Cindy A. Cohn, Esq. (SBN 145997)
Wendy Seltzer, Esq.
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
454 Shotwell Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Telephone: (415) 436-9333 x108
Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

Alan Korn, Esq. (SBN 167933)
LAW OFFICE OF ALAN KORN
1840 Woolsey Street
Berkeley, CA 94703
Telephone: (510) 548-7300
Facsimile: (510) 540-4821

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ONLINE POLICY GROUP

Jennifer Stisa Granick, Esq. (SBN 168423)
STANFORD LAW SCHOOL
CYBERLAW CLINIC
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305-8610
Telephone: (650) 724-0014
Facsimile: (650) 723-4426

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
NELSON CHU PAVLOSKY and LUKE
THOMAS SMITH

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ONLINE POLICY GROUP, NELSON CHU
PAVLOSKY, and LUKE THOMAS SMITH,
Plaintiffs,
v.
DIEBOLD, INCORPORATED, and DIEBOLD
ELECTION SYSTEMS, INCORPORATED,
Defendants.

No. C-03-04913 JF
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Time: 9:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 3
1. Cindy A. Cohn, hereby declare as follows.

1. I am an attorney with the Electronic Frontier Foundation, counsel to Plaintiff Online Policy Group. I make this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment. The facts stated here are known to me of my own personal knowledge, except where otherwise stated. If called upon to testify thereto I could and would competently do so.

2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a printout of what I am informed and believe to be an e-mail from Ken Clark, dated September 13, 2000, that appears on the Diebold e-mail archive that was posted on the Swarthmore Coalition for the Digital Commons website and that was linked to from the San Francisco IndyMedia website.

3. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a printout of what I am informed and believe to be an e-mail from Pat Green, dated January 24, 2003, that appears on the Diebold e-mail archive that was posted on the Swarthmore Coalition for the Digital Commons website and that was linked to from the San Francisco IndyMedia website.

4. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a printout of what I am informed and believe to be an e-mail from Jeffrey W. Dean, dated February 23, 2001, that appears on the Diebold e-mail archive that was posted on the Swarthmore Coalition for the Digital Commons website and that was linked to from the San Francisco IndyMedia website.

5. Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a printout of what I am informed and believe to be an e-mail from Ken Clark, dated July 6, 1999, that appears on the Diebold e-mail archive that was posted on the Swarthmore Coalition for the Digital Commons website and that was linked to from the San Francisco IndyMedia website.

6. Attached hereto as Exhibit E is a printout of what I am informed and believe to be an e-mail from owner-support@dieboldes.com, dated January 3, 2003, that appears on the Diebold e-mail archive that was posted on the Swarthmore Coalition for the Digital Commons website and that was linked to from the San Francisco IndyMedia website.

7. Attached hereto as Exhibit F is a printout of what I am informed and believe to be an e-mail from ken@dieboldes.com, dated January 3, 2003, that appears on the Diebold e-mail archive that was posted on the Swarthmore Coalition for the Digital Commons website and that
was linked to from the San Francisco IndyMedia website.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed in San Francisco, California.

Date: January 9, 2003

CINDY A. COHN
EXHIBIT A
Pima (County) is going to use a hacked l.11 for their upcoming election for this, as they have in the past.
EXHIBIT B
You make a very good point here. There are times we will need to release things for customers which do not choose to wait for ITA approval, but we want to move toward a system where we do a pre-release for certification purposes and then have a real release which sticks for a while. Today's system of doing a release and then having to do 2 or 3 more during the certification process causes a lot of confusion. Sometimes this is a necessary evil, but not always. We will try to start with pre-releases whenever possible...
EXHIBIT C
Thought I should clear the air on the 17" ballot traffic. What we are doing is certifying a firmware release that

1) Is backward compatible with the 1.94, 1.95 spider's web of uncertified features currently in use...
EXHIBIT D
We, the manufacturer, are supposed to set the procedures to follow for this equipment since we build it. I hate more than anyone else in the company to bring up a certification issue with this, but a number of jurisdictions require a "system test" before every election. I just helped Knecht yesterday with an RFP from Riverside that required this. That is why the AccuVote displays the silly ***System Test Passed*** message on boot up instead of "memory test passed", which is all it actually tests. No argument from me that it is pointless. You could probably get away with a batch file that prints "system test passed" for all I know. We will do something along those lines with the new unit after a memory test or whatever.
EXHIBIT E
There is an important point that seems to be missed by all these articles: they already bought the system. At this point they are just closing the barn door. Let's just hope that as a company we are smart enough to charge out the yin if they try to change the rules now and legislate voter receipts.
EXHIBIT F
Short for "out the yin-yang." Perhaps a little too colloquial; apologies for that.
In my defense, google turns up 694 references to the phrase.

Any after-sale changes should be prohibitively expensive. Much more expensive
than, for example, a university research grant.