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CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: All right. Thank you, Ms. McGeehan.

The Chair recognizes Senator Davis.

QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR

SEN. DAVIS: Hello. Good evening. Thank you so much for being here with us to provide answers for our questions. I know you've had a long day.

I just want to ask you a few questions about the current state of voter education as it's taking place today in the Secretary of State's Office. Can you describe for us the use of the HAVA funds and how those are currently being used today?

MS. McGEEHAN: We received -- when Congress passed the Help America Vote Act, the state of Texas received a set amount of funds. And pursuant to the Help America Vote Act, there are certain purpose areas that we can use those funds for, and one of the purpose areas is voter education. So since two -- we have conducted three statewide education -- voter education programs, one in 2006, one in 2008 and one in 2010 using those federal dollars. And they have been -- we've worked with a public education firm to do research, and then they develop creative material. We run PSAs on TV, radio. In this last cycle, 2010, we used the Internet quite a bit as well.
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1 SEN. DAVIS: That's the amount that was
2 given to the state of Texas?
3 MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.
4 SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And so of that amount,
5 how much have we spent so far?
6 MS. McGEEHAN: Let's see here. We -- I
7 think we have spent $177,798,488.
8 SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And you described
9 spending about $3 million over the last three two-year
10 cycles. How have we spent the balance of that?
11 MS. McGEEHAN: Well, I mean, the bulk of
12 the money or about half of the money went to counties to
13 obtain HAVA compliant voting systems, electronic voting
14 systems that made -- that complied with HAVA and allowed
15 disabled voters to vote independently. So let's see.
16 $140 million went to the counties for that purpose.
17 The other program areas are for developing
18 a statewide voter registration system. We've spent
19 25 million on that. And then as far as the
20 administrative expenses, we've spent about 2.8 million
21 on that. For voter education, we've spent 9.5 million
22 so far.
23 SEN. DAVIS: And what are the -- setting
24 aside the requirements of the bill that's being
25 introduced today, what are the intended plans for the
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budget that I discussed is following that state plan.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And under that state plan right now, what portion of funding remains for voter education?

MS. McGEEHAN: For voter -- okay. And actually to be more precise, what the -- the purpose area for voter education is for voter education and also for election official and poll worker training; that's grouped. And the amount remaining is between 5 and $7 million.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And that is expected to extend us or to take us through the next how many years under that plan?

MS. McGEEHAN: It will -- again, it's going to depend how extensive our next few voter education programs are because that's what the bulk of the money has been spent on, voter education programs. The average is about 3 million. So I guess the hope might be for at least two other statewide voter education programs.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And I'm sure you've seen the fiscal note that was a part of this bill. And by the way, I think it would be very helpful if you would enter that state plan into the record as an exhibit for our further use.
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but it's hard for me to say today exactly how much that
may take away from future voter education efforts.

SEN. DAVIS: When was the last time in the
state of Texas we made any changes of significance to
the voter rules?

MS. McGEEHAN: Probably the -- when we had
to implement the federal Help America Vote Act. That's
when provisional voting became a requirement. There
were significant changes to voter registration as to
what's required to become a registered voter, and that's
why we have these HAVA dollars for voter education.

SEN. DAVIS: And that began in '06.

Correct?

MS. McGEEHAN: Correct.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. In '06, the Texas
voter registration application form changed in
accordance with those requirements, it's my
understanding, and that's when we began to collect this
data that requested a driver's license number or a
social security number. Is that's correct?

MS. McGEEHAN: That's correct.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. So we have data, I
guess, only from '06, and that would -- would that only
be then for new registrants from '06? If I had already
registered to vote prior to that, you wouldn't have that
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percent number, but the actual number is 2.3 million
since 2006. Since January 1, 2006 through December 31,
2010, 2.3 million, when they registered, provided their
driver's license number.

SEN. DAVIS: What's the total number of
applications in that time period?

MS. MCGEEHAN: And the total number -- I
think it's going to be just under 3 million, and I'm
doing math on the fly. I might have to -- I'd prefer to
give that --

SEN. DAVIS: Can you provide that
information --

MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. DAVIS: -- to us?

MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. DAVIS: That would be appreciated.

