DECLARATION OF NON PARTY STATE SENATOR JUDITH ZAFFIRINI

My name is Judith Zaffirini and I am over the age of 18 and competent in all respects to make this declaration. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated below which are true and correct.

1. I was served with a the Subpoena to Produce Documents by the State of Texas, Rick Perry, the Texas Secretary of State and Steve McGraw ("Defendants") on June 11, 2014.

2. I provided documents responsive to the Defendants’ Subpoena to Produce Documents.

3. The documents identified in Exhibit A are a subset of documents included in my response to the Defendants’ Subpoena to Produce Documents. These documents are kept, created, or retained in the the ordinary course of my Senate duties.
4. It is the regular practice to keep, create or retain the documents produced in response to Defendants' Subpoena to Produce Documents, including the documents identified in Exhibit A.

5. The responsive documents, including those identified in Exhibit A, are true copies of the records in my possession.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: September 3, 2014

[Signature]
Senator Judith Zaffirini
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Bates Page #</th>
<th>Last Bates Page #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00037</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00039</td>
<td>Email W. Davis to J. Zaffirini, dated August 30, 2012, Subject: Re: 8 30 12 Voter ID preclearance response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00040</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00041</td>
<td>Email W. J. Zaffirini to W. Davis &amp; K. Watson, dated August 30, 2012, Subject: Re: 8 30 12 Voter ID preclearance response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00048</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00049</td>
<td>Email J. Zaffirini to K. Watson, dated August 30, 2012, Subject: RE: U.S. District Court defends access to vote for all Texans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00056</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00057</td>
<td>K. Watson Email, dated August 30, 2012, Subject: FWD: 8 30 12 Voter ID preclearance response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00058</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00064</td>
<td>Email Thread J. Zaffirini to W. Davis, dated October 30, 2013, Subject: Re: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00173</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00175</td>
<td>Senate Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00176</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00176</td>
<td>H. Cook email, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: DEM CAUCUS More opposition to voter ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00177</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00177</td>
<td>Email R. Martinez to S. Griffin, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: Emailing: Ray Martinez_AlteredDriversLic_JM_Final_012511.JPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00178</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00178</td>
<td>H. Cook email, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: entering exhibits into the record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00184</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00187</td>
<td>H. Cook email, dated January 23, 2011, Subject: Amendments request por favor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00188</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00188</td>
<td>H. Cook email, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: On point for this witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00191</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00191</td>
<td>A. Hausenfluck email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Senate Districts w/DPS stats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00192</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00192</td>
<td>S. Scheibal email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00193</td>
<td>JZ-PRIVO00193</td>
<td>H. Cook, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: poll worker pay in the Pitts budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000194</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000197</td>
<td>Email A. Hausenfluck to H. Cook, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: Republican witness list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000198</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000202</td>
<td>R. Martinez email, dated January 23, 2011, Subject: Amendments request por favor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000203</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000203</td>
<td>D. Buda email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: Side by Side Comparison of SB 362 and SB 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000204</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000205</td>
<td>H. Cook email, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: Retired nuns barred from voting in Indiana because of voter ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000206</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000206</td>
<td>H. Cook email, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000207</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000210</td>
<td>Email A. Hausenfluck to Harold Cood and David Edmonson, dated January 23, 2011, subject: RE: Amendments request por favor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000211</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000214</td>
<td>Email H. Cook to David Edmonson, dated January 23, 2011, subject: Re: Amendments por favor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000215</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000218</td>
<td>Email A. Hausenfluck to H. Cook and J. Hassay, dated January 23, 2011, subject: RE: Amendments request por favor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000219</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000222</td>
<td>Email S. Gonzalez to H. Cook, J. Hassay, dated January 23, 2011, subject: RE: Amendments request por favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000223</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000226</td>
<td>Email S. Scheckel to H. Cook, dated January 23, 2011, subject: RE: Amendments request por favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000227</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000227</td>
<td>Email S. Griffin to W. Krueger, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: Elections training funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000228</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000228</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 21, 2011, Subject: VID Working Group: LVP letter to Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000229</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000229</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: VID working group: suggestion FOR TODAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000232</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000232</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 25, 2011, Wentworth's remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000279</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000279</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: This Witness - bad guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000280</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000280</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 25, 2011, Subject: This witness - Dr. Tijerina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000281</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000281</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: VID Working Group: Duncan news clip on Tuesday hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000282</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000283</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 22, 2011, Subject: VID Working Group: add'l materials from Luis Figueroa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000285</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000286</td>
<td>A. Hausenfluck Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000287</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000288</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Questions to Frasier - MALDEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000289</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000293</td>
<td>Email Thread, Senate Democratic Caucus member legislative staff, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Senate Re: Amendments request por favor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000294</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000294</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2014, Subject: VID Working Group IM Chatroom during tomorrow's hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000295</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000296</td>
<td>S. Gonzalez Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000297</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000300</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: A really good question for the Sec of State's office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000301</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000302</td>
<td>D. Buda Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000303</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000304</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Suggested Q and A for Republican witnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000305</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000307</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: VID Working Group: IMPORTANT - questions to the Democratic witnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000308</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000308</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: A really good question for the Sec of State's office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000309</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000309</td>
<td>R. Martinez to W. Krueger, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: from mk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000310</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000311</td>
<td>H. Cook to W. Krueger, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: Re: A really good question for the Sec. of State's office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000330</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000341</td>
<td>R. Martinez to J. Zaffirini, dated January 23, 2011, Subject: Fw: Amendments request por favr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000484</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000485</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated April 29, 2009, Subject: DEM CAUCIS: SB 1784 Alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000486</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000487</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated September 2, 2009, Subject: DEM CAUCUS: Fort Worth editorial against voter ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000488</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000488</td>
<td>W. von Eschenbach Email, dated March 5, 2009, Subject: Voter ID working group: Presser Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000489</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000489</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 16, 2009, Subject: DEM CAUCUS: AAS-Local groups oppose voter ID bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000490</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000491</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated June 13, 2009, Subject: DEM CAUCUS: SAEN, &quot;Dewhurst trying to work out a voter ID deal&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000505</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000508</td>
<td>S. Chiarello Email to K. Watson, dated February 9, 2012, Subject: Voter ID Update and Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000589</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000608</td>
<td>H. Cook Email, dated January 24, 2011, Subject: follow-up on Zaffirini's identity issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000621</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000621</td>
<td>Memo to Sen. Zaffirini, Meeting Background, DOJ Phone Appointment re Voter ID Litigation, dated December 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000735</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000736</td>
<td>Email N. Lerma to Sen. Zaffirini, dated April 10, 2012, Subject: Re: contact info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000742</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000744</td>
<td>Email R. Martinez to Sen. Zaffirini, dated April 9, 2012, Subject: Re: Phone Appointment Request for Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000751</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000753</td>
<td>Email J. Zaffirini to R. Martinez and N. Lerma, dated April 9, 2012, Subject: Re: Phone Appointment Request for Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000834</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000834</td>
<td>Email N. Lerma to Sen. Zaffirini, dated April 9, 2012, Subject: Reminder of Phone Appointment, Catherine Meza, DOJ, 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ-PRIV000841</td>
<td>JZ-PRIV000843</td>
<td>Emails from N. Lerma and R. Martinez to Sen. Zaffirini, dated April 9, 2012, Subject: Re; Phone Appointment Request for Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you, Judy! Your testimony was crucial to our victory.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 30, 2012, at 3:10 PM, Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com> wrote:

The good results reflect on your steadfast leadership and fearless determination. Bravo, my friend!

Thanks for everything you do.

Z

From: Wendy R Davis <wendyrdavis@charter.net>
Date: Thu, 30 Aug 2012 14:44:45 -0500
To: Kirk Watson <kirkpwatson@gmail.com>
Cc: "whitmirejohn7@gmail.com" <whitmirejohn7@gmail.com>, Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com>, Leticia Van de Putte <leticiavandeputte@gmail.com>, Rodney Ellis <SenatorRGE@aol.com>, "royce.w@westlpp.com" <royce.w@westlpp.com>, Eddie Lucio <elucioir@rgv.rr.com>, "jihinojosa10@gmail.com" <jihinojosa10@gmail.com>, "mv_gallegos@yahoo.com" <mv_gallegos@yahoo.com>, "carlos@urestilaw.com" <carlos@urestilaw.com>, Jose Rodriguez <rodriguezforsenate@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 8 30 12 Voter ID preclearance response.doc

Very good. It's been a great week for justice in Texas. It was a damn long road getting here.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 30, 2012, at 2:34 PM, Kirk Watson <kirkpwatson@gmail.com> wrote:

Members:

I sent the following statement to the media regarding the Voter ID decision.

KPW

<image003.png> State Senator
Kirk Watson
District 14

Thursday, August 30, 2012

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Sarah Howard, Office of Senator Kirk Watson: (512) 463-0114

U.S. District Court defends access to vote for all Texans

Senator Kirk Watson, chair of the Texas Senate Democratic Caucus, released the following statement today regarding the Texas voter identification decision by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia:

Today the United States District Court for the District of Columbia stopped those in control of the Capitol from limiting Texans' access to vote by ruling against the voter identification bill passed last session. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus opposed this bill vehemently and voted unanimously against its passage. I'm proud of the efforts of the Caucus, advocates, and the public to defend Texans' rights to go to the ballot box without having to climb higher and higher hurdles. Tuesday, this same court ruled against the legislatively-drawn congressional, House, and Senate maps because they were discriminatory and retrogressive.

