## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ELECTRONIC PRIVACY INFORMATION CENTER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

1:17-cv-1320

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON ELECTION INTEGRITY; MICHAEL PENCE,
in his official capacity as Chair of
the Presidential Advisory Commission
on Election Integrity; KRIS KOBACH,
in his official capacity as Vice
Chair of the Presidential Advisory
Commission on Election Integrity;
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES; OFFICE OF THE
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JULY 3, 2017

Court Reporter:
Richard D. Ehrlich, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
333 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 354-3269

Proceedings reported by stenotype.

Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

## APPEARANCES 2 3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: MARC ROTENBERG Appearing via telephone 5 ELECTRONIC PRIVACY INFORMATION CENTER 1718 Connecticut Avenue, NW 6 Suite 200 Washington, DC 20009 (202) 483-1140 rotenberg@epic.org 8 9 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: 10 ELIZABETH J. SHAPIRO Appearing via telephone 11 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch 12 P.O. Box 883 Washington, DC 20044 13 (202) 514-5302 Elizabeth.Shapiro@usdoj.gov 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge
Kotelly. I have a court reporter here, so let
me call the case and then ask you to identify
yourselves.

This is the matter of Electronic Privacy
Information Center as the plaintiff. The
defendant is the Presidential Advisory
Commission On Election Integrity, Michael Pence,
Kris Kobach, the Executive Office of the
President of the United States, the Office of
the Vice President of the United States, and the
General Services Administration. It's
17-cv-1320.

If the Government counsel would identify themselves, please?

MS. SHAPIRO: Yes, Your Honor. This is Elizabeth J. Shapiro from the Department of Justice on behalf of the federal defendants.

THE COURT: Okay. And which section are you in in DOJ?

MS. SHAPIRO: In the Federal Programs
Branch of the Civil Division.

THE COURT: Okay.

And plaintiff's counsel.

MR. ROTENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. This is

Marc Rotenberg, counsel for the Electronic Privacy Information Center.

THE COURT: Okay. Obviously, this came in very quickly, and I've had just a passing glance at it, but I thought I should set a schedule, particularly for briefing, so that we can move this along as quickly as possible.

As I understand it, the Commission has asked for voter registration information. Their expectation of the due date would be July 14<sup>th</sup>. I've seen information that would indicate -- at least to the newspapers, to the extent they're accurate -- that some have refused to produce it.

Has anybody actually produced it to date?

If you can answer, Ms. Shapiro.

What I'm going to ask you to do is I'm going to ask some questions, set things out, and I'll call on you separately. At the end, I'll let each of you -- I'll call on you and let each of you make what comments you want. It's the only way to make sure everybody is not speaking at the same time.

Please listen to me. There may be occasions when I will stop you from talking

because we need to move on to something else, and I would expect you to be able to do that.

We do have a court reporter, so we will have a record.

So, Ms. Shapiro, has the Commission actually received any information? Do you know?

MS. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I don't know the answer to that. We have not even been able to reach out to or find out whom to reach out to on the Commission. We just received this probably within the hour.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Rotenberg, do you happen to know if anybody has actually submitted anything?

MR. ROTENBERG: Your Honor, we're maintaining a web page where we are posting information that has been provided by the Secretaries of State regarding their response to the request from the Commission. So to the extent that states have indicated that they are complying or not complying, we believe that that page will have current information provided by the states.

THE COURT: Okay. I was just trying to get a sense of, you know, whether somebody had

already, not just indicated they would or would not provide it, but actually provided it.

Okay. As I understand it, the plaintiffs have filed this under the APA predicated on the E-Government Act enacted in 2002, would set out procedures for Internet systems insuring the security of the information on them. You've also brought a constitutional privacy interest.

One of the claims -- or the claim is that the system that has been established, which is just requesting, as I understand it, the states to send it to an email, that the claim is that the system is unsecure and, therefore, violates the Act and the Individual Privacy Acts.

Is that in a nutshell what the case is about?

MR. ROTENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. Our view is that the Commission failed to undertake a Privacy Impact Assessment prior to the request for the collection of the personal data from the states; that they were also obligated to publish that impact assessment under the E-Government Act and under the FACA, and we do bring constitutional claims given the sensitivity scope of the data. And we point to certain

problems that have already arisen, the question stated by means of an unsecured email, and also by means of an unsecured website.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I missed the last part. Unsecure email and --

MR. ROTENBERG: They've requested the data both by insecure email so that data could be attacked in that fashion and also through an insecure website, which, in fact, carries the notice that it's subject to attacks.

THE COURT: All right. So let me set a schedule.

