No Match Rates By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Anglo</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>African American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Regression</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous Block Groups</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Highest Confidence</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ansolabehere Supp. Report (PL752) Tables VI.1, VI.2, VII.2
No Match Rates By Race
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No Match Rates By Race

No Match Rates By Race

- ER - No Match Under 65: 1.2 (Anglo), 4.8 (Hispanic), 6.4 (African American)
- Catalyst - No Match Under 65: 2.3 (Anglo), 4.4 (Hispanic), 5.8 (African American)
- ER - No Match, Under 65, Not Disability Eligible: 1.1 (Anglo), 4.3 (Hispanic), 5.1 (African American)
- Catalyst - No Match, Under 65, Not Disability Eligible: 2.0 (Anglo), 4.0 (Hispanic), 4.8 (African American)

Dr. Hood’s Database Matching Concerns

1. No unique common identifier.
2. TEAM database does not have state identification numbers on all records.
3. Inconsistencies between database fields.
4. Erroneous information in some TEAM records.
5. Incomplete data on deceased individuals.
6. No self-reported race or ethnicity.
7. No post-estimation validation.
SB 14 requires Texans who vote in person to present a specified form of photo ID to cast a regular ballot:

(1) A Texas driver license, personal ID card, or election identification certificate, each issued by the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS);

(2) A Texas license to carry a concealed handgun issued by DPS;

(3) A U.S. military ID card that contains the person’s photograph;

(4) A U.S. citizenship certificate that contains the person’s photograph; or

(5) A U.S. passport

The photo ID presented must be current or expired by no more than 60 days, except for U.S. citizenship certificates, which do not expire.

10 people

• 9 black
• 1 white
10 people
  • 9 black
  • 1 white

2 people lack ID
Ecological Regression Results

- White: 3.7%
- Hispanic: 8.3%
- Black: 11.5%
Ecological Regression Results

Dr. Herron’s Ecological Regression

White | Hispanic | Black
--- | --- | ---
3.7% | 8.3% | 11.5%

Dr. Ansolabehere’s Ecological Regression

White | Hispanic | Black
--- | --- | ---
3.6% | 8.6% | 11.9%
Testimony of Dr. Barry Burden
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The Calculus of Voting

\[(p \times B - C) + D\]

\[p = \text{Probability of Affecting Outcome}\]
\[B = \text{Benefit of Preferred Candidate Winning}\]
\[C = \text{Cost of Voting}\]
\[D = \text{Duty}\]
Minority Voter Participation
# Minority Voter Participation

## CPS Estimated Voter Turnout in Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>57.7%*</td>
<td>36.7%*</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>38.7%*</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>41.6%*</td>
<td>25.4%*</td>
<td>37.8%*</td>
<td>23.1%*</td>
<td>38.8%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically Significance Difference from Anglo

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Table 1
Political Science & the Senate Factors
The Senate Factors

1. History of Official Discrimination
2. Extent of Racially Polarized Voting
3. Use of Devices to Enhance Effects of At-Large Elections
4. Exclusion from Candidate Slating Process
5. Effects of Discrimination Hindering Political Participation
6. Overt or Subtle Racial Appeals
7. Extent of Minority Officials Elected to Public Office
   • Lack of Responsiveness to the Needs of the Minority Group
   • Tenuousness
Senate Factor 1: History of Official Discrimination
Official Discrimination in Voting
• White Primary
Official Discrimination in Voting

• White Primary

• Poll Tax
Official Discrimination in Voting

• White Primary

• Poll Tax

• Re-Registration Requirements
Senate Factor 2: Racially Polarized Voting
## Racially Polarized Voting

**NEP Exit Polls: Estimated Republican Vote Share**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Table 2
Senate Factor 5: Effects of Discrimination Hindering Participation
## Effects of Discrimination

### Socioeconomic Disparities in Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No High School Degree</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>No Vehicle Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>$63,393</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$37,906</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$38,848</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) ¶¶ 44, 46, 48
Costs to Obtain EIC
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• Travel
Costs to Obtain EIC

