd-year elections.

8 In that circumstance, based on
9 your analysis, would you expect minority-
10 preferred candidates to win in odd-year
11 Town elections going forward?

12 MS. WEEKS: Object to the form.

13 A I would argue that if they
14 returned to odd-year elections that the
15 success rate would not be the 50 percent
16 in general for minority-favored candidates
17 across all these elections.

18 Q It's fair to say that the
19 success rate for minority-preferred
20 candidates is lower in odd-year elections
21 than it is in even-year elections;
22 correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Okay. Are you aware that, even
25 if the law you referred to requiring towns

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 to conduct even-year elections is upheld,
3 there will still be odd-year Town
4 elections in Newburgh in 2025 and 2027?

5 A No.

6 Q Okay. Well, I'll represent to
7 you that, based on the way the law is
8 being implemented, there will still be
9 odd-year elections in 2025 and 2027.

10 Based on your analysis, would
11 you expect a minority-preferred candidate
12 to win in either of those races?

13 MS. WEEKS: Object to the form.

14 A I would expect that, given what
15 I report here, that they have a better
16 chance at even years, if that addresses
17 your question.

18 Q But just to confirm, under your
19 definition of minority-preferred, no
20 minority-preferred candidate has won an
21 odd-year Town Council election in
22 Newburgh, at least since 2011?

23 A That's my understanding.

24 Q Do you have any reason to
25 believe that that pattern would not hold

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 true in 2025 or 2027?

3 A No reason to assume, either way.

4 Q You just can't make a
5 prediction, either way?

6 A Well, we can always make
7 predictions. But I would argue that there
8 are probably other factors out there that
9 might be influencing elections in the near
10 term, as we are in, as you well know, a
11 tumultuous time.

12 Q Fair enough. If we look at your
13 report, on pages 3 through 6, you list
14 various elections that you analyzed for
15 your report. Is that correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And is this the full set of
18 elections that you analyzed for your
19 report?

20 A Yes. Well --

21 Q And --

22 A -- let me reframe. The Town
23 Council elections, I referenced outside of
24 this.

25 Q Right. Those were not included

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 in this, but you referred to them

3 elsewhere in your report?

4 A Correct.

5 Q Okay. Okay. So looking through

6 this dataset, I see that in 2013, which is

7 on page 5, a Democratic candidate

8 prevailed in a race for the Leg 6 office.

9 A Yes.

10 Q Do you see that?

11 A Yes, I do.

12 Q Do you know if a Democratic

13 candidate won in any other odd-year

14 election in your dataset?

15 A I would have to go back and look

16 at each of those elections. So I don't

17 know, off the top of my head.

18 Q Well, I'll give you a moment.

19 Can you look through the odd-year

20 elections and see if there's any other

21 Democratic candidate who prevails?

22 A It appears to be no others.

23 Q Okay. So I'll represent to you

24 that there are 25 odd-year elections in

25 your dataset. Does that sound right?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A I don't have the count in front
3 of me. I will accept your
4 characterization. I'm not going to try to
5 count on the fly here.

6 Q Fair enough. I will represent
7 that I counted them, one by one, and there
8 were 25 elections in odd-year -- 25
9 elections in odd years in your dataset.

10 So Democrats won -- or
11 Democratic candidate won in 1 of 25 odd-
12 year elections in your dataset. Is that
13 correct?

14 A Based on your representation,
15 yes.

16 Q And you have no reason to
17 dispute those representations?

18 A No. I have not counted them up
19 today.

20 Q Okay. So I'll just ask again,
21 based on this data, which indicates that
22 Democratic candidates win in 4 percent of
23 odd-year elections, do you believe that
24 minority-preferred candidates have a
25 reasonable opportunity to be elected in

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Town elections in 2025 or 2027?

3 MS. WEEKS: Object to the form.

4 A I would say the odds are not
5 good, if that addresses your question.

6 Q It does. Thank you. Why don't
7 we break there, and we can take a lunch
8 break.

9 MR. DAVIS: So we can go off the
10 record.

11 THE REPORTER: Okay. Off the record
12 now, 1:14 p.m.

13 (Off the record.)

14 THE REPORTER: Okay. We are back on
15 the record now at 2:02 p.m.

16 BY MR. DAVIS:

17 Q Hi, Dr. Lockerbie. Were you
18 able to get some lunch?

19 A Yes, the microwave was handy.

20 Q Glad you have the microwave.
21 You understand you're still under oath?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Great. Okay. So we'll go back
24 to Exhibit 1, which is your report. Can
25 you let me know when you have that up?

Page 117

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A I have it available.

3 Q Okay. And then, can you go to
4 paragraph 19? I think there's two
5 paragraph 19s.

6 A Yeah. I was about to say, first
7 or second 19? I realized that yesterday.

8 Q Let's go -- second paragraph 19.
9 I think it's on page 6.

10 A The one that starts "Barreto
11 states"?

12 Q Correct.

13 A Yes, I'm there.

14 Q Okay. In the second paragraph
15 19, you talk about a statistical
16 methodology called Bayesian Improved
17 Surname Geocoding, or BISG. Is that
18 correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q What is a BISG analysis?

21 A It is an attempt to assess the
22 racial makeup of a community making use of
23 location and surname.

24 Q Okay. And in general terms, how
25 would one perform a BISG analysis?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A In general terms, as I
3 understand it, one would look at the
4 location and the people around you when
5 they're assessing your race, as well as
6 your name, to see if it fits with
7 stereotypical White, Black, Hispanic,
8 Asian, whatever.

9 Q Okay. Have you ever yourself
10 conducted a BISG analysis?

11 A No.

12 Q Okay. In paragraph 19, towards
13 the end, I'll read. You state "We should
14 note that it is by no means 100 percent
15 accurate," referring to BISG. Is that
16 correct?

17 A That is correct.

18 Q And what did you mean by that?

19 A I was highlighting the fact that
20 it is not a completely accurate technique,
21 that there are errors associated with it.

22 Q Okay. And what did you base
23 that statement on?

24 A I reviewed some of the works
25 that Barreto cited in his report --

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Okay. And then --

3 A -- as justifying it.

4 Q Okay. And then I see in

5 Footnote 14, you reference the -- I'm not

6 going to pronounce it correctly -- Imai,

7 I-M-A-I, that study. Is that correct?

8 A That is correct.

9 Q Okay. So you reviewed that
10 study, presumably, for --

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. Were there any other
13 specific studies that you recall that you
14 reviewed?

15 A Not on the -- off the top of my
16 head, no.

17 Q Okay. Then, in paragraph 20,
18 you identify some error rates that are
19 identified --

20 A Yes.

21 Q -- in the Imai paper. Is that
22 correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Could you explain to me what
25 those error rates mean?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A They mean that they -- the --
3 using that procedure for assessing
4 somebody's race is inaccurate that
5 percentage of the times.

6 And I've got -- from reading the
7 article that Barreto cited, I cite the
8 false positive and the false negative
9 rates.

10 Q Okay. And the Imai paper, just
11 to clarify, is not about the Town of
12 Newburgh; correct?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q So those are error rates based
15 on a general analysis using the ISG -- or
16 strike that. Those error rates are not
17 specific to the Town of Newburgh; correct?

18 A That is correct.

19 Q Based on those error rates, can
20 you draw any conclusions about the
21 accuracy of a BISG analysis in the Town of
22 Newburgh?

23 A No more than Barreto did when he
24 used that as the justification for using
25 that technique in Newburgh.

Page 121

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q So what you can say is,
3 generally, BISG analysis has these error
4 rates, but you can't say for sure what the
5 error rates are in the Town of Newburgh,
6 specifically?

7 A Nobody can, as far as I'm -- as
8 far as I'm aware.

9 Q Okay. I'm going to try and mark
10 an exhibit. Just give me one second.
11 Okay. This will be marked as Exhibit 8, I
12 believe. And, Professor -- Dr. Lockerbie,
13 let me know --

14 A Either one is acceptable.

15 Q Let me know when it's up on your
16 screen?

17 A Going to make it so I can see
18 the screen. Forgive me for the delay.

19 Q That's okay.

20 A I see that.

21 (Exhibit 8 was marked for
22 identification.)

23 Q Okay. Are you familiar with
24 this document?

25 A I can't recall if this is one of

Page 122

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 the ones I referenced in my report or not.

3 Q Okay. I will represent to you
4 that this is the Imai report that you cite
5 in Footnote 14.

6 A Okay.

7 Q Do you have any reason to
8 dispute that?

9 A No.

10 Q Okay. So if you look at the
11 abstract, on the top, I'm reading here,
12 beginning of the first line --

13 A Let me expand the size of it a
14 little bit here.

15 Q Absolutely. I did the same.
16 Let me know when you're ready?

17 A Okay. I can see it.

18 Q All right. So Imai writes
19 "Bayesian Improved Surname Geocoding
20 (BISG), which relies on detailed census
21 information, has emerged as a leading
22 methodology for this prediction task."
23 Did I read that correctly?

24 A Yes, I believe so.

25 Q Do you agree with that

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 statement?

3 A I have no reason to dispute it.

4 Q Okay. And then, later on, Imai
5 and co-authors discuss two potential
6 limitations of a BISG analysis. Is that
7 correct?

8 A I believe so, if you're reading
9 from the next sentence that starts
10 "Unfortunately."

11 Q Yes. So one of those problems
12 is the census zero count problem; right?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And the other problem is the
15 missing surnames problem; correct?

16 A Correct.

17 Q Do you know whether either of
18 these limitations are present in
19 Dr. Barreto's BISG analysis in the Town of
20 Newburgh?

21 A No, I do not.

22 Q Do you know if there are any
23 zero counts of minorities in blocks where
24 minorities do in fact reside in the Town
25 of Newburgh?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A No, I do not.

3 Q Did you inspect Dr. Barreto's
4 code to assess whether he used the updated
5 census surname and first name lists?

6 A No, I did not.

7 Q Have you downloaded and run the
8 version of fBISG that Imai refers to in
9 this article?

10 A No, I have not.

11 Q Can you explain how the fBISG
12 methodology works?

13 A Other than to say it takes into
14 account more information than the original
15 BISG, no.

16 Q And did you use fBISG to analyze
17 election results in the Town of Newburgh?

18 A No.

19 Q Is it fair to say that you are
20 aware of the general limitations of BISG
21 raised in Imai's article, but you cannot
22 say, one way or the other, how accurate
23 BISG is when used in the Town of Newburgh?

24 A I don't know that anybody can
25 assess the accuracy in the Town of

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Newburgh.

3 Q But you have no basis --

4 A That's why we don't use BISG is
5 because we don't know the information. If
6 we had the information, we would actually
7 use it.

8 Q Understood. Let me rephrase,
9 then. You do not know whether the
10 limitations identified in the Imai article
11 are also present in Dr. Barreto's
12 analysis?

13 A I don't know if the problems
14 that -- that Imai refers to are present
15 there. All I can tell you is that Imai,
16 who is cited by Barreto, says .Here are
17 the limitations..

18 Q Right. Yes. There are -- those
19 are the general limitations. Yes. Okay.
20 I get what you're saying. Does a
21 statistical method need to be 100 percent
22 accurate to be considered reliable within
23 the field of political science?

24 A No.

25 Q Is the ecological regression --

Page 126

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 strike that. Let's turn to paragraph 21
3 of your report. I think that's on page 7.
4 Let me know when you're there?

5 A I'm there.

6 Q Okay. And I'll read, just so
7 we're on the same page. "Overall, the
8 error rate indicates a high level of
9 accuracy, but one should note that the
10 errors are not randomly distributed." Did
11 I read that correctly?

12 A Yes.

13 Q What did you mean when you said
14 "the error rate indicates a high level of
15 accuracy"?

16 A That despite the fact that there
17 are errors with it, which Imai, or however
18 one pronounces his name -- I apologize to
19 him if he's listening in or hears this --
20 that I said it has a high level of
21 accuracy 'cause it's better than a flip of
22 a coin, much better than a flip of a coin,
23 I would think.

24 Q And then you said "the errors
25 are not randomly distributed." What did

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 you mean by that?