So what's the number of people who are not
filling out either the driver's license number or the
social security number in Section 8 but instead are
going to Section 9 and signing the attestation clause of
Section 9?

MS. MCGEEHAN: And that's the attestation
clause saying they have not been issued either form of
ID?

SEN. DAVIS: (Nodded)
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was optional. It was on the form.

SEN. DAVIS: Uh-huh. Okay. So we really
don't know how many of that group were answering the
question voluntarily because they have the number versus
those who were not answering it, not because they chose.
to, but because they did have their driver's license
number?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes, you are correct.

That's right.

SEN. DAVIS: So when we're putting
together an estimate of what the cost to educate our
voters is going to be and when we think about how
significant the changes are that are addressed in this
bill, what's your -- what's your process been to try to
determine how many people will be impacted and what that
voter education is going to need to look like?

MS. McGEEHAN: Well, we -- I mean, to be
very honest, we haven't done much planning yet. We
prepared this fiscal note on Friday. That would be
obviously a very important component is trying to
identify who the appropriate audiences are, who you need
to get the information out to.

Senator Williams had approached us earlier
today to see if we could do some comparisons to try and
further focus in on who those registered voters are that
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what's required in order to vote in the state of Texas. Why is the number to educate -- on such a sweeping change for what will likely be a much larger group of impacted people in the state of Texas, why is that number so much lower than the $3 million number that's currently being spent for voter education?

MS. McGEEHAN: Well, if the -- if a $2 million program is added into an existing $3 million program, then you've got a $5 million program. I mean, our voter education under HAVA is directed to all registered voters. And so, you know, a new voter -- a new photo ID requirement would also need to be directed to all registered voters because it's a change for all voters.

SEN. DAVIS: So we're talking about -- I'm sorry to interrupt you. We're talking a $2 million addition to the $3 million that was already intended for voter education in this next two-year cycle.

MS. McGEEHAN: Possibly, possibly. I mean, we -- you know, we've got a communications director that would have some input on that. This fiscal note represented what we thought might be a reasonable fiscal note. If we have, you know, legislative direction to take it a different way or do additional outreach, that's fine. But based on the way
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really nice to have them to do that. We never had that kind of funding before. So if there's a desire to do voter education programs of this -- of this type, then we would need state appropriation.

SEN. DAVIS: So these federal funds will take us basically through a one-time voter education drive on the requirements of this new law, but it's not going to take us further than that?

MS. MCGEEHAN: Not if we use it all, not -- it could possibly use up the remainder of the voter education funds.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. So we've talked about the voter education. Talk to us a little bit about the costs of training the poll workers and the registrars.

MS. MCGEEHAN: We currently have several training programs for -- well, we have training programs for the county election officials and then other training programs for the poll workers. We have an online training program. We have a video. We have handbooks. So we would have to update all of those -- all those different formats of training.

SEN. DAVIS: And what's the anticipated costs for updating all those forms of training?

MS. MCGEEHAN: We don't usually put a fiscal note when there's a change in state law and we
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MS. McGEEHAN: It's my understanding that when we've been asked to prepare fiscal notes for these kinds of issues, we have not added a fiscal impact for something that's already a statutory duty. As we analyze HB 1, maybe we're going to have to revise that, but at least our standing policy was if it was a statutory duty that we're already charged to do, that we don't put an additional fiscal note on it.

SEN. DAVIS: Are you concerned that you're going to find yourselves fairly flatfooted in terms of not being prepared with the resources that you need, to train election workers and to train county administrators on the requirements of this new law facing the budget cuts that you're facing without a fiscal note that's going to add resources to your department for purposes of carrying out these requirements?

MS. McGEEHAN: I think all state agencies in the state have concerns about providing the services they are charged to provide in light of significant budget cuts. But on the issue of training, the analysis was that that was not going to cost anything additional as to what we've already been appropriated.

SEN. DAVIS: And do you agree with that, that it's not going to cost anything additional for your
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numbered year, we hold four seminars, and we have very
good attendance from our county election officials. So
I would be certain that our August county election
official seminar will be heavily -- if this passes will
heavily emphasize these new rules.

To go back to the federal funds, which we
know are limited, the grant for voter education also
includes election official training and poll worker
training. So if there are any remaining HAVA dollars in
that category that we don't use on voter education, we
could perhaps use to additional -- to develop additional
training materials.

