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Secretary Raffensperger, thank you for being here this morning. My name is ___ I am a senior investigative counsel for the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the U.S. Capitol, and I am also of counsel to the vice chair, Representative Liz Cheney.

Why don’t we each introduce ourselves, so --

Good morning. Investigative counsel.

Good morning. I’m ___ the chief investigative counsel.

Joe Maher, senior counselor to the vice chair.

And would you all like to --

Mr. Sewell. Jay Sewell, representing the Office of the Georgia Secretary of State.

Mr. Raffensperger. Brad Raffensperger.

Mr. Sharman. Jack Sharman, representing the Office of the Georgia Secretary of State.

Great. And then those are the people here in person. By video, we have some members. It looks like right now, Representative Liz Cheney, the vice chair, and Representative Zoe Lofgren. Also, our chief clerk, ___ is connecting virtually.

The members may come and go virtually. We will try to keep an eye on that, and when they join, announce it for the record.

Realistically, we probably won’t be able to do the same when they exit. It’s just that we might not notice. So it may not always be clear on the record when they left, but we’ll try to put it on the record whenever they join.

And the staff will sort of lead the interview, but we’ll take breaks throughout and
allow the members, of course, to ask questions.

Just to go over some of the basics of the logistics, we have a court reporter here who will be making a verbatim transcript of the interview.

You are not under oath, but, as I'm sure you know, you do have an obligation to tell the truth. So any false statements that are knowingly made could be a violation of 18 USC 1001, so it's important that you tell us the truth at all times.

Of course, if you don't know the answer or can't recall, you should feel free to say that. Importantly, if you either didn't hear the question or didn't understand the question, please tell us so that we can either repeat it or clarify it.

Also, if you want to talk with your attorney privately, we're happy to accommodate that. If you ever need a break, we're certainly happy to accommodate that. Just let us know.

Just to give you a general overview of the kinds of topics we're going to be covering, after we go through a few basics about your background and your current role, we're going to ask about the Georgia Secretary of State's Office preparations for the November 2020 election and the security of that election; secondly, the Georgia Secretary of State's Office investigation into allegations of election fraud; and third, communications between the White House and you and your staff or any pressure placed on you regarding allegations of election fraud after the election.

Do you have any questions before we get started?

Mr. Raffensperger. No. I think we're good.

Great.

Okay, so I'm going to try and keep it very brief on your personal background. I know you have a long and very impressive career, but it's all publicly documented, so I'll just go through a few very quick things.
EXAMINATION

Q  You are currently the secretary of state of Georgia, correct?
A  Correct.

Q  And when did you get sworn into that position?

Q  And when does your current term end?
A  January 2023.

Q  And you’re also a licensed professional engineer?
A  Correct.

Q  Okay. And are you also currently the owner and CEO of Tendon Systems?
A  Yes.

Q  And how long have you had that position?
A  Since its inception.

Q  Which was roughly when?
A  Roughly 2007.

Q  Okay. Could you just in very general terms describe what the roles and responsibilities are for the secretary of state in Georgia?
A  The secretary of state is charged with oversight for corporations, securities, charities, and professional licensing, and then obviously elections. And then we have some organizations that are administratively attached to us, but we don’t have really oversight of those.

Q  Okay. And we’ll be focusing today obviously on your election responsibilities. And in regard to elections, what are -- what could have been some of your priorities as secretary of state regarding elections?
When I took office in January 2019, number one is to secure new voting machines with a verifiable paper ballot due to a court order that we could not use the old DRE machines anymore. And then part of that was to be able to join the Electronic Registration Information Center so we could update voter rolls objectively.

Q Okay. So can you -- I know you're an engineer, but in layman's terms, can you sort of describe, with regard to the November 2020 election in particular, how the mechanics of voting worked both for in-person voting, and then, secondly, for absentee ballots?

So if you're a typical voter, you go in. Just describe for us what the machine is like and what a voter would do.

A So if you showed up to vote in the fall election of 2020, we had the new verifiable paper ballot. So if you showed up to vote, you would, first of all, have a new poll pad. And the poll pad is not connected to any other piece of equipment, but they're really to sign you in. And then you would get your little card, which now has been activated, which then you walk over several steps to the ballot marking device.

The ballot marking device was a machine that does not record any information, but, in effect, will show you all the selections on the screen. It looked like a giant 11 by 17 iPad, so to speak. You made all your selections, verified your selections. And then you could go ahead, once you verified your selections, print the ballot.

Then that machine, in effect, was just to print the ballot. It was not connected to the internet or anything else like that.

You then would have your paper ballot. You could review your paper ballot. You walk that over to the scanner, put that on the scanner, and then press the button, and that's when your ballot would be scanned.

Q And then what happens after that?
A  It was dropped down into the ballot -- the ballot box.  Looked like a big rectangular garbage can, but it's a secure ballot box.  Drop in there.  Then those ballots would then be secured.

Because the ballots, the paper ballots, were the official ballot.  So you had both the scanned record, and you actually had two flash drives on the back of the ballot scanner, and then you also then had the paper ballot.

Q  And what were done with those flash drives after voting?

A  They were secured, and so the counties would have records of those until the next election.  But those were -- and you could do a scanned recount.  Then you could also check the two totals to make sure that they did line up.  But they were available.  And then the paper ballot you could use also for rescanning the paper through there again or do a hand recount, like which we did in Georgia.

Q  So for the original count, and I'm not sure what the term is, but before the recounts, that first count, was that done electronically?

A  The counting, the tabulation was done electronically.  In other words, as you scanned it through there, you scanned the ballots, but did not tabulate until after 7 p.m. when closing.  Then you could press the button for tabulation.

And that is when every one of those machines, every one of those scanners would do the tabulation, and then the precinct worker, the poll worker, would have that tabulation by machine.  Some precincts would only have one scanner, some would have multiple, based on the precinct size.

Q  And how long -- leaving aside the absentee ballots -- how long would it take to then tabulate the votes?

A  If you closed at 7 o'clock, on time, you would be really done by, say, 10 o'clock at the precinct level at the latest.
Q  Okay.  And then how long would it take -- or did it take, roughly -- to count the absentee ballots?

A  On the November election, the counties were directed through the State Election Board to begin scanning, processing those absentee ballots.

So, in other words, you know, verifying the signatures of the ballots when they came in, separating the envelopes with those ballots, getting those ballots flattened and ready, and then actually beginning the scanning process about 10 days before Tuesday so that you didn't have this huge backlog coming into the -- into post-election, so you could really expedite that process.

Then, as soon as you finished at 7 p.m., you know, on Tuesday, election day, then you could press the tabulation button for those ballots, those absentee ballots that have already been scanned.

Q  Right.

A  So that was the process that all counties were supposed to follow.

Q  Okay.  And to your knowledge, did they follow that process?

A  By and large, most of them did, but Fulton County and a few other counties didn't get them all done.

But, also, you did have ballots that would come in during the day.  And then those ones, obviously, you have to work on those, you know, during the day or, you know, post-election, post-7 p.m. on Tuesday.

Q  Okay.  So stepping back, you've described the mechanics of how an in-person voter would vote.  How did people who voted absentee vote in the November 2020 election?

A  The voters would request the absentee ballot, and when they requested the absentee ballot, Georgia law required them to provide a signature with that.  The
counties received that application with signatures. Then they did a signature match that remained intact.

Q: A match against what?
A: Matched against the signatures that they had on file.

Q: Okay.
A: So they did a signature match then.

Once the signatures matched, then they'd send them a ballot. The county election office would send those absentee ballots to the voter.

When the voter received those absentee ballots, then they would go ahead and make all their selections, close up their envelope, and sign their name again with their signature oath.

When those ballots then were mailed in or dropped off in an absentee ballot drop box or dropped off at the county election office, but when those then were opened, reviewed, first of all, the county would look at those signatures that were on the actual ballot to make sure that there was then a signature match done at that stage.

Q: Matched against what?
A: The records that they had at the county election office of the voter signature on file.

Q: And the signature on file, is that from when the voter registered to vote?
A: Or when it had been updated over periods of time. So there could sometimes be up to three to four, multiple signatures on file, just because a voter has been on file for multiple years, 20 years or so, something like that.

Q: Okay.
A: In addition, because you can register with -- voter registration with the Department of Driver Services, if your signature is then updated at that time, that also
becomes part of the voter file record.

Q And the signatures that were on file, would those have been signed by voters in person either at the DMV or --

A Yes.

Q -- with your office or the local election bureau, whatever the term would be for it?

A Yes.

Q Okay. So with regard to the 20 -- actually, I'll pause before I turn to anything else.

BY

Q Yeah. Just to be clear, Secretary Raffensperger, when the absentee ballots are received, are they similarly put through the same scanning machine? In other words, are they --

A Yes.

Q -- just like in-person ballots, also going through the same --

A Right.

Q -- scanning process?

A Yes. We used the Dominion scanners. Generally, what the counties did have is a high speed scanner at headquarters just because of the volume of absentee ballots that would be required to be scanned, so they could expedite the process, but it's still the Dominion scanners, though.

Q I see. And does each county have one office or place through which the absentee --

A Yes.

Q -- ballots in that county are sent?
A  Yes. All 159 counties.

Q  Got it. Okay.

[Redacted]  Thanks, [Redacted].

[Redacted]  Do any of the members have any questions at this point?

Sounds like no.

BY [Redacted]:

Q  Okay. So, obviously, 2020 was unusual due to the coronavirus. How did the virus impact preparations for the November 2020 election?

A  Our biggest situation we had in Georgia was actually early in the year when we had the shelter at home orders.

Coming into the fall, more people were adapting to COVID. We didn't have the same participation rate voting absentee as we did have at the June primary, but we still had, you know, the protocols in place for COVID.

But we kept all three options open so people could vote absentee, and we have had no-excuse absentee voting in place since 2005 when it was signed into law by Governor Sonny Perdue. And then we also had our 3 weeks of early voting, a day of Saturday voting, and then some counties had a day of Sunday voting, and then also voting in person on election day.

Q  So you described three types of voting: absentee, early, and then --

A  Election day.

Q  -- in person on election day. The early voting and election day are both in person. Is that correct?

A  Correct.

Q  Then, at some point, did your office send out absentee ballot applications to voters?
We did that for the June 2020 primary.

Did you do it for the general election?

No.

Okay. And why did you do it for the June 2020 primary but not the general election?

Several reasons. Number one, because of the shelter at home orders. That also affected the counties. The counties just didn't have the staff.

And so we felt that if we would have gone ahead and sent out absentee ballot applications to all active registered voters in the State of Georgia, first of all, that would have -- they would have gotten one application, because we knew that outside organizations were going to be sending those out to voters.

So, in other words, a campaign could send you an application. Then the State party could send you an application. Then the State rep could send you an application. And so you would end up with four, five, six, seven different applications.

And if you happened to fill several of those out and send them back to the county, it would just swamp the counties. The counties did not have the manpower and resources because of COVID.

So, by doing this, we really had a uniform process that all active registered voters in Georgia got an application, and that's what we sent out for the June primary.

So why did you not do the same for the general election?

Because we thought that COVID had moderated to much of an extent, but also when people had gotten those absentee ballot applications, you can then check the box so that you could stay on the cycle for the end of the year. And some chose, to, you know, check that box and others didn't.

So there's been some controversy regarding so-called ballot harvesting.
Before I ask about your office’s policies regarding ballot harvesting, can you just describe what ballot harvesting is?

A Ballot harvesting is when activists would go around and collect people’s absentee ballots and then drop those off at a county election office or drop them into a mailbox or an absentee ballot drop box.

Q Was ballot harvesting permitted in the November 2020 election?

A No. The absentee ballot was outlawed, you know, with House Bill 316, which we passed when I came into office.

Q And to your knowledge, did ballot harvesting take place anyway?

A We have no record of widespread ballot harvesting in the State of Georgia.

Q So for the past 20 years or so, Georgia has been a fairly Republican State in terms of statewide elections. Going into the November 2020 election, did you have any thoughts as to whether the Presidential election in Georgia was likely to be close?

A That gets into political prognosticating. But if people were looking at the 2018 cycle, and really going back to 2012, 2014, you’d see that, really, the State has become more Democratic over a period of time.

Q And had you --

A Governor Kemp won in 2018 by nearly 55,000 votes, but that was less than the margin of 4 years earlier in the gubernatorial race, and I was in a runoff race. So people that were really watching that would have seen that Georgia had been changing. In fact, that was the very first election that the Democrats actually got more absentee ballot voting. Stacey Abrams got about 50,000 to 55,000 more absentee ballots votes than the Republicans for the very first time.

Q So did the possibility of a close election in Georgia, particularly in the Presidential race, cause you any concerns that there could be either controversies or a
1 contested election in 2020?

2 A I think most of us fully expected that the State would remain Republican.

3 Q So leading up to the election -- obviously, we'll later get to post-election

4 issues -- but leading up to the November 3rd, 2020, election, did you have any concerns

5 that President Trump could be undermining public confidence in the electoral process?

6 A President Trump made a comment about mail-in ballots, how he didn't care

7 for that.

8 The challenge that you have with that, most voters don't understand the

9 difference between mail-in ballots and absentee voting. It sounds -- the process sounds

10 similar, but the West Coast States and Utah are really mail-in ballot States. In other

11 words, the election offices send out live ballots, and the voter gets his and then makes

12 their choices and sends that back in. That's a mail-in State, as I would call it.

13 In Georgia, you have to request an absentee ballot, and then we have signature

14 match in place. Once that's been verified that you truly are who you say you are, then

15 you are sent a ballot. You fill out that ballot, send it back with a signature, and then the

16 signature match is done again in the State of Georgia.

17 And so that's an absentee ballot by mail. It is a distinctive -- distinction -- but I

18 think that got blurred out there in the media world and in the comments that President

19 Trump made.

20 Q And do you think that could have had any impact on public confidence in the

21 electoral process in Georgia?

22 A I think the results show that not as many Republicans voted absentee as the

23 Democrat Party did.

24 Q Prior to the November 3rd, 2020, election, were there any allegations or

25 evidence of fraud related to the election?
A  Prior to ’20?
Q  Yeah.
A  Say that again?
Q  Were there any allegations or evidence of fraud leading up to the November
3rd election?
A  We always have -- we hear about things that happen during the election
process.  Like the June primary, we had issues.  Some of those were the counties made
errors in judgments, and we had, you know, a couple people that double voted.
   Everything that we -- when we get a complaint or we get information, an affidavit,
then we begin an investigation process.
   But from the standpoint of about the fall election, that really was post-November
that we had all this.  Up until that point, we had -- it looked like a regular year in the
makings.
Q  And by that you mean maybe some small investigations?
A  Small investigations.  Nothing that was going to overturn the results of, you
know, the major election, the major races.
Q  And was there litigation leading up to the November 2020 election?
A  Yes.  We -- when I took office in January 2019, I had nine lawsuits
immediately from Stacey Abrams and her allied Democratic groups over the voting
machines and other issues, and we were still dealing with those.
Q  So I don't want to make you go through all nine of those because that can be
kind of time consuming, but could you describe in general the nature of those lawsuits?
A  That the machines flipped votes, that the machines were unreliable.  This is
the old DRE machines that did not have a verifiable paper ballot.  And then that voters
were, you know, arbitrarily kicked off voter rolls and things like that.
So we, you know, addressed those, you know, in court, you know, and, you know, worked on those, and bit by bit we worked that list down.

So that was that -- coming into 2020, the only, I guess, settlement agreement we had was with the Democratic Party over signature match, where we secured signature match both at the application phase and at the ballot phase, and also got the Democrats to agree that they would not contest any signature match questions or issues following the November 2020.

So for the people of Georgia, it was actually a victory. And then I followed that up with GBI training, made that available to all 159 counties on signature match.

Q And did you send out a bulletin --
A Yes, we did.

Q -- as part of that settlement? What did the bulletin say?
A Just to really follow best practices. It did not change State law.

Q And I think you made reference to your office, how you were all conducting investigations regarding election fraud. Can you sort of explain what role the Secretary of State's Office has in investigating election fraud allegations or evidence versus what Federal, State, or local law enforcement or prosecutors might do?
A So when we hear about any violation of State law or administrative code, administrative code is put into effect by the State Election Board. So, in other words, when a precinct doesn't open up at 7 a.m. in the morning, then we open up an investigation, and we bring that county before the State Election Board once we get a determination as to what happened exactly there.

Then, also, we get situations where people may have double voted or someone has voted in two States or other situations like that.

But every allegation of voter fraud, we investigate. So we have a total
investigation division of about 20 individuals, including the director of investigations. They do their investigation, they produce a report, and that comes before the State Election Board.

The State Election Board hears the case, and the defendant can then present, you know, their comments on what exactly happened, and then they make a determination whether to remand it over to the Attorney General’s office for prosecution as what should happen there, fines or whatever other remedy that the attorney general feels is appropriate.

Q And when you say the attorney general, that’s the Georgia attorney general?
A That’s the Georgia attorney general.

Q Are they ever turned over to the FBI or Federal prosecutors?
A Typically, what I -- when I took office, what I did when I thought it was an egregious case of ballot harvesting in old folks homes or things like that, I sent it not just to the Attorney General’s Office but to the local prosecuting attorney so that the local DA could pick it up if he wanted to, or our attorney general would definitely pick it up. But we referred these. These are violations of State laws.

Q In advance of the November 3rd, 2020, election, did you or anybody in your office, to your knowledge, have any interactions with anyone from the White House or the Trump campaign regarding the election?
A Prior to the November election?
Q Yes.
A I know that the campaigns -- we get calls from campaigns all the time when there’s a big race, and so we had some conversations. And that was really the extent of it, just what’s happening, what are we doing, how are we monitoring it. But that was just -- it seemed very casual.
Q Okay. So in advance of the November 3rd, 2020, election, the Trump campaign did not complain about any allegations of fraud or failure to follow State law or anything like that?

A Not that I recall.

I'll pause here.

Yeah, just a couple followups.

Q You said something earlier, Mr. Secretary, about no-excuse absentee ballot. Do I correctly understand that to mean the voter didn't need a reason, didn't need an illness or a professional commitment to get an absentee ballot, he or she could get it regardless?

A Correct. That's current State law.

Okay. And that, is that a change from the way it used to be, or has it always been that way?

A It's always been that since it was put into effect in 2005. It was signed into law by Governor Sonny Perdue.

Q I see. So a voter had three options, either an absentee ballot without necessary -- necessarily having a reason, an early in-person vote, or just like the old-fashioned way, going to a polling place on election day.

A Correct.

Q I see. But all three of those ballots -- each three of those choices generated a paper ballot for that voter.

A Correct.

Q And it went through one of those scanning machines.

A Correct.
Q I see. So every ballot in the State of Georgia, regardless of the mode of transmission, generated a paper record and went through one of the same kinds of machines?

A Correct.

Q And it sounds like what you said earlier is that those machines were new after the 2018 election.

A Yes.

Q You replaced the old ones that didn’t generate a paper ballot with new ones that did. Is that right?

A Correct. It was the fastest and the largest implementation of new voting machines in the entire country.

Q Yeah. And that was true, Mr. Secretary, across the State, every county --

A Every single county had new machines --

Q Okay.

A -- purchased by the State of Georgia.

Q Purchased by the State. I see. So it sounds to me like whatever happened in 2018 and the litigation that resulted made the 2020 election a lot more secure, in your view.

A Having a verifiable paper ballot is one of the best implementations that every State could make, and we made it in Georgia.

Q And just tell us generally why that makes it more reliable or safer, having a generated paper ballot for each voter.

A Because if you want to do a 100 percent hand recount, you now have a piece of paper that you can hand recount. With using the old DRE machines, all you could do was press the button and you would get the same answer.
Q: I see.

A: But this way, you could verify through the paper who people voted for.

Q: Got it. So you’ve got the machine flash drive electronic counts, but then you have a fail-safe, which is the actual paper ballots that could be hand recounted.

A: Correct.

Q: And that’s new for 2020, didn’t exist prior to that back in your election in 2018 or prior election.

A: Correct.

Q: Okay.

Q: Could you tell us a little bit about the process of selecting Dominion with their RFP process? How did that work?

A: We had an RFP process. We were on a fast track because we had to get this in place for the first election, the Presidential primary of 2020, because of court order.