3 A That some races are predicted
4 more accurately than others.
5 Race/ethnicity, not electoral contests.

6 Q Can you explain to me, why would
7 that matter when you're conducting a BISG
8 analysis?

9 A I would argue that if you're
10 doing analysis such as this, and your
11 error rate for one group is different than
12 another, that would lend me -- or lead me
13 to doubt the results for the groups that
14 are forecast more inaccurately.

15 Q Do you recall which groups have
16 higher error rates?

17 A I believe that is referenced in
18 paragraph 20 of my report.

19 Q All right. I see that now.
20 Okay. Okay. I'm going to introduce
21 another exhibit. Give me one second.
22 Okay. This should be marked Exhibit 9.
23 Will you let me know when it comes up on
24 your screen?

25 A I have to refresh every time we

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 add an exhibit.

3 Q Yes.

4 MS. WEEKS: Sam, I want to go ahead
5 and note an objection by the named
6 defendants on this.

7 It is our position that this was --
8 and I know you've been made aware of our
9 position -- that this was produced later
10 in time and is inappropriately before the
11 court or this witness at this time.

12 MR. DAVIS: Noted.

13 THE WITNESS: I have it available.
14 (Exhibit 9 was marked for
15 identification.)

16 Q Great. Are you -- have you seen
17 this document before?

18 A No.

19 Q Okay. It was not provided to
20 you by defendants' counsel?

21 A I don't recall ever seeing it.

22 MS. WEEKS: Again, I will just say,
23 you know, consistent with our objection,
24 it was not provided to Dr. Lockerbie.

25 MR. DAVIS: Understood. Thank you.

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 BY MR. DAVIS:

3 Q Okay. Okay. I'm going to go
4 through a couple questions. I apologize
5 in advance if I repeat something. Okay.

6 So in your report, do you offer
7 an opinion regarding the presence or
8 absence of racially polarized voting in
9 the Town of Newburgh?

10 A I believe I did not dispute
11 Dr. Barreto's characterization.

12 Q Okay. And you are not offering
13 an opinion on whether it's possible to
14 draw a single-member district for the Town
15 of Newburgh -- a single-member district
16 plan for the Town of Newburgh that allows
17 minority voters to elect at least one
18 candidate of choice; correct?

19 A I was not asked to evaluate
20 that.

21 Q Do you know --

22 A So I have no opinion.

23 Q Understood. Do you know what
24 rank choice voting is?

25 A Yes.

Page 130

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 Q Are you offering an opinion on
3 whether an election system that uses rank
4 choice voting would allow minority voters
5 to elect candidates of choice in the Town
6 of Newburgh?

7 A I'm not offering an opinion on
8 that.

9 Q Do you know what cumulative
10 voting is?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Are you offering an opinion as
13 to whether an election system using
14 cumulative voting would allow Black and
15 Latino voters to elect their candidates of
16 choice?

17 A I'm offering no such opinion.

18 Q Do you know what limited voting
19 is?

20 A That term eludes me.

21 Q I will represent that that is
22 another alternative method of election.

23 You are not offering an opinion
24 on whether an election system that uses
25 limited voting would allow minority voters

1 B. LOCKERBIE
2 to elect their candidates of choice;
3 correct?

4 A No --

5 MS. WEEKS: Object to the form.

6 -- I think I --

7 THE REPORTER: What was your --

8 THE WITNESS: I think I --

9 THE REPORTER: -- Dr. Lockerbie?

10 THE WITNESS: We're all talking at
11 once. While I think I know what limited
12 voting is, I am not offering an opinion on
13 whether it has any relation to the outcome
14 of elections with regard to the Town of
15 Newburgh.

16 BY MR. DAVIS:

17 Q Thank you. You are not offering
18 an opinion as to whether there's a history
19 of discrimination in the Town of Newburgh;
20 correct?

21 A That is correct.

22 Q You are not offering an opinion
23 as to whether Black or Hispanic candidates
24 have been elected to office in the Town of
25 Newburgh; correct?

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 A That is correct.

3 Q You are not offering an opinion
4 as to whether there are any voting
5 qualifications, laws, ordinances, or
6 policies that may enhance the allegedly
7 dilutive effects of at-large elections in
8 the Town of Newburgh; correct?

9 A I'm not offering any opinions
10 with regard to that.

11 Q You are not offering an opinion
12 as to whether Black or Latino voters or
13 candidates lack access to the processes
14 determining which candidates receive
15 access to the ballot in the Town of
16 Newburgh; correct?

17 A Not offering, as it's not in my
18 report.

19 Q Is it fair to say you're not
20 offering an opinion on anything that's not
21 specifically included in your report?

22 A That is fair.

23 MR. DAVIS: Okay. Let's maybe go off
24 the -- if we could take a five-minute
25 break, just go off the record quickly, and

Page 133

1 B. LOCKERBIE

2 then --

3 THE REPORTER: Okay. Off the record,
4 2:20.

5 (Off the record.)

6 THE REPORTER: Okay. We are back on
7 the record now, 2:25 p.m.

8 MR. DAVIS: Great. Dr. Lockerbie,
9 thank you for your time. We have no
10 further questions.

11 THE REPORTER: Is there any cross
12 or --

13 MS. WEEKS: No. Nothing further from
14 the named defendants.

15 THE REPORTER: Okay. Then before we
16 go off the record, I just want to confirm,
17 Mr. Davis, you're ordering the transcript?

18 MR. DAVIS: I believe Mr. Imamura is
19 going to handle --

20 MR. IMAMURA: Yes. We are. By
21 Monday --

22 THE REPORTER: Oh, right.

23 MR. IMAMURA: -- if possible.

24 THE REPORTER: Expedite.

25 MR. IMAMURA: Yeah. So by Monday, if

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

B. LOCKERBIE

possible.

THE REPORTER: Okay. Okay. Then we
can go off the record now at 2:26 p.m.

(Signature reserved.)

(Whereupon, at 2:26 p.m., the
proceeding was concluded.)

DR. BRAD LOCKERBIE

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this _____ day of _____, 2024.

Notary Public

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSITION OFFICER

I, THEA POPKO, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.



THEA POPKO
Notary Public in and for the
State of New York

Review of the transcript was requested.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, PENNIE M. HAHN, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from the digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

PENNIE M. HAHN

[02138 - 7]

Page 1

0	17 5:8	2024 1:15 6:10	400 3:8
02138 2:8,18	18 105:23	63:19 134:12	404 3:22
1	19 108:7	137:4	409-7340 3:11
1 5:7,21 17:8	109:25 110:2	2025 112:4,9	4105 2:7,17
17:11,12 25:11	117:4,7,8,15	113:2 116:2	45 93:8,12
52:8 63:18	118:12	2027 112:4,9	48 79:22 80:5
115:11 116:24	190 97:23	113:2 116:2	80:15,18
10 50:19 78:9	1952 103:17	21 126:2	5
78:10,18,22	1982 103:18	25 114:24	5 5:14 94:5,8
79:11 102:10	1987 103:13	115:8,8,11	94:22 96:16,19
100 118:14	104:14,23	27 94:22 95:2	96:21 114:7
125:21	105:14	275-6132 3:13	50 110:7
10601 3:9	1994 23:6	2:02 116:15	111:15
11 1:15 6:10	19s 117:5	2:20 133:4	52 79:24 80:5
66:3,7 69:4	1:14 116:12	2:25 133:7	55 105:24
70:11 75:22	2	2:26 134:4,6	106:4,9,19
76:7,8,13	2 5:9 55:18	3	560-0590 2:20
137:4	56:22 57:3	3 5:11 58:18,23	57 5:10
11:07 1:16 6:6	61:20 66:3,8	60:16,17 93:23	58 5:11 106:13
12 72:14 80:20	75:2 92:13	102:16 113:13	6
83:11,17	20 50:19	30 25:12 30:8	6 2:7,17 5:16
121 5:21	119:17 127:18	30:12	25:11 95:16,19
128 5:22	137:22	3000 3:19	113:13 114:8
12:07 64:10	2011 5:18	30229 136:15	117:9
12:14 64:13	96:17 97:18	30308 3:20	60 102:23
13 84:21	98:8,17 99:23	30630 135:19	103:6 105:9
14 5:21 89:10	109:2 112:22	34 108:9	600 3:19 50:5
91:5 119:5	2013 5:16	109:13,17	50:12
122:5	23:11 95:12	110:3	631 2:10
15 92:5,8 93:23	114:6	37 95:23	6903384 1:20
94:15 95:10	2019 5:14 92:9	4	7
96:16 98:11,15	93:24 94:16	4 5:12 92:19,23	7 5:18 32:23
102:11	202 2:20	95:11 115:22	97:9,11,12,13
16 102:17	2021 5:12		103:13 105:6
103:24	92:13,14		

[7 - analysis]

Page 2

126:3	absent 6:17	actually 15:6	106:17 122:25
8	absentee 37:6	69:6 77:20	agreement
8 5:20 121:11	38:7	96:12 125:6	48:19,20,22
121:21	absolutely	adam 47:9	ahead 64:7
807-2327 2:10	56:21 99:20	add 19:2 128:2	128:4
81 3:8	122:15	addendum	airplane 14:7
885-3634 3:22	abstract 122:11	5:22	al 6:9,10 34:9
9	academic 47:24	additional 37:4	137:3
9 5:3,22 63:18	accept 115:3	additionally	allegedly 132:6
107:2 127:22	acceptable	6:17	alliance 37:22
128:14	121:14	address 54:4	allow 43:24
90 78:8	access 58:19	86:13,13 107:8	130:4,14,25
914 3:11,13	97:10 132:13	addresses	allowed 89:11
92 5:13	132:15	112:16 116:5	89:24
94 5:15	account 124:14	addressing	allows 43:20
95 5:17	accounts 13:16	102:5	129:16
97 5:19	accuracy	administer	alternative
a	120:21 124:25	6:14	130:22
a.m. 1:16 6:6	126:9,15,21	adopted 45:12	america 20:5
abbott 34:10	accurate 11:22	advance 129:5	american 12:13
ability 35:23	65:19 118:15	aforemention...	12:15 21:24
135:9 136:6	118:20 124:22	69:17	23:7 24:19,21
able 9:25 13:22	125:22 135:8	african 12:13	25:5,5,7 26:2,7
16:23 58:19	136:5	12:15 66:23	32:19 77:3
59:2 82:11	accurately	72:22 80:24	81:6,14
86:21 87:15	127:4	81:20 83:13	americans
90:20 92:20	acknowledge...	agee 34:19,20	66:23 67:6
97:10 116:18	6:13	aggregate	72:22 80:24
abrams 3:7	action 135:11	42:22 100:20	81:20 83:13
7:18,22	135:15 136:8	ago 21:4 28:20	analyses 27:2
abramslaw.c...	136:11	29:11 30:16	53:25
3:10,12	actual 56:14	45:23 51:7	analysis 24:7
absence 129:8	57:16 82:5	91:12	26:21 27:16
	84:4 109:11	agree 6:15,20	32:18 40:13,22
		90:17 91:2	41:10 42:5

[analysis - attorneys]