SEN. DAVIS: Yes, and we talked about that
a moment ago, and you did state on the record that that
category of 5 to $7 million that's remaining is the
entirety of the federal resource that you have available
to you right now, both for voter education and for
training purposes. And we've also talked about the fact
that the expectation and the demand on that particular
fund for public education is going to take the
significant balance that remains there. Correct?

MS. McGEENAH: Right. Well, just to be
clear, the remaining balance in the HAVA is all we have
for voter education, but there are some state funds -- I
don't think it's a lot -- but that would go towards
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MS. McGEEHAN: Okay. I think that what that is referring to is that at the end of Senate Bill 14, there's a reference that says county voter registrars can use Chapter 19 funds to defray costs in conducting a voter registration drive. But I don't see anything -- and I may have missed it -- but I don't see anything in Senate Bill 14 that requires a voter registration drive. I think it's -- what that section in the bill is doing is trying to make clear that these funds, which are -- go to county voter registrars to enhance voter registration could be used to do voter registration drives, but I don't see anything that requires a voter registration drive in Senate Bill 14.

SEN. DAVIS: What resources currently are expected of our local governments in carrying out the training and the public awareness programs under our election code.

MS. McGEEHAN: The -- there's no state law requirement to do voter education by the county officials. Most of them do it as a public service because they want to, but there's not a mandate under state law to do that.

Under Senate Bill 14, there's required training of poll workers on the new photo ID requirements. And I may have missed part of your
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currently on the roll because I've married or I've
divorced, how is that situation handled today?

MS. McEEHAN: State law doesn't directly
address it. So I think that as a practical matter
what's happening is the poll workers are making judgment
calls as they qualify those voters for voting.

SEN. DAVIS: But they are not being given
guidance or rules or requirements in terms of how they
are to deal with that situation today?

MS. McEEHAN: No.

SEN. DAVIS: It's within their discretion?

MS. McEEHAN: At this point. I mean,
state law is silent on it, and our office has not issued
any guidance on it. So we're hearing a lot about that
today. That's definitely something we'll probably need
to look into, but right now there is no rule or statute
on that issue.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And today if I go to
vote and my identification that I use for purposes of
voting has a different address on it than is listed on
the precinct roll, I think it's the interpretation today
under 2004 Secretary of State opinion that I am asked
for my correct address, and I am to be believed if I say
that my address is the address that's on the precinct
list as opposed to what might be on my ID?
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SEN. DAVIS: And what steps would the Secretary of State's Office engage in to assure that the ID wasn't being used to establish an understanding of the voter's residency?

MS. McGEEHAN: Would definitely, I think, be included in our training materials to emphasize that.

SEN. DAVIS: Currently, is there any information that the Secretary of State's Office gathers that breaks down by category voters in the state? And when I say "by category," I mean by race, by gender, by disability, by age.

MS. McGEEHAN: We have some information. We have -- we have age for sure. On gender -- we have some information on gender, but it's not conclusive because gender is now -- it used to be a required element on the voter registration application. In 1995, it was taken -- or it became optional after the National Voter Registration Act. So we have some data on gender, but, again, it's not complete.

Regarding ethnicity, we really -- we don't have any information like that because it's not collected when a person applies to register to vote. The only data that we do have is we do have the number of voters that have an Hispanic surname. And so we can run the list of registered voters against this list of
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to have some way to collect it. So we could revisit
putting that question or adding that as a question to
the voter registration application. I’d be happy to
visit on ways where we could try and collect that, but
right now we would not have the tools that we would need
to be able to collect that data.

SEN. DAVIS: It seems rather important as
implementation of this law advances that that
information be made available for the Justice Department
review as well as any judicial review that might occur
in terms of the impact of the implementation of the law.

I believe that’s all the questions I have
for you. Thank you so much.

MS. McGEEHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: The Chair recognizes
Senator West.

SEN. WEST: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman. Many of the questions Senator Davis has
already asked, but have you had a chance to look at the
bill as introduced?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. WEST: Okay. Do you happen to have
it there in front of you?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes, I do.

SEN. WEST: Okay. Great. Before I get
opinion or something like that?