Obviously, the turnaround date has to be very quick in terms of getting something out both in terms of, obviously, the dates that — the concern about the information already going or being sent. And the other thing, frankly, is a practical one from my perspective. Next Monday I'm doing jury selection in a two-month criminal trial. So I would like to get this briefed prior to that starting. I do have some proceedings related to the criminal case near the end of this week.

If I need a hearing, I will set one up. Sometimes I do; sometimes I don't. If I have

specific questions, I might actually do a telephone conference call. I'll do whatever I can to make this as expeditiously as possible.

What I would like -- and I'm sorry to do this to the Government. You're probably not going to get a July 4<sup>th</sup> out of this. But for me to be able to take a look at it, make sure I have the information I need, do the research and get something out and potentially have a hearing -- what I need is by Wednesday at noon, a response or opposition from the Government; and Thursday at 9:00 in the morning, a reply from the plaintiffs. By Thursday, I will then have it briefed. I can figure out if there's anything additional that I need. I can decide whether we need an actual hearing or not.

Is there anything additional from the plaintiff that I need to know?

MR. ROTENBERG: No, Your Honor. We can make the briefing deadline.

THE COURT: All right.

Ms. Shapiro, anything that I need to know from your end?

MS. SHAPIRO: Well, I think that -- I mean, it's a very difficult deadline from a practical

perspective, not because of us working on the Fourth of July, but being able to reach the people that we would need to reach.

I might propose that, you know, if the Government could file Thursday instead, I don't know that it's necessary for the plaintiff to have a reply.

THE COURT: I would do a reply. I'm sure that -- I don't know what your issues will be, but I'm not going to leave it that they're not going to have an opportunity to respond to something.

I don't know precisely what you're going to be raising unless you can tell me now what you think you're going to be raising. I'm assuming that, you know, they'll want to say something back.

That's too late. I think you need to put some calls in now and get these people available. I would've assumed that since the reaction was not a positive one by a lot of states, that they would've expected that there could be a lawsuit.

I'm not going to move this. If you move it to Thursday, I can't get it done. I need to

have this in so that I can look at it, get it ready, and work on it while I'm in trial.

So if you cannot absolutely get ahold of them -- and these are government people. I would expect people on the Commission -- you, obviously, are not going to be speaking to the Vice President. So it's going to be the people on the Commission. I'm assuming they have staff. So I would expect that you, as soon as you get off the phone, would reach out there.

I'm leaving the schedule as it is. You'll have to give me something further to indicate that you cannot reach any of these people for them to respond to this lawsuit.

MS. SHAPIRO: I understand, Your Honor.

Is there any chance of at least extending it to the close of business on Wednesday? That would help at least give us a few more hours.

THE COURT: If I extended it, when would you be able to get your reply in, Plaintiff?

MR. ROTENBERG: Your Honor, we would still meet the Thursday 9:00 a.m. deadline if filed by close of business Wednesday.

THE COURT: All right. If you could get it in. And Wednesday your response, opposition,

whatever, if you can get it in by -- how about 3:00? So I can take a look at it.

MS. SHAPIRO: Okay. If that's Your Honor's preference, we'll try to do that. I mean, 4:00 or 5:00 would be better. I'm just concerned about locating people on the Fourth and getting, you know --

THE COURT: You need to notify them now.

It's 5 after 5:00. I hope somebody is over there, and they can reach out to whoever they are.

I mean, these are people at a high level. They must have emails and other kinds of things. Nobody is totally incommunicado when you're at this level of the government. So I would expect they would be able to do it. I'll make it 4:00, but that's it.

MS. SHAPIRO: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. So I can get a chance to look at it, they can, and then the reply would be done at 9:00.

Anything else, Ms. Shapiro?

MS. SHAPIRO: Nothing from our end.

THE COURT: Okay. If there's nothing else, then the parties are excused. You'll see a

minute entry. I don't believe they put it up. 2 So just expect that, when they have actually 3 docketed the material, the pleadings, that you will see then the minute entry. 5 Ms. Shapiro, have you entered an 6 appearance? 7 MS. SHAPIRO: No. We couldn't find it on 8 ECF. 9 THE COURT: It should be on ECF now. 10 just double-checked. If you can enter an 11 appearance so you can actually start getting 12 everything on ECF, that would be most helpful. 13 MS. SHAPIRO: We'll do that right away. 14 THE COURT: All right. The parties are 15 excused. Thank you. 16 MS. SHAPIRO: Thank you. 17 (Telephonic scheduling conference 18 concluded.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, Richard D. Ehrlich, a Registered Merit Reporter and Certified Realtime Reporter, certify that the foregoing is a true, complete, and accurate transcript of the proceedings ordered to be transcribed in the above-entitled case before the Honorable Colleen Kollar-Kotelly, in Washington, DC, on July 3, 2017. s/Richard D. Ehrlich July 5, 2017 Richard D. Ehrlich, Official Court Reporter