Page 3

43:4,11,24 65:20 75:18 77:18 82:24 83:20,23 85:25 88:11 89:6 91:21 99:15,23 111:9 112:10 117:20,25 118:10 120:15 120:21 121:3 123:6,19 125:12 127:8 127:10 analysts 108:5 analyze 82:5 84:4 85:6,10 85:13 87:20 88:19 99:7 103:20 124:16 analyzed 108:8 113:14,18 analyzes 103:16 analyzing 100:3 animus 35:4 answer 10:4,10 10:18 20:14 21:6 47:7 71:22 88:11 89:6 91:16 answering 70:2 answers 11:12 11:17 72:3	anybody 124:24 anytime 10:23 apologies 17:10 36:21,22 76:10 87:9 apologize 22:11 30:18 59:18 76:6 126:18 129:4 appear 58:12 59:9 appears 57:5 94:10 97:16 98:9 114:22 applicable 6:24 applications 13:20 appointed 45:8 apportionment 33:22 38:18 approach 106:16 approached 46:18 approximately 50:19 area 25:25 35:5 arena 101:2 argue 111:13 113:7 127:9 argues 103:5 105:8 arkansas 33:12 33:20,20,21	38:16,17,18,22 arthur 20:5 26:9 article 5:20 27:16 103:12 104:14 105:14 120:7 124:9,21 125:10 articles 23:17 25:13 81:19 107:2,3,8 ascertain 68:23 91:23,25 asian 67:6 118:8 aside 22:24 asked 35:3 53:23 55:3,4,6 64:23 65:6,9 74:15 99:11 129:19 asking 9:10,22 10:3,19 41:20 44:4 54:4 56:13 88:5 assertion 100:15 assess 67:24 68:19 69:22 117:21 124:4 124:25 assessed 76:25 assessing 107:20 118:5 120:3	assessment 36:18 37:5 assigned 6:4 assistance 62:10,14 associated 118:21 assume 10:18 44:4 49:22 65:18 73:2 84:7 104:12 108:19 113:3 assumed 74:2 77:2,8 82:13 84:15 assumes 75:9 assuming 75:16 80:15 109:3 assumption 72:19 74:19 83:13 84:10 102:21 assumptions 42:16 atlanta 3:20 attempt 117:21 attendance 7:7 attitudes 23:13 attorney 7:9,11 7:14 50:20 135:13 136:9 attorney's 37:13 attorneys 9:8 14:12,14,22
---	---	--	---

[attorneys - believe]

Page 4

34:22 37:14 38:2,3 45:17 48:2 63:6 64:24 audible 88:9 audio 135:7 136:3 august 51:9 authorized 6:13 authors 123:5 available 43:6 46:9 62:5 91:17 117:2 128:13 averages 54:7 aware 18:9 51:16 55:23 71:25 72:2,7 88:18 91:20 100:19 102:7,8 103:22 107:11 110:15,19 111:24 121:8 124:20 128:8	31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1,10 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1,13 91:14 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1	121:1 122:1 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 back 27:20 32:21 46:11 52:7 55:16 63:10 64:12 74:24 75:21 77:23 80:20 93:22 96:25 97:6 98:10 103:23 114:15 116:14,23 133:6 baked 41:23 42:3 ballot 33:19 38:8 90:8 98:25 132:15 ballots 37:6 barreto 4:6 5:10,11,22 8:5 15:8 51:23 55:23 57:6,12 57:17 58:3,5 58:10 60:2 65:7,17 72:20 74:19,25 98:17 99:16,21 117:10 118:25 120:7,23	125:16 barreto's 14:11 55:10,15 62:7 74:16 75:8 123:19 124:3 125:11 129:11 barring 79:4,4 base 118:22 based 84:11 111:8 112:7,10 115:14,21 120:14,19 basically 41:20 53:11 71:6 basis 125:3 bayesian 24:11 117:16 122:19 bear 16:19 92:18 95:14 beat 94:25 beginning 22:10 122:12 behalf 2:2,12 3:2,15 behavior 19:15 20:23 21:8 23:12,25 24:20 25:6 29:7 30:22 32:19 76:24 100:12 100:24 101:8 believe 19:18 21:13 23:18 26:14 28:20 29:24 33:18,23
b			
b 5:5 6:1 7:1 8:1,13,13 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1			

[believe - candidates]

Page 5

34:7,15 35:9 36:5 37:18 38:6 39:8 42:9 45:22 46:16,22 47:9 48:5 50:23 52:14 53:10 54:25 55:8 56:25 57:9 58:7,14 58:17,20 59:12 59:16,22 60:14 60:24 61:18 62:2,9,21 75:2 76:20 77:17,22 83:4 84:9 92:16,18 93:12 93:20 94:5,6 95:13,18,24 96:14 99:6 112:25 115:23 121:12 122:24 123:8 127:17 129:10 133:18 benson 34:20 34:20 best 54:4 76:8 135:9 136:5 better 45:25 112:15 126:21 126:22 bigger 60:23 96:3 billing 50:8 bisg 24:12 117:17,20,25	118:10,15 120:21 121:3 122:20 123:6 123:19 124:15 124:20,23 125:4 127:7 bit 96:12 101:11 122:14 black 12:13,14 77:19 82:6 84:18 90:19 109:12 118:7 130:14 131:23 132:12 blacks 66:25 blocks 123:23 blue 60:5,19 61:5,8 board 1:9 3:16 33:21 37:23,25 38:18 80:6 boockvar 36:9 book 19:11,12 19:24 21:16 26:8 43:12,13 books 26:22 bottom 95:23 97:22 bounds 42:18 boxes 35:24 36:17 37:4 brad 1:14 5:7 6:7 8:12,18 17:20 134:9 137:4,20	break 10:22,24 63:24 102:12 109:20,21 116:7,8 132:25 breaking 63:23 briefly 15:15 broadly 25:24 built 54:6 busy 25:8	candidate 71:6 71:8 72:17,20 72:21,23 73:12 73:18 74:20,21 75:9,10,17 77:3,9 78:9,10 78:10,17,21,22 78:24 79:10,13 79:15,22,24 80:25 82:14,15 83:15 84:8,16 84:17 86:9,14 86:22 87:16,21 87:21,22 88:6 88:20 89:12,25 90:7 91:8 92:2 102:23 106:12 108:25 112:11 112:20 114:7 114:13,21 115:11 129:18 candidate's 78:14 candidates 43:21,25 44:2 44:6 66:11,14 66:15 67:12,20 68:16,20,22,24 69:5,7,11,12,15 69:16,18,23 70:4,7,12 71:13,17,24 72:5 73:20,25 74:6,12 75:18 76:2,18 77:2
		c	
		c 2:1 3:1 4:1 8:13 43:17,19 43:23 86:11 89:5 91:13,15 calculate 54:7 calculations 53:12 62:17,20 62:23 63:3,13 65:19 call 48:18 60:16 called 8:19 22:7 22:14 24:11 34:9 43:17 60:20 61:21 117:16 calling 41:20 cambridge 2:8 2:18 19:11 campaign 79:13 campaigning 71:9 canceling 37:4	

[candidates - classes]

Page 6

77:16,19 78:2 80:12 82:7,25 83:3,6 86:5,8 86:17,24 87:5 87:11,17 89:11 89:17 90:11,20 91:7,13,18 93:18 94:16 95:7 96:9 98:2 98:6 99:4,5,8 100:3,6,8 101:11 108:8 108:12,13,21 108:22 109:12 110:6,11 111:10,16,20 115:22,24 130:5,15 131:2 131:23 132:13 132:14 cap 50:14 carolina 6:11 24:16 37:22 carson 107:4,5 case 8:6 9:10 13:3 14:25 15:23 16:3,6,9 16:12 33:16,20 33:25 34:9,21 35:16,22 36:10 36:16 37:10 38:5,16,20,25 39:5,12,12 40:4,8,11,22 41:5,10 43:2	44:11 45:16,24 46:5,8,19 47:18 48:4,14 48:17 49:5,11 49:14 50:6,15 50:18,22 51:18 51:21 62:19,19 62:23,24 63:12 63:12,20 74:3 84:5 88:8,23 90:9 98:9 137:3 cases 33:4,7,9 34:18 44:16 47:19 72:2 catch 36:24 cause 20:14 126:21 caveat 61:2 census 122:20 123:12 124:5 certain 20:14 21:6 27:6 38:7 41:18 46:25 47:10 48:25 51:7 certainly 100:18 certificate 135:1 136:1 certified 6:20 certify 135:3 136:2 chair 18:16	challenged 110:16 challenges 110:20,21,24 111:3,5 chance 68:25 69:2 71:18 78:7,11 79:15 112:16 chances 109:16 change 20:6,7 34:5 104:9 137:5 changed 31:8,9 104:9 105:20 110:13 changes 79:5 chapters 19:11 19:24 21:16 26:9 characterizati... 115:4 129:11 charitable 70:8 check 62:20 76:9 checked 62:22 63:3 choice 66:12 67:13,20 71:14 71:24 72:6,12 76:2,18 77:16 78:3 86:22 87:16,22 90:20 129:18,24 130:4,5,16	131:2 choices 74:17 101:25 choose 42:24 85:24 circumstance 79:9 111:8 citation 96:22 citations 52:20 52:23 54:21,23 58:13 81:17 cite 106:25 120:7 122:4 cited 5:20 118:25 120:7 125:16 clarification 42:2 49:4 56:20 58:8 clarifications 55:4,7 clarify 10:17 53:22 56:9 57:24 69:3 120:11 clarke 1:4 2:2 2:12 3:2 6:9 9:9 137:3 class 29:6,9,15 30:4,12,19,23 30:25 31:5,11 31:12,18 classes 31:24 32:4,6
---	--	---	--

[clear - convention]

Page 7

clear 41:19 clearly 20:15 21:7 22:10 73:14 80:4 clinic 2:6,16 4:3 7:12,16 8:4 close 78:5 coads 34:4 40:3 code 31:21 41:7 41:16,20,22 43:12 52:11,16 53:8,19,24,25 54:6 55:24 56:10,14 99:14 99:19,24 124:4 coding 99:22 coin 126:22,22 colleagues 15:2 63:2 color 61:3,6 colorblind 61:5 column 59:9 60:10 61:12 columns 43:20 comes 26:6 127:23 coming 46:8 101:14 comment 37:3 commentators 108:5 commission 34:23 45:5 137:25	communities 34:5 72:5 community 29:19 70:24 71:23 75:19 117:22 comparative 78:4 compete 86:9 86:10 competitive 66:16 70:13,17 71:7 72:9 73:22 77:6,11 77:25 78:18 80:8 82:20 83:5 102:22 103:2 106:8,10 106:14,15 108:2 competitiven... 71:10,22 72:6 77:24 79:6 107:13,20 complaint 16:9 complete 11:17 11:22 33:6 63:19 completely 21:7 118:20 compliance 43:9 component 30:11	computer 13:10,17,20,24 14:2 41:21 concept 77:23 concerned 61:6 concluded 134:7 conclusion 81:10,12,16 107:18 conclusions 44:11 62:17 65:13,22 77:14 120:20 conditions 11:8 70:20,21,23 78:13 conduct 31:22 32:2,11 40:21 41:9 77:18 83:20,23 110:17 112:2 conducted 27:17 118:10 conducting 75:17 91:21 111:7 127:7 conference 18:12,15 32:17 confirm 65:21 69:21 83:11 85:5 108:11 112:18 133:16 confused 67:14	consider 88:22 consideration 35:5 considered 71:5 125:22 consistent 128:23 consistently 79:11 80:5 constitute 7:4 constitutional 110:21 constitutional... 110:16 consulting 35:2 35:22 36:16 38:5,25 39:17 40:11 47:25 cont'd 3:1 4:1 contact 45:20 contacted 46:4 48:3 contain 63:19 contested 85:2 contesting 85:16 86:8 contests 89:13 89:18,19,21,23 89:25 127:5 context 29:2 47:16 102:6 continues 111:7 convention 100:5,9,10
---	--	---	--

[conversation - d]