• Travel

• Costs for Documents
Costs to Obtain EIC

• Travel
• Costs for Documents
• Documents to Obtain Documents
Senate Factor 7:
Extent of Election to Public Office
## Extent of Election to Public Office

### Share of Seats Held by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen Population</th>
<th>Legislative Seats</th>
<th>Federal, State, &amp; Local Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>7.1%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2000 Data.  ** 2003 Data

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) ¶¶ 53-54
Second Additional Senate Factor: Tenuousness
Policy Justifications
Policy Justifications

• In-Person Voter Fraud in Texas
Policy Justifications

• In-Person Voter Fraud in Texas
• Effects of Voter ID on Confidence
Policy Justifications

• In-Person Voter Fraud in Texas
• Effects of Voter ID on Confidence
• Misrepresentation or Lack of Awareness by SB 14 Supporters
# Two Classes of Votes

## Voters Casting Ballots by Mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.9%**</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.0%**</td>
<td>3.9%*</td>
<td>3.5%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 90% level.  ** Significant at 95% level

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Table 3
Second Additional Senate Factor: Tenuousness
Additional factors that in some cases have had probative value as part of plaintiffs’ evidence to establish a violation are: * * * whether the policy underlying the state or political subdivisions use of such voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice or procedure is tenuous. 117

117 If the procedure markedly departs from past practices or from practices elsewhere in the jurisdiction, that bears on the fairness of its impact. But even a consistently applied practice premised on a racially neutral policy would not negate a plaintiff’s showing through other factors that the challenged practice denies minorities fair access to the process.

Source: Senate Report, No. 97-417 at 29 (1982)
## Marked Departure from Past Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Past Law*</th>
<th>SB 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration Certificate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas DL/ID</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Passport</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Photo ID</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Only Military &amp; CHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Papers</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Only with Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Certificate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Mail</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Check</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other SOS-Approved Document</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Other Identifying Documents</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poll-Worker Vouching</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding first-time voters due to HAVA requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ameliorative Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Federal ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any State ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigence Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID from Other States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Impediment Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthier Expiration Grace Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of No-Fee ID in Every County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Figure 1
## Comparison to Other Strict ID States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DL/ID/Election ID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Passport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military ID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State ID</td>
<td>CHL only</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Certificate with Photo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University and College ID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Board and Authority ID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired Driver’s License</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigent Exemption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election ID Available in Every County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) ¶¶ 6, 67-69, 71, 75-77; Burden Reply (PL 759) ¶ 17
Prior Research on Effects of Voter ID
Analysis of Post-Implementation Elections
Opportunity to Participate in the Political Process
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The Calculus of Voting

\[(p \times B - C) + D\]

- \(p\) = Probability of Affecting Outcome
- \(B\) = Benefit of Preferred Candidate Winning
- \(C\) = Cost of Voting
- \(D\) = Duty
$$\left( pxB - C \right) + D$$

- **p** = Probability of Affecting Outcome
- **B** = Benefit of Preferred Candidate Winning
- **C** = Cost of Voting
- **D** = Duty
Minority Voter Participation
# Minority Voter Participation

## CPS Estimated Voter Turnout in Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>57.7%*</td>
<td>36.7%*</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>38.7%*</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>41.6%*</td>
<td>25.4%*</td>
<td>37.8%*</td>
<td>23.1%*</td>
<td>38.8%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically Significance Difference from Anglo

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Table 1
Political Science & the Senate Factors
The Senate Factors

1. History of Official Discrimination
2. Extent of Racially Polarized Voting
3. Use of Devices to Enhance Effects of At-Large Elections
4. Exclusion from Candidate Slating Process
5. Effects of Discrimination Hindering Political Participation
6. Overt or Subtle Racial Appeals
7. Extent of Minority Officials Elected to Public Office
   • Lack of Responsiveness to the Needs of the Minority Group
   • Tenuousness
Senate Factor 1: History of Official Discrimination
Official Discrimination in Voting
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• White Primary

• Poll Tax

• Re-Registration Requirements
Senate Factor 2: Racially Polarized Voting
## Racially Polarized Voting