So we began the RFP process. It was a five-member team. We had someone from the disability community. We had someone from the tech community so we could look at the tech basis. My deputy secretary of state was on that committee, and we had two other individuals. I was not on that.

They went through a point system, and they evaluated companies on qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative accounted for 75 percent of the score. Quantitative, which was price, counted for 25 percent of the score.

Dominion scored very strongly on the price. They’re much more economical than the other systems. On the qualitative, they were close to another one, but there was another company. But when you added it all up, Dominion was the low apparent
We went through the State procurement process, which is actually run by the State, not the Secretary of State’s Office, because it was a bond issue that was paying for that. There are rigorous and tight rules for procurement.

Q Did any political parties or campaigns object to the selection of Dominion at the time?

A No.

Q Is Dominion foreign owned?

A No.

Representative Cheney, do you have any questions at this time?

Ms. Cheney. I don’t, Thank you.

Are the machines that were used doing the 2020 fall election the same ones that are in use now for Georgia elections?

Mr. Raffensperger. Yes.

And you mentioned that in June of 2020, you sent out ballot applications to voters, and then that did not happen for the general election. Who makes that decision, whether to do that or not?

Mr. Raffensperger. I was -- I had that authority as secretary of state. I made that decision.

No.
So I’m about to turn to election day, November 3rd, 2020. Before I do that, is there anything that we have not covered about preparations for the election that we should know about?

I thought your questions were thorough.

Okay. So let’s turn to November 3rd, 2020. In general, how did election day itself go?

Amazingly well. We had a few counties that struggled. If you look at the June 2020 primary, the middle of COVID, we had about five counties that had issues, major issues. We have 159 counties. So we probably had about 10 or 15 others that had, you know, minor issues that you work through. But we had about 139 counties on the June 2020 primary that did tremendous.

Coming into November, we had about five counties that struggled, and one of those was Fulton County that struggled again, but a few of the other five were different ones.

But a screen shot in the afternoon of election day, the average wait time in Georgia was 3 minutes. And at one time, it actually even went down to 2 minutes of all the -- of the precincts that we were following with wait times.

The longest wait time I saw on the board was under an hour. And that’s one of the things that we really had been working hard after the June 2020 primary, working with the counties to make sure they had appropriate equipment, precinct size, and manpower size so that they could run people through, and line times were less than an hour. So from that standpoint, it was a success.

And when you said some counties had issues, were there any issues on
November 3rd, 2020, that came to your attention besides wait times?

A Yeah. We had issues with Floyd County, Fayette County. Spalding County had some issues early in the morning. Morgan County had some issues, I believe, that was that day, and then also Fulton County. But I can get those five counties. I know Fulton County was front and center.

Q When you say issues, what types of issues?

A People show up, long wait times, disorganization, slow in tabulation, you know, issues that just -- logistical and management issues that just permeated, you know, throughout many, multiple precincts.

Q On November 3rd, 2020, did you have any concern that any of those issues could potentially affect the outcome of the election in Georgia?

A No. It affected the timeliness of getting the results.

Q So then in the days after November 3rd, 2020, did your office receive any kind of allegations or evidence of election fraud?

A Yes.

Q What kinds of things?

A Questions that, you know, just -- you know, they started, you know, coming in. "I showed up to vote and, you know, someone said, I, you know, already had voted," you know, things like that. And just, you know, started then coming in from the State GOP also, you know, which they sent letters to us about some of their concerns.

Q And we talked earlier about how long it took to tabulate the ballots. How long did the -- and I might get the terminology wrong here -- how long did the initial count for the Presidential race take?

A It was pretty much done by Friday after election day, but we also waited for the UOCAVA, the overseas ballots, to come in.
Q And what is that?
A Those are military ballots, but also any American that lives overseas can vote. And so those ballots had to come in by 12 noon on Friday after election day.
Q And was this an unusually long time to determine who the winner was of the Presidential election in Georgia?
A It was very close.
Q Okay.
A And because it was so close, we really needed to have every single ballot come in. So it wasn't until all the UOCAVA ballots, you know, came in that you could make the final determination on who had the highest vote totals.
Q And when was it that you were able to make that determination?
A I don't recall exactly, but it probably would have been the week -- early the next week, the Monday, Tuesday thereafter.
Q And this was prior to the recount?
A Prior to the recount.
Q So can you sort of explain how that works? What does it mean to make a determination?
A Once you have -- all the ballots have been tabulated, then you have your totals. And once we had the totals, then we knew that President Trump was about 12,000 votes short of what Vice President Biden had.
Q And did you make an announcement or take some sort of official action at that point?
A When we passed House Bill 316 back in 2019, part of that was added is that we had to a risk audit of a statewide race, and also, you have to do a recount when it's ever -- whenever it is within 0.5 percent, and the Presidential race was within 0.5 percent.
Q  Okay.  I'm going to turn to the recount in just a minute, but first going
somewhat chronologically.

So on November 9th, 2020, which was 6 days after the election, Senators Perdue
and Loeffler and some other people called on you to resign.  What's your understanding
as to why they called on you to resign?

A  I've never really been given, other than the press release.  That's the only
official reason that I know of.  I could make guesses, but that's what I was told, and I let
them know in a press release that that wasn't going to happen.

Q  Okay.  Can you just tell us generally, what were the reasons that they gave
in the press release?

A  They said -- they alleged that there was errors.  I'd have to look at it again,
but it was stuff that was not supported by the facts.

Q  Okay.  And what did you say in response?

A  In a nutshell, it ain't happening.

Q  What did you mean by that?

A  I wouldn't quit.

Q  Okay.  And why were you not quitting?

A  Because I did my job.  I'm sorry they're disappointed with the results.  I
was too.  I'm a Republican.  But those were the results.

Q  So a few days later, your wife reached out to Senators Perdue and Loeffler
by personal text asking if they understood what they had done to your family.  What's
your understanding as to why she did that?

A  Somewhere after the election, all of a sudden my wife started getting texts,
death threats, sexualized texts, stuff like that.  And my wife is a private person.  Her
Gmail account -- let me restate that.  Her email account, for the record, is not out there.
Her phone number is not out there. And she was getting this stuff coming in from email addresses in to her phone number.

This is my wife that I -- I met Tricia in high school, and we've been married 45 years. And so she wanted to respond to them. I let my deputy know that Tricia was going to send them a text, and Tricia sent them a text.

Q. So, first of all, I'm sorry that your family has had to go through that. But the fact that she sent those two Senators a text suggested that she must have seen some tie between what they had done and these other people who were sending threats and things like that.

What's your understanding of how the statements by the two Senators may have contributed to what happened to your family?

A. The media, social media, was saying stuff that was not supported by anything that we were seeing on the ground. What we were seeing was a normal election with normal election issues.

As I said in my letter to Congress, there's never a perfect election, but things were just being spun up and made out of whole cloth.

Q. Do you think that the letters -- or statements, I should say -- by Senators Perdue and Loeffler misled the people of Georgia?

A. They were not supported by facts, and I don't think it helped their campaigns.

Q. Did either of the Senators reply to your wife?

A. No.

Q. Did either of them communicate with you about their statement?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any reason to believe that President Trump may have prompted
either or both of the Senators to make those statements?

A  You'd have to ask him.

I'll pause here.

Do you have anything?

I don't, no.

Anybody else have anything?

No.

Okay. Representative Cheney, do you have anything?

Ms. Cheney. I don't have anything. We actually lost video connection with you all, the technical piece of it.

And I just want to echo, obviously, what you said to Secretary Raffensperger, just to thank him and to recognize the challenges and the threats that his family and he have faced, and nobody in public service should have to face those.

I have no other questions right now.

Okay. And so we are aware of the camera issue. Apparently, it's an issue with the bandwidth. We have an engineer in the room, but he's also the witness, so we won't make him work on that.

[Laughter.]

BY

Q  So, obviously, it's been well publicized that there were a couple of calls from President Trump to you and to somebody on your staff, but before those two well-publicized calls where the transcripts were publicly released, did you have any interaction either with the President himself or with anybody at the White House?

A  No.

Q  Did you have any interactions with the Trump campaign?
No.

Okay. Were there sort of routine things that normally would -- communications that would occur after an election with a campaign?

They may have reached out to, like, my staff, but I didn't get -- they didn't reach out to me directly.

So you've got a binder there in front of you. If you can turn your attention to exhibit 1. And this is a November 10th, 2020, letter from Doug Collins and David Shafer, S-h-a-f-e-r, and it's got their titles on there.

But who are Doug Collins and David Shafer?

Doug Collins is a former Congressman from the State of Georgia, and he was at that time Georgia Recount Team Leader, Donald J. Trump for President.

Okay. And David Shafer?

Is the State chairman of the Georgia Republican Party.

And did they communicate with you in advance of this letter to tell you it was coming or to voice any concerns?

I recall we had a phone call with David Shafer at some point, but I don't recall what date that was, and I don't know if that was pre-election or post-election.

Okay.

But Doug Collins, I don't believe we had any conversations with him.

So you don't recall anything significant that they would have raised that's not also in this letter?

No.

Okay. So in the letter, in this last paragraph on page 1 that carries over into page 2, they write, there are "substantiated documentary, testimonial and expert evidence of each of the following categories of discrepancy and error."
Before I go through each of those different categories that have a letter attached to each of them, do you agree with their statement that there were "substantiated documentary, testimonial and expert evidence" of each of those categories?

A No, I don't agree with the statement.

Q Okay. So the first one -- and when I ask you these questions, try as much as you can to answer with regard to what you knew on November 10th, 2020, which is the date of the letter. We'll later get to similar allegations that President Trump raised on the phone call with you, so we'll go through them in more detail later.

But just as of around the time of this letter, November 10th, 2020, so about a week after the election, their first allegation here is "A, ineligible, out-of-State voters casting ballots in the general election."

Do you agree with that allegation?

A Our review subsequent to the election found that -- and I wrote that in my letter to Congress -- out-of-State voters, we estimated it was in the range of, I believe, 300, but less than 500, in that range, the best I recall. So I take objection to his wording of where he said substantiated. It was not substantiated. These are his allegations.

Q And then B is "deceased voters casting ballots after their death." Was that allegation substantiated?

A No. In my letter to Congress, I said there was two. Since that time of my January letter, we found two more. So, for the record, there's -- we found four people in the State of Georgia.

Q C is "duplicate ballots by voters." Is there any substantiation for that allegation?

A No.

Q Do you even know what he's referring to there, or they were referring to, I
should say?

A I believe he was referring to when people showed up to vote, and they said,
"Well, someone already voted absentee ballot for me." But we found no record of that.

Q Okay. D is "ballots counted that were received by mail, but lacked the
signature verification required under Georgia law." Did you find evidence of that?

A Not of anything that would overturn the result of the race. We did a
signature match investigation in Cobb County, and we showed that there was only 2 out
of the 15,000 where we had a credible allegation that it wasn't being done.

Q And why did you select Cobb County?

A Because it's the one county that we had a credible allegation. A person
that had worked for the Cobb County office said they didn't do that in June, and she had
just left just prior to the November election.

And so we felt that that would be a county that would be -- you know, it's a large
county. So we went ahead and we did a study, an investigation with GBI. It was a joint
investigation. We produced a report on that.

Q Yeah. Can you explain a little bit more what the concern was about the
person who had worked there?

A She said that they weren't doing signature match. Janine Eveler, the Cobb
County election director, said we did do that, there's nothing to support what she said.
But based on that, and she being a former employee, we felt that out of an abundance of
cautions and due diligence that we would investigate Cobb County.

Q E is "voters denied the opportunity to vote a regular ballot on November 3rd
because they were advised that someone had already voted absentee in their name."

Oh, and I'll just pause here. It looks like Representative Kinzinger has joined us.
So, anyway, with regard to allegation E, is there any evidence to support that
allegation?

A None that I recall.

Q Okay. F is "denial of statutory access to observe the opening of ballots, and to observe the counting of ballots." Was there any evidence to support that allegation?

A I would say that the challenge that some of the political parties had that they wanted to observe some of the processes, and some of the process is the county election office, they support transparency, but they also don't want to expose people's private information, such as Social Security numbers and birth dates. So they wanted to make sure that people weren't close enough to see that but close enough to verify that the process was being handled.

And post-election, some of the groups wanted to be, you know, right up, you know, right on the screen, and that would be a violation of the voter's, you know, privacy.

And so that's really what the stress that we had going on. But there was nothing that ever, you know, showed that there was any kind of widespread voter fraud. The counties were, by and large, following the process.

Q G is "the illicit, ex parte meeting of Vote Review Panels excluding Republican panel members denied notice of a meeting and the opportunity to participate."

Can you explain what you think that allegation means?

A I believe that refers to when you have your absentee ballots, you know, come in, when you run them through the scanner, because it's a hand-marked paper ballot, and some people don't fill in the bubble all the way or they put an X or they circle the name, so they get kicked out by the scanners.

So then you have, you know, vote review panels that then look at these ballots to come up with a determination, you know, were they voting for candidate A, B, or C.

And so they were alleging that their Republican panel members, you know, were
1 denied access.

2 Q  Was that true?
3 A  Not that I recall.
4 Q  So if you go down a couple paragraphs, the paragraph starting -- this is on page 2: "On behalf of the Georgia Republican Party and The Donald J. Trump for President Campaign, we respectfully request, prior to certification of the election results, that your office exercise its statutory authority to order a manual hand recount of every ballot cast within the State of Georgia." And then it continues on.

5 Did your office end up ordering a manual hand recount of every ballot cast in the State of Georgia?

6 A  As part of our procedure, we -- I ordered that we would do those, not run it through the scanning machines for electronic count, but we'd actually do a hand recount. Because we could do two things with that process. One is verify what the results were, but also, we could verify whether the machines flipped votes.

7 There was a widespread narrative out there that the machines were flipping the votes. When you do a hand recount, then you'll find out very quickly whether machines are accurate or not. And the results proved that the machines did not flip the votes.

8 Q  So did your office do more than was required by State law in terms of the recount?
9 A  Yes.

10 Q  Could you explain that?
11 A  I ordered, when we did, as part of the audit procedure that was in House Bill 316 and also the SEB, State Election Board, rules, I ordered that we actually do a 100 percent hand recount. So all 5 million paper ballots were hand recounted for the Presidential race.
Q: So on the next page towards the bottom, there's a reference to "affidavits we are providing to your office for purposes of your investigation." Did they provide affidavits?

A: Yes. We received affidavits --

Q: And do you recall whether they provided support for these allegations?

A: We opened up investigations, and we went through that, and we never found significant or enough fraud that would overturn the results of the race.

Q: At the very bottom of that page, leading into the next page, it says, "Your office has publicly committed that transparency was vital during the election process and we are troubled that there are multiple reports to the contrary."

Do you know what they're referring to by "reports to the contrary"?

A: No.

Q: Okay. Do you think your office was transparent?

A: Yes. Very transparent.

Q: Okay. Did you --

A: We had multiple press conferences. We'd have sometimes one or two press conferences a day to explain where we were in the process. We were doing the very best we could to get information out there, fact-based information.

So I understand that if we take a short break we'll be able to get the video back on for the members. Is that right? How long do you think that will take?

Five minutes? Okay.

So why don't we take a 5-minute break, and then I'll turn to the other staff in the room and the members to see if they have any questions, and we'll hopefully get this video working.

So we'll go off the record.
[Recess.]
[11:03 p.m.]

Before I move on to the next exhibit, do you have anything?
I don't, no. Thank you.
Okay.

Other staff in the room?
Representative Cheney, do you have anything at this time?
Ms. Cheney. No.
Okay.

Q Secretary Raffensperger, if you could turn your attention to exhibit 2 in the binder. Thankfully, this is a much shorter letter, so it shouldn't take as long.

This is from eight Members of Congress. Since it's in the record, I won't read off all the names, but is it correct that these are eight Republican U.S. House Representatives representing districts in Georgia?
Yes.

Q Okay. And is this the entire Republican House delegation from Georgia?
Yes.

Q The second paragraph begins, "As such, we write to request your thorough review of the allegations brought forth by the Georgia Republican Party and the Donald J. Trump for Congress Campaign."

So I would characterize this as asking you to look into the issues raised in the letter we just went through. Is that the way you understood it?
Yes.

Q Did any of these Members or their staffs reach out to you or your staff
regarding any of these matters?

A Don't recall, prior to receiving this letter.

Q And did you take any action in response to either the letter we just went through, exhibit 1, which was the fairly detailed letter from Doug Collins and David Shafer, or this November 10th -- this is exhibit 2 -- letter from the members of the Georgia delegation who were Republicans? Did those prompt you to take any action?

A We already had ongoing investigations initiated. As complaints were levied, then we -- brought -- opened up a file on it and began our process of investigating every election claim.

Q And when you referred to the manual statewide recount, was that prompted by either of these letters?

A No. I decided that we were going to find out if the machines flip votes, and I thought that would put it to rest.

Q Okay. And when you say find out whether the machines flip votes, was that in response to allegations that the machines flip votes?

A Widespread allegations that were out there on social media and cable news networks.

Q Okay. And do you remember roughly when you made the decision to do the manual statewide recount as opposed to the minimum required by State law?

A I had a press conference at the foot of the steps -- on the foot of the Capitol steps, and we had about 10 election directors there. And that was reported in the media, local newspapers. I don't recall exactly what date that was.

Q And why did you choose --

A But I believe --

Q -- the Presidential -- oh, go ahead.
-- it was November 11th.
Okay.
Because, as I recall now, I also talked about -- my preamble to that about the sacrifice that our servicemembers have made, dying, fighting in wars for our Nation, recognizing the service of my father who fought in World War II and all World War II veterans. And then I had those election directors behind me. So that, I believe, would be the date that I announced that decision.

And why did you choose the Presidential race from among the many statewide races?
It's obviously, to us and I think to all Americans, the most significant race. It's the top of the ticket.

But the outcome of the Georgia race by itself would not have changed the outcome of the overall Presidential race in terms of the electoral college, correct?
Correct, but House Bill 316, when it passed, requires to pick one statewide race. So we had multiple races that we could've chose; I chose the one I thought was the most significant.

To your knowledge, had there ever been a statewide manual recount before?
I don't believe -- I don't have -- no understanding that one has ever occurred prior to that.

And was your office prepared to handle this kind of work, if it hadn't been done before?
Well, it was really the 159 counties that did the actual hand recounting.

And were they prepared? Did they have sufficient resources to do this?
They accomplished it on time.
And do you think they did it well?

Yes.

What do you base that on?

If you look at the results, many of the counties had the same results that they had on Election Day with those hand -- the original counts as they actually got on the hand recount. Some had minor differences. If you looked at the total percentage, it was very miniscule.

And then, also, we had a few counties -- Floyd County caught an error that went to the benefit of President Trump. I believe that was about 2,000 votes, as I recall. And then Fulton County found, you know, some issues, which allowed them to rectify those. And then also Fayette County.

So -- but many of the counties, nearly 140 counties, had very similar totals. And if you look at the total percentages, it was amazingly accurate and lined up with vote totals.

So, if you turn your attention to exhibit 3, this is entitled "Risk-Limiting Audit Report, Georgia Presidential Contest, November 2020." It's dated November 19, 2020. Is this the results of the manual recount?

Correct.

And so, overall, what did you find, your office find, as a result of the recount?

That it was really within 0.0099 percent of variation in the overall margin.

And can you explain what that means, variation in the overall margin?

It was statistically insignificant. We counted all 5 million ballots, and so the delta was so minor it was within, as we said, 0.1053 percent.

So you've got two numbers here in the audit report. There's the one that's
the variation in statewide total vote count, and then there’s the one that’s variation in the overall margin. Could you just explain the difference between those two numbers?

A It’s just really what is the percentage of what they had before and then what is the margin between the two voters.

Q So how much -- the second one being how much the margin changed --

A Right.

Q -- from the initial count to the recount?

A Right.

Q All right.

A And so it was actually less than 0.01 percent.

Q And it looks like, if my math is correct -- and I have to admit I used a calculator -- that the audit found a difference between the two candidates of 12,284 votes. Now, that’s different from the 11,779 number that’s frequently used in, for example, in your conversation with President Trump.

So just explain -- it’s got the total vote counts for President Trump and later President Biden here on this audit report. The difference I calculate is 12,284.

A Right.

Q As we’ll get to the call you had with President Trump later, he frequently referred to 11,779. Can you explain the difference between those numbers?