Page 8

conversation 13:15	85:11,17,18 88:8,12,13	72:24 74:8 76:3,19 81:2	97:18
copy 12:24 57:10 96:24 98:15	90:13 91:3,9 91:22 92:10,15 93:19,25 94:2	85:3 89:14 98:20 103:10 107:22 109:16	county's 95:11 couple 49:23 129:4
cornel 101:20 101:21	94:19 95:8,9 95:12 96:6,7	119:6 122:23 126:11	course 28:19,22 courses 24:18 28:24 29:5
corner 95:23 97:22	96:10,18 97:19 99:17 102:24	council 51:15 65:11 85:10,21	court 1:1 9:23 9:25 10:8 16:5 16:12 33:4,15
correct 13:3,4 15:9 21:16 23:16,23 24:4 24:16 25:14 26:16 28:16 29:11,12 30:17 31:19 32:11,12 32:15 33:4 37:15,16 40:8 40:19,20 41:6 44:7 46:6 50:6 50:7 53:7 57:17 58:13 59:10,15 60:7 61:14,15 62:15 62:25 63:4,5,8 64:16,17,21 65:25 67:3,4,7 67:20,21 68:17 69:9,24,25 72:12,13 74:22 77:11,12 78:25 79:7,8 80:7 82:9,11,12,16 82:21 83:18,19 84:6,20 85:7,8	103:14,15,18 104:14 105:10 105:11,14,15 105:20,25 106:2 107:6,23 108:9,10,14,17 108:18 109:7 111:22 113:15 114:4 115:13 117:12,18 118:16,17 119:7,8,22 120:12,13,17 120:18 123:7 123:15,16 129:18 131:3 131:20,21,25 132:2,8,16	86:4 87:12,18 90:12,15,21,21 94:18 96:9 98:3,8 108:17 108:25 109:4,5 112:21 113:23	creating 62:11 critchlow 15:22 52:2 cross 133:11 crossover 39:3 csv 61:14 cumulative 130:9,14 current 70:23 currently 12:20 13:20 31:2 33:24 curriculum 17:20 cv 18:3,4,8 19:2 19:20 23:16 27:21
	corrected 54:19 54:21	councilman 93:15 95:3 96:5	cran 43:6
	correcting 54:22,23 56:18	counsel 7:25 8:24 52:13,16 55:25 58:6 59:21 64:2,19 99:22 128:20 135:10,13 136:6,9	critchlow 15:22 52:2
	correction 56:19	count 115:2,5 123:12	cross 133:11
	correctly 20:22 66:17 70:14	counted 115:7 115:18	crossover 39:3
		counts 123:23	csv 61:14
		county 1:2 33:25 34:4,6 40:4,4,6 42:25 92:9,14 93:6 93:24 96:17	cumulative 130:9,14
			current 70:23
			currently 12:20 13:20 31:2 33:24
			curriculum 17:20
			cv 18:3,4,8 19:2 19:20 23:16 27:21
			d
			d 5:1 8:13 86:11 91:13,15

[data - discussed]

Page 9

<p>data 15:16,17 15:18 21:19,22 21:25 24:6 42:22 52:11,17 53:6 55:24 58:25 60:2 65:20 72:15 73:20 81:9 99:21 107:18 115:21</p> <p>dataset 108:16 114:6,14,25 115:9,12</p> <p>date 1:15 18:4 137:4</p> <p>dated 63:18</p> <p>david 3:6 7:17</p> <p>davis 2:5 5:3 7:10,10 8:2,25 9:3,8 17:10,15 17:16 37:7 47:12 64:2,4,6 64:14 65:5,8 68:14 101:18 116:9,16 128:12,25 129:2 131:16 132:23 133:8 133:17,18</p> <p>day 134:12 137:22</p> <p>dealing 33:12</p> <p>decide 67:10 73:23</p>	<p>decisions 72:3</p> <p>deemed 43:7 83:2</p> <p>defeated 66:14 66:16 68:17,20 69:6,8 70:13</p> <p>defendants 1:11 3:15 7:25 37:24 38:3 40:7 52:13 55:25 58:5 59:21 64:19 128:6,20 133:14</p> <p>defined 82:20</p> <p>definition 107:13 108:24 109:10 112:19</p> <p>delay 121:18</p> <p>deliver 18:18</p> <p>demanding 105:24 106:4,6 106:8,23</p> <p>democrat 84:25 85:15 98:23</p> <p>democratic 72:21,23 74:21 75:10,17 77:2 80:25 82:15 83:14 84:8,16 108:13,20 110:11 114:7 114:12,21 115:11,22</p>	<p>democrats 81:21 82:10,19 115:10</p> <p>department 24:15</p> <p>dependent 42:20</p> <p>depending 19:12</p> <p>deposed 9:15 35:8 36:4 37:17 38:11 39:7,22 40:16</p> <p>deposition 1:13 6:7 7:2 11:25 14:9,23 15:12 16:15 33:15 50:9 135:1 137:4</p> <p>desantis 35:15</p> <p>describe 80:7 80:10</p> <p>description 5:6</p> <p>design 24:22</p> <p>despite 126:16</p> <p>detailed 122:20</p> <p>determine 65:9 66:9 67:10,18 75:18,24 76:16 77:19 82:7 90:19</p> <p>determining 132:14</p> <p>developed 100:8</p>	<p>dictionaries 60:6</p> <p>difference 42:11,14,15 69:10,14 75:15</p> <p>different 62:24 79:18 86:16 87:4,10 104:22 104:25 105:4 127:11</p> <p>difficult 86:7 91:6</p> <p>digital 135:7 136:3</p> <p>dilutive 132:7</p> <p>dimamura 3:12</p> <p>diminish 78:14</p> <p>discrepancy 97:5</p> <p>discrimination 131:19</p> <p>discriminatory 68:2,3</p> <p>discuss 14:25 28:25 29:22 31:7,11,14,17 48:12 62:7 123:5</p> <p>discussant 18:21</p> <p>discussed 29:16 31:11,13 38:16 44:17 83:12 88:14 108:15 110:3</p>
---	---	---	---

[discussion - elections]

Page 10

discussion 29:14 30:4 31:4,6 dispute 56:4 115:17 122:8 123:3 129:10 distinguish 61:7 distributed 126:10,25 district 45:11 129:14,15 document 16:21,24 17:3 17:19,24 57:2 58:22 92:25 94:7 97:15 121:24 128:17 documents 12:22 13:6 15:12,14 16:12 doing 57:25 88:4,22 127:10 dorothy 1:6 2:3 2:13 3:3 doubt 101:15 127:13 downloaded 124:7 dr 1:14 4:6 6:7 8:10,12,18 9:4 14:11 17:17 36:25 51:23 55:10,15,20,23 57:6,12,17	58:3,5,10 62:7 64:15 65:7,17 74:16 75:8 92:19 99:16,21 102:13 116:17 121:12 123:19 124:3 125:11 128:24 129:11 131:9 133:8 134:9 137:4,20 dramatically 104:10 draw 44:21,25 45:5,9 65:13 65:22 120:20 129:14 drawn 45:11 drop 35:24 36:17 37:4 duly 8:20 135:5 duncan 1:18 6:11 duplicates 57:19 dynamic 104:16,20 105:17,19	early 18:20,24 19:10 easier 43:3 east 24:15 ecological 22:7 22:14 28:25 29:14,17,22,23 29:25 30:6,20 30:21 31:4,14 31:15,22 32:2 32:11,13,17 40:21 41:2,3,4 41:9 42:7,11 42:12,16,19,25 43:2,5,11,16 88:15 99:15 125:25 ef002460-2024 1:9 effect 68:3 effects 132:7 ei 99:22 eicompare 44:14 either 13:23 18:23 31:23 47:11 62:23 70:19 71:8 73:21 112:12 113:3,5 121:14 123:17 elect 66:11 67:12,19 71:13 71:23 72:5 75:25 76:17	77:16 78:2 86:21 87:15 90:11,20 129:17 130:5 130:15 131:2 elected 80:14 82:11 115:25 131:24 election 2:6,16 4:3 5:12,14,16 5:18 7:12,15 8:4 18:17,19 21:24 43:24 44:2 59:6 68:2 73:20 76:22 78:25 81:25 82:3,8 83:8 84:17 91:8 92:9,14 93:18 93:24 94:10,18 95:12 96:4,10 96:17 97:16 98:3,7,17,25 99:16,23 101:14 103:8 104:2,6,10 108:25 112:21 114:14 124:17 130:3,13,22,24 elections 19:15 21:9 25:13,17 32:19 37:23,25 65:11,15,24 66:8 67:17 75:23 76:15
	e		
	e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1 4:1 5:1,5 7:19 7:19 8:13,13 earlier 15:16 15:18 26:8 88:14 99:11,13		

[elections - experts]

Page 11

77:10,21 78:23 79:20,21,23 80:5,11,14 82:16 84:25 85:6,10,15,22 86:2,18 87:6 87:12,18 90:18 90:22 93:6 99:8 100:20,21 103:21 104:18 104:22 107:9 107:19,21 108:17 109:4,6 110:14,18 111:7,11,14,17 111:20,21 112:2,4,9 113:9,14,18,23 114:16,20,24 115:8,9,12,23 116:2 131:14 132:7 electoral 20:6 70:23 127:5 eludes 130:20 email 13:16 emerged 122:21 employed 72:19 74:19 135:10,13 136:7,9 employee 135:12 136:9	enhance 132:6 environment 79:5 ernest 1:5 2:3 2:13 3:3 errata 137:2 error 119:18,25 120:14,16,19 121:3,5 126:8 126:14 127:11 127:16 errors 118:21 126:10,17,24 es 135:4 esquire 2:5,15 3:5,6,17 essentially 77:7 estimate 16:16 21:19 estimating 19:5 20:11,18 22:8 22:15 29:18 et 6:9,10 34:9 137:3 ethnic 19:6 20:20 26:4 43:21 66:22 87:23 ethnicity 22:19 23:3 69:19 85:21 127:5 evaluate 35:3 129:19 everett 2:7,17	everybody 78:6 evidentiary 6:25 exact 33:16 43:8 81:17 exactly 101:4 examination 5:2 9:2 39:2 examined 8:22 66:8 67:17 72:15 75:23 76:15 example 79:19 101:2,5,7 excel 53:11 54:5,12 exclude 100:2 excluded 89:10 89:23 excuse 18:11 23:9 27:21 45:4 47:4 53:21 79:4 92:12 93:8 98:12 101:17 106:7 exhibit 5:7,9,11 5:12,14,16,18 5:20,21,22 16:19 17:11,12 52:8 55:16,18 56:22 57:3 58:16,18,19,23 63:18 75:2 92:18,19,21,23	94:4,5,8,22 95:15,16,19 97:9,9,11,12,13 116:24 121:10 121:11,21 127:21,22 128:2,14 existing 42:4 exists 65:10,15 65:23 expand 96:11 122:13 expect 111:9 112:11,14 expedite 133:24 experience 26:24 27:4,7 expert 4:5,6 5:7 5:9 8:6 15:21 15:25 17:6 25:17 27:9,11 33:3,10,12,15 35:6 36:2 37:9 37:12 38:9 39:4,20 40:14 44:17 45:21 46:15,18 48:4 48:21 expertise 25:20 25:22,25 26:4 26:14 53:3 experts 47:17 47:19 51:18,20 51:21
---	---	---	--

[expires - front]

Page 12

expires 137:25 explain 21:5 46:5 77:24 99:18 101:13 119:24 124:11 127:6 explanations 100:21 explicitly 74:10 75:14 extensive 30:3 extent 65:3 82:23	faith 34:9 39:12 false 120:8,8 familiar 34:11 43:16 121:23 far 49:20 50:18 59:21 61:6 93:10 121:7,8 fast 10:16 favored 68:22 68:24 69:18,20 71:17 72:17,20 73:20,24 74:5 74:12,20 75:9 108:8,12,21 109:11 110:6 111:16 fbisg 124:8,11 124:16 feature 32:3 federal 107:9 107:14,19 feel 10:23 49:3 56:18 fees 50:14 fensterman 3:7 7:18,22 field 25:18,21 100:10 125:23 fight 71:7 file 5:11 35:6 36:2 37:9 38:9 39:4,19 40:14 59:8 61:21,25	files 53:11 57:11,17 58:4 59:4,13,20 60:9,12,20 61:9,13,16 99:20 filings 16:6 financially 135:14 136:10 find 36:19 fine 16:16 finish 10:3 firm 35:17 36:11 39:14 40:5 54:20 62:21,22 first 8:19 16:19 32:23 45:15 89:15 107:3 117:6 122:12 124:5 fits 118:6 five 32:9 63:24 78:22 132:24 flip 126:21,22 florida 35:19 flournoy 1:6 2:4,14 3:4 fly 115:5 focus 26:10 folder 16:21 60:20 61:9 follow 37:8 follows 8:22	footnote 5:21 92:13 93:23 95:11 96:16,19 96:21 103:13 105:6 107:2 119:5 122:5 footnotes 58:13 forecast 127:14 forecasting 18:17 100:20 101:23 foregoing 135:3,4 136:4 forget 43:8 forgive 48:23 121:18 forgot 23:25 form 47:5 63:14 93:3 111:12 112:13 116:3 131:5 format 94:13 forward 45:24 56:17 111:11 found 57:15 86:6 104:13 105:13 four 16:17 32:9 33:4 86:8 91:18 free 49:3 56:18 frequently 27:12 front 12:23 13:6 52:9 66:5
f			
f 7:19 fact 118:19 123:24 126:16 factors 68:8,13 113:8 facts 81:9 107:17 fair 25:16 26:3 28:14 31:16 43:14,23 49:9 52:17,18,19 61:7 78:20,23 79:12 82:4 84:3,15 89:7 98:5 106:22 108:23 109:9 110:23 111:18 113:12 115:6 124:19 132:19 132:22			