During the upcoming legislative session, we will continue to fight in defense of civil liberties and the right to vote. We will also continue to push for greater transparency and openness in government, avoiding bad policy and legislation which results in expensive litigation and the misuse of state resources.
Texas can do better, and Texas deserves better from its elected leadership. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus prioritizes the values of middle class Texans— from voting rights to public education to access to quality health care.

<image001.png>
<8 30 12 Voter ID preclearance response.doc>
Judith Zaffirini

From: Judith Zaffirini
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2012 3:10 PM
To: Wendy R Davis; Kirk Watson
Cc: whitmirejohn7@gmail.com; Leticia Van de Putte; Rodney Ellis; royce.w@westllp.com; Eddie Lucio; jhinojosa10@gmail.com; mv_gallegos@yahoo.com; carlos@urestilaw.com; Jose Rodriguez
Subject: Re: 8 30 12 Voter ID preclearance response.doc

The good results reflect on your steadfast leadership and fearless determination. Bravo, my friend!

Thanks for everything you do.

Z

From: Wendy R Davis <wendyrdavis@charter.net>
Date: Thu, 30 Aug 2012 14:44:45 -0500
To: Kirk Watson <kirkpwatson@gmail.com>
Cc: "whitmirejohn7@gmail.com", "whitmirejohn7@gmail.com", Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com>, Leticia Van de Putte <leticiavandeputte@gmail.com>, Rodney Ellis <SenatorRGE@aol.com>, "royce.w@westllp.com" <royce.w@westllp.com>, Eddie Lucio <eluciojr@rvr.rr.com>, "jhinojosa10@gmail.com" <jhinojosa10@gmail.com>, "mv_gallegos@yahoo.com" <mv_gallegos@yahoo.com>, "carlos@urestilaw.com" <carlos@urestilaw.com>, Jose Rodriguez <rodriguezforsenate@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 8 30 12 Voter ID preclearance response.doc

Very good. It's been a great week for justice in Texas. It was a damn long road getting here.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 30, 2012, at 2:34 PM, Kirk Watson <kirkpwatson@gmail.com> wrote:

Members:

I sent the following statement to the media regarding the Voter ID decision.

KPW

<image003.png>State Senator

Kirk Watson

District 14
Thursday, August 30, 2012

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Sarah Howard, Office of Senator Kirk Watson: (512) 463-0114

U.S. District Court defends access to vote for all Texans

Senator Kirk Watson, chair of the Texas Senate Democratic Caucus, released the following statement today regarding the Texas voter identification decision by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia:

Today the United States District Court for the District of Columbia stopped those in control of the Capitol from limiting Texans' access to vote by ruling against the voter identification bill passed last session. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus opposed this bill vehemently and voted unanimously against its passage. I'm proud of the efforts of the Caucus, advocates, and the public to defend Texans' rights to go to the ballot box without having to climb higher and higher hurdles. Tuesday, this same court ruled against the legislatively-drawn congressional, House, and Senate maps because they were discriminatory and retrogressive.

During the upcoming legislative session, we will continue to fight in defense of civil liberties and the right to vote. We will also continue to push for greater transparency and openness in government, avoiding bad policy and legislation which results in expensive litigation and the misuse of state resources.

Texas can do better, and Texas deserves better from its elected leadership. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus prioritizes the values of middle class Texans— from voting rights to public education to access to quality health care.
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Judith Zaffirini

From: Judith Zaffirini
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2012 2:40 PM
To: Kirk Watson
Subject: Re: U.S. District Court defends access to vote for all Texans

Thanks/Z

From: Kirk Watson <kirkpwatson@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, 30 Aug 2012 14:39:06 -0500
To: "whitmirejohn7@gmail.com" <whitmirejohn7@gmail.com>, Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com>, Leticia Van de Putte <leticiavandeputte@gmail.com>, Rodney Ellis <SenatorRGE@aol.com>, "royce.w@westlplp.com" <royce.w@westlplp.com>, Eddie Lucio <eluciojr@rgv.rr.com>, "jihinojosal0@gmail.com" <jihinojosal0@gmail.com>, "mv_gallegos@yahoo.com" <mv_gallegos@yahoo.com>, "carlos@urestilaw.com" <carlos@urestilaw.com>, wendy davis <wendyrdavis@charter.net>, Jose Rodriguez <rodriguezforstate@gmail.com>
Cc: Stephanie Chiarello <stephanie@texasstatelegis.gov>
Subject: Fwd: FW: U.S. District Court defends access to vote for all Texans

Actually, this is the one I sent. Only slightly different. I'm sorry, the one I just sent was the next to last draft.

Sorry for the confusion.