### NEP Exit Polls: Estimated Republican Vote Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Table 2
Senate Factor 5: Effects of Discrimination Hindering Participation
Effects of Discrimination

Socioeconomic Disparities in Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No High School Degree</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>No Vehicle Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>$63,393</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$37,906</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$38,848</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) ¶¶ 44, 46, 48
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Senate Factor 7: Extent of Election to Public Office
### Extent of Election to Public Office

#### Share of Seats Held by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen Population</th>
<th>Legislative Seats</th>
<th>Federal, State, &amp; Local Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>7.1%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2000 Data. ** 2003 Data

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) ¶¶ 53-54
Second Additional Senate Factor: Tenuousness
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Policy Justifications

• In-Person Voter Fraud in Texas
• Effects of Voter ID on Confidence
• Misrepresentation or Lack of Awareness by SB 14 Supporters
Two Classes of Votes

Voters Casting Ballots by Mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.9%**</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.0%**</td>
<td>3.9%*</td>
<td>3.5%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 90% level.  ** Significant at 95% level
Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Table 3
Second Additional Senate Factor: Tenuousness
Tenuousness

Additional factors that in some cases have had probative value as part of plaintiffs’ evidence to establish a violation are: * * * whether the policy underlying the state or political subdivisions use of such voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice or procedure is tenuous.117

117 If the procedure markedly departs from past practices or from practices elsewhere in the jurisdiction, that bears on the fairness of its impact. But even a consistently applied practice premised on a racially neutral policy would not negate a plaintiff’s showing through other factors that the challenged practice denies minorities fair access to the process.

Source: Senate Report, No. 97-417 at 29 (1982)
Marked Departure from Past Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Page 89 of 153</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Past Law*</th>
<th>SB 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration Certificate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas DL/ID</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Passport</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Photo ID</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Only Military &amp; CHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Papers</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Only with Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Certificate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Mail</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Check</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other SOS-Approved Document</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Other Identifying Documents</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poll-Worker Vouching</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding first-time voters due to HAVA requirements.

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) ¶¶ 7, 60
Rejected or Omitted Ameliorative Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any Federal ID</th>
<th>Employee ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any State ID</td>
<td>Tribal ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal ID</td>
<td>Indigence Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID from Other States</td>
<td>Vouching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ID</td>
<td>Reasonable Impediment Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthier Expiration Grace Period</td>
<td>Availability of No-Fee ID in Every County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) Figure 1
## Comparison to Other Strict ID States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DL/ID/Election ID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Passport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military ID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State ID</td>
<td>CHL only</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Certificate with Photo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University and College ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Board and Authority ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired Driver’s License</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigent Exemption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election ID Available in Every County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burden Report (PL 758) ¶¶ 6, 67-69, 71, 75-77; Burden Reply (PL 759) ¶ 17
Prior Research on Effects of Voter ID
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Dear Senator Ellis:

Thank you for your recent correspondence concerning the implementation of Senate Bill 14, passed by the Eighty-second Texas Legislature. Following is my response, along with your original questions for reference.

- How many DPS office locations will be issuing the election identification certificate (EIC), the free identification option that satisfies the requirements of Section 63.001(b), Election Code? All DPS offices will issue the Election Identification Certificate (EIC).

- Where are these offices located? Throughout the state. [Link to DPS office locations]

- Will persons seeking to apply for an EIC have to wait in the same line as other seeking to apply for a driver’s license? Large driver license offices have queuing systems that assist in routing applicants, according to service needs. Since requirements for an EIC will be similar to those for a Texas ID, we anticipate utilizing the ID lines for EIC applicants.

- Or will there be a separate processing line for those only seeking and EIC? There are no plans to establish separate lines for EIC applicants at this time. However, changes can be made based upon service demand using the queuing system.