A Well, the audit is not a recount, even though it’s been called a manual recount. It’s a re-tally of that. But instead of doing -- we were required to do a 90 percent risk limit, which would’ve been pulling out 1.5 million of the 5 million ballots. We could’ve gone to a 95 percent risk limit, which would’ve been pulling out 2.5 million of the 5 million. But if you start pulling out that many ballots, you might as well just count them all, and that’s why we did a 100 percent, you know, count.
Then we then upped it up further and said, instead of just running those through the machine again, let's do a hand recount, because, that way, we can verify whether the machines flipped the votes. When you got virtually the same results, we then proved that the machines did not flip the votes.

Q So the numbers, though, from the audit don't become the new results.
A Correct.

Q They are simply used to determine the reliability of the initial count.
A Of the initial count, correct.

Q Okay. And so that's why --
A There's a slight delta.

Q And President Trump continued to refer to 11,779, because that was the number from the original vote. Is that correct?
A Correct.

Q Or original tabulation, I guess I should say.

Do you have any questions, [ ]?

Q I'm sorry, just quickly, the recount covers everything; it's all three of the modes of voting. All of those paper ballots are hand recounted?
A Correct.

Q Mail-in, absentee, and in person?
A Correct.

Q Right. Okay. So literally every ballot cast in Georgia was looked at again and recounted.
A Correct.

Q Got it. Thank you.
Representative Cheney, do you have anything?

Ms. Cheney. No. Thanks,

And, Representative Kinzinger, do you have anything?

Mr. Kinzinger. No questions for me right now. Thanks.

Great.

Secretary Raffensperger, is there anything about the audit that we should know before we turn to a new topic?

A I thought your questions were thorough.

Q Great.

Now I'm going to turn your attention to a November 13, 2020, call you received from U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham. Prior to that call, did you know Senator Graham?

A Other than I know he's the U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Q So you knew who he was, but --

A Right.

Q -- had you had any kind of --

A No.

Q -- interaction with him previously?

So just, if you don't mind, describe how the call was set up, and then walk us through what you can recall from the call.

A Someone from his office, his scheduler, reached out to our office and said, Senator Graham would like to, you know, talk to, you know, Secretary Raffensperger.

And so here's -- I got the phone number for the office.

So I called the office and told her who I was, and she set up a time, I guess, for me to talk to, you know, Senator Graham or she may have got him on at that time. I don't
recall exactly. But I talked to Senator Graham at that time.

Q Was anybody else on the call with you and Senator Graham?

A Not the first time we talked. But as soon as he -- I understood that he didn't want to talk about the senatorial races -- I thought originally that's why he was reaching out to us. And so, then, realizing he wanted to talk about Fulton County, I said, well, let me get, you know, some of my people on the phone call, too, and let me circle back with you. So we set up another time.

Q That same day?

A That same time, say, 6 o'clock or, you know, like, 30 minutes or an hour later, something like that.

Q Okay. So can you walk us through, to the extent you can recall, what Senator Graham said on the first phone call?

A It was that he wanted to talk about Fulton County and their, you know, signature match. I thought he was really calling about, you know -- I thought he was talking about the senatorial runoffs, just him being a U.S. Senator. And I thought, well, if we're going to talk about Fulton County, I need to have, you know, someone in the weeds, you know. I don't know how deep in the weeds he wanted to go; I just wanted to have, you know, additional people on that phone call.

Q I think you said this earlier, but Senator Graham is a Senator -- U.S. Senator from South Carolina, not Georgia. So did he explain why he, as a Senator from South Carolina, was calling about a Georgia election?

A No. I can -- there was so much misinformation about Georgia's signature match, and I believe that he probably wondered if we even did signature match because of the misinformation. And I do believe that South Carolina lost the ability to do signature match due to an unfavorable court ruling. So he may have thought that we
were positioned similar to South Carolina. I don’t know. You’d have to ask him.

Q  But did he give any indication that he was calling because what happened in Georgia could inform what was happening in South Carolina?

A  No. It was really just about Fulton County, I believe.

Q  Okay.

And now he also at the time was, I believe, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Does the Senate Judiciary Committee, to your knowledge, have any kind of oversight regarding elections in Georgia?

A  I don’t know what you all do up here.

Q  Okay. That’s a fair answer. I’m still trying to figure that out as well.

Did he make any reference to the Senate Judiciary Committee on the call that you can remember?

A  Not that I can recall.

Q  Okay. Anything else you can recall from that first phone call?

A  No.

Q  Okay.

So tell us about the second phone call. Who was on the second phone call?

A  I had my deputy, Jordan Fuchs, and then Gabriel Sterling. Gabriel Sterling was our implementation manager of the new voting machines, and so Gabriel understood the nits and the grits of all the little ins and outs of every little process that we went through. So we could go as deep into the details as Senator Graham wanted to go.

Q  Okay. So, as far as you can recall, what did Senator Graham say on that second phone call?

A  It was really this idea that -- he said that he was questioning whether signature match was done in Fulton County, but he said, there’s also a way that you can
verify. You know, if you look at -- he mentioned about credit card companies. He says, they get millions of signatures every day and they run that through their machines.

And I was really just listening to what he was saying, because, in effect, I guess he was -- I'm trying to, still, in my mind, collect what he was saying -- but that, if you had this machine way of doing that -- and Fulton County actually did have a way of, you know, running that through machines; they just didn't use it -- then you could verify whether the signatures matched as the machines were reading that, as you scanned it. So you could go through all 150,000 absentee ballots very quickly using a machine process.

And then, really, Gabriel Sterling did most of the talking on that call, because then they talked about, you know, information. And I just, you know, was uncomfortable because I didn't know where this was going to lead, if they, in effect, would -- once the ballots had been separated -- had been accepted and they'd been separated from the ballots, then, you know, my concern was, would you be disenfranchising voters when the ballots have already been accepted by the county process?

And so I told him -- we finished up the call, and I said, "Well, let me talk to our general counsel," who wasn't on the call, "and we'll get back to you." And we just never got back to him.

Q So was Senator Graham asking your office to do something?

A He was talking about a process of using companies, and I didn't know exactly where he was going. I just didn't want to go where he was -- where I thought he might want to go. I just thought it best not to call him back.

I thought we had our process in place, we were following State law, we were following the Constitution, and I just didn't want to go -- I just didn't know what he was -- it was kind of like I didn't understand what he was talking about with this process. Because we all use our credit cards daily. I didn't know that credit card companies really
are checking everything. I don’t think they do, but I don’t really know.

And so I just let it go, "Let me talk to our general counsel," and we never got back. And he recalls the conversation differently than as I recall it, and so I’ll just let it go at that.

Q So I have a few questions about this. You reference Fulton County having some kind of machine or technology that they didn’t use. What was that?

A Well, there are States that use an awful lot of vote-by-mail. There’s, you know, scanners that are looking at all the signatures, and they’ll kick them up to a team of people that verify those signatures. And then, if they still can’t verify it, then they’ll call the voter and say, we can’t verify it, it got kicked out by the machine, got kicked out by our review panel, and is that really your signature?

But Fulton County just never got to that. They were just really swamped with the quantity of absentee voters, that they just went through hand signature match and did it that way.

Q So would the machine that they had actually compare the signature on the ballot to the signature on file?

A The machine, as billed, that’s what it would do, because it would have those voter record files. So, yes, that’s what the machine process was supposed to be doing. But Fulton County didn’t use it.

Q Do you know why Senator Graham was asking about Fulton County specifically?

A Post-election, that became the foci of all the allegations that were -- or most of the allegations that were levied at Georgia.

And I’ll just note that Representative Aguilar has joined us.
Q  So, sorry, you mentioned that Fulton County became the foci. Can you explain why?
A  Number one would’ve been the State Farm Arena.
Q  Okay. We’ll get to that in a minute, so you don’t have to go through it in detail, but anything else?
A  Fulton County has struggled since 1993 getting elections done on time. It's the largest county, and they also were struggling in 2020, and it took them the longest to finish up their tabulation.
Q  So did Senator Graham say anything about what your office or Fulton County should do if they found problems with the absentee ballots, like, what the remedy would be?
A  No.
Q  Okay. But you said you were uncomfortable or concerned about where it could go. Is that what made you concerned?
A  Right. It’s -- we have a policy. We have, you know, State law in place. We review the signatures when the application is made. We review the signatures when the ballots come back in. And we know that Fulton County -- we had a monitor there, Carter Jones, as part of our consent agreement with Fulton County. He was verifying that signature match was being done in Fulton County.
Q  So did Senator Graham say that if errors were found that absentee ballots should be disregarded or thrown out or disqualified or whatever the term might be?
A  I don’t recall.
Q  Okay.
A  And you said that Senator Graham recalled the conversation differently than you do. What was the difference in your recollections?
A Well, I just shared mine, and --

Q Okay.

A -- his recollection was different. It's out there. I haven't read that for nearly a year, but it got out there in some newspaper articles.

Q Did you ever communicate with Senator Graham the -- address the discrepancies in your recollections?

A No.

Q As far as you can recall, did Senator Graham make any reference to President Trump on the call?

A I don't recall.

Q I mean, other than the fact that, obviously, President Trump was a candidate in that election. But did he indicate whether President Trump had asked him to call or if he was calling on behalf of President Trump or anything like that?

A I don't recall.

Do you have any questions?

Nope. Thank you.

I have just one, Mr. Secretary. Did Senator Graham say where he was learning the information that he conveyed to you about various forms of signature matching?

Mr. Raffensperger. I don't recall.

And do you recall whether Senator Graham had any staff on the call?

Mr. Raffensperger. I don't believe he did.

Representative Cheney, do you have anything?

Ms. Cheney. I don't. Thank you.

Representative Kinzinger?
Mr. Kinzinger. No, sir. Thank you.

Representative Aguilar?

Mr. Aguilar. No, sir. Thank you.

Great.

Q So, as I said earlier, we will get to and go through in detail the calls from President Trump, one to a member of your staff, Frances Watson, one to you. Other than that call, did you have any other calls with Federal officials, whether White House, Member of Congress, anybody else that you can recall? And this is post-election, regarding the 2020 election.

A Post-election, the only conversation I recall is the Republican House Oversight Committee.

Q Okay. And we will get to that in a moment, so you don’t have to cover that right now.

A Okay.

Q Other than that, do you recall anything?

A No, I don’t recall anything.

Q Okay. Did you have any communication with anybody at the Department of Justice?

A Post-election, I don’t think I had any.

Q Okay. Anything pre-election, related to the election?

A No. I don’t recall. Other than Bobby Christine, the U.S. attorney from the Southern District, was on our Absentee Ballot Fraud Task Force --

Q Okay.

A -- along with several other members.
Q: Now, did you have any conversations with Mr. Christine about the security of the 2020 election?

A: No, not post-, not when he came up to Atlanta.

Q: Okay. And what about before he came up to Atlanta?

A: It was just, he was part of the Absentee Ballot Fraud Task Force. And we just, you know, we'd have Zoom calls or phone calls and just greet all the members on that, just talk about, this is what we're doing, just so they could be apprised of that.

Q: Okay.

A: We wanted everyone to have confidence in the security of the absentee ballot process, since we had expected a huge upsurge due to COVID-19.

Q: Now, you made reference to Mr. Christine coming up to Atlanta. I know what that means, but, just for the record, can you explain what happened there?

A: The U.S. attorney for the Northern District, B.J. Pak, resigned, and then Bobby Christine from the Southern District was appointed acting director for the Northern District, which is based out of Atlanta.

Q: And was U.S. attorney for both districts at the same time, as far as you know?

A: I believe so. Correct.

Q: And, aside from what you've already told us, did you work with either of their offices regarding any of these allegations of fraud involved in the 2020 elections?

A: Not the Department of Justice, but the FBI did come down to State Farm Arena, FBI agents, to investigate what really happened. You know, the video that came out, I don't know if you want to talk about that now, get ahead of myself, or --

Q: Go ahead. We'll end up going over it a little bit again when we get to your call with President Trump, but, sure, let's talk about it now.
Rudy Giuliani came down to a State Senate meeting, and he showed a video that had, I call it "sliced and diced." So he took portions out of sequence, and they projected a narrative that was not what happened at all.

And so that then commenced not just, you know, our investigative staff, but, also, we called it the GBI and also the FBI. So we had three sets of law enforcement eyes.

Exactly. They looked at the whole run of tape.

And, in a nutshell, there were no ballots, no absentee ballots, in those absentee ballot cases. Early in the morning, they were opened up, they observed, they were closed, zip tied, and then they were brought in and put underneath the table. And the reason that was is, if you don’t finish counting all your ballots, then you would then pull out those cases and put the uncounted ballots in there.

10:30 or so that day, they thought they were done, and so they started putting those ballots that they hadn’t counted in those ballots and then put them underneath the table. And then they get a call from headquarters that said, you aren’t done, you guys have to work here until 1 o’clock, or whatever time, but much later. So then they pulled those out, and they proceeded to keep on, you know, scanning and tabulating those ballots.

But Rudy Giuliani’s team took that out of sequence.

Q Before you get to that, I have a question. Did you personally review that videotape?

A No. I just -- portions of it. I haven’t watched the whole, you know, 24-hour run of that, but law enforcement has.

Q Someone did.

A Yes.

Q Did somebody from your office do that?
A Our investigators have, along with Georgia Bureau investigators. And, also, the Federal Bureau of Investigation sent agents to look at it.

Q Okay. And do you know what else they did? When you say they investigated it, it's all on tape. Was --

A Right.

Q -- there anything to the investigation other than just watching the tape?

A They said that there was nothing that happened that was illegal, that there was no ballot stuffing, no illegality, no double counting of ballots. And so we could verify that nothing happened, and it was something that was -- it was misinformation that got out there, and it was an urban legend.

Q Do you know whether law enforcement interviewed any witnesses or anything like that, or did they just watch the tape and that answered your question?

A Oh, they interviewed people that worked for Fulton County, the poll workers and precinct workers, also.

Q And when you say "they," is that GBI and FBI?

A Yes.

Q And do you know how the FBI got involved in this?

A No.

Q That's okay.

Okay. So I interrupted you. You were about to describe how -- I think your words were -- Mayor Giuliani "sliced and diced" the video. What did that mean?

A Well, he took what they were doing and they took the video out of sequence, so then it looked as if they were actually, you know, pulling ballots out of the table, hidden ballots. But they weren't hidden ballots; they were ballots just put in there, you know, moments or minutes earlier.
And so he spread disinformation, which got out there, you know, on cable news networks, the 7 o'clock, 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock, and 10 o'clock evening shows, that same run of video that was shown in the State Senate hearing.

Q And when you say "sliced and diced," does that just mean he showed video of them taking the boxes out but didn't show the video of them putting it in?

A Exactly. Exactly. It ended up that people got the wrong impression that something illegal had happened.

Q Okay.

And I'll probably turn to that hearing where Mayor Giuliani testified in a minute, but, before I do that, I just want to turn your attention to exhibit 4.

This is a letter dated November 23, 2020, from the law firm Smith & Liss, LLC, signed by Ray S. Smith III, Esquire. It says "for the President of the United States" there under his signature, and then the first line of the letter says "on behalf of President Donald J. Trump."

What did you understand Mr. Smith to be saying when he refers to himself as writing "on behalf of President Donald J. Trump" and then his signature "for the President of the United States"? Did you understand it to be in his capacity as a candidate or as his official capacity as President of the United States, or what did you understand that to mean?

A I interpreted that as Mr. Smith had been retained by the campaign, the President Trump campaign.

Q So, in the first paragraph, a little bit more than halfway through the first paragraph, it says, "Hundreds of thousands of Georgians voted via absentee ballot, and this information (and alleged signature matches) has yet to be thoroughly examined."

As of November 23, 2020, do you think that statement was accurate?
A No.

Q Why not?

A Because the counties did signature match during the absentee ballot application phase, as required by State law, and then they did signature match when the ballots came in. And that never ceased being the standard operating procedure, because it's State law, and the counties follow State law.

Q Okay.

So then, later on that page -- oh, I'll just note for the record that Representative Schiff has joined us.

Later on that page, under heading number 1, the first sentence says, "We respectfully request that your office conduct the audit of absentee ballot signature verifications."

So did your office or the counties conduct any kind of audit of absentee ballot signature verifications?

A As I stated earlier, we did one in Cobb County where we had a credible allegation, what appeared to be a credible allegation. And we found 2 out of the 15,000 were -- the spouse had signed the signature for their other spouse.

Q And was any kind of audit done of the absentee ballot signature verifications in any of the other counties, to your knowledge?

A None that I'm aware of.

Q Okay. Do you know why not?

A Because they followed the procedure of verifying the signatures when it came in. Once the ballots had been accepted, then the ballots had been accepted.

Q Okay.

Before I turn to the next exhibit, does anybody have a question
What happens to the envelopes in which the absentee ballots are sent? Are they discarded?

They are kept in storage. They are? Yeah.

So you, to this day, have both the envelope and the ballot itself? Yes.

Are they kept together?

No. They've been separated once you've, you know, scanned them. So you'd have all your envelopes in one stack in boxes, and then you have all the other, you know, absentee ballots. But the paper ballots, you know, are kept --

Right.

-- because that's the official ballot, and then the envelopes are kept also.

Okay.

And when we're -- the letter that [redacted] was just asking about that requests a signature match audit, it's your understanding that that's the signature on the envelope being matched to the ballot or the signatures on file that were required to be matched to generate the sending of the absentee ballot?

It's the -- for the application, it's the signature on file.

Right.

For the ballot, the ballot envelope, you know, that signature is matched to what is on file also.

Okay.
A So, every time a signature is provided to the county, they can scan that in. So they could have multiple signatures, so they can really look at, you know, five or six different signatures to verify that this is truly the voter who says it is.

Q And that's what happened in Cobb County?

A Correct.

Q All the signatures that were on file, the one on the ballot, and the envelope were all matched --

A Correct.

Q -- in that review process.

A Correct.

Q Okay. Thanks.

Do any of the members have questions?

Ms. Cheney. No, I don’t.

Mr. Schiff. I do not. Thank you.

Q So, Secretary Raffensperger, obviously, President Trump tweeted about you and your office several times. I’m going to go through a few of those tweets and give you a chance to respond. I’m not going to try to go through every single one of them. But, in general, were you following -- you or your office following what President Trump was saying about the work of your office?

A We would become aware of what President Trump would say, yes.

Q Okay. Before I go through the particular tweets, what was the reaction within your office to the tenor and content of the tweets from the President?

A When someone has 80 million Twitter followers and we have on a good day 40,000, it's very difficult with a match going up against a blowtorch.
Q Were people in your office upset at the President's comments?
A Inundated, because we had people -- citizens from all over the country were contacting our office, emailing us, sending postcards, or, you know, calling our office.
Q And were they getting threats?
A Yes.
Q So I'll turn your attention to a couple of these tweets at tab 5 in your binder. The first one -- well, both of these on this page are November 12, 2020. The first one says, "Must see @SeanHannity takedown of the horrible, inaccurate and anything but secure Dominion Voting System."
A As you've already said, Dominion Voting Systems was used in Georgia. Do you agree with the President's characterization there?
A No.
Q Why not?
A We did a 100 percent hand recount, and we verified the machines were accurate.
But, also, Dominion Voting Systems -- any system that we use in Georgia has to be certified by the United States Election Assistance Commission, which it was. And then we also did our own testing with Pro V&V before we put that into use. So we did our dome diagnostics and forensics before we used the machines.
Q Okay. And, as you said earlier, Dominion is not foreign-owned, correct?
A Correct. They're out of Colorado.
Q And you have no reason to believe that Venezuelan former dictator Hugo Chavez had any role in the creation of the software used by Dominion Voting Systems?
A I have no reason to believe that.
Q Okay.
The next tweet on the same page, again from then-President Donald Trump,
"REPORT: DOMINION DELETED 2.7 MILLION TRUMP VOTES NATIONWIDE."

Do you know what his basis was, if anything, for that number?

A  No idea.

Q  And then there’s reference to Pennsylvania, which is not your State, so I
won't make you address that. But then it says, "STATES USING DOMINION VOTING
SYSTEMS SWITCHED 435,000 VOTES FROM TRUMP TO BIDEN."