MS. McGEEHAN: Well, advisories are usually a little more -- it's like the most formal that we do.

SEN. WEST: Right.

MS. McGEEHAN: Yeah. Okay.

SEN. WEST: All right. Let me ask you to go to Page 4 of the bill.

MS. McGEEHAN: Okay. Can you tell me the section? Because I think I have a different format.

SEN. WEST: Okay. It's Section 7, and Section 7(c) and (d).

MS. McGEEHAN: Okay.

SEN. DAVIS: Let me know when you get there;

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. WEST: Okay. It's my understanding that the election officer that's being referred to in Section (d) is -- is the individual working at the poll. Is that right?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. WEST: Okay. That person will be called upon in Section (d) to determine if the voter's name is on the precinct list of registered voters, and the voter's identity can be verified from the
the best practices on reasonable methods to verify the
ID document against the list of registered voters.

SEN. WEST: Okay. But you would agree
with me that in interpreting Section (c) and (d) without
some sort of guidance would lend itself to a great deal
of subjectivity; thus inconsistent application
throughout the state?

MS. McGEEHAN: It could, yes.

SEN. WEST: Okay. As it relates to --
let's see. What page is it on? The next page, which
will be (h), it's in the same section.

MS. McGEEHAN: Okay.

SEN. WEST: Would you read Section (h) and
tell me how you interpret that as the chief
administrator of the election laws in the state of Texas
next to, needless to say, Secretary of State?

MS. McGEEHAN: (h) reads, "The
requirements for identification prescribed by Subsection
(b) do not apply to a voter who: (1) presents the
voter's voter registration certificate on offering to
vote; and (2) was 70 years of age or older on January 1,
2012, as indicated by the date of birth on the voter's
voter registration certificate."

The way I had -- until earlier this
afternoon when Senator Ellis asked the question, I had
CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes. Our agency put it -- I helped.

SEN. WEST: Okay. Did someone under your supervision contact local governments to determine the impact, the fiscal impact, that implementation of this will have?

MS. McGEEHAN: No, we did not.

SEN. WEST: That was done by someone else?

MS. McGEEHAN: I think LBB does that. We just -- we just --

SEN. WEST: Provided the information?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yeah. Right.

SEN. WEST: And based on your experience when these types of changes -- let me back up. How much experience have you had in this particular area, that is, the election laws, in administration of election laws?

MS. McGEEHAN: I have been working in the elections division for 21 years.

SEN. WEST: So you've had a little experience, huh?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. WEST: Okay. All right. As it relates to when changes are made in state law of this nature, is there an impact, a fiscal impact, on local
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impact is the training. If the counties have to change
up their training procedures much or do more training
because they want to make sure the word is out to all
their -- that might increase their training costs.

SEN. WEST: Okay. So there are some
factors that need to be taken into consideration as to
whether or not counties will be burdened with additional
cost to implement this law. Is that correct?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. WEST: Okay. And would it be a fair
statement to say the larger the county, the more of the
burden -- of the financial burden -- well, that's not a
fair question.

Would it be a fair statement to say that
the larger the county, the larger the potential
financial obligation that they would have to encounter
in order to implement the law?

MS. McGEEHAN: I think that's true, but I
can hear small counties say that it might be
proportional, you know, since their budgets are -- I
mean --

SEN. WEST: Right. It's all relative to
what your budgets are.

MS. McGEEHAN: Yeah.

SEN. WEST: But the fact is that that --
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analysis -- at least solicit from the various counties what the fiscal implication is going to be in order to implement this bill.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: Okay. I think, Senator, that will be an individual request from you, and then it can be distributed to all members of the Senate --

SEN. WEST: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: -- whenever it's done.

You know, I doubt that that will be done by the time we rise and report to the Senate.

SEN. WEST: Okay. We can't get it tonight?

(Laughter)

SEN. WEST: I'm just joking with you.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: You won't be a very popular guy if the --

SEN. WEST: I'd like --

(Laughter)

SEN. WEST: I'd like to get it as soon as possible, though.

Let's see. No further questions. Thank you very much.

MS. McGEEHAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: Thank you, Senator West. Senator Gallegos?
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you came up with your fiscal note. Is that correct?

    MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. GALLEGOS: Okay. Well, then what are they doing that we're not or, you know, how can you -- you know, for $10 million for 5.9 million people and we're only going to spend 2 million, I mean, what's the difference?

    MS. McGEEHAN: I am not familiar with the Missouri voter identification bill, and I did hear you ask that earlier today, but I've been trying to listen to all the questions. So we can -- we can research it and see. Some states actually provide more to their local county governments and print ballots and things like that. I don't know if that's the situation in Missouri, but I honestly don't know the answer to that question because I don't know what the Missouri voter ID law requires.

    SEN. GALLEGOS: Well, it's a substantial more amount of money than we're looking --

    MS. McGEEHAN: Yeah.

    SEN. GALLEGOS: -- at the fiscal note that you have -- that you've given this committee on Senate Bill 14. And I just -- it concerns me that that amount of money, if somebody is doing -- in the formula or methodology that you came up with that number -- I mean,
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1 would concern me, and I would hope it would concern any
2 of the other Senators on this floor. Are we, you know,
3 really going to do -- in implementing this bill, are we
4 going to educate those folks out there?

5 Now, you know -- and I'd like that answer.
6 I mean, you can't answer it now, I understand, but I
7 would like an answer to that.

8 MS. McEEHHAN: We'll get you an answer.
9 SEN. GALLEGOS: And a comparison on what
10 really your states that have implemented voter ID, how
11 much are they paying, you know, to implement the program
12 and what they do.

13 Now, on the fiscal note, it says you're
14 going to do TV and radio and some other things. I mean,
15 can you explain to this body the process on TV, or is it
16 going to be in different languages, or how are you going
17 to -- how are you going to split up the money? Who gets
18 the most? You know, I mean, it's not -- it's not
19 explained to us in the fiscal note how you're going to
20 spread the money around. And is that going to be
21 accessible to us or how the process is going to be, or
22 how much money are you going to spend in Harris County
23 as opposed to Lubbock, Texas or wherever?

24 MS. McEEHHAN: Yes, that would be
25 available. And, you know, the programs that we've done
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under 31.012, Voter Identification, Senator West brought it up about -- it says here you and -- your office and the voter registrar of each county that maintains it shall provide notice of the ID requirements as prescribed by this change.

Now, my concern there is, is at the county level -- you know, I think Senator West brought it up -- is how much is going to be incumbent on each county, you know? I and others here on this floor represent the largest county, Harris County, and Harris County is already starting to lay off, and they have a shortfall, and they are laying off as we speak right now. So, you know -- and I see what it says in the bill, you know, that you're going to get together with them. I mean, are they going to have the money? Or where is the -- if they don't have the money, where is the other money going to come from? Other than the 2 million you already have prescribed here and any federal matches that come in, where is that money going to come if those counties cannot provide?

MS. McGEEHAN: I think that the bill presumes that counties have a website, and so this requirement is that they post, you know, the information about the new photo ID requirements that the Secretary of State's Office will actually prescribe. So we will
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You can't presume anything if they're laying off right now as we speak, and that's a fact. Like I said, that's not a presumption. That concerns me. And what I'm asking is that if that can't happen in Harris County or any other county in this state, where is the extra money? If they don't have, obviously, the funds to provide what is prescribed under Senate Bill 14, where is that money going to come from?

MS. McGEEHAN: Well, you know, Senate Bill 14 doesn't make an appropriation to the county, so I don't know the answer to your question on that because, like I said, the bill -- I think the assumption is that counties have a website. So if they're not going to have a website --

SEN. GALLEGOS: But the bill prescribes that you will work in conjunction with the county registrar. Is that what I'm reading --

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. GALLEGOS: -- or am I reading the wrong bill?

MS. McGEEHAN: Maybe I'm not -- the way I read that was that we would provide them the wording, the language that they would put up on their website.