[front - hispanic]

Page 13

75:5 76:9,11 80:21 84:22 92:5 98:13 115:2 full 11:17,22 113:17 further 133:10 133:13 135:12 136:8	121:10 127:21 given 70:19 77:3 82:8 112:14 glad 116:20 go 9:18 25:11 27:20 34:17,18 45:24 56:11 64:7,9 74:24 77:23 81:11 93:22 96:25 97:6 114:15 116:9,23 117:3 117:8 128:4 129:3 132:23 132:25 133:16 134:4 goes 65:3 going 6:12 9:10 10:18 16:18 34:17 45:24 55:14 56:17 58:15 63:10 86:12 92:17 94:3 95:14 96:11 98:10 101:15 103:23 111:11 115:4 119:6 121:9,17 127:20 129:3 133:19 good 6:2 9:4,6 11:2 49:3 79:13 101:11 101:11 116:5	government 24:19 25:5 44:25 grace 1:4 2:3 2:13 3:3 great 9:14 14:8 100:25 116:23 128:16 133:8 green 101:16 101:19 greenwood 2:15 7:13,14 ground 9:18 group 12:5,16 20:11 21:9 22:8,15 69:20 87:23 127:11 groups 19:7 20:19,20,23 29:19 43:22 110:15 127:13 127:15 guess 35:12 47:2 60:15 61:20 guesses 61:4	handy 116:19 happy 109:21 hard 96:24 harvard 2:6,16 4:3 7:12,15 8:4 head 10:11 81:18 88:3 114:17 119:16 header 17:19 heading 21:16 hear 9:11,13 22:9 73:14 80:4 heard 109:15 hearing 8:8 hears 126:19 help 56:8 helps 101:13 hereto 135:13 136:10 hi 116:17 hiatus 45:25 high 126:8,14 126:20 higher 103:7,25 127:16 highlighted 61:9 highlighting 60:6,19 118:19 hired 39:14 74:9 hispanic 12:2,4 12:9 118:7 131:23
g			
ga 3:20 garners 79:22 gary 29:25,25 43:6 96:21 102:21 103:4 general 53:4 83:24 96:4 111:16 117:24 118:2 120:15 124:20 125:19 generally 67:2 83:8 101:23 121:3 geocoding 24:12 117:17 122:19 georgia 33:17 33:18 47:22 gingles 48:9,12 68:7,11 give 10:3 11:12 11:22 19:21 55:17 58:16 79:18 93:9 96:13 114:18			
		h	
		h 5:5 20:5 26:9 hahn 136:2,16 half 14:20 hamilton 3:18 hand 8:16 43:13 handle 133:19	

[hispanics - involved]

Page 14

hispanics 66:23 historical 84:12 history 131:18 hold 112:25 holds 104:18 105:17 hopefully 101:3 hour 14:20 50:5,12 63:22 hours 16:17 50:17 house 102:2 103:5,16 108:3 huh 10:12 hypothetical 80:3 91:15 hypothetically 111:5	imagine 79:19 87:24 imai 5:20 119:6 119:21 120:10 122:4,18 123:4 124:8 125:10 125:14,15 126:17 imai's 124:21 imamura 3:6 7:17,17 133:18 133:20,23,25 impair 11:9 implemented 112:8 imply 71:16 important 10:10 impossible 86:7 91:6 improved 24:11 117:16 122:19 inaccurate 120:4 inaccurately 127:14 inappropriately 128:10 include 85:25 86:3 100:5 108:16 included 52:21 52:22 84:24 98:18 99:22	113:25 132:21 including 67:5 101:10 incoming 13:22 increased 103:9 104:3,7 independent 45:5 65:22 independently 57:15,21 index 1:8 indicate 96:8 indicates 115:21 126:8 126:14 indicating 107:12 individual 42:17 100:23 101:8 individuals 48:7 inference 22:7 22:14 29:2,15 29:23,25 30:20 30:22 31:4,15 32:13,18 41:4 41:5 42:12,16 43:2,5,11,17 88:15 99:15 inferences 31:23 influence 20:22 20:23	influencing 113:9 information 59:7 122:21 124:14 125:5,6 informed 74:16 110:12 initially 46:4 50:21 53:23 93:22 innumerable 81:19 inspect 124:3 instant 13:19 instruct 72:8 74:4,11 intended 6:23 interchangea... 12:3,14 interested 135:14 136:11 interject 17:8 internal 56:14 intro 24:19 25:5 introduce 16:19 95:15 127:20 invading 65:3 invalidation 110:25 invoices 49:13 49:17,19 50:2 involved 33:7 33:10,11,25
i			
identical 59:7 identification 17:13 57:4 58:24 92:24 94:9 95:20 97:14 121:22 128:15 identified 57:11 119:19 125:10 identify 7:7 12:9 100:17 119:18 imagination 51:12			

[involved - list]

Page 15

34:8 isg 120:15 island 34:2 issue 86:14 item 23:6 33:19	kincaid 47:9,13 47:20 kind 21:19 86:14 88:11 king 30:2 43:6 know 9:17 13:25 17:21 18:5 24:4 28:9 32:24 42:10 43:10 44:12 45:23 46:17,24 47:18,23 48:2 48:6,9,18 51:3 51:19 54:3 56:22,24 57:18 58:18 59:24 66:4 72:22 75:3 78:21 80:23 81:15,24 82:2 87:25 90:14 91:16,18 92:20 93:10 94:4,14,22 95:17 97:10 98:12 100:14 102:17 104:16 104:24,25 105:16,18 106:18 110:22 113:10 114:12 114:17 116:25 121:13,15 122:16 123:17 123:22 124:24 125:5,9,13	126:4 127:23 128:8,23 129:21,23 130:9,18 131:11 knowledge 44:9 53:4 77:3 100:7 135:9 136:6	law.harvard.e... 2:9,19 laws 6:25 132:5 lawyers 33:17 64:20 lead 110:24 127:12 leading 122:21 learn 45:15 leave 18:20,24 leg 114:8 legal 44:18 54:20 legislative 44:21 107:9 legislature 44:21 102:3 lend 127:12 level 21:9 24:6 27:4,7 101:8 126:8,14,20 levels 35:3 89:3 likely 72:16 73:11,17 limitations 123:6,18 124:20 125:10 125:17,19 limited 90:14 130:18,25 131:11 line 122:12 137:5 list 19:13 33:6 59:20 113:13
j		l	
jacobson 103:5 103:12,24 104:13 105:7,8 105:13 106:14 106:21 jacobson's 96:22 102:21 jill 101:16,16 101:19 job 1:20 join 13:14 journal 23:7 july 63:18 jumped 93:21 jurisdictions 110:17 justification 120:24 justifying 119:3		labeled 19:24 59:5 60:2 lack 45:25 132:13 laptop 60:22 large 132:7 largely 106:17 latino 12:2,4,10 77:20 82:6 84:5 90:19 109:12 130:15 132:12 latinos 66:25 83:17,21,24 84:8,18 law 2:6,6,16,16 4:3 7:12,15 8:4 35:17 36:11 39:14 40:5 54:20 62:12,20 62:22 68:2 110:12,17,25 111:25 112:7	
k			
k 8:13 kansas 34:15 39:11,15 keep 14:5 56:9 56:18 kent 14:17			

[listed - makeup]

Page 16

listed 19:12,21 23:15	36:25 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1	124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1	looks 58:25 59:4 93:5 100:23
listening 126:19	41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1	128:1,24 129:1 130:1 131:1,9	loser 86:11,11
lists 124:5	47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1	132:1 133:1,8 134:1,9 137:4	losing 80:18
literature 71:21 100:15 100:19 101:12 101:22,24 102:5 108:4	53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 64:15 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 92:19 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1,13 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1,17 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1,12 122:1 123:1	137:20 logistics 14:12 long 14:18 16:14 27:7 34:2 81:13 look 31:7 32:22 58:4 62:13 68:23 72:8 73:19,23 74:4 74:9,11 86:25 90:18 96:25 99:14 102:4,16 110:10 113:12 114:15,19 118:3 122:10 looked 15:13 15:15,16,18 16:11 59:6 67:9 73:10,16 76:22 77:7 82:10,18 83:4 looking 19:14 35:23 36:17 38:7 39:18 70:3 72:6 89:3 99:3 100:12 101:14,16,25 105:22 110:2 114:5	lot 79:14 loud 10:10 lower 111:20 luck 69:2 lunch 102:12 116:7,18
little 93:14 96:2 96:12 122:14			m
llc 137:2			m 7:19 119:7 136:2,16
llp 3:7,18 7:19 7:22			ma 2:8,18
lm 42:9			macentee 98:18
local 44:25 85:21 102:6 103:20 107:14 107:20,25			made 54:5 62:4 74:17 128:8
location 1:17 117:23 118:4			main 3:8 42:15
lockerbie 1:14 5:8 6:1,8 7:1 8:1,10,12,12,18 9:1,4 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 17:17,20 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1			major 26:23 90:6 98:19 99:3,4 100:6,8
			make 10:6,12 10:20 12:10,17 18:22 20:14 21:6 26:20 41:18 48:25 61:4 76:9 90:24 96:2 102:2 106:11 113:4,6 121:17
			makes 42:16 57:22
			makeup 117:22

[making - mode]

Page 17

making 117:22	73:9,15 90:4	methodologies	minority 66:13
mangle 10:16	91:11 98:22	31:10	66:15 68:16,20
manner 7:2	101:23 104:5	methodology	68:22,24 69:5
108:2	106:3 108:13	20:11 88:19	69:7,11,11,15
mark 17:10	118:18 119:25	117:16 122:22	69:17,20 70:3
55:14,15 58:15	120:2 126:13	124:12	70:7,12 71:16
92:17 94:3	127:2	methods 25:23	71:23 72:4
97:8 121:9	meaning 106:5	26:15,15 28:15	73:11,17,24
marked 17:8	means 7:3	29:2,21,22	74:5,12 75:19
17:12 56:22	11:16 85:5,9	32:18 91:21	76:25 77:9
57:3 58:23	118:14	mice 95:25	79:21 80:12
63:18 75:2	meant 73:6,19	michael 4:5 8:5	82:14,25 83:2
92:19,23 94:5	medications	34:10	83:6 86:16,23
94:8 95:16,19	11:7	michigan 47:18	87:4,10 88:4
95:22 97:13,22	meeting 14:18	microwave	90:10 92:2
121:11,21	member 129:14	116:19,20	99:7 108:8,12
127:22 128:14	129:15	midst 60:23	108:21,24
mary 3:17 7:24	members 51:14	miller 4:3 20:5	109:10 110:6
mary.weeks	memory 11:9	26:9	111:9,16,19
3:21	mention 15:5	mind 97:3	112:11,19,20
match 91:7	29:24 46:7	mine 47:21	115:24 129:17
matching 37:5	mentioned	minimum	130:4,25
material 57:11	38:15	27:14	minute 21:4
matt 4:6 5:9	messages 13:23	minor 99:5	63:24 91:12
8:5,6	messaging	100:2,7 101:10	132:24
matter 6:8 79:3	13:19	minorities	minutes 30:8
79:12 127:7	met 9:5	66:10,20,22,25	30:13 102:11
matters 47:24	method 20:17	67:6,11,18	misha 50:23
47:25	22:7,14 24:10	69:17,23 71:12	55:9
mean 15:18	40:24 42:18	72:18,21 73:3	missing 18:7
21:5 26:18	43:16,19 88:15	73:21 74:20	123:15
27:6 42:2	125:21 130:22	75:10,16,24	misunderstan...
45:18 59:3	methodologi...	76:16 77:15,25	107:24
66:19,25 69:6	72:11	86:21 87:15	mode 14:7
70:16,25 71:3		123:23,24	