KPW

Thursday, August 30, 2012

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Steve Scheibal, Office of Senator Kirk Watson: (512) 463-0114

U.S. District Court defends access to vote for all Texans

Senator Kirk Watson, chair of the Texas Senate Democratic Caucus, released the following statement today regarding the Texas voter identification decision by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia:
Today the United States District Court for the District of Columbia ruled against the voter identification bill passed last session and stopped those in control of the Capitol from limiting Texans' access to vote. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus strongly opposed this bill and voted unanimously against its passage. I'm proud of the efforts of the Caucus, advocates, and the public to defend Texans' rights to go to the ballot box without having to climb higher and higher hurdles. On Tuesday, this same court ruled against the legislatively-drawn congressional, House, and Senate maps because they were discriminatory and retrogressive.

During the upcoming legislative session, we will continue to fight in defense of civil liberties and the right to vote. We will also continue to push for greater transparency and openness in government, avoiding bad policy and legislation which results in expensive litigation and the misuse of state resources.

We love Texas. But Texas can do better. And Texas deserves better from its elected leadership. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus prioritizes the values of middle class Texans – from voting rights to public education to access to quality health care.
I sent the following statement to the media regarding the Voter ID decision.

Kirk Watson
State Senator
District 14

Thursday, August 30, 2012

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Sarah Howard, Office of Senator Kirk Watson: (512) 463-0114

U.S. District Court defends access to vote for all Texans

Senator Kirk Watson, chair of the Texas Senate Democratic Caucus, released the following statement today regarding the Texas voter identification decision by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia:
Today the United States District Court for the District of Columbia stopped those in control of the Capitol from limiting Texans' access to vote by ruling against the voter identification bill passed last session. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus opposed this bill vehemently and voted unanimously against its passage. I'm proud of the efforts of the Caucus, advocates, and the public to defend Texans' rights to go to the ballot box without having to climb higher and higher hurdles. Tuesday, this same court ruled against the legislatively-drawn congressional, House, and Senate maps because they were discriminatory and retrogressive.

During the upcoming legislative session, we will continue to fight in defense of civil liberties and the right to vote. We will also continue to push for greater transparency and openness in government, avoiding bad policy and legislation which results in expensive litigation and the misuse of state resources.

Texas can do better, and Texas deserves better from its elected leadership. The Texas Senate Democratic Caucus prioritizes the values of middle class Texans— from voting rights to public education to access to quality health care.
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Judith Zaffirini

From: Judith Zaffirini
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 4:53 PM
To: Wendy R Davis
Subject: Re: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot

She's great.

Thanks/Z

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2013, at 2:25 PM, "Wendy R Davis" <wendyrdavis@charter.net> wrote:

Thank you, Judy! And thank you for connecting me with Josie. She is amazing and has been so helpful to us.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2013, at 1:39 PM, Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com> wrote:

Posted and tweeted.

Thanks/Z

From: Stephanie Chiarello <stephanie@texassenatedemocrats.org>
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2013 13:31:04 -0500
To: "carlos@urestilaw.com" <carlos@urestilaw.com>, Eddie Lucio <elucioir@rgv.rr.com>, "whitmirejohn7@gmail.com" <whitmirejohn7@gmail.com>, Jose Rodriguez <rodriguezforsenate@gmail.com>, "jihinojosa10@gmail.com", Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com>, Kirk Watson <kirkpwatson@gmail.com>, Leticia Van de Putte <leticiaavandeputte@gmail.com>, Rodney Ellis <SenatorRGE@aol.com>, "royce.w@westlplp.com" <royce.w@westlplp.com>, Sylvia Garcia <srg2011@att.net>, Wendy Davis <wendyrdavis@chartef.net>
Subject: Fwd: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot

Senators -

Please see the below article that Senator Davis's campaign has brought to our attention; please share via social media, etc. as you see you fit.

Thanks

Stephanie

-------- Forwarded message --------

From: Kate Fox <kfox@wendydavistexas.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 30, 2013 at 12:39 PM
Subject: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot
To: Kate Fox <kfox@wendydavistexas.com>

Hi everyone:

Please push this story out at your discretion over social.

http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/wendy-davis-outsmarts-texas-voter-id-law

If you have any follow up questions, let me know.

Kate

--
Kate Fox
Wendy Davis for Governor, Inc.
910-233-0409 mobile
817-886-8863 office
www.wendydavistexas.com

--
Stephanie
Judith Zaffirini

From: Wendy R Davis <wendyrdavis@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 2:16 PM
To: Judith Zaffirini
Subject: Re: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot

Thank you, Judy! And thank you for connecting me with Josie. She is amazing and has been so helpful to us.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 30, 2013 at 1:39 PM, Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com> wrote:

Posted and tweeted.