He doesn’t specify which States, but Georgia, as we discussed, is a State that used
Dominion. Is there any evidence suggesting that the Dominion Voting System switched
votes in Georgia from Trump to Biden?

A  Not in Georgia. We did a 100 percent hand recount. So I think the
evidence would show that the number would be zero.

Q  Okay. And do you know what the basis was for President Trump to say
435,000 votes were switched?

A  No idea.

Q  Okay.

And then, obviously, you know, you’re not responsible for what happens in other
States, but I would think in your capacity as secretary of state for Georgia, if there were
problems with Dominion Voting System machines in other States, that would be of
interest to you because that could impact Georgia. Are you aware of any votes in other
States being switched because of Dominion Voting Systems?

A  None.

Q  And do you communicate with other secretaries of state regarding problems
that are discovered?

A  We’re a member of the National Association of Secretaries of State. So we
get together for meetings and have conversations. So we look at best practices, and we see what other States are doing.

Q And, if another State had found widespread problems with Dominion Voting Systems, do you think they would've brought that to your attention?

A I think the entire world would've brought that to our attention.

Q Okay. Did you talk to secretaries of state from other States regarding Dominion Voting Systems?

A Not really so much. Kyle Ardoin is secretary of state of Louisiana; they use Dominion. He's now the president of NAS, the National Association of Secretaries of State. And so he faced some of these same issues that we did about the reliability of the machines, even though that State went, you know, 60/40 for President Trump.

Q Did he say whether he looked into those issues and, if so, what he found?

A No, I don't recall that, anything specific.

Q But I assume he did not say anything that would cause you to have --

A No.

Q -- a lack of confidence in Dominion?

A Correct.

Q And I know you've covered some of this before, but are the Dominion Voting Systems machines used in Georgia connected to the internet?

A No, they are not.

Q Okay.

To follow up on that, you said, Secretary Raffensperger, that they generate data onto a flash drive that is specific to that machine?

Mr. Raffensperger. Right.

They're not connected to each other or to some central source?
Mr. Raffensperger. Right. It's really just, you have two flash drives so that you have two sources. In case something happened to a flash drive, you'd always have a backup.

Yeah.

Q And could anybody have tampered with those flash drives?
A No.
Q I mean, is it something where somebody could've come in and switched out the flash drives?
A There would be a record of that on the forensic back end. And we did a forensic audit of the -- Pro V&V did a forensic audit of a sample size of the machines post-election.
Q And then, in addition to that, having the two flash drives for the machine, as you said earlier, there's then, of course, the paper record, which is the most reliable of all.
A Correct.
So they're really more like a calculator than a computer. In other words --
Mr. Raffensperger. Correct.
-- they sort of tabulate stuff just within that individual box, that machine, but do not, like a computer, connect to other boxes or other machines.
Mr. Raffensperger. Correct. It's an adding machine.
Yeah.
Q Is there any way that they could be hacked?
A They haven't been.
Q I mean, if they're not connected to the internet --
A They're not connected to the internet.
Q -- is there any way that you can think of where that could happen, where
they could be hacked?
A The machines are secured, and they're always, you know, identified that you
have security, you know, tape on it, you know, so that you know that, if you broke it,
broke the seal, that someone could've been in there. And so there was never any
evidence of that that we are aware of.
Q Okay.

Any members have questions so far?
Mr. Schiff. I do not. Thank you.
Great.

Q So let's turn your attention to exhibit 6 now in your binder. This one, at the
top, it says, "Administration of Donald J. Trump, 2020, Remarks During a Video
Teleconference With United States Servicemembers and Exchange With Reporters,
November 26, 2020."
He says at the beginning, "Happy Thanksgiving," so this appears to be President
Trump's Thanksgiving address to servicemembers. And there were reporters there.
There's, you know, a lengthy discussion of, you know, thanking the troops, which I won't
cover.

But I would turn your attention to page 6, and about three-quarters of the way
down the page there's a question. Question: "Mr. President, do you have any big
plans for your last Thanksgiving at the White House?"
You can see, then, the reference to it being the last Thanksgiving at the
White House prompted the President to make extensive remarks about the 2020 elections.

So, at the bottom of page 6, the last paragraph there:  "Nobody wants to see the kind of fraud that this election has really come to represent. We are looking at things that are so bad in Georgia. They don't want to show us signatures. The reason they don't want to show us signatures is very simple: because we will find thousands and thou- -- it's a very close race; it's hair-thin -- but we'll find thousands and thousands of discrepancies, fraud."

So, first of all, is it true that your office would not show signatures? And, if so, what does that mean?

A  What President Trump was requesting in his previous letters was, he wanted us to do an investigation for all these counties on signature match. And there was no credible evidence that signature match was not done at both the application phase and when the ballot came in, you know, from these counties.

The only credible allegation that we had -- at the time, it appeared to be credible -- was Cobb County, and we did a study. And it showed that 2 out of the 15,000, you know -- this one spouse had signed the signature for the other, one because they were incapacitated and the other one because they hadn't done it before and just made a mistake. But that was the extent of it.

Q  So, then, at the top of the next page, page 7 -- and it's not always easy to tell what he's referring to, but it sounds like he's still talking about Georgia -- the President says, "Why they aren't wanting to show those signatures is amazing. They're doing recounts. And even in the recount, they found thousands of votes that were off."

Is that true?

A  No. In one of your earlier exhibits, you saw that we had less than 2,000.
think it was really about -- I can get my calculator out and we can get you that number,
but --

Q That's okay.

A -- it didn't -- nowhere near significant enough to change the outcome of the race.

Q And then he continues, "But now we want to look at the signatures. And you will find tens of thousands of false ballots, fraud -- forged ballots."

Q Is there any basis for that statement?

A None that we could find.

Q And, then, at the top of page 8, this is much later -- but I guess, before I get to that, I'll just say on the record, at the bottom of page 7, the President makes reference again to Georgia.

Then, going to the top of page 8, where it sounds like he's talking about Georgia still: "But you're going to find out, the people that signed aren't the people that are supposed to be signing. You're going to find that the people that signed those envelopes -- they didn't do the ballots. Envelopes. And then, somebody said, 'Maybe the envelopes were thrown out.'"

Q Do you know what the President was referring to there?

A No.

Q Okay. Were envelopes thrown out?

A No, none to my record. But if we get to the call that I had with the President, he alleged that there was destruction of evidence, and Ryan Germany, our general counsel, responded in that phone call.

Q Okay. Do you know whether there were some blank, unused envelopes that were thrown out somewhere as part of just a routine cleaning-up process?
A There was in Cobb County, and I know in Fulton County --

Q Okay.

A -- you know, may have ordered additional ballots. Fulton County just is in
the process of getting rid of theirs from last November's election, but Cobb County was
doing some housecleaning and there was a question about that. But they were not
ballots from the November race.

Q And Representative Raskin has joined us.

So, then, on page 8, the President says, "So, you know, Dominion is also partially
based in Canada, but it's based in other countries too." Do you know if that's accurate?

A Their headquarters is Colorado, and I believe that they're owned by a private
equity company based out of New York City.

Q Okay. And so, as secretary of state of Georgia, where you'd obviously be
concerned with election security, if it turns out that Dominion also does business in
Canada, does that cause you any concern?

A Coca-Cola does business in other countries.

Q So, a little bit later, I guess the next paragraph, the President says, "So think
of it: They're based in Canada, and Canada refuses to use them. They're smart. They
use paper ballots, because paper ballots are the only thing -- frankly, the only thing that
really you're going to get an accurate tab on, because those machines are fixed."

So, first of all, in Georgia, you did use paper ballots, didn't you?

A Correct.

Q And then he says, "They're rigged. You can press 'Trump' and the vote goes
to Biden. All you have to do is play with a chip and it's down -- it's shown all the time."

Do you have any idea what he's talking about there?

A No, I don't.
Okay. Is it accurate to say that you can play with a chip and that can somehow change the vote from Trump to Biden?

We have not seen any proof of that.

Okay.

On page 11, sort of in the middle of the page, President Trump, still talking about the 2020 election, says, "It wasn't the machinery. And, by the way, the machinery, if you look -- just take a look anywhere on the internet; you will see many, many people where they're experimenting with this stupid machinery -- where, if you set it a certain way, the votes go from Trump to Biden."

Do you have any idea what the President was talking about there?

No.

I mean, is it even possible for the machines to have been switching votes from Trump to Biden?

Not as they were used in the State of Georgia.

Okay.

At the bottom of page 12, the President says, "I mean, we're in courts. We are in courts, but we're also in front of legislatures, and we're doing very well in front of the States."

Do you know what he was referring to about the State legislatures there?

On page 12?

Yeah. Page 12, near the bottom. The President says, "I mean, we're in courts. We're in courts, but we're also in front of legislatures, and we're doing very well in front of the States."

I don't know what he means by that.

Okay. Do you know whether he was referring to any efforts to get State
legislatures to send alternate electors to the electoral college?

A I don't recall what efforts were made, if any, in the State of Georgia for that.

Q Okay.

On 13, the third paragraph, "But I told them today, I said: Listen, you have a fraudulent system. You have a system where the flick of a switch or the putting in of a new chip could change the course of history, and you have to be very careful."

I know this is similar to the question I asked earlier. Is there any kind of switch that could be flicked or chip that can be changed that would change the outcome of the election?

A Not that I'm aware of.

Q Okay.

The next paragraph: "I read this morning where Stacey Abrams has 850,000 ballots accumulated. Now, that's called 'harvesting.'"

To your knowledge, did that happen in the November 2020 election?

A Not to my knowledge.

Q Are you aware of any evidence that Stacey Abrams was harvesting ballots in 2020?

A Not 850,000 ballots.

Q Okay.

A I don't know where he got that number from.

Q Okay.

A I don't know where that--

Q Was there evidence that she was harvesting ballots at all?

A No, not that we could find.

Q Okay.
He continues, "You're not allowed to harvest, but I understand the secretary of state, who is really -- he's an enemy of the people, the secretary of state."

Sounds like he's referring to you there. I'll give you a chance to respond. Are you, in fact, an enemy of the people?

A No.

Q Okay. Do you know what he's referring to there?

A What part?

Q The referring to you as being an enemy of the people.

A I think he, somewhere in life, has this learned behavior that if he attacks people, makes up stuff, and disparages them that he'll get what he wants.

Q Did he, with you?

A No.

Q Why not?

A Because I love my country, and I will follow the Constitution.

Q What do you think he --

A I'll follow the law, and I'll respect every single American who has ever given his life, who has died for this country. And that's what I'll stand for. I'll stand for the truth.

Q What do you think he wanted you to do?

A You'd have to interview him and ask what his intentions were.

Q Okay. Well, we might be interested in that. But we're going to get to your call with him a little later during this interview, so maybe I'll ask you then about some of the specific things that he was asking for there.

But, going back to this transcript of his remarks, a couple sentences later, he says, again, on page 13, "Supposedly he," referring to you, "made a deal -- and you will have to
check this -- where she's," referring to Stacey Abrams, "allowed to harvest, but in other areas they're not allowed."

Is that true?

A  No.  It's absolutely false.

Q  Okay.  That's all I have on that.

Does anybody else have a question about this exhibit?

Yeah.

Just, were you aware, Secretary Raffensperger, that some of this stuff that the President referenced in the speech was also proliferating on the internet, was published on certain websites?  In other words, do you have any sense that this was repeating some of the sort of scurrilous, false allegations that others, noncredible sources, had put forth on the internet?

Mr. Raffensperger.  Uh-huh.  Yes.

Okay.  In other words, when you're reviewing this today, this is not the only time you've heard it; it has been repeated on other sources on the internet.

Mr. Raffensperger.  Correct.

Got it.  Okay.

Do any members have questions?

No?  Okay.

And if at any point you want to take a lunch break, just speak up.  We're happy to work with whatever --

Mr. Raffensperger.  I'm good.

Mr. Sharman.  Maybe we could take a little break in a little while, but let's keep moving.

I'll keep going then for a while.
Q So, if I could turn your attention to exhibit 7, this is another tweet from then-President Trump, dated December 12, 2020.

He starts off, "Who is a worse governor, @BrianKempGA of Georgia or @dougducey of Arizona??" I'm not going to make you answer that question.

He continues, "These are two RINO," R-I-N-O, "Republicans who fought against me and the Republican Party harder than any Democrat. They allowed states that I won easily to be stolen. Never forget, vote them out of office!"

Do you believe that President Trump won Georgia in the 2020 election?

A No.

Q And do you believe that Governor Kemp or you allowed the State of Georgia to be stolen?

A No.

Q So, if I could turn your attention to exhibit 8, this is entitled, "Secretary Raffensperger Announces Completion of Voting Machine Audit Using Forensic Techniques: No Sign of Foul Play."

Is this a press release or a statement from your office?

A Both. It's our announcement and a press release.

Q Okay. Is there a date on this? I don't see a date.

Yeah, the date doesn't seem to appear with the press release on the website, but my understanding is that it was issued around November 17. Does that sound correct to you?

Mr. Raffensperger. Sounds about the right timeframe.

Q So, based on the text in here, which I'm not going to read the whole thing
into the record, but it's referring to the Pro V&V audit, I guess it would be called.

What is Pro V&V, and what did they find?

A Pro V&V is the company that we retained to do a forensic audit of the equipment that was used. We selected equipment from Cobb, Douglas, Floyd, Morgan, Paulding, and Spalding Counties, and we just verified the accuracy of the machines. So it was a forensic audit of the actual equipment to prove that it accurately recorded the votes as selected by the voters.

Q What was the point of that, given that there was also a statewide hand recount?

A This is just a, I guess you could say, belts and suspenders, but just -- this is the actual to verify the accuracy of the machines. So you did an audit of a relevant sample size to prove that the machines were accurate. So a scientific analysis.

Q Okay. And what did Pro V&V find?

A That there was no -- that all the software and firmware on the sample machines were verified to be in full compliance and accurate.

Q And then you say there in the second-to-last paragraph, "Coupled with the risk-limiting audit of all paper ballots relying solely on the printed text of the ballots, these steps confirmed the assessment of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency that there are no signs of cyber attacks or election hacking."

Could you explain what the assessment was by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, which you can feel free to refer to as "CISA" if that makes any difference?

A Yeah, CISA reviews -- they're looking at all sorts of threat vectors, both foreign and domestic, of any kind of cyber attacks that could come in through a backdoor that somehow could affect the operation of your election, either the equipment itself or
So this Pro V&V forensic audit backed up what CISA's finding was, and so we can state to the people of Georgia that the machines and the systems were secure, cybersecure.

Q Okay. What was CISA's finding?
A That there were no foreign or domestic cyber attacks that affect the outcome in the State of Georgia.

Q And was the CISA assessment specific to Georgia?
A They do nationwide, but they look at every single State. And we had representatives with them on election night looking at any kind of threats that would come in through the internet or other areas. So DHS and CISA typically were showing up on our election dates.

Q Okay. And just for the record, CISA is part of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.
A Correct.

Q Did you have any interactions with anybody at CISA regarding the November 2020 election?
A Other than election night I saw them and we knew who they were. And they would then correspond, really, with our elections division and have, you know, conversations to make sure that we were aware of any potential threats.

Q So when you say you saw them, did they have people physically --
A They had people physically there.

Q Where?
A We met at the Georgia GMA headquarters. And that's where we monitored the elections for the State of Georgia on election night.
Q Did you have any communications with Chris Krebs, who at the time was the head of CISA?

A No, not until, you know, post- his termination.

Q Okay. Tell us about that while we’re on the topic. What communication did you have with Mr. Krebs after his termination?

A Just, I wished him all the best.

Q Was this a phone call or --

A I believe it was a phone call. But he got terminated because he said we had an honest and fair election in the State of Georgia.

Q And did he tell you anything about his understanding of why he was terminated?

A I don't recall that, but I think President Trump was quite clear on why he was terminated.

Q In a tweet?

A In a tweet.

Did anybody else have anything on this?
[12:02 p.m.]

Q  Mr. Secretary, "hack" implies some sort of internet-based intrusion, or at least that's how I've always understood it. But if I understood you earlier, you said these machines were not connected to the internet.

A  Right.

Q  It specifically says in the press release that what Pro V&V did -- and I'm looking here at the third paragraph from the bottom -- "extracted the software or firmware from the components to check that the only software or firmware on the components was certified for use by the Secretary of State's Office."

So, in other words, they weren't looking for external intrusions. They were looking for flaws in the actual --

A  Right.

Q  -- software that was installed in the, in your term before, adding machines.

A  Right. To make sure it was -- that the results are accurate, that nothing had happened since they had been certified prior to use.

Q  Right. So there was nothing that had happened to the stuff inside those machines that was any different than what -- the condition they were in before the election.

A  Correct.

Q  Okay. I just want to make sure I understood sort of what a forensic audit was and what it wasn't. That's helpful. Thank you.

BY

Q  Mr. Raffensperger, we've discussed already the results of your hand tally of
the election. Do you recall when that was completed?

A  No, I don't remember the date.

Q  Does November 19th sound about right?

A  That would be about right.

Q  And then the most recent press release we just looked at was on

November 17th, the conclusion of the Pro V&V audit --

A  November 17th?

Q  -- forensic audit.

A  Okay.

Q  Does that sound right to you?

A  I guess. It's been a year -- over a year.

Q  And then -- so the information that President Trump, that went over in that press conference that Mr. -- that President -- then President Trump was
discussing about Dominion Voting Systems, was that information about the Pro V&V audit
already publicly released at the time that the President made those comments?

A  Yes, it was.

Q  And was your office doing regular press conferences discussing

misinformation that was available on the internet about Dominion Voting Systems at that
time?

A  Yes.

Q  Okay.

Do any members have questions?

Mr. Kinzinger. I'm good. Thank you.

BY

Q  So, before I turn to the next exhibit, we've gone through several of the
President's tweets already, as well as the, you know, public statement on Thanksgiving.

Did any of this affect your or your office's ability to do your job?

A We just continue to do our job.

Q Okay. Did it affect morale?

A I think, for many of the people, yes.

Q In what way?

A Well, they were fielding the field calls, the phone calls, and they were also fielding the emails, texts that would have come into our office, the staff members. So they were, you know, having to listen to these people.

And it was just a cavalcade of information -- disinformation -- that was coming in. People were fed a lot of mistruths and falsehoods. And so it made it, you know, tough for them. But it also made it tough for our county election directors.

Q Okay. And it sounds like, from what I've read, Gabriel Sterling was affected by this and did some kind of press conference or statement on December 1st. Do you recall that?

A Which conference was that one?

Q This is the one where -- I guess I would characterize it as he was -- Mr. Sterling was sort of passionately pleading with President Trump to condemn the dangerous rhetoric and stop undermining the integrity of the election.

A That was December 1st. Okay.

Q Okay. Just tell us how that came about, the press conference that is.

A My deputy called me and --

Q So that's Jordan Fuchs?

A Jordan Fuchs called me and said, Gabriel Sterling wants to -- in his press conference, wants to talk about what happened in Gwinnett County. You know, an
election worker was threatened, and he just -- he wants to talk about that.

And so I said, Okay. And so he did.

Q Then, in general, how would you characterize his statements?

A I didn't realize that Gabe would come with so much passion and conviction and truth, and it needed to be said. And I don't know if I could have really had, you know, done such a fine job as Gabe did, because this gentleman in Gwinnett County had a weird last name, like I do, so it's easy to find him, but also find his parents. And he was just doing his job, and he wasn't doing anything wrong.

But someone not understanding the process attributed, you know, false motives to this person, bad motives to this person, and then sent him a noose, you know. You know, he -- the character of a noose, and as, in fact, a threat.

And then they went after his parents. And that's when Gabe Sterling said: This needs to stop, and we need leadership. We need to have people stand up and be counted, to do the right thing.

Q And do you recall what he said specific to President Trump?

A I'd have to read it again, but it was really about be -- to become a leader and to stand on truth. And I fully support the statements he made that day. And, sadly, he was prophetic.

Q Explain that.

A Because people did die. And I think it's very sad when people die for whatever reason.

Q Are you referring to January 6th, or when --

A Yes.

Q And so, when you say people did die, it sounds like you're drawing a connection between something President Trump did or failed to do and what happened
on January 6th. Can you explain that?

A Well, I think that people were spun up to just believing the lies that were
told to them, and things got out of control. And it's just one of those hinge points in
American history.