SEN. GALLEGOS: Well, you're going to provide them with that. But what about the bodies and
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1 Secretary of State's office.
2 SEN. GALLEGOS: Okay. So what you're
3 telling me is that outside of the $2 million that's in
4 the fiscal note and that under this section that you're
5 going to work with the registrar in each county, then we
6 just have to roll the dice and hope that the money is
7 there. Is that what you're telling me?
8 MS. McGEEHAN: Well, I think this fiscal
9 note that LBB did put -- does indicate that there may be
10 some county costs. You know, they did put some numbers
11 in for Tarrant County and for Bexar County. So, you
12 know, it's not -- I don't think it's the number you're
13 looking for. It's not a comprehensive number, but I
14 think that the fiscal note does indicate that there may
15 be a fiscal impact on counties.
16 SEN. GALLEGOS: There may be a fiscal
17 impact. You don't know how much?
18 MS. McGEEHAN: No, I don't.
19 SEN. GALLEGOS: So what we're looking at
20 in your fiscal note is just an open-ended fiscal note.
21 Is that what you're telling me?
22 MS. McGEEHAN: The fiscal note is really
23 showing the impact on the Secretary of State's office.
24 I can't really speak to how the portion of the fiscal
25 note that concerns impact on local government, how
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funds to do it. You know, to me, that's an unfunded mandate in really telling Texans that are looking at this debate on computer and that are looking at this bill online, that this $2 million fiscal note that you've provided is only an impact to the state, not the counties, not each county. Is that correct?

MS. McGEEHAN: That's correct.

SEN. GALLEGOS: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: Thank you, Senator Gallegos.

Senator Van de Putte.

SEN. VAN de PUTTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. McGeehan, you've been an excellent resource witness for us, and there are just two questions that I need to ask to get into the record with regard to a survey.

Does Texas participate in the Election Administration and Voting Survey?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. VAN de PUTTE: When was this survey completed, the last survey was completed? Was it after the 2008 election?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.
provisional ballots in all of the country.

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. VAN de PUTTE: At least that's what I understand from the report.

MS. McGEEHAN: That's correct.

SEN. VAN de PUTTE: Thank you. I know that we have the datasets that were put in for 2008, and so hopefully that we will be able to get this and make sure that as we monitor the bill as it progresses and the bill as it's implemented, we certainly don't need to get to the bottom of the bottom of the bottom on rejection of provisional ballots.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: Thank you, Senator Van de Putte.

Senator Fraser.

SEN. FRASER: Thanks for being here today and waiting all day.

I would like to clarify a point before you sit down. I think you're aware this morning that we had entered into a record -- the Secretary of State had a letter addressing the $2 million in the HAVA funds that was put into the record. Our understanding, from talking to the Secretary, the way the HAVA funds work, and also her relationship with the county, that she has
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MS. McGEEHAN: That's correct. And just an example of that, the cost that Bexar County put in the fiscal note was -- I think their assumption was that the certificate, the voter registration certificate would have to increase in size. And I don't see anything in the bill that requires that. And the Secretary of State prescribes the form. So once that's explained to the county, they might withdraw that fiscal --

SEN. FRASER: I want to make sure that that's clear, is that some of these assumptions are possibly the-sky-is-falling assumptions that this is -- you know, this expense is going to be put on us, and I don't think that's been discussed. And some of this, I think, can be done by ruling of the Secretary of State, directing them. And there is a real good chance that a lot of these expenses go away that can be absorbed through the Secretary of State. And that is correct, isn't it?

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. FRASER: Okay. I wanted to clear that up. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: The Chair recognizes Senator Williams.

SEN. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
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had talked earlier about the project that I asked you to
do, to cross-reference the driver's licenses and the
voter registration. How is that coming along? I know I
only asked today, but I just --

MS. McGEEHAN: Yes.

SEN. WILLIAMS: -- but what is a
reasonable expectation for us to get that information?

MS. McGEEHAN: I would hope by the end of
the week. One thing that our IT folks and our election
experts are trying to struggle with is like matching
criteria --

SEN. WILLIAMS: Right.

MS. McGEEHAN: -- you know, which we won't
have a TLD number, so we're working through some of
that. But I would expect by the end of the week we
would have it, if not earlier.

SEN. WILLIAMS: Okay. So do you need any
further direction from us? For instance, if we wanted
to target that universe of people that we know are out
there and maybe make a little extra effort to make sure
that they understood they were going to have a new
requirement when they went to vote as far as getting a
photo ID, if they didn't already have one -- and we've
identified who they are -- if we gave legislative intent
as a part of the bill tomorrow, would that be sufficient