Thanks/Z

From: Stephanie Chiarello <stephanie@texasenatedemocrats.org>
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2013 13:31:04 -0500
To: "carlos@urestilaw.com" <carlos@urestilaw.com>, Eddie Lucio <eluciojr@rgv.rr.com>, "whitmirejohn7@gmail.com" <whitmirejohn7@gmail.com>, Jose Rodriguez <rodriquezforsenate@gmail.com>, "jihinojosa10@gmail.com" <jihinojosa10@gmail.com>, Judith Zaffirini <zaffcomm@zaffirini.com>, Kirk Watson <kirkpwatson@gmail.com>, Leticia Van de Putte <leticiaavandeputte@gmail.com>, Rodney Ellis <SenatorRGE@aol.com>, "royce.w@westllp.com" <royce.w@westllp.com>, Sylvia Garcia <srg2011@att.net>, Wendy Davis <wendyrdavis@charter.net>
Subject: Fwd: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot

Senators -

Please see the below article that Senator Davis's campaign has brought to our attention; please share via social media, etc. as you see you fit.

Thanks

Stephanie

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Kate Fox <kfox@wendydavistexas.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 30, 2013 at 12:39 PM
Subject: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot
To: Kate Fox <kfox@wendydavistexas.com>

Hi everyone:

Please push this story out at your discretion over social.

http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/wendy-davis-outsmarts-texas-voter-id-law

If you have any follow up questions, let me know.
Kate

--
Kate Fox
Wendy Davis for Governor, Inc.
910-233-0409 mobile
817-886-8863 office
www.wendydavistexas.com

--
Stephanie
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From: Stephanie Chiarello <stephanie@tessedems.org>
Date: Wed, 30 Oct 2013 13:31:04 -0500
To: "Carlos@urestilaw.com" <Carlos@urestilaw.com>, Eddie Lucia <elucioir@rgv.rr.com>, "Whitmirejohn7@gmail.com" <whitmirejohn7@gmail.com>, Jose Rodriguez <rodriguezforSenate@gmail.com>, "Ihinojosa10@gmail.com" <Ihinojosa10@gmail.com>, Judith Zaffirini <Zaffcomm@zaffirini.com>, Kirk Watson <KirkWatson@gmail.com>, Leticia Van de Putte <LeticiaVanddepok@gmail.com>, Rodney Ellis <SenatorRGE@aol.com>, "Royce.W@Westllp.com" <Royce.W@westllp.com>, Sylvia Garcia <srg2011@att.net>, Wendy Davis <Wendyrdavis@charter.net>
Subject: Fwd: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot

Senators -

Please see the below article that Senator Davis's campaign has brought to our attention; please share via social media, etc. as you see you fit.

Thanks

Stephanie

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Kate Fox <kfox@wendydvistexas.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 30, 2013 at 12:39 PM
Subject: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot
To: Kate Fox <kfox@wendydvistexas.com>

Hi everyone:

Please push this story out at your discretion over social.

http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/wendy-davis-outsmarts-texas-voter-id-law

If you have any follow up questions, let me know.

Kate

--
Kate Fox
Wendy Davis for Governor, Inc.
910-233-0409 mobile
817-886-8863 office
www.wendydvistexas.com
Stephanie
From: dmstephanie@gmail.com on behalf of Stephanie Chiarello
<sstephanie@texasenatedemocrats.org>

Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 1:31 PM

To: Carlos Uresti; Eddie Lucio, Jr.; John Whitmire; Jose Rodriguez; Juan Hinojosa; Judith Zaffirini; Kirk Watson; Leticia Van de Putte; Rodney Ellis; Senator Royce West; Sylvia Garcia; Wendy Davis

Subject: Fwd: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot

Senators

Please see the below article that Senator Davis's campaign has brought to our attention; please share via social media, etc. as you see you fit.

Thanks

Stephanie

---------- Forwarded message ----------

From: Kate Fox <kfox@wendyavistexas.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 30, 2013 at 12:39 PM
Subject: News story to push: Wendy Davis' fix to voting law lets her cast ballot
To: Kate Fox <kfox@wendyavistexas.com>

Hi everyone:

Please push this story out at your discretion over social.

http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/wendy-davis-outsmarts-texas-voter-id-law

If you have any follow up questions, let me know.

Kate

--

Kate Fox
Wendy Davis for Governor, Inc.
910-233-0409 mobile
817-886-8863 office
www.wendyavistexas.com

--

Stephanie
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 9 and Article IV, Section 16 of the Texas Constitution and Article XIII of the Senate Rules recognize the existence of the Committee of the Whole Senate; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Senate Rule 7.06, the President referred Senate Bill 362, relating to voter identification requirements, directly to the Committee of the Whole Senate; and

WHEREAS, Senate Rule 13.01 provides that it is in order for the Senate at any time after bills and resolutions have been called to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole Senate; and

WHEREAS, The Senate may adopt by resolution specific procedures to govern the operation of the Committee of the Whole Senate during its consideration of Senate Bill 362; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole Senate on Tuesday, March 10, 2009, at the conclusion of the morning call, for the consideration of Senate Bill 362, and

RESOLVED, That the Senate may meet as in Committee of the Whole Senate from day to day as necessary; and

RESOLVED, That the following procedures shall apply when in Committee of the Whole Senate for the duration of its consideration of Senate Bill 362:

1
1. The Committee shall afford reasonable opportunity to interested parties to appear and testify before the Committee.