Q How do you think the lies, as you called them, contributed to people getting
spun up and then ultimately attacking the Capitol?

A People -- we tend to believe our people in leadership, or we want to believe,
and we could not respond quick enough or with a broad enough, you know, bullhorn to
get it out that every allegation that's been made, we've checked it out, and it's not
supported by what -- and the facts do not support what you've alleged.

Q Did Mr. Sterling's pleas to the President of the United States to change his
behavior succeed in any way as far as you could tell?

A As far as I could tell, I don't believe it changed anything.

Q Okay. What do you mean by that?

A We still had the information, misinformation, disinformation, and falsehoods
put out there, continue to be repeated.

Q So if you look at exhibit 9, there are two tweets from then President Trump.
The first one is December 1st, 2020, at 10:27 p.m. So I believe that's later the same day
that Gabriel Sterling made his public comments.

And President Trump tweeted: "Rigged Election. Show signatures and
envelopes. Expose the massive voter fraud in Georgia. What is Secretary of State and
@BrianKempGA afraid of? They know what we'll find!!!"

So, based on that tweet, do you think that President Trump changed his behavior
or tone in light of Mr. Sterling's comments?

A Well, I don't know if he heard what Gabe Sterling really had to say that day
either. I assume the President's a busy person.

Q  But is it safe to say that, whether he heard what Gabe Sterling said or not, the President's tone did not improve from your perspective?

A  It was more of the same.

Q  And then December 4th -- this is on the same page -- President Trump tweeted, in all caps:  RIGGED ELECTION! Would you describe that as more of the same?

A  As it relates to Georgia, yes.

Q  Okay. Then is it correct that your office certified the results of a statewide recount on December 7th?

A  Is that the recount?  Is that --

A  It should be.

A  Do you know if that's correct?  Did you certify the --

Mr. Raffensperger.  I know we certified it.  I don't recall what date it was.

A  Okay.

A  Would it be helpful to refer to your book at any point here?

Mr. Sharman.  What page?

A  You're welcome to, 148.

A  Yes.  I will be happy to direct you to page 148.

A  Yeah.  This is not meant to be a memory test today.

A  Yeah.  We know that you've spoken about this in writing.

Mr. Raffensperger.  Yes, it was December 7th.

A  Okay. And then I think this is on page 148 of your book, and I think this is quoting you at a press conference.  Yes.

A  You write in the book, at a capitol press conference, I said -- and then it's
quote -- "It's been a long 34 days since the election on November 3rd. We've now counted legally cast ballots three times, and the results remain unchanged. Continuing to make debunked claims of stolen elections is hurting our State," close quote.

How is it hurting your State?

Mr. Raffensperger. It's not a positive image. Georgia has been priding ourselves ever since probably following World War II of we're open for business, you know, we want people, corporations to come to Georgia, we have a healthy business climate. We want people to think that things are quiet in Georgia, everything's peaceful. Come on down, invest in Georgia. Grow your business, grow your families. And so those narratives just aren't good for business.

As far as you can tell, did your certification of the election results change any of the criticisms from the President?

Mr. Raffensperger. Not to my knowledge.

Do you have --

I don't, no.

Do the members have any questions at this point? No.

So next I want to go --

Do you want to -- is it a good time for a break or --

Yeah. Do you want a break?

Mr. Sharman. We'll see.

Mr. Raffensperger. Well, we can go for a few more.

Mr. Sharman. Yeah, go --

Go a few more? Okay.

Mr. Sewell. I was just watching the clock, and that's all.

At least another 15 minutes or so.
Q So now let me ask you some questions about some of the hearings before the State legislature that you referred to earlier.

So, as I understand, on December 3rd, 2020, there were two hearings in the State legislature. In the morning, there was a hearing before the State senate Government Affairs Committee. And this is discussed in your book at pages 135 to 140. And I think you indicate there that Gabe Sterling, Ryan Germany, and Chris Harvey from your office participated.

First of all, why did those three participate?

A Chris Harvey was our State election director. Gabriel Sterling was the implementation manager.

Q And Ryan Germany?

A And Ryan Germany is our general counsel.

Q And what were their respective roles at the hearing, if you can recall?

A To answer any questions. But if it's a question related to the law, then Ryan Germany would be best positioned to answer that. Related to implementation of exactly -- you know, any question they had about -- with the count, Gabriel Sterling and really Chris Harvey could have answered those questions.

Q What did you understand the purpose of the hearing to be?

A Well, there had been so many allegations of fraud, of miscounting, all those, you know, the State Farm Arena, and so it was really to, you know, answer the senators' questions.

Q And, in general, what did those three members of your staff tell the committee?
A Well, they answered the questions point by point. So they answered the
questions about the absentee ballot drop box. They answered about the machines not
being connected to the internet, that the scanner did the scanning of the ballots, and
then you'd press tabulation. It was just really to explain the processes of this -- of -- it
was a fact-based meeting with fact-based questions.

Q All right. And then there was an afternoon hearing in front of the State
senate Judiciary -- or at least a subcommittee of the State senate Judiciary Committee.
Do you recall whether anybody from your office participated in that?

A No. We weren't asked to be there. And so statements were made. No
one was signed in, took an oath, sworn testimony. So they were basically -- my opinion
of this was that people could say whatever they wanted to because they were not having
to put their hand on a Bible to swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
the truth so help them God. And so they made stuff up.

Q And do you remember who testified at that hearing?

A Rudy Giuliani.

Q Anybody else that you recall?

A That's the one that I recall the most.

Q Okay. Do you know if it's unusual for a witness to testify and not be sworn
in?

A The general assembly does that a fair bit.

Q Did you watch Mayor Giuliani's testimony?

A No.

Q Okay. But you're familiar with it?

A I'm familiar with it.

Q Okay. So we talked earlier about the video with what Mayor Giuliani
referred to as suitcases filled with ballots. So were those, in fact, suitcases?

A No. They were ballot boxes.

Q And can you describe what those ballot boxes looked like and how they were secured, if at all?

A They're large, you know, plastic containers for storing absentee ballot boxes -- for storing absentee ballots that have not been, you know, scanned yet, so that you could then put them in the box for overnight storage and secure them, you know, with a seal.

Q And based on the videotape, is it your understanding that those boxes were, in fact, sealed?

A They were sealed.

Q Mayor Giuliani, I believe, also said that poll watchers were asked to leave. Do you know if that's correct?

A They weren't asked to leave. At around 10:30 or so, Fulton County, at that State Farm Arena, thought that they were going to be done for the day. They knew that. They looked at their stack of ballots and said: We're not going to be done here, we might as well just knock off and come back tomorrow.

And so that's when the poll watchers that both political parties had, Democrat and Republican, and other observers, left, because they thought they were done for the day, and the poll workers thought they were done for the day.

They get a call from Rick Barron, the Fulton County election director. He said: No, you guys need to keep on, you know, working until at least, you know, much later, like 1 o'clock or so.

And so they were the only ones there for about a 40-minute period until our monitor, Carter Jones, got back there, along with one of our investigators.
Q And I think you explained this earlier, but was all of that captured on videotape?

A Yes, it was.

Q So I'm going to ask you a question that I don't think I've ever asked a witness before, but was there a leaky toilet?

A Early in the morning -- this had nothing to do with State Farm Arena -- but early in the morning, the water had been turned off because they weren't using State Farm Arena because of COVID-19. When they turned it back on, there was -- one of the valves leaked. And that was the extent of the -- all of that had been cleaned up by 9 o'clock in the morning. It didn't affect anything at State Farm. So it was just part of the urban legend, the misinformation that was put out there.

Q And was the urban legend or misinformation that there, instead of being a leaky toilet, had been a water main break?

A They mentioned it was a water main break, but there wasn't a water main break.

Q Okay. What was this rumor -- according to this rumor, what was the impact of a water main break, if any?

A They were implying that ballots had gotten wet, and nothing like that had happened, and so it was just something that was spun up again.

Q Okay. And then I think Mayor Giuliani said that ballots had been scanned after the media and partisan observers left. Do you know what that refers to, or is that what you already described?

A Because that's -- because they went back, they pulled the ballots back out, and they continued their process. And, at that time, you didn't have partisan political,
Democrat or Republican, observers there, or anyone else were there.

So for that time, until we got our person back, one of our investigators, and also Carter Jones, there is that 40- to 50-minute window. And that’s why the FBI and the GBI came in and interviewed the people that were working that night and also saw the whole run of tape to verify that nothing illegal had happened.

Q So what’s your view of Mayor Giuliani’s allegations overall?
A They’re not supported by the facts.
Q And did your office make any effort to respond to him?
A We responded out there. We had WSB -- I talked to WSB. A WSB investigative reporter sat down with both Gabriel Sterling and also with Frances Watson, looked at the whole run of tape. We did a press release. We got information out there.

But it’s the next day, and, meanwhile that had aired on, you know, some cable news networks at 7 o’clock, 8 o’clock, 9 o’clock, and 10 o’clock. And no one ever called us to find out was any of this true.

Q And when you say it aired, was that because Mayor Giuliani testified publicly and then the media picked up his testimony where he showed --
A Correct.
Q -- a videotape?
A Right.
Q Okay. And then my understanding is that Mayor Giuliani testified again on December 10th at another State legislative hearing. I think you discuss this at page 150 of your book.

Based on your book, it sounds like your office declined to participate in that hearing. Do you recall why?
When you've already had someone come to Georgia, make all sorts of false statements, disinformation, misinformation, however you want to characterize it, and then you invite them back, we didn't see the value in participating in that type of a meeting.

Okay. And was there also litigation going on at the time?

Oh, there was litigation going on also.

Did the litigation have any impact on your office's willingness to participate?

It would -- if we sent someone, we would have sent our general counsel, because when you are in a period of litigation, you want to be very legally cognizant of what you say and what you don't say.

And do you remember what Mayor Giuliani said at this hearing to the extent it may have differed from what he said at the December 3rd hearing?

I don't remember specifically what he said on the -- to the Georgia House of Representatives.

So, following the hearing, Georgia State House Speaker David Ralston called for eliminating the independently elected secretary of state.

Can you tell us a little bit about what you think prompted that and what your reaction was to it?

He was upset that I didn't show up to his committee hearing.

And did you agree with his proposal?

No.

Why not?

The secretary of state had been a constitutional officer going all the way back to some of the earliest constitutions we had in the State of Georgia. I think the secretary of state is -- best serves the people if they're held accountable to the people
and they’re on the ballot as a constitutional officer.

It also provides us the independence to make sure that we are at all times following the law and following the constitution.

Q Now, is it correct that the State legislature of Georgia ultimately ended up removing you, or specifically your position of secretary of state, from being chair and voting member of the State Election Board?

A That's true.

Q Can you explain what that means?

A They removed me as chair. And I really should say they removed the secretary of state as chair of the State Election Board.

Going back, as far back as we can go in time, the secretary of state has always chaired the State Election Board, be they Democrat or Republican.

So now they will be appointing -- the General Assembly will appoint -- someone recommend an appointment to the Governor, who then will agree to that appointment or not.

But it’s really a legislative process. And the secretary of state is ex officio, nonvoting member of that.

Q Do you have any views as to why the State legislature did that?

A Petty retribution on behalf of the speaker of the house.

Q Retribution for what?

A I think it probably would go back to when I sent out the absentee ballot applications early in the year. I think that the speaker was concerned that that would actually encourage more people to vote. And I stated that during a pandemic I would make sure that people always had the opportunity to vote. And there may have been other reasons, but we'll never know. You'd have to ask him.
Mr. Sharman. Would this be a convenient time to take a break or --

Could I just ask a couple quick questions --

Yeah. If there are questions on this, if any members have questions, and then we can take a break.

Q I just want to go back quickly to the State senate hearings. I think you testified, Secretary Raffensperger, that it was after Mr. Giuliani's testimony that the GBI and the FBI investigated the allegations about the State Farm Arena. Is that -- that's the sequence? That hearing comes first?

A I believe that's the sequence, yes.

Q Okay. We've had testimony from another witness that the Giuliani testimony actually got the attention of Federal authorities, including Attorney General Barr.

Did you ever personally have any contact with the Attorney General of the United States or anyone in the Department of Justice about the State Farm Arena issue?

A Not me, no. I don't recall.

Q We've seen some email communication between the U.S. attorney at the time, Mr. Pak, and FBI agents about investigating the State Farm Arena allegations that Mr. Giuliani referenced.

Again, did you have any communication with Mr. Pak or with anybody in the FBI about those specific allegations?

A No. I didn't have any conversations with them.

Q Okay. I believe the outcome of that communication was essentially a joint investigation where the FBI and the GBI, the Georgia Bureau of Investigation --

A Right.
Q -- together looked at the tape and interviewed some people. Do you remember them working together?

A Yes. It was a -- both of them had agents there at the same time.

Q Exactly. FBI agents in Georgia, GBI agents together, literally in the same room, spoke to some of the election workers who were involved?

A Correct.

Q Okay. And the outcome of that joint investigation, I think you testified, was that there was nothing nefarious, that those -- there was not a suitcase of ballots that were double counted or miscounted.

A Correct.

Q It was all proven to be done consistently with -- done consistently with State law.

A Correct.

Q Okay. But, again, you had no idea how the Federal authorities came to be involved in that? That was -- that all happened separate from --

A Yeah.

Q -- your office?

A Yeah. They're an independent organization.

Q Yeah. Okay.

That's all I had. Thank you.

Anybody else?

BY

Q Is it fair to say, Mr. Raffensperger, that you don't agree with the legislature's change in removing the secretary of state as the chair of the State Elections Board?

A That is fair, because I've been very clear on that matter.
Q  Yeah. And what are your concerns about it?
A  I've never supported, when I was in the State House, unelected boards,
commissions, and authority having a lot of sway and influence. I always believed that,
whenever you can have people accountable to the voters, then that's really the best
thing.

And I think something, you know, as significant as the chair of the State Election
Board, I think that's really good. If you don't like the ruling when the State Election
Board is chaired by an elected official, then who do you hold accountable? There is 100
State -- 180 State reps, and there is 56 State senators, and everyone will just be pointing
fingers at the other person. In effect, you're creating Washington, D.C., politics here in
Georgia.

And so, when you have a secretary of state that's accountable to voters, they
know who they can hold accountable, and I think accountability is a good thing. I always
believe in it, always will.

Thank you.
Do any members have questions?
Mr. Schiff. I do not. Thank you.
Ms. Cheney. I don't. Thanks, [silence]
Okay. Well, let's go off the record, then.
[Recess.]
[1:40 p.m.]

It looks like we have Representatives Cheney, Aguilar, and Raskin on right now.

Q So, Secretary Raffensperger, you referenced earlier a call that either you or your staff had with the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Reform. Can you tell us about that?

A The House members of the Oversight Committee wanted to have a conversation, and so we had a conversation. I, first of all, opened it up and let them know -- let them know where we were in Georgia.

And I think what was really revealing is that I mentioned that we kept signature match at the application phase, we kept signature match at the ballot phase, because later one of the House members was asking of General Counsel Ryan Germany, you were counting what?

And so he started asking -- drilling down and asking questions, because he, I guess because of the national narrative, thought that we didn't have signature match. And so it was an opportunity really to clarify.

And it was at that point where I also did remind them that, when the House was controlled by the Republicans, the Senate, and we also had the Presidency, we did not do a single piece of election reform legislation.

Q And why was that important to tell them?

A Because I think they need to be aware that they didn't do anything when they had the opportunity to do something, and perhaps, from my perspective as a State secretary of state, one of the biggest issues we have is Federal legislation that, during the
election cycle of 2020, we, in effect, can't update our voter roll for the whole year, because we can't update our voter roll 90 days before an election.

But when you have a Presidential primary, then you roll into a June primary with a June runoff, then you run into the November election, then have you a November runoff, you, in effect, after about January, end of January, you're precluded for updating the voter rolls.

And the reason that's important is that, with 5 million -- or 7 million, 7.5 million active voters, and Pew saying that 11 percent of all people in America move every year, that's 800,000 people that have moved over the course of the year, and you're trying to make sure you have clean, updated voter rolls.

So just wanted to clarify that for them, and other issues.

Q So moving on from that, did anybody communicate with you about a proposal to have the State legislature of Georgia send an alternate slate of electors?

A I don't recall that.

Q Can you explain how that works as far as who selects the electors and certifies them?

A Generally, it's the political parties would have -- the State Republican Party would have their slate of electors, the State Democrat Party, and presumably someone with the Libertarian Party. And then the party that carries the State of Georgia -- in this case, it's the, you know, Vice President Biden -- then he was -- would be awarded the slate and those electoral votes.

Q And is that provided by either the State constitution or State statute?

A That's State statute. And I don't know if it's constitution or statute. It gets into a legal issue, and I'm an engineer, but it's really the process of following the law that we have. And so, when the election was certified by our office, then Governor
Kemp, that, you know, Joseph R. Biden carried the State of Georgia, then the electors would be Democrat electors.

Q And under the then existing law, could the State legislature have sent an alternate slate of electors?

A I think that goes to a legal question, but I would -- I would say no.

Q Did you ever have any communications with Rudy Giuliani?

A No.

Q Okay. Jenna Ellis?

A No.

Q John Eastman?

A No.

Q Do you know whether anybody, either President Trump himself or anybody on behalf of President Trump or his campaign, reached out to members of the Georgia State Legislature to encourage them to hold a special session to consider appointing an alternate slate of electors?

A I'm not aware of any of that.

Q Did you ever talk to Governor Kemp about his communications with President Trump?

A No.

Q Did you have conversations with Governor Kemp about the fraud allegations related to the 2020 election?

A None that I can recall.

Q Okay.

And I'll pause here. Does anybody, any member, have any questions before I move on?
So you mentioned earlier that there were several lawsuits related to the 2020 election. What was the role of your office in defending against those lawsuits?

A Our job is to defend the laws of Georgia. So, if there is a lawsuit, we would defend it.

Q Okay. But the Attorney General's Office, I take it, would handle --

A The Attorney General's Office --

Mr. Sharman. Let him get his question out.

Q Would the Attorney General's Office handle the litigation itself?

A Correct.

Q And what would be the role of the Secretary of State's Office?

A We would, if it required information, investigations, we would provide all that information.

Q Okay. Do you recall roughly how many lawsuits were filed challenging the results of the 2020 election in Georgia?

A In the order of about 10.

Q Okay. Did any of them succeed?

A No.

Q Did, in your opinion, did any of them have any merit?

A None of them had any merit.

Q And when you said they didn't succeed, what -- without going through each one of them individually -- what were the outcomes of those cases?

A Lack of standing in many cases, and then just not supported by any facts.

Q And were some of them just outright dropped?

A And some were dropped at the end, withdrawn.
Q Okay. Did the President or his legal team in any way misrepresent what was happening in those cases?

And, if you want, you can take a look at page 220 of your book, if that helps to refresh your recollection.

A Yeah. Well, I think I know what you're referring to there.

Q Well, there was one where I believe the President or his team were --

A Right.

Q -- described as an out-of-court settlement and you had a different understanding.

A Right. After our -- during our phone conversation that the President and I had, we talked about, you know, the State's attorneys getting together with the Trump campaign's attorneys. And then he later said that there's a settlement agreement.

There was no settlement agreement. They just dropped the case. And we were very clear about that.

Q So on December 31st, 2020, the Trump campaign, represented by attorneys Kurt Hilbert and John Eastman, brought another lawsuit. Do you recall what that one was?

A No, I don't.

Q Okay. It was called Trump v. Kemp, if that helps, but I don't know if that does.

A No, it doesn't.

Q So my understanding is that on December 22nd of 2020, White House Chief of Staff Mark Meadows traveled to Cobb County to observe the signature match audit that we've talked about earlier. Were you aware of that?

A Yes.
Q  Did you meet with or talk to Mark Meadows during that trip?
A  No.

Q  Okay. Do you know who did from your office?
A  I believe my deputy, Jordan Fuchs, and also Frances Watson, our chief of investigations.

Q  Do you know why Mark Meadows was there?
A  No.

Q  So what did -- and Jordan Fuchs is a woman. I'm that correct?
A  Yes.

Q  What did Ms. Fuchs and Ms. Watson tell you, if anything, about Mark Meadows --
A  Well, we found out that he was going to be showing up at Cobb County, and, you know, it was, in effect, an investigation that was ongoing as they did their work of looking at the ballot images, or the envelope images, the signature images.