- What is the current average wait time, by day of the week, for persons seeking to apply for a driver’s license at each DPS office location that will be issuing EICs? Wait times vary by location, type, and time of the transaction. While we do not have specific wait times for all offices, it can range from zero in many offices to as long as 3 hours in metropolitan areas during our busiest months of the year. From March 1 through June 30, 2011, the 59 busiest offices in the state, which have queuing systems, posted an average wait time of 42:52 minutes, with an average transaction time of 7:08 minutes. Customers in these offices spent an average of 50 minutes from the time their transaction was entered into the queuing system until it was completed. This does not include the time someone would have to wait in line before they could be entered into the queuing system. The addition of six mega centers in our most populated areas throughout the state is essential to reducing wait times. The goal is to issue an EIC within 30 minutes from the time a person arrives at a driver license location anywhere in the state. Funding by the State Legislature is critical to reducing wait times.
• What identification will be required in order to obtain an EIC? An original applicant for an election identification certificate must present: (1) One piece of primary identification; (2) Two pieces of secondary identification; or (3) One piece of secondary identification plus two pieces of supporting identification.

o A Texas driver license or personal identification card issued to the person that has been expired for 60 days and is within two years of expiration date may be presented as primary identification.

o Secondary identification. Original or certified copy of a birth certificate issued by the appropriate State Bureau of Vital Statistics or equivalent agency; (2) Original or certified copy of United States Department of State Certification of Birth (issued to United States citizens born abroad); or (3) Original or certified copy of court order with name and date of birth (DOB) indicating an official change of name and/or gender.

o Supporting identification. (1) voter registration card; (2) school records; (3) insurance policy (at least two years old); (4) vehicle title; (5) military records; (6) unexpired military dependant identification card; (7) original or certified copy of marriage license or divorce decree; (8) Social Security card; (9) pilot's license; (10) unexpired photo DL or photo ID issued by another (United States) state, US territory, the District of Columbia; (11) expired photo DL or photo ID issued by another (United States) state, US territory, or the District of Columbia that is within two years of the expiration date; (12) an offender identification card or similar form of identification issued by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice; (13) any document that may be added to Section 15.24 (relating to Identification of Applicants) other than those issued to persons who are not citizens of the U.S.

• How long do you anticipate the turnaround will be from the day a person applies for an EIC to the date they receive the actual EIC? DPS is currently mailing DL/IDs less than 10 days after application. We do not anticipate any changes with the addition of the EIC.

• Will DPS be offering a temporary EIC at the DPS office locations that will comply with the requirements of Section 63.001(b) of the Election Code so that any delays in processing or mailing out the official EIC will not result in a person’s inability to vote? A temporary EIC, which includes a photo, will be issued at the time of application. The Secretary of State’s office has confirmed that it will be accepted at the polls in the same manner as the actual card. This also applies to temporary DLs and IDs.

• Recent press reports indicate that a top official in the Wisconsin Department of Transportation instructed staff at Division of Motor Vehicles service centers not to tell members of the public that they can obtain voter identification cards free of charge unless they know to ask for it. Will DPS be taking a similar approach? No it will not.

• In other words, will DPS staff be precluded from telling members of the public that they can obtain an EIC free-of-charge unless staff is directly asked? No. Driver License employees will be trained on the provisions of the law and will be able to explain the differences in an EIC and a State ID to those persons who come into a driver license office to obtain an EIC. DPS staff will be expected to serve the customer and provide them an EIC cost free as required by law. We will also inform customers that if they have any of the documents acceptable for voting; a driver license, identification card, concealed handgun license, US passport, citizenship card, or military ID, they will not be eligible to receive the EIC.
Does DPS plan on organizing any satellite locations, temporary or otherwise, in order to provide Texans with opportunities to apply for an EIC outside of the normal DPS office locations? I would note this would be especially relevant for Texans with disabilities, the elderly, and those too sick or without means to travel to a DPS office location. No. The law does exempt those persons who can prove disability through Social Security Administration or Veteran's Administration documentation to the Secretary of State from presenting additional identification.

The proposed DPS rules for implementing the requirement to issue an EIC are attached for reference. These rules will be published in the October 14, 2011, Texas Register and available for public comment for 30 days after publication.