2. The Chair shall require all parties appearing at the meeting to swear or affirm that the testimony they give to the Committee is true and correct.

3. The Chair may fix the order of appearance and time allotted for each witness unless a majority of the members present directs otherwise.

4. Senate Rules addressing access to the Senate Floor shall be enforced by the Chair while the Committee is meeting, except as follows:

   (a) Witnesses appearing before the committee may be admitted to the floor of the Senate as their names are called by the Chair, and may remain only until their testimony is completed.

   (b) Each Senator may be assisted by one employee of the Senate within the brass rail at any given time. The Sergeant-at-Arms shall provide seating next to a requesting senator for such authorized employees.

5. Senate Rule 3.04, relating to posters, placards, banners and signs, and Senate Rule 3.05 relating to applause, outbursts, and demonstrations shall be strictly enforced.
by the Chair. Subject to approval by the Chair, witnesses may use visual aids as necessary in the presentation of their testimony.

6. Senate Rule 3.01, relating to attire, shall not apply to witnesses.
The attached is a letter from NALEO in opposition to the voter ID bill.
From: Ray Martinez
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 12:31 PM
To: Sean Griffin
Cc: Mark Kavanaugh; Will Krueger; Ray Martinez
Subject: Emailing: RayMartinez_AlteredDriversLic_JM_Final_012511.jpg
Attachments: RayMartinez_AlteredDriversLic_JM_Final_012511.jpg

SG:

Picture by JM on RM’s Computer and Sent from RM’s email. Please print one in color for proof before printing 40 copies.
T/JM

The message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

RayMartinez_AlteredDriversLic_JM_Final_012511.jpg

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.
Sean Griffin

From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 9:57 AM
To: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: entering exhibits into the record

group - Senator Davis' chart reminds me, if you want any exhibits such as that entered into the official record, your Senator will need to ask the chair to enter it into the record - the only thing the court reporter is recording is what is said, not what is shown.
Folks, if I could get a reply from each office on amendments each office has drafted for voter ID it might help the Senators' conference call more productive. No huge explanation necessary, just one sentence summaries.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:47 PM, Jason Hassay <Jason.Hassay@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

We did an informal break down but only have our notes in pencil. Will work on typing them up to share.

-Jason

At least 2 Senators have asked this very question, so somebody should sure tackle that project.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:28 PM, Debra Gonzales <Debra.Gonzales@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:
Hello

I was wondering if anyone had already done a side by side comparison of SB 14 and SB 362 (senate engrossed version from the 81st)? If so...may I please have a copy?

If not I will be working on one and will share it if anyone wants a copy...Thanks!

Debra Gonzales

Legislative Director

Senator Gallegos

512-463-0106 office

512-463-0346 fax

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2011 6:06 PM
To: Amber Haufenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalez Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: VID Working Group: add'l materials from Luis Figueroa

Luis Figueroa sent some requested items to several of the group so I wanted to share with all.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Luis Figueroa" <lfigueroa@MALDEF.org>
Date: January 22, 2011 5:33:42 PM CST

2
To: "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com>, "David Edmonson" <David.Edmonson@senate.state.tx.us>, "Amber Hausenfluck" <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>, <richard.sooksiasian@senate.state.tx.us>

Cc: "Laurie Vanhoose" <austintransplant@gmail.com>

Subject: Additional materials for Voter ID Senate Committee hearing

Attached:

1) Crawford v. Marion County - Supreme Court ruling that upheld Indiana's strict voter id legislation.

Distinguishing points:

1) Texas is a section 5 state with a much larger minority population than Indiana

2) Indiana provided a 10 day cure period after the election where as SB 14 only provides 5 days


3) Deceptive Elections Flyer given to minority voters in Tarrant County in 2007. Example of fraud that is substantiated and unprosecuted because there is no law on the books to address.

4) Voter Id power point. Pages 4-8 layout the studies demonstrating impact of voter identification laws on minority electorate.