Q  And did Ms. Fuchs or Ms. Watson tell you anything about what Mark Meadows did while he was there or what he said?
A  I don't recall specifically, but from my recollection he was not allowed in the room where the investigators were doing their work. There was a glass window on the door, and he could look through and he could see that there were these teams of, you know, individuals that were looking at the images, and they had conversations. But that was the extent of it.

Q  Do you know whether Mr. Meadows tried to get into that room?
A  I believe he thought that, you know, by him showing up, that he was going to be allowed into that meeting room, but we were very clear that this was an ongoing investigation and, therefore, it wouldn't be appropriate for him to be inside that room.
Okay. Is there anything else that you recall about Mr. Meadows' trip to Cobb County?

I believe that's at the time that Frances Watson told him, told Mr. Meadows, that the President's tweets were demoralizing to the investigation team. The President had put out a tweet, I believe, sometime near that time, but -- where he said that we were -- we, the investigation division, was slow-walking this audit study. And, meanwhile, the actual facts were the investigation team, which consisted of GBI and the secretary of state investigators, were working overtime to get this done.

And was the FBI also working on that?

No. That was actually -- That was State Farm?

It was -- yeah, that State Farm was separate. The Cobb County was a GBI and State investigators, really so we could leverage our workforce of investigators.

To your knowledge, did Mr. Meadows ask anybody on your staff to do anything in particular with regard to this audit?

I don't think he asked them to do anything.

Okay. Do you know if he then made any public statements about the audit?

I don't recall anything.

Okay. And then it appears that he must have talked to the President about it, because then, on December 23rd, President Trump called Frances Watson. Is that correct?

And you can look at exhibit 10 regarding that.

That's correct on the date.

Did you know in advance that this call was going to happen?
A No.

Yes, go ahead.

Q Before we leave Mr. Meadows' visit to Cobb County, do you know whether Mr. Meadows made any representations or said anything about in what capacity he was there?

A No. I don't recall anything specific.

Q Okay. And you said that your office learned that he would be coming to Cobb County. Do you know how your office learned that?

A I don't know who in our office got that information that he was going to be there, but we knew that he was going to be showing up unannounced, and so our deputy was there, and Frances Watson, you know, obviously was out there, so, to introduce themselves to him.

Q Would your deputy have been there regularly, or was she in Cobb County because she knew that Mr. Meadows was coming?

A She was there a bit more. I was -- once we began the investigation, began the work of actually doing the inspection, that's when I left the room.

In other words, I welcomed all the investigators. I told them I appreciate the hard work they're going to do, that they had to do very quickly and timely. And I said: And, as soon as we get started, I'll be walking out, because this will be an ongoing investigation. I don't think it's appropriate that I stay here.

So I walked out. And so I let them do their work. And Cobb County election officials worked with GBI and our investigators to do that work. So I know that our deputy was there from time to time. I also learned that Frances Watson was there all the time, in effect.
Q So if you turn your attention to exhibit 10. And the title on this is "Georgia Secretary of State Recording of Trump Phone Call to Election Investigator."

So it says here in the first sentence that this call happened on December 23rd, 2020. You were not on this call, so I won't ask you about the accuracy of this transcript, but I'll have an opportunity to do that hopefully with Ms. Watson.

But if you look at the second page -- and I realize the pages are not numbered -- but second page where President Trump says about three-quarters of the way down the page, "And I won everything but Georgia and, you know, and I won Georgia, I know that, by a lot and the people know it. And you know something happened, I mean, something bad happened."

And then the next paragraph, it says, "You know, I hope you're going back two years, as opposed to just checking, you know, one against the other, because that would be a signature check that didn't mean anything. But if you go back two years, and if you can get to Fulton, you're going to find things that are gonna be unbelievable, the dishonesty that we've heard from them."

What did you understand -- or what do you understand President Trump to be referring to about going back 2 years?

A I don't understand why he said that.

Q Okay. But, again, as you discussed earlier, when the signature check is done, they're checking the signature on the envelope and the ballot against the signature on file.

A The ballot -- well, to clarify, so it's not -- the ballot has no signature on it.

Q Okay. The envelope?

A The envelope that goes with the ballot or the application has the signature
also. So that's a two-step process.

But the counties would have many times many signatures, because as the records
are updated they would keep those, they would be in their files of different signatures
over the course of the years.

Q And that could go back more than 2 years?
A That would go back more than 2 years, yes.

Q Just depends on when the voter registered?
A Exactly.

Q So you have no idea of what he could mean by going back 2 years?
A Yeah. I don't understand. You'd have to ask him.

Q Okay. So then on the third page, the middle of the page, President Trump
says, "But Fulton, Fulton is the mother lode, you know, as the expression goes."

Do you have any idea why he thought Fulton was the mother lode?
A It was just part of the whole narrative that we had heard post-election.

Q Which was what?
A That Fulton County, you know, had done something wrong, and that was just
their focus about Fulton County.

Q So if you go to the fifth page -- and, again, I recognize these are not
numbered -- but about two-thirds of the way down, President Trump says, "And it
didn't -- it never made sense and, ya know, they dropped ballots. They dropped all
these ballots."

Do you have any idea what he meant by dropped ballots?
A I think that he could possibly be alluding to, for example, in DeKalb County
all of a sudden they uploaded, you know, and updated their counts. You know, it looked
like they, quote, "dropped ballots."
But the ballots that were -- ballots had to be in by 7 p.m. on election day. We had gone to appeals, the appeals court, and we won. And so all ballots had to be in by 7 p.m., unless a precinct opened late and then that precinct could be open until 8 o'clock or 9 o'clock. But notwithstanding those few circumstances, 7 p.m. was the time that you received ballots.

With the absentee ballot situation, though, you could be, you know, scanning and tabulating those ballots well into the night or the next day or the next day thereafter. But those are all ballots that were received before 7 p.m. Those are lawfully received ballots.

Q So, if you go to the next page, towards the bottom, President Trump says, "Well, and I appreciate it too, Frances. Do you think they'll be working after Christmas to keep it going fast? Cause, you know, we have that date of the 6th, which is a very important date."

Do you know why the 6th was an important date?

A That would be the date I assume that he would be referring to when the election is certified.

Q By the U.S. Congress in a joint session?

A Right.

Any questions about that? Okay.

Do any members have any questions before I move on?

Ms. Cheney. No, I don't.

Q Okay. So I'll just ask you one more question. On page 5, again, I know it's hard to find, but at the bottom of that page, it says, "Cause, you know, we have that date of the" -- oh, no. I'm sorry.
A 6th.

Q Yeah. So I asked you about that earlier.

Further up on that page, a little more than halfway down, he said, "Anyway, but whatever you can do, Frances, it would be -- it's a great thing, it's an important thing for the country, so important."

Hopefully on --

Mr. Raffensperger. I'm with you.

Where am I?

Right here.

Okay. Turn the page.

Q So, when President Trump said to Ms. Watson, "Whatever you can do, Frances, it would be" -- and then he sort of got cut off, or cut himself off, and said, "It's a great thing."

Do you have any idea what he was asking Ms. Watson to do?

A No, I don't.

Q Okay. On the page before that, near the bottom, President Trump said, "But hopefully, you know, I will, when -- when the right answer comes out you'll be praised."

First of all, do you know what he meant by "the right answer"?

A No, I don't.

Q Okay. You look like you may have a thought. Anything -- do you want to elaborate on that answer?

A I believe what President Trump might be alluding to, that the right answer would be the answer that favored him as opposed to the right answer that we did find,
that it did not favor him.

Q: Okay. And do you have any idea what he means by, "You'll be praised"?

A: Well, his supporters would be very pleased if, all of a sudden, you did find something that did switch the election from Vice President Biden to President Trump.

The only other thing, I might ask.

Yeah.

BY

Q: Mr. Secretary Raffensperger, just on the second to last page, he talks a little bit about the GBI.

Do you see there is a statement there where he asks Ms. Watson, "I hear the Georgia -- it's not the FBI. What was it, the GBI, right?"

And Ms. Watson says, "Right."

And then President Trump said, "Right, but I hear -- I hear they're fantastic. And I hear I'm about 96 percent with them, so that's good, okay."

Any idea what he's referring to about being 96 percent with the GBI?

A: No.

Q: Potentially a reference that he's popular with them, or that that somehow will make a difference in the audit that the line men and women of the GBI are politically aligned with him?

A: Perhaps he felt that he had 96 percent of the votes of everyone that was a GBI agent in the State of Georgia.

Q: And the suggestion there is that that would somehow affect their work on the audit?

A: That's perhaps what his thinking was.

Q: I realize we're asking you to speculate about somebody else, but we're just
try to understand the transcript. So thank you.

Q If you then look at exhibit 11 entitled, "3rd Third Strike Against Voter Fraud Claims Means They're Out After Signature Audit Finds No Fraud."

This was like a release by your office describing the findings of the Cobb County audit. Feel free to look at that if you want. But, in general, what were the findings of the audit of Cobb County?

A We took a random sample of approximately 15,000 ballots of the total 150,000 Cobb County ballots, and we found two envelopes that were not handled appropriate, should have been flagged by the county election officials. They were, in both cases, signed by spouses.

One of the people that signed, their spouse had a health issue. The other one is just they got confused or what have you, but it should have been picked up.

But that turned out that we had a 99 percent confidence, you know, level in that. So, in effect, there was no fraud in the absentee ballot process.

Q To your knowledge, when Mr. Meadows went to Cobb County and watched the audit going on, did he express any concerns to your staff about the way they were conducting the audit?

A I don't believe I heard any complaints from my -- relayed to me through my staff that Mr. Meadows had.

Q So if you look at exhibit 12, these are -- appear to be text messages. First one is an iMessage, Thursday, November 19th, 6:56 a.m. It appears to be to you. "Mr. Secretary, Mark Meadows here. If you could give me a brief call at your convenience. Thank you."

Do you remember receiving that?
1 A Yes.
2 Q Did you call him?
3 A No.
4 Q Why not?
5 A I didn't know it was him.
6 Q Okay. Did you think it was somebody else?
7 A It could have been. I had a big spam folder at that time. So all the people sending me nastygrams, you know, that they were in my unknowns, I guess, and they were over there. But I happened to see that, so I just kind of tucked it away.
8 Q Okay. And then the next message is Saturday, December 5th, at 8:16 a.m., "Mr. Secretary, can you call the White House switchboard at 202-757-6000. For a call. Your voicemail is full," coming again from someone purporting to be Mark Meadows.
9 A Right.
10 Q So do you remember getting that one?
11 A I do.
12 Q And what was your reaction to that one?
13 A Maybe it is him.
14 Q Okay. So what did you do?
15 A I let it sit there.
16 Q For how long?
17 A I never got back to him.
18 Q Okay. So as you sit here today, do you know how many times either Mr. Meadows or people at the White House on behalf of the President tried to reach you?
19 A I believe these two, to me directly. I know that there was calls into our
office. But they got left in the general mailbox and, you know, just didn't get picked up, probably because we had so many other calls. But it was just one of those things.

Q And was that because people in your office didn't believe it was really the White House or the President calling?

A I don't know what their reasons were, but my reason was -- I learned this on city council. It was drilled into our heads that when you're on city council, you don't get involved in policing investigations. If you have any questions, you go to the city manager and you talk to them about any concerns you have.

And so we had ongoing investigations. We also had lawsuits with the Trump team and the Trump campaign and all these other organizations, and I just didn't feel that that was the appropriate channel to go. That they had their attorneys, we have our attorneys, and we'll follow the process, we'll follow the law, and the results will be what the results will be.

Q So does that mean that you believed that, even if it was, in fact, the President or someone on his behalf trying to reach you, that you did not want to talk to them?

A That is correct.

Q Okay. But eventually you did.

A Yes.

Q Okay. Can you tell us how that came about?
Mr. Raffensperger. I was on the Neil Cavuto show, and we were talking about
the election. And I think -- I shared some data points with FOX News, Neil Cavuto, and I
said that there was 20,000 Georgians, Republicans, that voted in the June primary that
did not come out and vote in the November election, and I shared that about
19,000 -- Senator David Perdue got 19,000 more votes in the metropolitan area than
President Trump, and in the Republican congressional areas the Republican Congressmen
got about 33,000 more votes than President Trump.

And I believe that President Trump was watching FOX News and he didn't care for
my comments on those three data points.

Q So what happened?
A So my deputy secretary called me, Jordan Fuchs called, and said, "The
President wants to talk to you." And so, "Me?" He says, "Yeah, Mark Meadows called.
The President wants to talk to you." I don't want to do that. And just tell him, you
know, we're just not interested in doing that.

So she called him back and said --
Q Called who back?
A Mark Meadows.
Q Okay.
A And I gather they had a conversation. And so she called me back and said,
"No, they really want to talk to you." I said, "I don't want to." And so she said, "Well,
they really want to talk to you." I said, "We have all these lawsuits going on. It's not
appropriate for me just to talk to the President by myself. We need to have, you know,
our general counsel on this call, Ryan Germany, and you need to be on that call as well."

And so that's how that got set up for, I believe it was 3 o'clock that afternoon.

Q And were you told anything about what the President wanted to discuss with you?

A No.

Q So you may have said this earlier, but how did you find out that the President was unhappy with what you said on the Neil Cavuto show?

A That was kind of the inference I got from my deputy, I guess.

Q Who got it from Mark Meadows?

A Right, that President Trump saw you on, you know, FOX News this morning, so -- got it.

Q Now, as I understand, the call with you and President Trump, with others on as well, was January 2, 2021. Does that sound correct to you?

A Sounds about right.

Q Now, by then, the election results in Georgia had already been certified by your office, correct?

A Right.

Q And the electoral college had already cast their votes --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- correct? So what's your understanding of why he was calling?

A Didn't really know why. But I assumed it was to express displeasure, make a case. But that's why I really had reluctance to have the call.

Q Okay.

And then in your book at pages 178 to 179, you wrote, "The President was asking me to do something that I knew was wrong, and I was not going to do it."
What was your understanding of what the President was asking you to do?

A Well, he kept on saying to find some additional votes. You know, we've -- we counted them three times. Every single rabbit trail we ran down. We had all the numbers.

And so, over the course of that phone call, he said -- he used the term that there was 5,000 dead people. The actual number that his people was found was 10,315, I believe. But I told him that there was actually two dead people, which I corrected today. It's now up to four.

But it was those kind of allegations. He talked about there was thousands of felons. You know, we identified 74 felons that were still under sentence, and we began an investigation. Doesn't mean there's 74, but there's -- the total universe of the potential of 74.

If you looked at all the numbers, it never added up to anywhere near what could throw the election in doubt in the State of Georgia.

Q So what did you think he was asking you to do that you didn't want to do?

A To somehow recalculate and somehow pull a rabbit out of my hat and say, "We found this." There was nothing to find.

Q And, as secretary of state, did you have any legal authority to change the outcome of the vote?

A No.

Q So, if you turn to Tab 13, which is a transcript of your conversation with the President and others -- and this has been, you know, published in The Washington Post and other places.

I won't make you read the whole thing, but the published transcripts of the recording, as far as you know, are an accurate reflection of what you said with the
President?

A I haven't looked at every single page, but it appears to be.

Q Okay.

The background paragraph here before the transcript describes it as an hour-long call. Does that sound about correct?

A It was about an hour and 10 minutes.

Q And it says, in addition to you and the President, Mark Meadows was on it -- "several lawyers, including longtime conservative attorney Cleta Mitchell and Georgia-based attorney Kurt Hilbert."

Do you know -- first of all, were those two on the call?

A They spoke during that call, so I know that, you know, they were on.

Q Do you know if other attorneys were on, as well?

A When we first -- I had, on my side, myself, Jordan, and Ryan. He mentioned some person named Alex. I didn't know who Alex was until a day or a couple days later, And it turned out it was Alex Kaufman, who lives in Georgia, who resigned from a law firm when this phone conversation came to light.

Q And so Alex Kaufman was an attorney representing --

A The Trump campaign at some level.

Q Do you know if any other attorneys were on the call?

A No. They -- I don't know who all was on the call, so I don't know who was remote and who was in the Oval Office, wherever President Trump was.

Q Okay.

On the first page of that transcript, it says in the middle of the page, "We have a number of things. We have at least 2 or 3 -- anywhere from 250 to 300,000 ballots were dropped mysteriously into the rolls. Much of that had to do with Fulton County, which
hasn't been checked."

So this may be similar to the question I asked you about the President's previous comments about dropping ballots. What do you think he meant by "ballots were dropped"?

A I think he's talking about ballot stuffing.

Q Okay. And what is ballot stuffing?

A People stuff fraudulent ballots. That did not occur.

Q Do you know what his basis was for claiming there were 250,000 to 300,000 ballots that were dropped?

A No, I don't.

Q The next paragraph, he says, "Another tremendous number. We're going to have an accurate number over the next two days with certified accountants. But an accurate number will be given, but it's in the 50s of thousands -- and that's people that went to vote and they were told they can't vote because they've already been voted for."

So, first, did any of these certified accountants come forward that he refers to?

A Not that I'm aware of.

Q And was it true that 50s of thousands of people went to vote and were told that they can't vote because they've already been voted for?

A We never heard reports of that magnitude.

Q What magnitude, roughly, did that happen for?

A Maybe 10s and 20s, total.

Q Tens and 20s of thousands?

A No, 10s and 20s, like --

Q Tens and 20s, total.

A -- less than 50. Yes.
Q At the bottom of that page, if you're looking at the same version I have, it says, "We had, I believe it's about 4,502 voters who voted but who weren't on the voter registration list."

Do you know if that's true?

A No. We had zero.

Q Okay.

Later on that page, he says, "You had 18,325 vacant address voters."

Do you know if that's true?

A That's not true.

Q How do you know that?

A We checked it.

Q And what did you find?

A That some voters -- you know, they really were lumping a lot of things together. Vacant addresses, but also they were lumping in there people that had things delivered to a post office box. But people would have a street address but, if you live out in the country, you might use a post office box just for mail delivery, or if you lived in an apartment, you'd have a box, a lot of times, to a street address. That's how the mail gets delivered to you in your, you know, mailing location.

So that was all checked out, and that claim was never supported either.

Q So is an absentee voter allowed to have their absentee ballot sent to a P.O. box?

A Yes, they are. And they did in 2020.

Q The next paragraph, he says, "Smaller number -- you had 904 who only voted where they had just a P.O."

Do you know if that's accurate?
A That's not accurate.

Q Okay. So explain how that works.

A Well, it goes back to, if you are in an apartment or if you're a rural route out there in a rural area, they'll use a post office box, just because that's how you get your mail delivered.

Q Okay. But, in that situation, does somebody have to also have a physical address?

A They would have a physical address. And we had physical addresses for everyone. And so President Trump was not supported by the -- what he said there is not supported by the facts.

Q Later in that paragraph, he says, "18,000 voters having to do with [name]" - so the name's redacted. "She's a vote scammer, a professional vote scammer and hustler" -- again, the name redacted. "That was the tape that's been shown all over the world that makes everybody look bad, you, me, and everybody else."

Without giving us the person's name who has been redacted, can you tell us who he's referring to there?

A He was referring to the Fulton County poll worker, and he's referring to the Fulton County situation, and he's referring to, really, Rudy Giuliani's doctored tape that he presented before the Senate committee, which then, you know, was like the shot heard around the world.

Q And the person that he's referring to, is that, like, a paid employee or a volunteer?

A Well, poll workers are paid.

Q Okay. And do you know why he's referring to her as a professional vote scammer and hustler?
A No.

Q Does she have any, to your knowledge, criminal history --

A No.

Q -- or a history of vote scamming?

A None that I’m aware of.

Q So was it simply that she was the one who happened to be on the videotape having removed the boxes of ballots that had previously been put --

A That’s how it appears to me.

Q In the next paragraph, he refers to "a major water main break." I think you've covered that already. You said that was the leaky toilet. Is that correct?

A Correct.

Q And that didn't affect voting or counts of votes, did it?

A No.

Q Okay.

In the next paragraph, he refers to "they were in what looked to be suitcases or trunks, suitcases, but they weren't in voter boxes."

I think you've already said they were, in fact, in voter boxes?

A Yeah. Those are the official plastic voter boxes.

Q And could you see that on the videotape?

A Yes.