[model - oh]

Page 18

model 24:7	124:5 126:18	90:12 93:15	o
models 100:24	137:3,4	94:11,18 95:3	o 8:13
modern 106:15	name's 7:10	96:5,5 98:7	oath 11:5,15
106:19	named 7:25	109:13 111:6	64:16 116:21
modifier	128:5 133:14	112:4,22	oaths 6:14
106:18	names 59:9	120:12,17,22	object 47:3,5
moment 114:18	nassau 33:25	120:25 121:5	63:14 65:2
monday 133:21	34:4,6 40:4,4	123:20,25	111:12 112:13
133:25	42:25	124:17,23	116:3 131:5
monitor 60:23	nation 84:14	125:2 129:9,15	objection 6:17
months 46:3	national 21:24	129:16 130:6	8:8 128:5,23
49:23	nature 29:13	131:15,19,25	observers 81:6
morning 6:2	31:3,6	132:8,16 137:3	obtain 59:2
9:4,6	near 113:9	newburgh.r	odd 111:7,10
move 60:24	need 10:23 24:3	61:22	111:14,20
92:4 110:13	125:21	newspaper	112:3,9,21
moving 35:14	needed 46:12	81:7	114:13,19,24
36:8 72:14	negative 120:8	nielsen 35:14	115:8,9,11,23
84:21 89:9	neither 98:23	ninth 17:18	odds 116:4
multi 86:14	135:10 136:6	nodding 10:11	offer 85:19
87:21 88:19	new 1:1 18:10	nomination	129:6
91:8	18:25 34:5	98:19	offering 129:12
multiple 19:13	110:13 135:20	nominations	130:2,7,12,17
43:21,21,25	137:2	99:4	130:23 131:12
44:3,5 86:4,5	newburgh 1:9	north 37:22	131:17,22
mutually 48:25	1:10 3:15,16	notary 6:13	132:3,9,11,17
n	5:12,14,16,18	134:15 135:20	132:20
n 2:1 3:1 4:1	6:10 51:14	137:24	office 37:13
5:1 7:19,19	65:11,15,24	note 8:2 98:17	85:2 100:6
naacp 33:21	66:9 67:2,18	118:14 126:9	114:8 131:24
38:17	72:16 73:10,16	128:5	officer 135:1,2
name 6:3 7:13	75:24 76:16,23	noted 128:12	offices 62:13
8:11 9:7 33:16	76:24 77:21	noticing 7:8	official 59:5
50:24 60:6	82:6 83:3,21	ny 3:9	oh 20:3 37:2
63:15 118:6	84:19 85:11,22		41:8 64:5

[oh - paid]

Page 19

133:22 okay 8:7,14,23 9:17 10:22 12:19 13:8 14:4,6 15:7,21 16:18,20 17:2 17:14,17,23 18:10,14,25 19:19 20:4,9 21:14 22:24 23:8,15 25:10 26:13 29:20 30:3,10,14 31:3,16 32:3 32:21 33:2,24 34:8,12,17 35:14 36:8,19 37:21 38:4,15 39:11,19 40:2 42:6,10 44:16 52:7 55:14 58:15 59:19 60:5,15 61:19 62:6 63:17,25 64:2,3,6,8,12 66:2,7 68:9,15 69:3,21 70:10 70:10 72:14 75:4,21 76:13 84:21 86:12 87:3 89:9 90:17 91:5 92:4,8,17 93:7 93:21 94:3,21 94:25 95:10,14	96:15 97:6,8 98:10,16 99:13 102:9,12,15,20 103:23 105:6 105:22 106:11 106:25 108:6 108:15,19 109:9,18,20,23 109:24 110:2 111:4,24 112:6 114:5,5,23 115:20 116:11 116:14,23 117:3,14,24 118:9,12,22 119:2,4,9,12,17 120:10 121:9 121:11,19,23 122:3,6,10,17 123:4 125:19 126:6 127:20 127:20,22 128:19 129:3,3 129:5,12 132:23 133:3,6 133:15 134:3,3 once 131:11 ones 19:10 21:3 25:3 28:11 80:15 122:2 open 13:9,17 16:23 opinion 24:20 25:6,14,18 29:7 30:23	129:7,13,22 130:2,7,12,17 130:23 131:12 131:18,22 132:3,11,20 opinions 63:20 85:20 132:9 opportunity 66:11 67:12,19 71:13,15 75:25 76:17 77:15 78:2,25 80:13 90:11 107:23 115:25 oppose 91:15 opposed 60:22 101:10 opposing 91:7 91:23 oral 1:4 2:2,12 3:2 6:8 orange 1:2 92:9 92:14 93:24 95:11 96:17 97:18 ordering 133:17 ordinances 132:5 original 51:6 124:14 originally 45:22 53:17 outcome 131:13 135:14	136:11 outreach 51:5,6 outside 89:6 113:23 outstanding 50:3 overall 126:7 overlap 59:18 own 37:8
			p
			p 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,1 p.m. 64:10,13 116:12,15 133:7 134:4,6 package 28:7 28:10,12 30:2 42:4,7 44:14 56:12 packages 28:4 54:10 page 5:2,6 17:19 25:11 32:23 59:24,25 60:16,17 61:20 61:21 66:3,8 89:23 93:8,12 94:22,25 95:23 97:22 102:16 103:4 114:7 117:9 126:3,7 137:5 pages 113:13 paid 50:2,4

[panel - polity]

Page 20

<p>panel 18:16,19 18:22</p> <p>paper 18:19 32:16 103:20 119:21 120:10</p> <p>papers 12:23</p> <p>paragraph 25:11 32:22 66:3,7,21 67:16 69:4 70:11 72:14 73:5,7 75:22 76:7,8,13 80:20 83:11,17 84:21 89:10 91:5 92:5,8 93:8,23 94:15 95:10 96:16 98:11,15 102:17 103:24 105:23 108:6 109:25 110:2 117:4,5,8,14 118:12 119:17 126:2 127:18</p> <p>part 11:15 53:8 53:20,25 74:8 89:2 106:19</p> <p>particular 20:19</p> <p>parties 6:14,19 90:7 100:7 104:9 135:11 135:13 136:7 136:10</p>	<p>partisan 104:17,21</p> <p>party 90:7 98:19 99:3,4,5 100:3,8,22,25 101:9,10,19 102:4</p> <p>path 5:11</p> <p>pattern 112:25</p> <p>patterns 20:12 20:18 21:6 22:8,15 29:3 29:18 31:7 82:5 84:4,12 85:20</p> <p>pdf 59:8</p> <p>pdfs 59:5</p> <p>peachtree 3:19</p> <p>peer 22:2 23:19 25:12 27:15 71:20 81:15,19 100:14 107:11</p> <p>pending 10:25 111:3</p> <p>pennie 136:2 136:16</p> <p>people 118:4</p> <p>pepper 3:18 7:25 45:19 48:3 49:18 50:25 63:7 64:20</p> <p>percent 78:8,9 78:10,18,22 79:11,22,25</p>	<p>80:16,18 102:23 103:6 105:9,24 106:4 106:9,13,19 108:9 109:14 109:17 110:3,7 111:15 115:22 118:14 125:21</p> <p>percentage 120:5</p> <p>perez 1:5 2:3 2:13 3:3</p> <p>perform 26:25 88:10 117:25</p> <p>performance 69:22 73:24 74:5,11 82:24</p> <p>performed 53:25</p> <p>period 32:8</p> <p>permitted 6:23</p> <p>persistently 80:17</p> <p>person 63:16</p> <p>persons 37:23</p> <p>peter 1:5 2:3,13 3:3</p> <p>ph.d. 5:8,10</p> <p>phone 14:2,5</p> <p>piece 23:6,11</p> <p>plains 3:9</p> <p>plaintiffs 1:7 2:2,12 3:2 7:11 7:15,18,20,23 9:9 34:23</p>	<p>plan 31:11,14 44:22 45:2,6,9 129:16</p> <p>plausible 70:18 71:2,4,5,18 75:20 78:6,11 78:24</p> <p>play 26:7</p> <p>please 7:7 8:10 10:2,16 56:17 87:8</p> <p>point 19:19 58:7 63:23 71:21 78:17</p> <p>points 68:21</p> <p>polarization 33:13 35:4 39:3,18 40:13 89:3</p> <p>polarized 65:10 65:14,23 129:8</p> <p>policies 132:6</p> <p>political 23:7 23:12 24:15,23 25:21,23 26:21 28:2,15 70:24 79:5 81:7 100:11 108:4,5 125:23</p> <p>politics 24:21 25:7 26:2,5,8 28:2 77:4 81:6 81:14</p> <p>polity 27:25</p>
---	--	--	---

[popko - pronounce]

Page 21

<p>popko 1:19 6:3 135:2,19</p> <p>portion 54:24</p> <p>portions 54:18</p> <p>position 128:7 128:9</p> <p>positions 94:17</p> <p>positive 51:11 120:8</p> <p>possible 57:25 86:15 87:3,9 87:13,20 99:6 99:12 104:20 105:3,19,21 129:13 133:23 134:2</p> <p>postal 35:24</p> <p>potential 123:5</p> <p>pre 42:4</p> <p>preceding 73:5 73:7</p> <p>precinct 24:5</p> <p>precincts 42:17</p> <p>precise 56:16</p> <p>predicted 127:3</p> <p>prediction 113:5 122:22</p> <p>predictions 113:7</p> <p>prefer 84:8 86:16 87:4,10</p> <p>preferences 19:6 21:20 99:7 100:4</p>	<p>preferred 66:15 69:7,11 70:4,12 73:11 73:17 76:25 77:9,20 79:21 79:24 80:12 82:7,14,25 83:2,6 84:17 86:23 87:17 88:6 92:2 108:24 109:12 111:10,19 112:11,19,20 115:24</p> <p>preparation 14:22 53:20 58:2</p> <p>prepare 14:9 15:12 53:2 64:20</p> <p>prepared 13:3 15:22 16:2 55:20 136:3</p> <p>preparing 16:15 52:12 53:9,14 57:8 60:13 61:17 65:16</p> <p>presence 129:7</p> <p>present 4:2 123:18 125:11 125:14</p> <p>presentations 18:12,15</p>	<p>presented 32:16</p> <p>president 36:12</p> <p>presidential 18:17 19:15 101:23</p> <p>press 19:11</p> <p>presumably 78:16 119:10</p> <p>pretty 93:9</p> <p>prevail 86:24 87:17</p> <p>prevailed 77:9 114:8</p> <p>prevails 114:21</p> <p>previously 43:15 47:14 53:13 61:24 64:18 109:6</p> <p>primaries 86:13,15,24</p> <p>primary 85:6 85:25 86:17</p> <p>prior 28:21 135:4</p> <p>privilege 65:4</p> <p>probably 30:8 78:11 79:15 102:10 113:8</p> <p>probative 90:18,23 91:3</p> <p>problem 24:3 27:22 123:12 123:14,15</p>	<p>problems 123:11 125:13</p> <p>procedural 6:24</p> <p>procedure 120:3</p> <p>proceed 8:24</p> <p>proceeding 1:17 6:5,22 44:18 134:7 136:4</p> <p>proceedings 135:3,4,5,8 136:5</p> <p>processes 132:13</p> <p>produced 6:21 55:24 58:5 128:9</p> <p>producing 57:12</p> <p>professor 15:22 16:2 24:14 52:2,5 104:13 121:12</p> <p>program 26:25 27:5,10,13,17 41:9,12,14 53:17 54:5 56:14,15</p> <p>prong 67:25</p> <p>prongs 48:10 48:13</p> <p>pronounce 50:24 119:6</p>
---	---	--	--

[pronounces - reached]