5) Maricopa County Analysis of Conditional Provisional Ballots in Arizona after their implementation of a voter id(proposition 200) that mirrored last year's Tx Senate Voter ID Bill (SB 364). Conditional Provisional Ballots were given to voters that lacked the ID documents in Arizona meaning these ballots are separate from regular provisional ballots.
Luis Figueroa
MALDEF
Legislative Staff Attorney
110 Broadway
Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
LFigueroa@maldef.org
210-224-5476 ext. 212
We now know that Indiana's law has actually disenfranchised real citizens. In contrast, no party or amicus cited even one case of impersonation at the polls in Indiana to the Supreme Court. In fact, more real Hoosiers have been disenfranchised by the law in the last four years than the number of reported cases of impersonation at the polls cited to the Supreme Court - from anywhere in the country - in the last two decades. For example, in limited-turnout local elections in Marion County, Ind. in 2007, 32 voters cast ballots that could not be counted because of the voter ID law. Moreover, these were long-time voters: 14 of them had previously voted in at least 10 elections, http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/Democracy/_%20ID-related%20stats.pdf

Also - voter ID supporters claim the voter ID law actually increased participation, which is absurd - what increased participation is voter excitement about Obama's candidacy.
Sean Griffin

From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 9:29 AM
Subject: DEM CAUCUS: Attn press secs

Press Secretaries/Communication Directors:

The Houston Chronicle has a scathing editorial against the voter ID bill this morning, so that feels good:


I have to admit, however, that I am at odds with many Senate offices over the impact of anything appearing on an op-ed page of a major daily newspaper these days. There are Senate offices which shoot off an op-ed every time a major issue comes before them, and many of the newspapers print them. I frankly believe the impact of these efforts is zero.

Such a small percentage of the electorate is reading the op-ed pages any more, the pages have been left to only the most informed of voters, and only a small number of even them - virtually all of whom have already formed a strongly-held opinion on just about every issue under the sun. Persuasive arguments on op-ed pages have become like a tree falling in the woods which nobody is there to hear.

Governor Perry was the first one to put this to a full test, when he blew off editorial board endorsement meetings, ceding all newspaper endorsements to Hutchison in the primary, and White in the general. His electoral results speak for themselves.

Similarly, every newspaper in the state scathingly and repeatedly editorialized against 2003 mid-decade redistricting, and against 2007 and 2007 voter I.D. The needle didn't move a bit on public opinion regarding either of these two issues.

If your office wants to place a guest op-ed in a newspaper, by all means do so - it provides something to copy and send around to like-minded supporters who need to know that your Senator stands with them on an issue. But for anybody who still believes that these efforts succeed in pushing any kind of broad-based message to any segment of the electorate whatsoever, I would recommend that you invest the time elsewhere, because it just simply does not.

Personally I haven't bothered to recommend to any client, political or non-political, that they attempt to place a guest opinion-editorial in a newspaper in several years.

That's my two cents, adjusted for inflation. However, in the Pitts base budget, I note that it's down to 0.00001 cent.
Ray Martinez  
Chief of Staff and General Counsel  
Director, Senate Higher Education Committee  
Office of Senator Judith Zaffirini  
Texas State Capitol, Rm. 1E.14  
(512) 463-0121
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Sean Griffin

From: Amber Hausenfluck
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2011 6:05 PM
To: Dan Buda; Debra Gonzales; Harold Cook; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Senate Districts w/DPS stats
Attachments: Senate District no DPS.docx

Amber Hausenfluck
Deputy Legislative Director
Senator Van de Putte, R-Ph
E1.610
512-463-0126
amber.hausenfluck@state.texas.us

From: Dan Buda
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2011 5:39 PM
To: Debra Gonzales; Harold Cook; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: RE: Side by Side Comparison of SB 362 and SB 14

And this is a brief comparison of SB 14 vs. Indiana Voter ID Law.

Dan Buda
Chief of Staff
State Senator Wendy Davis
(512)463-0110
dan.buda@state.texas.us

From: Debra Gonzales
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2011 5:34 PM
To: Harold Cook; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Cc: Sean Abbott_SC; Lesley Nelson; MaryAnn Carrion
Subject: Side by Side Comparison of SB 362 and SB 14

Here it is....I haven’t even read it yet...

Debra Gonzales
Legislative Director
Senator Gallegos
512-463-0106 office
512-463-0346 fax
Senator Watson is planning on carrying the two amendments discussed yesterday — one tightening penalties on those who engage in voter fraud and intimidation, and the other being the Ogden Amendment from last session. They're attached.

From: David Edmonson
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2011 6:14 PM
To: Graham Keever_SC; Dan Buda; Debra Gonzales; Harold Cook; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: RE: Amendments

Sen. Ellis is still going with the three I outlined yesterday. A few staffers have talked to me about their boss signing on to one of the amendments. If your boss is interested in signing on, have them talk to Ellis tomorrow morning to physically sign the amendment.