Q And at the very end of that paragraph, he says, "The minimum it was 18,000 ballots, all for Biden."

Is there any truth to the assertion that these ballots in the voter boxes all went to

Biden?

A No.
Q. Do you have any idea what he would base that assertion on?

A. No.

Q. In the next paragraph, he says, "You had out-of-state voters. They voted in Georgia, but they were from out of state, of 4,925."

Do you know if that's true?

A. We researched that, and we found on the order of 300 to 400 voters that should not have voted. They were actually truly out-of-State voters, not voters that had an absentee ballot sent to them because of COVID or taking care of a family member or other situations like that.

Q. Do you have any idea where he came up with the number 4,925?

A. I believe that probably where that came from was any ballot that was sent out of State, and if it was sent out of State, just arbitrarily assuming that those people didn't live in Georgia anymore.

But they could've been a student. They could've been someone that had a second home. In fact, my wife and I met a couple that had a second home in Utah, which I thought was very interesting. I didn't know Georgians did that. But why I say that is that, during COVID, a lot of people that had second homes, that's where they went, but that's where they had their ballot sent to. Or they could be taking care of a family member -- a whole host of reasons.

But I believe that's where his number came from. And that's why we checked that out with our investigation team, and it came in that range of about 300 to 400.

Q. So, if a voter legally resides in Georgia and is a registered voter in Georgia but they're going to be out of Georgia on election day, can they have their absentee ballot sent to an address out of State?

A. Yes.
Q Okay.

So the next paragraph, he says, "And you had dropboxes, which is very bad. You had dropboxes that were picked up. We have photographs, and we have affidavits from many people."

So the dropboxes, I assume, are the dropboxes for absentee ballots?

A Correct.

Q Do you know what he's referring to here by photographs and affidavits?

A He's alleging that they had photographs and affidavits from people that were, you know, people somehow committing some type of, you know, voter fraud due to the absentee ballot dropboxes.

Q Did you ever see these photographs?

A No.

Q What about the affidavits? Were those ever submitted?

A I don't recall.

Q The next paragraph, he says, "I don't know if you saw the hearings, but you have dropboxes where the box was picked up but not delivered for three days."

Do you know if that's true?

A No, I don't know if that's true.

Q At the bottom of that page, he says, "Ballots were dropped in massive numbers."

Do you know if -- he used the term "dropped" earlier in the call. Do you again think he's talking about ballot stuffing?

A I think he's referring -- I know that DeKalb County had a major upload which -- all of a sudden, they updated their records. So they were counting for hours at a time but they didn't upload what their counts were; then, when they pressed the
button to upload, all of a sudden you'd see a big increase.

I think that could be what he was alluding to in that case. But there wasn't anything illegal. There was no illegality to support what he said.

Q And did those votes tend to favor Vice President Biden?

A Depending on which county it was. It was in DeKalb County. It is a county that leans, you know, to left of center, so that would favor, you know, Biden, just like it would in Fulton County. Other counties, like Cherokee, Bartow, are going to favor Republicans.

Q So you could see a shift in terms of the margin in favor of Vice President Biden, but that's not necessarily a sign of fraud.

A It's really just a sign of the local political strength of each candidate.

Q So, then, on the next page, near the top, he says, "The other thing, dead people. So dead people voted, and I think the number is close to 5,000 people."

Do you know if that's true?

A I know it's not true.

Q And have you already covered all that? Is there anything new to add on that?

A No.

Q Okay.

And in the next paragraph, "The bottom line is, when you add it all up and then you start adding, you know, 300,000 fake ballots" -- do you know what that means?

A No.

Q And then later in that paragraph, it says, "This just came up this morning, that they are burning their ballots, that they are shredding, shredding ballots and removing equipment."
Do you know what the burning of ballots refers to?

A I think that was -- I forget which county, if that was either Fulton County or Cobb County. But Ryan Germany answered that and told President Trump that that was not true.

Q Do you know what, in fact, happened?

A I believe that they weren't burning ballots; they were burning trash -- or shredding. I don't think it was burning. I think it was actually shredding, you know, old paperwork that had -- they were not ballots.

Q Okay. And when he says removing equipment, do you know what equipment he's talking about?

A They didn't remove equipment, and they did not change the equipment on the Dominion machines.

Q Okay.

If you go a couple of pages later, two pages later, where it says, "Raffensperger: Well, Mr. President, the challenge that you have is the data you have is wrong," do you see that? I think that's the fifth page, at least in my version.

A Yes. Got it.

Q So you said, "Well, Mr. President, the challenge that you have is the data you have is wrong. We talked to the congressmen, and they were surprised."

Is that the same call that you talked about earlier?

A Yeah, to the House Oversight -- Republican House Oversight Committee.

Q But then you say, "But they -- I guess there was a person named Mr. Braynard who came to these meetings and presented data, and he said that there was dead people, I believe it was upward of 5,000. The actual number were two. Two. Two people that were dead that voted. So that's wrong."
Do you know who Mr. Braynard is?

A He was a person that was coming -- that came to a meeting, that held himself out to be an election expert. And he said a lot of things based on his review, and so we looked at his information. And we then found that his information wasn't correct.

Q Then, towards the bottom of the page, the President starts talking again, and he is again referring to the person whose name was redacted. And he says, "She ran back in there when everybody was gone and stuffed, she stuffed the ballot boxes."

I assume that's what you talked about earlier. Is that correct?

A Correct.

Q And then the last paragraph on the page says, "Each ballot went three times, they were showing: Here's ballot No. 1. Here it is a second time, third time, the next ballot."

Do you have any idea what he based that assertion on, that ballots were put through the machine three times?

A When you put a ballot in to scan, if it doesn't take, it will spit back out, and then you can re-scan it again. But it hasn't -- it's because the scan has not been recorded.

So, in other words, if you had a stack of, say, 1,000 ballots and you scanned it, then you're going to get, first of all, 1,000 ballots in the bottom of the box when you're done, and your counter will show that you've only counted 1,000 ballots. So you can really verify all this.

But what they're really watching is a mechanical process, that it didn't take, so it spit back out, so you've got to feed it again until it actually does take, and then it drops into the ballot box.

Q So, if the ballot spits back out, does that mean it was not recorded?
A That means that it's not been recorded.

Q Or tab- -- is there a difference between recorded and tabulated?

A Yes. Obviously, by "recorded," they mean "scanned." Because tabulated is then when you finish the whole process. And you can start tabulating after 7:00 p.m. on election day.

Q So then there's more of the same. I'm going to skip over some of it to save time, but there's a lot more about the boxes under the apron of the table.

And then at the bottom of the page, you say, "Mr. President, we'll send you the link from WSB." And Trump said, "I don't care about the link. I don't need it."

What was the link from WSB?

A Well, if you watch the whole link, WSB came in after originally a misinformation video. They looked at the whole run of tape, and then they did, you know, a program, a news, you know, program on that.

I said, we'll send you that whole link so you can watch. And you can see that nothing happened and President Trump didn't want to see what WSB reported.

Q And he said, "I don't care about the link. I don't need to." Correct?

A Correct.

Q And then Cleta Mitchell steps in and says that she and Alex, who I assume is Alex Kaufman, that they've watched it. And then she says, "And what we saw and what we've confirmed in the timing is that they made everybody leave -- we have sworn affidavits saying that. And then they began to process ballots."

Do you know what she's referring to there?

A Well, she's saying that, from the time that they said, "Folks, we think we're done tonight" at around 10:30 and when our investigators got back there, she's saying that there's 18,000 ballots that were scanned.
And the challenge that she has with what she's saying is that it was under visual surveillance that whole time for that period of time, about 50 minutes, when our investigators weren't there -- Carter Jones, the person that we had as the monitor, wasn't there.

I don't believe it would've been 18,000, but it was -- whatever that number was, it was under visual surveillance, and --

Q  Meaning the cameras?

A  The cameras were there. And that's then what ended up precipitating the FBI and the GBI, with their investigators, going down and interviewing the people, watching the whole run of tape to see if there was any illegality or ballot stuffing that happened during that period of time.

Q  Okay.

And then if you turn to, I guess, two pages later, in the middle of the page, the President says, "Do you think it's possible that they shredded ballots in Fulton County? Because that's what the rumor is. And also that Dominion took out machines. That Dominion is really moving fast to get rid of their, uh, machinery."

So it sounds like two different things there. The shredding of ballots in Fulton County, do you believe that's what you referred to earlier about the trash being disposed of?

A  Correct.

Q  And what do you think he's talking about, about "Dominion took out machines"?

A  I think that was an allegation that someone came up with, that somehow Dominion, you know, was removing machines that malfunctioned or did something.

You know, it was just an allegation. And that's when Ryan Germany responded back,
no, Mr. President, Dominion hasn't taken any machinery out of -- you know, out of the county.

Q And then it seems like the President pivots from removing machinery to saying here, a little lower than halfway down the page, "But have they removed the inner parts of the machines and replaced them with other parts?" And Ryan Germany says, "No."

Do you know how Ryan Germany knew that the answer to that was no?

A You would have to interview him, but I assume Ryan -- Ryan knows his business, and he was on top of all the details, so --

Q Okay. Are you aware of -- oh, sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off. Are you aware of any evidence that --

A There's no evidence to support that the inner parts of the machines were replaced -- removed and replaced with other parts.

Q Okay.

And if you look at the next page, towards the bottom, President Trump says, "And I hate to imagine what's going to happen on Monday or Tuesday, but it's very scary to people."

Do you know what he's referring to by "Monday or Tuesday"?

A Well, Tuesday would've been the election for -- the runoff election for the U.S. Senate in Georgia.

Q And is that what you understood him to be referring to?

A Yes. I don't know what his allusion to would be for Monday.

Q Okay. And any idea why he says "it's very scary to people"?

A No.

Q On the next page, President Trump says, "Okay, whatever, it's a disaster."
It's a disaster. Look. Here's the problem. We can go through signature verification, and we'll find hundreds of thousands of signatures, if you let us do it."

Do you know what he means by "find hundreds of thousands of signatures"?

A Well, he was implying that he would find hundreds of thousands of non-signature-matches.

Q And when he says "if you let us do it," what did you understand him to be referring to that he wanted you to let him do?

A I don't know if he wanted to bring in a team of his people. I don't know exactly what that referred to.

Q Okay.

Later on that page, he says, "I think you're going to find that they are shredding ballots because they have to get rid of the ballots because the ballots are unsigned. The ballots are corrupt, and they're brand new, and they don't have seals, and there's a whole thing with the ballots. But the ballots are corrupt."

Is he talking about the same allegations we've already discussed, or do you think he's referring to something different there?

A I think it was really the same generalized allegations that we've already discussed.

Q In the next paragraph, he says, "And you're going to find that they are -- which is totally illegal -- it's more illegal for you than it is for them because, you know, what they did and you're not reporting it. That's a criminal, that's a criminal offense. And you can't let that happen. That's a big risk to you and to Ryan, your lawyer. And that's a big risk."

What do you think he was referring to by something being criminal and being a risk to you and Mr. Germany?
A Well, I think he's saying that -- what he was saying was that we somehow were aware of some criminality and that we were turning a blind eye to it. And nothing could be further from the truth.

Q Did you understand him to be suggesting, though, that you and Mr. Germany were, yourselves, committing a crime?

A I think that was the veiled reference there.

Q And did you take it as a veiled threat, coming from the head of the executive branch, who oversees the Department of Justice?

A I heard what he said.

Q And what do you mean by that?

A I understood the positional power that the President of the United States of America has, and I heard what he was saying. And so I heard what he said, but I also knew that we followed the law, we followed the Constitution. And he was alleging, really, accusing of us of doing something illegal, something criminal, but I knew we followed the law. It was a hollow threat, but it was, I feel, a threat.

Q And by "a threat," you meant a threat of criminal prosecution by the Federal Government?

A Having people knock on your door and make your life miserable, you know, asking you, you know, the same question 25 times and, you know, somehow twisting you into a pretzel and making your life miserable and making you spend all sorts of money on personal legal defense fees when you've done nothing wrong, you've just done your job, you've followed the law, you've followed the Constitution.

And I'm sorry he's disappointed, but he lost the election in Georgia.

Q So did you think he was threatening a Federal investigation -- implicitly threatening a Federal investigation?
A: I didn't know what to think. I just was -- I heard what he was saying, and I had high confidence in the integrity of the U.S. attorney, B.J. Pak.

Q: And he, Mr. Pak, was -- or -- resigned or was fired roughly around that time.

Is that correct?

A: That's correct.

Q: Okay. Do you have any insight into how that happened?

A: No.

Q: So the next passage I'm going to ask you about is later in that paragraph, and this is the one that I think has probably been most publicized. The President said, "So look. All I want to do is this. I just want to find 11,780 votes, which is one more than we have because we won the state."

What was your reaction when he said that?

A: There just weren't votes to find. Every single allegation that his team had made since election day, we ran down that trail. We checked out every single thing. We did a 100 percent hand recount, which -- the official ballot was the paper ballot. We counted all 5 million pieces of paper. We got virtually the same results. Then, when he was allowed -- after the election was certified, you can ask for a recount, per State law -- we did another, you know, count. The ballots have been counted three times.

We did a signature match in Cobb County.

We checked out everything. It just wasn't there.

Q: Now, this is in the same, you know, probably minute or so from when he was just discussing, you know, the words that we just went over that sounded like they could have been a veiled threat of a Federal investigation. So then he makes this reference to, "I just want to find 11,780 votes."

Did you understand him to be asking you to do something?
A: I knew what he wanted.

Q: What was that?

A: He wanted a different -- he wanted a different answer. But --

Q: Meaning a different outcome to the Presidential election in the State of Georgia?

A: Exactly. But the numbers weren't there.

Before I move on from that passage, because that's important, does anybody else want to ask questions about that particular passage?

Do any of the members want to ask -- I still have more, a little bit more to cover on the phone call, but I know that passage has been reported a lot, so I didn't know if any members wanted to ask any questions about that before I move on.

Mr. Raskin. This is Raskin, just with one followup question for Mr. Raffensperger.

What was your reaction to former President Trump's statement that "we won this State by one vote" or some other margin?

Mr. Raffensperger. He didn't win Georgia. And that's just -- that's the bottom-line fact. President Trump did not win the State of Georgia.

Mr. Raskin. Yeah.

And if you don't mind just restating, what was your reaction to the suggestion that you just find those 11,780 votes?

Mr. Raffensperger. There weren't 11,780 votes to find. We had checked every single allegation. Our staff had worked overtime. We continually circled back, you know, amongst our group in the office and said, did we miss anything? You know, what could we have overlooked? We wanted to make sure that we were accurate.

And we believe, as was said in my letter to Congress, there's never a perfect election, but there was never enough votes to overturn the results of the election.
President Trump lost the election.

Mr. Raskin. So, given the magnitude of the outlandishness of that suggestion, did you take him to be asking you to actually go and find ballots that you had somehow overlooked before or did you understand him to be suggesting something else in terms of inventing ballots?

Mr. Raffensperger. I didn't really understand what he really expected from us.

And, at the time, I didn't know if he believed what he was saying, because he had been fed all this misinformation and disinformation from all of his supporters and team that he had around him. I just knew that there weren't the votes to find.

And, as I said, it would've made my life and my wife's life a whole lot better if President Trump would've carried the State of Georgia. Because he still -- even if he were to carry Georgia, he still needed two more States. And so it just -- it was what it was.

And my job is to follow the law and follow the Constitution. I know I just repeat that a lot, but that's what my job is to do. It's just to do my job.

Mr. Raskin. Thank you very much. I yield back.

Mr. Raffensperger. Thanks.

Any other members?

Q So, Secretary Raffensperger, you just said a moment ago, you said, at the time I didn't know whether he, meaning the President, believed what he was saying.

As you sit here today, do you have any further insight into whether the President believed what he was saying?

A Well, when people write books, not mine but others, and you read them, you just wonder, did he realize quite early on that he actually lost? Because I read the
1 book "I Alone Can Fix It," and you get a different take from that.
2 Q What take did you get from that?
3 A That he understood that he did lose.
4 Q And do you recall what in the book led you to think that perhaps the
5 President did realize that he lost?
6 A Because the book said that his advisors told him that they lost. So you'd
7 have to interview those people and find out what conversations they had.
8 All I know is that, you know, I wasn't aware of that. I just see what I saw when I
9 had my conversation with the President. And I just know that the work that our team
10 had done, that our counties had done, to make sure that we buttoned it up and could
11 report these with certainty, that these are the results, the official results, from Georgia.
12 Q So, on the next page, the President says, "Look, we need only 11,000 votes."
13 I'm just reading that in the record because that's pretty much the same thing that he said
14 earlier.
15 The top of the next page, he says, "I have to find 12,000 votes, and I have them
16 times a lot."
17 And in the next paragraph, he says, "But I mean all of this stuff is very dangerous
18 stuff. When you talk about no criminality, I think it's very dangerous for you to say
19 that."
20 I know this is similar to what I asked you about before, but when he says "this is
21 dangerous stuff" and "I think it's very dangerous for you to say that," meaning no
22 criminality, what message do you think he was trying to send to you?
23 A I guess that pressure. I wouldn't use the word "subtle" pressure. That
24 there could be consequences.
25 Q In your book, on page 194, your observation regarding that same passage
that I just read to you -- you wrote, "Observation: I felt then and still believe today that this was a threat. Others obviously thought so, too, because some of Trump's more radical followers have responded as if it was their duty to carry out this threat."

Do you still believe that today?

A Yes.

Q And why do you think it was a threat?

A Well, first of all, there's the positional power.

And what we've seen, sadly, is, some people that, you know, have had government positions started going down the rabbit trail and buying into this stuff.

And then, also, we just saw that from a personal standpoint -- you know, people driving by our house, people that send you threatening texts, threatening emails, things like that, not just us but to my wife. Someone broke into my daughter-in-law's house the same night that the two Oath Keepers came by our house, so -- from North Carolina and Pennsylvania. I saw the text.

So I say all that because I understood that some people could believe this stuff, or they want to believe it.

Q When you referred to government officials going down that rabbit trail, what did you mean by that?

A People that come up with these convoluted legal theories that have since been reported that I've read about recently, professors.

Q Do you have examples?

A The fellow from, was it Claremont?

Q John Eastman?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Tell us about him, about --
A Oh, just, I saw his theory and I thought it was interesting. I'm just an
engineer, but I don't think it's supported by the Constitution. But I'll let you, the
attorneys and constitutional scholars, dig that one out.

Q And by "his theory," do you mean the theory that the Vice President of the
United States could either reject electors from certain States or postpone the electoral
college vote to give States more time to send new electors?

A Correct. I think Vice President Pence did his job, with honor.

Q Did you ever talk to Vice President Pence?

A No.

Q And I think you said earlier you've not talked to John Eastman.

A No.

Q Do you know whether any of your lawyers, either Ryan Germany in your
office or anybody in the attorney general's office representing the Secretary of State's
Office, whether they had any conversations with John Eastman?

A I'm not aware of any.

Q Okay.

So, later on that same page that we were on, the President says, "So what are we
going to do here, folks? I only need 11,000 votes. Fellas, I need 11,000 votes. Give
me a break. You know, we have that in spades already. Or we can keep it going, but
that's not fair to the voters of Georgia because they're going to see what happened, and
they're going to see what happened."

So, again, when he's saying, you know, "what are we going to do here, folks," did
you take that to mean he was asking you or your office to do something?

A Well, where we left the call is that our legal team would meet with President
Trump's legal team, and they could then review the information which would show you
that we had no underage voters -- because we had their birth dates, day/month/year; we knew that they had all turned 18 by the time election day had happened -- that we had the information and we would sit down with them.

And that's where we left that. So that was the ending note for that phone call.

Q  Okay.

So, later on that page, it says, "Every single ballot that she did" -- and I think that's again referring to the person whose name was redacted that we talked about earlier -- "through the machines at early, early in the morning went to Biden. Did you know that, Ryan?"

And Mr. Germany says, "No, that's not correct" -- or, no, sorry -- "That's not accurate, Mr. President."

What do you think the President was basing his assertion that all of these ballots, presumably the ones that were in those boxes that were removed and then fed through the machines, what do you think he based his assertion that those were all for Vice President Biden on?

A  I don't know.

Q  And then at the top of the next page, he says, "No, they were 100 percent for Biden. 100 percent." I think he's talking about the same ballots there.