Page 22

pronounces 126:18	pull 56:21 98:14	questions 9:11 9:23 11:13,18 129:4 133:10	108:3,7 112:12 127:3
proposition 33:19	pulled 76:4	quickly 132:25	racial 19:6 20:19 26:4 31:7 33:13
provide 48:21 48:22 52:11,16	purples 61:5	quote 76:14	35:4,4 39:2,18 40:13 66:22 87:23 89:3 117:22
provided 58:8 99:21 128:19 128:24	purposes 98:24	r	racially 65:10 65:14,23 129:8
providing 11:17	put 61:2	r 2:1 3:1 4:1 7:19 8:13,13 26:25 27:5,10 27:13,17 28:3 28:6,9,13 31:23 32:2,10 41:15,17 43:17 43:19,23 44:14 53:14,14,16 54:12 89:5	raise 8:15 raised 124:21 ramon 1:5 2:3 2:13 3:3 ran 82:19
provision 37:3	putting 70:9	race 19:14 20:22 22:18 23:2,5,11,25 26:6,12,13 42:22 44:5 69:19 70:19 71:3,7,11 77:25 78:5,8 85:20 87:21 90:5 106:10 114:8 118:5 120:4 127:5	randomly 126:10,25 rank 129:24 130:3
ps 27:25	q	races 66:16 70:13 72:9 73:22 77:5 82:19 83:5 86:4 88:20 101:9 103:17 107:14,15,25	rate 50:5,11 109:11 110:10 111:15,19 126:8,14 127:11
public 24:20 25:6,13,18 29:7 30:23 134:15 135:20 137:24	qualifications 132:5		rates 119:18,25 120:9,14,16,19 121:4,5 127:16
publication 19:16,21 23:20	qualified 135:7		rather 10:11 43:2,25
publications 19:2,5,9 20:7 20:10,16,25 21:15,20 22:3 22:6,13,18,21 23:2,4 24:5,10 27:19,24 28:4 53:5 81:16	quantitative 20:10,17 24:6		rds 60:9
published 25:12 27:15 104:13 105:13	quarterly 23:14		reach 77:14
publisher 19:14	quarto 53:17 54:11		reached 46:11 50:21
publishers 26:23	question 10:3 10:15,18,25 20:13,21 22:10 22:12 53:22 63:11 67:14 70:3 71:11,22 72:4 73:13 74:7 86:20 87:7,14 88:12 89:5 90:9 91:17 99:9 102:6 108:20 109:15 112:17 116:5		
	questioning 14:5		

[reaching - related]

Page 23

reaching 44:10 read 66:17 68:21 70:14 72:24 76:2,10 76:18 80:25 81:18 85:3 89:14,22 98:19 103:3,10 104:3 118:13 122:23 126:6,11 reading 76:5 96:23 108:4 120:6 122:11 123:8 ready 122:16 realized 117:7 really 79:13 reason 10:15 11:11,21 56:4 74:8 109:25 112:24 113:3 115:16 122:7 123:3 137:5 reasonable 66:10 67:11,19 71:12,15 75:25 76:17 77:15 78:2,7 79:2,17 80:13 90:11 115:25 reasons 78:19 recall 21:18,23 34:24 37:11 38:19 39:23 40:6 42:6 49:8	51:5 54:12 56:2 59:21 62:4,18 63:10 63:11,15 67:8 74:13 75:14 88:16,17 93:2 119:13 121:25 127:15 128:21 receive 59:20 132:14 recent 27:20 32:5,7 recently 46:2 46:10 recodes 41:22 recognize 17:2 17:24 57:2 58:22 92:25 94:7 97:15 recollection 107:10 recommended 46:22,24 record 6:5,6,18 7:8 8:11 9:7 10:2,9 47:6 64:10,11,13 116:10,11,13 116:15 132:25 133:3,5,7,16 134:4 135:9 136:5 recorded 7:2 135:6	recording 6:21 135:8 136:3 redistricting 44:22,25 45:6 45:9,13 reduced 135:6 reed 1:4 2:2,12 3:2 refer 12:4,7,14 55:16,18 61:3 66:24 92:9,14 93:24 96:16 102:21 103:13 reference 70:6 81:12 95:11 119:5 referenced 21:4 30:21 85:12 113:23 122:2 127:17 references 100:21 referred 43:15 111:25 114:2 referring 12:5 12:8,16 14:15 22:23 36:13 51:4 56:9 59:8 60:25 68:5,6 70:22 94:17 105:7 118:15 refers 124:8 125:14 reflect 97:25	reflected 78:15 reflecting 105:12 reflects 49:10 95:6 reframe 113:22 reframed 102:25 refresh 127:25 regard 21:12 131:14 132:10 regarding 48:17 49:14 104:17 129:7 regardless 66:14 69:18 70:11 regress 42:21 regression 29:17,23 30:7 31:14 32:2,11 40:22 41:2,10 41:12,21,23 42:5,8,11,19,25 125:25 regular 32:3 regularity 100:25 regularly 28:22 regulations 38:8 relate 19:5 related 135:10 136:7
---	--	--	---

[relating - returned]

Page 24

relating 19:17 relation 33:3 48:13 131:13 relative 135:12 136:9 relevant 71:11 86:22 87:16,19 99:2 107:14,19 reliable 125:22 relied 15:19 44:10 52:12,20 52:22 53:2 55:24 57:12,17 58:3 59:14 relies 122:20 religion 23:12 24:21 25:7,25 26:7,12,13 rely 53:19,24 remedy 45:12 remember 33:16 35:12 101:3 remote 1:17 remotely 6:14 6:16 repeat 67:15 73:13 87:7 129:5 rephrase 20:13 67:15 68:11 106:7 125:8 rephrased 55:5 report 5:7,9,22 12:24 13:2	14:10,11 15:8 15:8,19,22,25 17:6 25:10 32:22 35:6 36:2 37:9,12 37:12 38:9 39:5,20 40:14 49:6,10 52:8 52:13,23 53:2 53:9,15,20 54:2,14,24 55:11,12,15,19 55:21,25 57:5 57:7,8,13 58:2 59:15 60:13 61:17 62:7,8 62:11 63:7,17 64:21 65:7,16 66:3 67:23 74:16,25 75:8 75:13,22 76:4 76:11 84:2 85:7,19 86:2 89:4,7 93:23 98:11 102:16 109:4 112:15 113:13,15,19 114:3 116:24 118:25 122:2,4 126:3 127:18 129:6 132:18 132:21 reported 1:19 reporter 6:2,4 8:7,14,23 9:23	9:25 10:8 17:7 17:14 36:23 64:3,5,7,9,12 68:10 101:5 116:11,14 131:7,9 133:3 133:6,11,15,22 133:24 134:3 reporters 81:7 reporting 137:2 reports 40:12 represent 38:17 39:15 52:15 56:3 112:6 114:23 115:6 122:3 130:21 representation 115:14 representations 115:17 representative 103:17 representing 9:9 34:22 35:17 38:2,3 40:5 republican 85:2,16 93:18 95:7 96:9 98:2 98:6,24 requested 135:21	requiring 110:17 111:25 research 24:21 25:22 26:11,15 57:25 62:14 reserved 134:5 reside 123:24 residents 12:8 12:9 respect 82:24 86:15 response 88:9 responses 10:9 restate 22:11 results 5:13,15 5:17,19 83:8 92:10,15 93:5 93:25 95:12 96:8,17 97:17 97:25 124:17 127:13 retain 48:20 retained 33:3 34:21 35:15 36:9,11 37:3 37:14,21 38:19 39:13 40:3 46:14 49:24 64:19 retainer 48:16 48:19 retired 37:22 returned 111:14
--	---	--	---

[returns - sees]

Page 25

returns 59:6 76:22 94:11 98:25 review 15:11 15:21,25 16:5 26:22 40:12 55:10,19 57:16 60:12 61:16 62:3,16 65:6 74:15,15 81:9 99:24 135:21 reviewed 14:10 14:11 15:7 16:8 22:2 23:20 25:13 27:16 57:8 58:11 59:13 61:24 63:7,13 65:17,20 71:20 81:15,19 94:12 94:13 100:14 107:12 109:6 118:24 119:9 119:14 rgreenwood 2:19 right 8:15 9:12 13:10,24 30:16 32:14 90:2 95:23,25 97:22 101:19 104:3 106:16 108:13 110:8 113:25 114:25 122:18 123:12 125:18	127:19 133:22 rios 4:5 8:5 rivera 34:9 39:12 roberts 107:4 romance 1:4 2:2,12 3:2 room 12:20 rough 16:16 roughly 14:19 18:5 31:16 32:8 49:19 50:17 51:4 rows 43:20 rule 37:8 rules 6:25 9:19 run 41:21 42:5 43:4,10 124:7 running 58:21 78:6 runs 79:13 ruth 2:15 7:14 rx 88:14	sandoval 16:2 52:5 55:20 saw 93:2 saying 10:12 57:24 125:20 says 93:13,14 95:2 96:3,4 125:16 sc 1:18 scheduled 18:18,21 scholarship 107:12 school 2:6,16 schwab 34:10 science 23:7,13 24:15,23 25:21 25:24 26:21 28:2,16 100:11 125:23 scientists 81:7 scope 49:5 89:7 scott 34:9 screen 121:16 121:18 127:24 screens 60:21 screenshot 60:17 scroll 17:18 59:23 93:7 94:21 95:22 97:21 sean 47:10 seat 85:16 98:7 102:22 106:6	seats 86:5,9 91:14,19 95:7 96:10 98:3 103:5 second 16:20 19:22 24:2 55:17 58:17 59:23 68:22 74:25 89:16 93:9 96:13 107:4 117:7,8 117:14 121:10 127:21 section 19:23 102:10 109:19 109:22 see 13:22 16:20 59:4 60:5,24 61:9,19,23 67:25 72:16 73:10,16,20 77:4 83:16 93:13 94:4 95:2,4,17 96:12 114:6,10 114:20 118:6 119:4 121:17 121:20 122:17 127:19 seeing 128:21 seen 57:10 128:16 sees 100:24 101:9
	s		
	s 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:5 7:19 137:5 sadavis 2:9 safe 73:2 103:2 103:5 105:9 106:7 sake 108:20 sam 9:8 128:4 samuel 2:5 7:10 sanders 3:18		

[selected - statement]

Page 26

selected 26:22 semester 24:25 30:10 senate 68:7,13 102:2 sense 10:6,12 10:20 12:10,17 53:16 57:22 sent 97:2 sentence 123:9 separate 18:19 september 1:15 6:10 51:9 137:4 serve 18:21 46:18 48:4 served 44:17 server 43:7 service 35:25 services 46:11 48:23 serving 45:21 session 30:12 set 113:17 several 80:4 share 42:21 78:14,15 shares 104:8 sheet 137:2 short 59:25 102:10 109:19 109:22 shortly 40:17 show 13:25 75:7	showed 98:25 shows 93:17 96:14 side 70:19 sievert 107:5 sign 48:16 signature 36:18 37:5 134:5 135:19 136:15 signed 48:19 similar 58:25 59:6 108:2 simultaneously 86:6 single 44:5,8 90:6 129:14,15 sir 81:3 situation 78:5 sixth 23:18 size 122:13 skills 135:9 136:6 slight 97:4 small 28:11 60:16 social 20:6 23:13,13 24:22 software 26:25 27:10,13,17 41:8,17 54:10 56:12 sole 70:2 somebody 28:12 62:19	somebody's 120:4 somewhat 61:4 sorry 13:8 17:7 19:19 23:10 36:23 64:4,7 68:11 101:6 sound 10:25 102:12 114:25 sounds 25:8 34:11 55:2 99:10 source 57:21 107:25 sources 52:22 53:5 54:8 58:3 59:14 south 6:11 speak 10:15 14:21 speaking 25:24 specific 48:24 49:3 94:13 119:13 120:17 specifically 19:20 23:24 28:13 67:9 69:22 74:14 81:11 84:5 121:6 132:21 specified 40:25 spell 8:11 spend 101:15 spending 71:8	spent 16:15 30:8 50:9,18 spoken 51:14 51:17,22,25 52:4 squared 14:13 sstill 3:10 star 93:14 95:2 start 9:19 29:8 30:6 34:19 92:13 started 32:5 55:11,21 76:5 starting 7:8 20:4 starts 117:10 123:9 state 1:1 8:10 33:2,18 35:18 35:19 37:23,25 38:21,22 39:15 44:21 66:8 68:15 70:11 75:12 76:14,14 80:23 81:20 83:11 84:24 91:6 94:15 98:11 102:3,20 108:7 118:13 135:20 stated 99:13 statement 52:17,18 63:20 81:5 118:23 123:2
---	--	--	---