Thank you again for your correspondence and please feel free to contact Rebecca Davio, Assistant Director, Driver License Division at 512.424.5232 if you have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Steven C. McCraw
Director

Attachments: Transaction Frequency 2010
DPS Proposed Rules-Election Identification Certificate
Testimony of Dr. Gerald Webster

Qualifications
## Texas Population Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000 Population</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) ¶ 10
# Statewide Poverty Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen Poverty Rate</th>
<th>Percent Household Units without Vehicle Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 1
Anglo Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 1
African American Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 2
Hispanic Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 3
Citizen Poverty Rate

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 6
Statewide EIC Availability
Registered Voters without SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 25
Percent Voters without SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 26
## Voters Without SB 14 ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>RVs without ID</th>
<th>Percent RVs without ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>13,462,610</td>
<td>606,444</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Vehicle Access Tracts</td>
<td>199,397</td>
<td>24,522</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 9
# Geographic Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Texas (N=5,234)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo CVAP</td>
<td>-0.581**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. CVAP</td>
<td>0.403**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic CVAP</td>
<td>0.398**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>0.669**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Access</td>
<td>0.628**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 10
Travel Burden
Methodology
Sample Travel Routes

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 12
City of Houston
Houston: Anglo Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 6
Houston: African American Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 7
Houston: Hispanic Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 8
Houston: No Vehicle Access

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 10
## Travel Time: Houston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Way Travel Time</th>
<th>All Tracts</th>
<th>Low Vehicle Access Tracts</th>
<th>LVA Tracts including Temporary DPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes By Car</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes By Bus</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 4
Houston: No SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 27
Houston: No SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 27

Houston: African American Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 7
Houston: No SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 27

Houston: Hispanic Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 8
City of San Antonio
San Antonio: Anglo Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 13
San Antonio: African American Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 14
San Antonio: Hispanic Population

*These Mobile ID Locations were available February 25th and 26th, 2014.

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 15
San Antonio: No Vehicle Access

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 17
Travel Time: San Antonio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Way Travel Time</th>
<th>All Tracts</th>
<th>Low Vehicle Access Tracts</th>
<th>LVA Tracts including Temporary DPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes By Car</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes By Bus</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 6
San Antonio: No SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 28
San Antonio: No SB 14 ID

San Antonio: African American Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 28

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 14
San Antonio: No SB 14 ID

San Antonio: Hispanic Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 28

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 15
City of Dallas
Dallas: Anglo Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 19
Dallas: African American Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 20
Dallas: Hispanic Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 21
Dallas: No Vehicle Access

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 23
# Travel Time: Dallas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Way Travel Time</th>
<th>All Tracts</th>
<th>Low Vehicle Access Tracts</th>
<th>LVA Tracts including Temporary DPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes By Car</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes By Bus</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 6
Dallas: No SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 29
Dallas: No SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 29

Dallas: African American Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 20
Dallas: No SB 14 ID

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 29

Dallas: Hispanic Population

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Figure 21
## Voters Without SB 14 ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>RVs without ID</th>
<th>Percent RVs without ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>966,820</td>
<td>57,458</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston LVA Tracts</td>
<td>47,780</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>682,056</td>
<td>38,735</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio LVA Tracts</td>
<td>29,860</td>
<td>3.376</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>601,232</td>
<td>42,251</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas LVA Tracts</td>
<td>39,594</td>
<td>5,606</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 9
## Geographic Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Houston (N=458)</th>
<th>San Antonio (N=285)</th>
<th>Dallas (N=302)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo CVAP</td>
<td>-0.715**</td>
<td>-0.759**</td>
<td>-0.757**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. CVAP</td>
<td>0.648**</td>
<td>0.188**</td>
<td>0.660**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic CVAP</td>
<td>0.234**</td>
<td>0.697**</td>
<td>0.311**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>0.743**</td>
<td>0.689**</td>
<td>0.779**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle</td>
<td>0.669**</td>
<td>0.670**</td>
<td>0.695**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Source: Webster Final Report (PL 775R) Table 10
Conclusion
Driver Licenses

Bill: SB14
Companion: 
Author: 
Version: ENR: Enrolled as Finally Passed

DIVISION SME & CONTACT INFO
Name: Janie Smith
Phone: x2976
Email: janie.smith@txdps.state.tx.us

1. Does this bill contain a priority of the Department or the Public Safety Commission? If Yes, please list the priority.