Okay. A couple pages later, he says, "But I'll tell you it's going to have a big impact on Tuesday if you guys don't get this thing straightened out fast."

So, again, you think the reference to Tuesday is the Senate runoff election?

A  I believe that was what he'd be referring to.

Q  Okay.

And then on the last page of the transcript, it looks like he's suggesting the lawyers should get together. He says, "I'd like you to perhaps meet with Ryan, ideally
tomorrow, because I think we should come to a resolution of this before the election," presumably meaning the Senate runoff. "Otherwise, you're going to have people just not voting. They don't want to vote. They hate the state, they hate the governor, and they hate the secretary of state. I will tell you that right now. The only people that like you are people that will never vote for you."

When he says, "Otherwise, you're going to have people just not voting," do you think that the President's public comments and tweets about alleged election fraud in the November 2020 election impacted voters' willingness to vote in the runoff election for the Senate?

A What I do know is that the calls that our general counsel got from the Democrat Party post-November were all about the runoff election and the State Republican Party were all about the November election. So the Republicans were looking backwards and the Democrats were looking forward. And so I think it really hurt our two Senate candidates to really get to get their message out.

Q But do you think the President's public statements also led some voters who perhaps would have voted for the Republican Senate candidates not to vote at all because they didn't trust the integrity of the election system?

A I do know that on that Tuesday we had three races. One was our State-level public service commissioner, and he did win as a Republican. And the two Republican Senators lost.

Q And what lesson do you take from that?

A He was -- the successful candidate for PSC commission was focused on running his race and focusing forward, and he ran a very solid campaign. And I congratulated him on his victory.

Q So, after this call that we've just gone through in some detail, did you have
any further communication with President Trump?

A  No. I think that’s the last time we’ve ever had a conversation.

Q  And did you have any further communication with anybody from the Trump White House?

A  No.

Q  Did you have any further communication with anybody from the Trump reelection campaign?

A  Not me personally, no.

Q  But your staff, did they have this --

A  Well, they may have had this meeting. I don’t recall if that actually happened. I know the court case got -- it got withdrawn by the Trump team.

Q  And do you know why it was withdrawn?

A  I know when you show up in court you have to have the facts or you won’t win. And we had the facts on our side, and we lost the opportunity to present our facts.

Q  So I think there’s been some public reporting that the Secretary of State’s Office opened an investigation into this call. Is that correct?

A  I’m not aware of that.

Q  Okay. Does anybody have --

A  Oh --

Q  Oh, go ahead.

A  I believe a State Election Board member may have requested that.

Q  Okay.

A  But it’s now been really -- the Fulton County DA has their own investigation, so I think that’s probably more where that’s going to probably rest. But I’m not really sure. I don’t chair the State Election Board anymore.
Do you have any questions?

Yeah, just a couple followups about the call.

Secretary Raffensperger, I appreciate the detail with which you went through it with.

At the beginning of the call, was it your perception that the President somehow perceived you as an ally or thought that somehow you would be sympathetic to his claims?

I can't say. I don't really know.

Yeah. And, again, I know we're asking you to speculate a bit about his intentions. I know when I, for instance, meet someone who went to school where I went to school, I feel immediately--

Me, for example.

And I both went to UVA, and there's a kinship that comes with that--

Uh-huh.

-- that perhaps there's a similar sense if you're of the same political party, that there's a kinship or an alignment of sorts.

Did you have any sense that the President, because you're a Republican, was giving you the sense that, hey, maybe you're sympathetic or maybe we're aligned?

No, I can't say I felt that.

Okay. You've always been a Republican; is that right?

Uh-huh.

When you ran for city or county council?
A: I've been conservative all my life, probably since I've been 12 years old.

Q: Right.

A: Maybe sooner.

Q: Did you vote for President Trump in the 2020 election?

A: Yes.

Q: Okay. Did you campaign for him --

A: No.

Q: -- or give him money?

A: As secretary of state, I don't endorse candidates.

Q: Okay. Would you have personally been pleased had he won the election in Georgia?

A: Yes.

Q: Despite that, did you do your job in investigating these various claims of fraud?

A: Yes.

Q: Did your political party have any influence whatsoever, Secretary Raffensperger --

A: No.

Q: -- in the way you conducted your professional responsibility?

A: No, we -- we just -- we call balls and strikes. We walk the line of integrity.

We expect every county election director to do the same thing.

We knew that some counties have -- the county election director may be on the left side, and some may be on the right side, and you can figure out a lot of times where they live and things like that.

Q: Right.
A: But we just ask them to run fair and honest elections. And that's what we do in our office also.

Q: Right. I appreciate that.

There have been -- a lot of witnesses have given us information about calls that the President made to various State officials -- all Republican, no Democrats.

Just wondering again if, because you were a Republican, because you were someone he may have perceived to be aligned with his desire in the outcome, whether he ever mentioned, hinted, said anything about that political alignment during this or any other conversation with him.

A: No, he never mentioned that at all.

Q: How about Mr. Meadows or anyone else close to him?

A: No.

Q: Okay.

Mr. Raskin, did you have a question?

Mr. Raskin: Yes, I did, just one question.

Which is: In your career as secretary of state, have you ever had another disappointed candidate in a similar situation approach you to have you find votes before, whether at the Federal level, the State level, or the county level?

Mr. Raffensperger: Nothing to this extent. We've had races where we had candidates that may have lost, like, a State House race within six votes, I believe it was, and they just did their natural filings. And we actually found some people that were put in the wrong district, and so we ran the election again. But it was all through a process, and no one ever made a personal appeal, if that clarifies that question.

Mr. Raskin: Thank you very much.

Do any other -- yes, Mr. Aguilar?
Mr. Aguilar. Yeah. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Mr. Secretary, I was struck by your discussion about the text messages and the calls and the drive-bys of your house and the threats and intimidation. And it just got me thinking a little bit more about it, you know, from a legislative focus here.

My kinship with you, while I didn't go to the University of Virginia and I'm politically across the table from you, I was a city council member and a local mayor. So I'll stick to my lane.

But, you know, do you think that harassment and intimidation of election officials at the State and even at the local level is something that should be addressed by Federal legislation?

Mr. Raffensperger. I'll probably stay in my own lane, but I will say this: It's entirely inappropriate. It's reprehensible. They're people doing their job.

If you look at poll workers, who are they? By and large, they're people over the age of the 50. In Georgia, actually, the average age was 72 before COVID. So these are people that are volunteering their time. They get paid $150 a day, maybe $200, things like that, but they're giving back to their community. They're the people that you see at the grocery store. They're the people you see at Rotary, Kiwanis, at your church groups, soccer fields. They're your neighbors. And they're working 16-hour days on election day to make sure that we have an honest and fair election. And I think it's reprehensible that their lives could be threatened.

And that happened in Georgia. And that happened in some counties that went 75 percent Republican, and yet some of these poll workers were actually followed home. It just made no sense.

And so that is something that, if it continued on, you'd end up with no poll workers. And imagine when you show up to vote and you say "we're ready to vote" and
they say "well, there's no one here today," or "there's just one person." What do you do? We will have lines longer than 1 hour then.

And so I think it's really important that people understand and really appreciate your local poll workers and the hard work that your county election directors do.

Mr. Aguilar. I appreciate that. Thank you.

I yield back.

Ms. Cheney, do you have anything?

Okay.

Anyone else?

BY

Q Before I move on, did you have any anything else you wanted to add about that conversation with the President?

A No.

Q So, if you look at exhibit 14, it's a letter from you, dated January 6, 2021, to the Honorable Jody Hice, the Honorable Barry Loudermilk, and the Honorable Kelly Loeffler.

First of all, why did you choose those three Members to write to?

A Because they had indicated that they were going to object to the seating of the electors. I think that's the right term to use. And so I directed it to them so it would be both House and Senate, because you need an objection from both, you know, the Senate and the House.

And so we wrote the letter, but then I copied in all the other congressional delegation and also the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker, majority leader, minority leader. I wanted it to be read into, you know, the Congressional Record, so that: This is what we have found, and if you choose to want to go down another path,
it's on you. We've told you. Here's the facts.

Q And when you say that those three Members had said that they were going
to object to the electors, that was specifically the Georgia electors?
A Correct.

Q And you sent this on January 6th, which was the day of the joint session of
Congress, correct?
A Yes.

Q And the letter's in the record now, so, you know, we won't go through it in
great detail. You sort of explained why you sent it, but could you just give us a little bit
of an overview, since it's a lengthy letter, an overview of what you said in the letter?
A Well, number one is I talked about the Dominion voting machines. I
refuted everything that they said. I refuted the Hugo Chavez myth, that the machines
flipped the votes. So we talked about that.

And then I went to talking about the absentee ballots, and I talked about the Cobb
County. I talked about the signature match and also the signature match settlement
agreement. That had been totally misrepresented by the State party chairman,
Republican State party chairman, and other people.

And then I talked about what my lawful authority was, based on what Judge
Grimberg said, when he said that I followed the law, I followed the Constitution.

But then I go into poll watchers, and I give them the detailed information on that.
And then I go into specific allegations of the numbers. So, in other words, the
President's allies allege 2,056 felons; we've identified 74. They allege 66,241 underage
voters; there was zero. He said that there was 2,423 people who voted that were not
registered to vote; there were zero. So I go through that point by point.

And so I then, you know, make my case. And, in effect, I say what I've been
saying, really, since January of 2020. I understand that these are polarized times, and I understand America’s polarized. I understand that really well, especially after this election, but I understood that before. Because you really look at where America was in 2016 and then where we are today. And I understand, after an election, that half the people will be happy and the other half will be sad, but I wanted 100 percent of people to be confident in the results. And that’s why I really positive and I was optimistic with the new verifiable paper ballot in January of 2020 that we could then report results like that.

And so my bottom line to them was, you don’t have to like the results, but these are the results.

And so that’s why I wrote the letter for the record. And I stand corrected today that there were actually four dead people, not two.
[3:09 p.m.]

Q  On page 207 of your book, in referring to that same letter, you wrote, "I was hopeful to think a final presentation of the facts might change the minds of all or even most of them. They knew the truth. They knew that the election was not stolen. They also believed their political futures depended on Donald Trump's continued support, and Trump's support mattered more to them than the truth."

So what do you base your statement that they knew the truth, what do you base that statement on?

A  This letter is dated January 6th, 2021. And so you've had it, Congress has had this now for 11 months. Not a single person has ever written a letter back to me saying, "I've looked at your data, Brad, and here's where it's wrong." Not a single person in America has written me a letter telling me where my letter is factually incorrect, including every single Congressperson that this letter went to.

So I know that we are standing on the facts. I know they know the facts. And that's why I finish up my letter saying what the real problem we have in America right now. And the problem that we have is integrity, courage, honesty, common decency, and I think kindness.

And I say that as a Republican, because I had a quote from Ronald Reagan in there, because Ronald Reagan was still a kind person. So you can be conservative and you can be kind.

So I'll take the next question.

[Laughter.]

Q  So as I think you referenced earlier, it takes at least one Member of the
House and one member of the Senate to object to a State’s electoral votes -- or electors, I guess I should say. Ultimately, that did not happen for Georgia, correct?

A Right. The Senator changed her mind after the events, I believe, of January 6th.

Q But House Members did go forward with their objections, correct?

A The Republican House Members, yes.

Q Did you then discuss your letter with any of the Republican Members of the Georgia delegation?

A No, they haven’t called me.

Q So what role do you think that President Trump’s misrepresentations about the election in Georgia could have had in contributing to the tragic events of January 6th?

A Things were so spun up, there’s so much disinformation, misinformation out there, and there weren’t very many calm voices out there just explaining factually what had happened.

And some of this stuff takes time. For example, State Senator Ed McBroom from Michigan, I believe that he originally leaned into this idea that something bad had happened in Michigan, something untoward.

And so he did a deep dive, deep investigation, and he issued a 60-page report, very professional. And out of that report he said there was nothing there there. And then he does offer some election reform ideas, you know, to help rebuild confidence in the State of Michigan.

And I would really lean into what someone like Ed McBroom says, because I always thought when I compare that to Paul Harvey, because Paul Harvey says, and then God being a farmer. And Ed McBroom is a farmer, dairy farmer, you know, and his brother died, and I understand that, you know, he’s got two families and working the
family farm.

So I just happen to -- I just have to believe that's a person of integrity, saw one path, got the facts, and then had the courage to write a report. And that is to be commended, and I think we should commend courage whenever we see it. So I commend that man.

Q The last exhibit I have is exhibit 15. And if this were large enough to be read by the human eye, you would see that it says that it's from Save America, President Donald J. Trump, dated September 17th, 2021, addressed to you. It says, "Large-scale voter fraud continues to be reported in Georgia. Enclosed is a report of 43,000 absentee ballot votes counted in DeKalb County that violated the chain of custody rules, making them invalid."

First of all, was there a report enclosed with this letter?

A Yes, I believe it was. But we had heard about this before we got his, President Trump's, letter and already had opened up an investigation on that.

Q And what was it that you were investigating?

A What we were really investigating was the chain of custody. We were still finishing up that investigation that had come before the State Election Board.

But, not to get ahead of myself, but in essence what happened is that the ballots, you know, came in, and then they were left in a secure warehouse, and then they were then processed the next morning.

And so that period of time you could say that there was not a chain of custody, but they were in a secure warehouse.

So did they violate election procedures? Yes. Did they break the chain of custody? Yes. Are those invalid ballots? No, because nothing happened to the ballot. They weren't fiddled with, you know. Those -- no one touched the ballots.
And you just don't disenfranchise 43,000 voters because an election worker didn't do their process.

So imagine if that had been you and your votes because election worker, would you want your vote not to count?

And so -- but there will be an investigation, and that will come back down to the poll workers and to the county, and they will be brought before the State Election Board for the appropriate charges.

Q So later in this letter President Trump asked you to, quote, "start the process of decertifying the election, or whatever the correct legal remedy is, and announce the true winner," close quote.

What do you think he means, given that, you know, President Biden has now been sworn in and been serving for -- had been serving for several months by the time President Trump sent this letter? What do you think he meant by "start the process of decertifying the election"?

A We will continue to report our findings. Our investigation team will report that to the State Election Board. But that -- we do not have the lawful authority to decertify an election that's been certified by us and then has been certified by the Governor.

Q So why do you think he was sending you this letter?

A You'd have to ask him.

Q So I know you've addressed this before, but I'll just ask it one more time. Who won the Presidential election in Georgia in 2020?

A Joseph R. Biden won the State of Georgia in 2020.

Q And what do you think the effect could be of President Trump's public statements on the future of our democracy?
A I don’t think it’s helpful whenever people run a race and then once they lose come up short. And so I’ve been very vocal about this, and this is where I start irritating both sides of the aisle.

Stacey Abrams lost Georgia in 2018 by nearly 55,000 votes, and she still hasn’t conceded. In fact, a month ago she was in Virginia, she said just because you win doesn’t mean you’ve won.

That’s not helpful for democracy. When you lose, you lose. If you want to run again, by all means, run again. That’s your right as an American.

But it’s kind of like when you play a football game, you know. We had a lot of close football games this past weekend. One went into four overtimes. But there was a team that won, there was a team that lost, you know. Accept that loss and then you can come back and play next year and play it again, and maybe you’ll do better. But that’s the American way. And it’s not helpful for democracy.

And so we saw a little bit of that in 2004. We saw a little bit, you know, what happened in 2016. There’s been inklings. It happens from time to time. But we need to just, you know, stop it.

Q So you still have some members of the committee on the call. Is there anything else you’d like to say to them?

A No, thanks. I’m good.

Okay. Anybody else in the room have questions?

Q Yeah. One of the things that the Select Committee has to do, Secretary Raffensperger, is not just look backward about what happened but look forward and think about recommendations.

And I’m just wondering, as a State elected official, and Congressman Aguilar gave
you one specific idea, but if you have other thoughts about policy changes, Federal legislation, anything that might help ensure the integrity of elections or combat some of the sort of polarization that you’ve described over the course of the day today.

A Well, to make sure that poll workers, that they work in a safe environment.

Q Yeah.

A That they are appreciated for what they do. It's like jury duty. And so it's very important work, and it sometimes gets overlooked by all of us. I think that's very important.

I think being able to update your voter rolls with objective measures, like the Electronic Registration Information Center. It's bipartisan. The States lead the organization. It's not a Federal top-down mandate.

But let's us -- but if we could update our voter rolls to have cleaner rolls so we -- we have a very dynamic global society. And so that's very important.

I think that the one area if you ever have potential fraud is in the absentee ballot process, and we've actually followed more along the Minnesota model where we've moved away from so much signature match. We actually want to use driver's license and incorporate that element, because it's an objective measure and it comes back to photo ID, and we just think that's a good process.

So we think that's a bipartisan, nonpartisan way of doing it. It's more objective.

But I think it's really looking at what can we do for objective measures.

We have early voting. We have now 17 days, plus 2 days of optional Sunday.

So we actually do quite well on that.

I think every State really gets the choices. Some States like to do mail-in. Some States are still -- I think you used the term the old way of voting, showing up on Election Day, and I think New Hampshire is one of those, and it works for them.
So I think you let the States do. Just make sure that we have a lawful process, that everyone gets their voice heard, and I think that we work through these things.

We do live in a time of stress, and I think that you get lots of opinions from a lot of different places. I can't control what other people say. All I can do is control what I say. And so my job is to make sure that I speak calmly, thoughtfully, and that people understand that I'm going to fight hard for everyone to have fair and honest elections.

And even though I am a very conservative Republican and I want my team to win, my job is to make sure we have fair and honest elections. And that's, I think, what you want up and down the line, that everyone's not trying to put their thumb on the scale.

So when we have that personal integrity, I think a lot of these problems will work itself out.

Yeah. Appreciate that. Thank you.

Do any members have questions?

Mr. Raskin. Secretary Raffensperger, given everything that you went through with former President Trump and then with the threats leveled against you and your family, I'm wondering, what were your reactions to seeing the events of January 6th?

Mr. Raffensperger. I think it was a shock. I think it was a shock to my system. I think it was a shock to our Nation's system. I mentioned that. We haven't seen something like that for 150 years, maybe longer.

And so I think it was really like the straw that broke the camel's back. I think everyone pulled back and said that was way over the top, and I think now we're trying to figure out, what do we do?

In some respects, it does date me, but it almost reminded me of Kent State, 1970, when four students were killed. All of a sudden our Nation, you know, sucked in and gasped, you know, and figure out what do we do now. And so I think that's what we're
trying to do, is figure out what do we do now, because --

Mr. Raskin. I'm wondering how you linked the two events in your mind, what you've been dealing with, with respect to the Georgia election result and then what you saw happen on January 6th with the coercive pressure brought on Vice President Pence and then the violence of that day.

Mr. Raffensperger. Well, I respect anyone that will stand up and do their job with honor, and I salute and I commend Vice President Pence. He did the work that he was called to do according to the Constitution of the United States of America. And that's what we swear our oath to, is the Constitution, and we all should do that with honor, and he did.

Mr. Raskin. Thank you very much for your service to Georgia and to our country. I yield back.

Ms. Cheney, do you have anything?

Ms. Cheney. I don't have any questions. Again, I just want to thank Secretary of State Raffensperger.

Thank you for your time today. Thank you for your willingness to come in and speak to the committee. And mostly thank you for your service. I think that you've demonstrated, both in terms of your service and also in your comments today, what it means to be in a position of public trust.

And I hope that students across America have the opportunity as the history is written to study how you've conducted yourself and to study the seriousness with which you took your duty to the Constitution and to our country, and I'm sure that they will.

And I, for one, as an American, just want to express my gratitude to you for that and for standing up and for doing what's right. So thank you very much.

Mr. Raffensperger. You're welcome.
Ms. Cheney. I'll yield back.

Is there anything else that we should cover before we go off the record?

Anything else you want to make sure we know before we stop?

Mr. Raffensperger. [Nonverbal response.]

Okay. Thank you very much for your service, as the members said, and for the time you spent with us today. It's been extremely helpful.

So we will go off the record.

[Whereupon, at 3:28 p.m., the interview was concluded.]
Certificate of Deponent/Interviewee

I have read the foregoing ____ pages, which contain the correct transcript of the answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.

___________________________________________
Witness Name

___________________________________________
Date