[states - testify]

Page 27

states 20:5 26:5 75:8 81:23 83:25 84:14 117:11 static 79:7 statistic 110:4 statistical 22:6 22:13 24:10 26:15 27:2 28:15 41:11,12 117:15 125:21 statistics 24:22 25:23 26:20,22 29:6,8,9 stein 101:16,19 stenographic 7:3 stereotypical 118:7 steven 3:5 7:21 stipulate 6:12 stipulation 7:5 90:25 straight 78:22 strausz 16:2 52:5 55:20 street 2:7,17 3:8,19 stretch 51:12 strike 29:21 31:21 41:8 52:21 68:5 80:11 90:16 92:12 120:16 126:2	student 47:21 students 15:4 31:20,22,25 63:3 studies 21:25 101:7 119:13 studio 54:12 study 119:7,10 studying 29:3 subheader 96:4 subject 34:25 35:21 36:15 38:4,24 39:16 40:10 submit 49:16 submitted 49:13,20 63:8 subscribed 134:11 137:21 success 79:16 109:11 111:15 111:19 successful 111:6 suite 2:7,17 3:8 3:19 support 75:16 81:10,16 100:15 107:18 supports 75:19 supreme 1:1 sure 76:9 106:11 121:4 surname 24:11 117:17,23	122:19 124:5 surnames 123:15 survey 88:4,7 swear 6:15 8:8 swing 104:21 swings 103:8 103:25 104:6 104:17 switch 60:21 sworn 6:18 8:20 134:11 135:5 137:21 system 41:24 42:3 130:3,13 130:24	task 122:22 taught 28:15 28:19,22,24 29:10 30:15,20 30:25 31:25 32:10 teach 24:18 31:20,21 teaching 24:24 25:3,4 31:2 technique 30:5 41:4 42:20 43:5 118:20 120:25 techniques 29:15 41:5 telephone 13:23 tell 8:20 10:16 11:16 34:13 93:4 125:15 ten 79:19 term 12:12 66:19,24 70:16 81:13 113:10 130:20 terms 12:2 31:17 33:14 48:25 117:24 118:2 test 67:25 68:4 68:6,7,12 testified 8:22 testify 35:10 36:6 37:19
		t	
		t 5:5 7:19 tab 13:15 tabs 13:9,12 take 6:4,13 10:22,24 40:18 42:20 63:23 116:7 132:24 taken 6:8 135:3 135:11 136:8 takes 124:13 talk 23:24 117:15 talked 14:11,16 51:20 53:13 talking 10:5 30:9 56:11 88:17 101:22 131:10	

[testify - turn]

Page 28

38:13 39:9,24 testifying 135:5 testimony 11:23 33:14 44:10 text 13:23 thank 8:7,14,24 8:25 14:8 17:15 21:14,18 23:19 30:18,24 41:25 54:13 95:21 98:5 102:15 116:6 128:25 131:17 133:9 thankfully 25:2 thanks 17:14 thea 1:19 6:3 135:2,19 thing 56:8 57:20 86:25 things 55:5 56:13 think 16:14 38:10,15 40:2 51:3,11 54:3 56:6 57:14 71:2 99:11 117:4,9 126:3 126:23 131:6,8 131:11 third 59:9 60:10 61:12 89:16	three 94:16 threshold 103:7,25 105:24 106:4 106:20,23 time 1:16 7:6 28:18 29:10 30:15,25 31:8 31:9 32:7 50:9 50:12 71:8 101:15 108:9 110:7 113:11 127:25 128:10 128:11 133:9 times 120:5 tirado 1:6 2:3 2:13 3:3 today 9:11 11:5 11:13,23 60:23 104:18,22 105:17 115:19 today's 11:25 took 11:15 top 81:17 88:3 96:3 114:17 119:15 122:11 topic 19:17 22:18 23:2 25:17 total 30:12 54:7 totality 49:10 towards 118:12 town 1:9,9,10 3:15,15,16 6:9 51:14 65:11,15	65:24 66:9 67:2,17 72:16 73:10,16 75:23 76:15,23,24 83:3,21 84:18 85:10,11,21,25 86:3 87:5,11 87:18 90:12,15 90:21,21 93:6 93:15 94:11,18 95:3 96:5,5,9 98:2,7 108:16 108:25 109:3,5 111:6,11 112:3 112:21 113:22 116:2 120:11 120:17,21 121:5 123:19 123:24 124:17 124:23,25 129:9,14,16 130:5 131:14 131:19,24 132:8,15 137:3 towns 111:25 trained 26:19 transcriber 136:1 transcribing 9:24 transcript 6:20 133:17 135:21 136:3,4 transcriptionist 135:7	transmitted 98:14 trende 47:10,14 47:17 trial 33:17 35:10 36:6 37:19 38:13 39:9,24 40:19 troutman 3:18 7:24 45:19 48:3 49:18 50:25 63:7 64:20 troutman.com 3:21 true 81:22,25 104:18 105:17 113:2 135:8 136:4 truism 81:8 trump 36:8,13 truth 8:20,21 8:21 11:16 truthful 11:12 try 10:4,17 16:18 37:8 55:15 56:16 115:4 121:9 trying 48:24 68:23 tseytlin 50:24 tumultuous 113:11 turn 32:21 52:7 66:2 75:21
--	---	---	--

[turn - videoconference]

Page 29

80:20 102:15 126:2 turned 14:2 turning 25:10 two 16:17 20:2 20:4,7 21:15 22:25 27:23 28:20 29:10 30:15 43:4 44:2 49:21 60:9 68:21 86:8 91:7,14 91:19 93:15,17 94:17 95:4,4,6 96:9 98:2 100:22,25 101:9 102:4 106:25 117:4 123:5 type 53:18 95:25 typewriting 135:6 typically 72:22 80:24 83:14 102:4 typo 70:7 typos 54:19,22	uncertain 90:24 unclear 56:10 under 6:24 11:5 19:23 23:17 35:5 44:4 64:16 106:14,15 108:23 109:10 112:18 116:21 underlying 99:14,18 understand 6:19 10:14 11:4,18 12:3 20:21 43:3 64:15 74:7 80:2 99:9 106:12 111:2 116:21 118:3 understanding 9:20 81:13 112:23 understood 10:19 49:2 51:13 58:11 65:5 73:8,8 74:18 78:20 83:10 90:16 107:22 125:8 128:25 129:23 unfortunately 123:10 united 20:4 26:5 81:23	83:24 84:14 university 19:11 24:16 47:22 updated 124:4 upheld 112:2 use 24:5,10 26:20 27:12 28:25 29:14,16 29:20 32:17 40:24 41:8,11 42:24 53:14 54:5,11 66:20 73:6 88:18 101:9 105:23 106:18,22 117:22 124:16 125:4,7 used 21:19 27:7 31:13 42:7 44:13 53:16,17 54:6 56:15 73:4 74:14 105:10 106:20 107:13 120:24 124:4,23 uses 6:23 42:17 71:21 103:7,24 130:3,24 using 12:2,12 26:24 27:5 31:23 53:25 60:22 73:3 120:3,15,24 130:13	usually 66:14 68:16,20 69:5 69:7 utilize 20:10,17 22:6,13 utilizing 27:16 v v 1:8 34:4,9,19 34:20 35:14 36:9 37:23 38:17 40:3 137:3 variable 23:5 42:21 variety 78:19 various 29:18 61:13 113:14 veniece 4:3 8:3 verbal 10:9 veritext 6:4 13:14 137:2 verse 33:21 version 97:4 124:8 versus 33:18 victor 90:6 victorious 73:21 83:7 victors 105:8 victory 68:25 69:2 71:19 78:7,12 video 13:10 videoconfere... 2:5,15 3:5,6,17
u			
u.s. 102:2,2 103:16 108:3 uh 10:12 unaware 58:9 78:19			

[videoconference - write]

Page 30

<p>4:4,5,6 view 92:21,22 violation 45:13 vitae 17:20 19:13 vote 21:10,10 21:12 35:23 42:21 72:17,23 73:11,17 78:14 78:15 79:14,23 79:25 80:24 81:20 83:14,17 83:21,24 89:12 89:24 93:15 95:3,4 100:22 100:25 102:4 102:24 103:6 104:8 106:13 voter 19:6 60:20 61:9 89:11,24 99:7 100:4 voters 12:4,5 12:15,15 21:8 77:20 82:6 84:5,18 86:16 86:17,23 87:4 87:5,10,11,22 88:5 90:10,19 102:2 109:13 129:17 130:4 130:15,25 132:12 votes 54:7</p>	<p>voting 19:15 20:11,18,23 21:5,20 22:8 22:15 23:12,25 24:6,20 25:6 29:3,7,18 30:22 31:7 32:19 39:3 65:10,14,23 76:23 82:5 84:4,12 85:20 100:12,24 101:8,25 129:8 129:24 130:4 130:10,14,18 130:25 131:12 132:4 vying 86:5 91:13,19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">w</p> <hr/> <p>wait 10:2 want 17:8 20:14 48:24 63:23 66:2 69:3 77:23 79:18 128:4 133:16 way 29:17 44:4 70:2,8 73:4,6 112:7 113:3,5 124:22 ways 19:13 we've 22:22 44:16 83:12</p>	<p>wednesday 1:15 week 18:13 weekly 27:14 weeks 3:17 7:24,24 14:16 47:3,5,8 63:14 64:8 65:2 111:12 112:13 116:3 128:4,22 131:5 133:13 west 101:20,21 white 3:9 12:7 12:8 79:24 86:17 87:5,11 118:7 williamson 107:5 win 71:2,17 77:4 78:25 86:10 91:14 110:6,10 111:10 112:12 115:22 windows 13:9 13:13 winner 44:8 106:9 winning 79:11 wins 78:22 79:24 102:23 wisely 71:9 wish 42:23 witness 6:15,18 6:19 8:9,19</p>	<p>33:12 37:2 46:15 47:4,7,9 65:6 68:13 101:7 128:11 128:13 131:8 131:10 135:4 137:4 won 70:19 93:18 95:7 96:9 98:2,6 103:6 104:8 106:12 108:9 108:25 109:17 112:20 114:13 115:10,11 word 46:2 54:16 89:15,16 wording 43:8 words 10:11,16 74:13 work 9:21 44:3 48:17 49:5,10 49:14 worked 44:20 44:24 45:4 47:13,20 working 50:18 works 102:14 118:24 124:12 would've 30:11 53:11 write 25:12 28:3,9,11 41:7 41:16,19,22 53:8,24 54:13</p>
---	---	---	--

[write - zip]

Page 31

54:18,24 72:15 74:18 75:22 98:16 105:7,23 110:5 writes 122:18 writing 55:11 55:21 56:13 62:6 written 7:4 19:4 20:9 22:5 22:12,17,25 24:5,9 28:6,12 wrote 12:25 26:9 30:2 73:9 89:10	32:9 79:20 110:5,11,14 112:16 115:9 yesterday 117:7 york 1:1 34:5 110:13 135:20 137:2
	z
	zero 123:12,23 zip 1:18
x	
x 5:1,5 135:21	
y	
yeah 21:8,10 57:23 65:5 67:16 96:2 101:20,21 117:6 133:25 year 18:6 45:23 51:7,10 79:7,7 103:8 104:2,6 110:18 111:7 111:10,14,20 111:21 112:2,3 112:9,21 114:13,19,24 115:8,12,23 years 28:20 29:11 30:15	

New York Code

Civil Practice Law and Rules

Article 31 Disclosure, Section 3116

(a) Signing. The deposition shall be submitted to the witness for examination and shall be read to or by him or her, and any changes in form or substance which the witness desires to make shall be entered at the end of the deposition with a statement of the reasons given by the witness for making them. The deposition shall then be signed by the witness before any officer authorized to administer an oath. If the witness fails to sign and return the deposition within sixty days, it may be used as fully as though signed. No changes to the transcript may be made by the witness more than sixty days after submission to the witness for examination.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE STATE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS

COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored

in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.