No

2. Does this bill relate to the DPS goals of: combat terrorism, enhance public safety, disaster response and recovery or provide world class services? If Yes, which goal does it relate to and how?

Yes
World Class Service - The Enrolled version requires a new Election Identification to be issued at no cost, separate from the current Personal Identification Certificate. As with other versions of this bill, this could affect lines at wait times at DL offices, particularly surrounding major voting times like a Presidential election.
3. Who have you spoken with about this bill? (For example, legislative office, other state agencies, your supervisor, external organizations.) Please be specific: name of who you spoke with; their contact information; and details discussed. **Update as needed.

Rebecca Davio, DLD AD, regarding the new Election ID card that was never discussed or included in any previous versions of the bill.

4. Does this bill create or expand a penalty? If Yes, please list the new or enhanced penalty.

No
5. Does this bill repeal any current state statute? If Yes, please list the citation of statute that is to be repealed.
Yes
Not as it relates to DL
Election Code 63.007 and 63.008 are repealed.

6. Does this bill create or expand a fee or fine? If Yes, which one and what is the fiscal impact per fiscal year for FY11 - FY16. Show the current fee, new fee and frequency of collection by fiscal year.
Yes
The Enrolled version requires DPS to issue a no cost Election ID card. The CCR requires that the new card be a different color than a DL/ID but otherwise look similar.
Production and mailing cost for a card is $1.67. We do not know the number of cards that will be issued, but DPS will bear the cost of the card production.

7. Does this bill require DPS to create, update, or modify any policies, procedures, reports, administrative rules, etc., including the General Manual, publications, reports to the Legislature, executive branch or task forces? If Yes, what policy or report is it and what is the fiscal impact per fiscal year for FY11 - FY16. List the cost of each new or revised manual, publication, report, etc. by fiscal year. Estimate the number of additional work hours needed to accommodate the new or revised product.
Yes
Since the Enrolled version requires a new card to be issued, this will require additional training for customer operations staff on the issuance of a new card. The following training requirements were provided for the original bill, which required issuance of a free Personal ID for persons meeting the requirements to obtain such for voting.
*Training
50 hours of preparation time for one DLD employee to create the training module
1534 employees to be trained in a two-three-hour session - training can be done at the workplace, so no need for travel or out of office time
Cost to produce training materials- $3481.70
*Manual revisions to update issuance procedures - 3 hours
8. Is there a fiscal impact to the Department program or division? Please be specific about the number of FTE's needed, administrative costs, program costs, etc. List the state classified titles, the start dates for those positions, and the number of such classified titles for each fiscal year from FY11 - FY16. Show how many positions will be stationed at headquarters versus field offices. For a full list of all classified titles go to: http://sao.hr.state.tx.us/Compensation/index.html. Specify how much is needed for travel and training for each position by fiscal year.

Yes

**Required Programming:**
*Programming would be needed to allow an original or renewal election identification certificate.*
*Programming to the Driver License System would be needed to add an additional Correction – No Fee reason (Register to vote) to be added to the list of CNF reasons listed in Alt Flow 7 of UCS Collect Fee.*
*Updated: Programming would be needed to add a new enforcement action code (see Review item #27132).*

**Use Cases Effected:**
- UCS Collect Fee
- Issuance
- Submit Enforcement Action
- TOL
9. What is the justification for the cost estimate? Explain the methodology for your cost estimate.

DLS programming
Training - actual cost for materials

10. What is the effective date of this bill?

01/01/2012

11. Is there anything else that Executive Management needs to know about this bill? (For example, was it previously filed? Was it previously passed and subsequently vetoed? Does the bill codify a current rule or practice of the Department or Commission?)

The Enrolled version will cost significantly more money to implement due to the requirement of creating a new Election ID card.
Privileged