I've attached the text and a Q&A for each amendment as background. Thanks,

David

From: Graham Keever On Behalf Of Graham Keever_SC
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2011 6:02 PM
To: Dan Buda; Debra Gonzales; Harold Cook; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Amendments

As of right now, we're running with the Medicare card amendment only.
Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Tuesday, January 25, 2011 12:17 PM
Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson;
Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham
Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
poll worker pay in the Pitts budget

There is a reduction of poll worker pay in the Pitts budget - from the current $8.50 down to $7.00. (It had been thought that it was a $2 reduction before, but it is apparently $1.50). Conclusion: poll workers aren’t gonna be getting any smarter.

There is some confusion as to whether this applies to all elections or would only apply to Republican and Democratic Party primaries, but either way...not getting and smarter.

This may be a good question for the Secretary of State’s office. Along with the other necessary questions Frasier has referred to them, involving issues of election processes and procedures, voter registration methods, the age of Senator West, and whether Frasier is wearing boxer of briefs.
Terry Seibert didn’t show up. Mr. Ward brought another gentleman to testify, but we don’t know that gentleman's name of if he will actually testify.

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 25, 2011, at 8:45 AM, "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com> wrote:

Begin forwarded message:

From: Amber Hausenfluck <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>
Date: January 25, 2011 8:28:35 AM CST
To: "hc@haroldcook.com" <hc@haroldcook.com>
Subject: Fwd: Invited Testimony

Sent from my Samsung Epic™ 4G

From: Servando Esparza <Servando.Esparza@senate.state.tx.us>
Date: January 25, 2011 8:26:47 AM CST
To: Amber Hausenfluck <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>
Subject: Invited Testimony

Invited Testimony

Sen. Fraser
- Jerry Bonnett, General Counsel, Indiana Secretary of State
- Christian Ward, YetterColeman LLP
- Terry Siebert, Texas Watchdog

Sen. Van de Putte
- Luis Figueroa, MALDEF
- Gary Bledsoe, NAACP
- Andres Tijerina, Professor of Texas History
- Chase Bearden, Advocate for People with Disabilities

Resource Witness Panel
- David Maxwell, Deputy Director of Law Enforcement, Office of the Attorney General
- Ann McGeehan, Director of Elections, Secretary of State's Office
- Rebecca Davio, Assistant Director for Drivers Licenses, Department of Public Safety
From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 3:22 PM
To: Amber Hausenfluck
Cc: Steve Scheibai; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Re: Republican witness list

He's completely unqualified to be an expert witness anyway.

On Jan 25, 2011, at 3:20 PM, Amber Hausenfluck wrote:

Terry Seibert didn't show up. Mr. Ward brought another gentleman to testify, but we don't know that gentleman's name of if he will actually testify.

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 25, 2011, at 8:45 AM, "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com<mailto:hc@haroldcook.com>> wrote:

Begin forwarded message:

From: Amber Hausenfluck
<<mailto:Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us<mailto:Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>>
Date: January 25, 2011 8:28:35 AM CST
To: "<mailto:hc@haroldcook.com>hc@haroldcook.com<mailto:hc@haroldcook.com>"
<<mailto:hc@haroldcook.com>hc@haroldcook.com<mailto:hc@haroldcook.com>>
Subject: Fwd: Invited Testimony

Sent from my Samsung Epic™ 4G

From: Servando Esparza
<<mailto:Servando.Esparza@senate.state.tx.us>Servando.Esparza@senate.state.tx.us<mailto:Servando.Esparza@senate.state.tx.us>>
Date: January 25, 2011 8:26:47 AM CST
To: Amber Hausenfluck
<<mailto:Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us<mailto:Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>>
Subject: Invited Testimony

Invited Testimony

Sen. Fraser
- Jerry Bonnett, General Counsel, Indiana Secretary of State
- Christian Ward, YetterColeman LLP
- Terry Siebert, Texas Watchdog

Sen. Van de Putte
- Luis Figueroa, MALDEF
- Gary Bledsoe, NAACP
- Andres Tijerina, Professor of Texas History
- Chase Bearden, Advocate for People with Disabilities

Resource Witness Panel
- David Maxwell, Deputy Director of Law Enforcement, Office of the Attorney General
- Ann McGeehan, Director of Elections, Secretary of State's Office
- Rebecca Davio, Assistant Director for Drivers Licenses, Department of Public Safety
Based on the emails, it appears everyone is working on a variety of these below. Here’s what we’re looking at:

1. **Affidavit bypass amendments** – Michigan has an affidavit bypass option, where voters who show up at the polls without required photo ID can sign under penalty of perjury and cast a regular (not provisional) ballot. Also, in Florida, voters who don’t have required ID cast a provisional ballot but those ballots are counted if the voter signature matches those on the voter rolls. The final affidavit-bypass option is to allow a voter who does not have photo ID to cast a regular ballot if they provide one or two forms of non-photo ID.

2. **Franchise-expanding amendments** – From the various emails, it looks like other offices are already working on a good list of amendments in this category. One idea we’re looking at is automated transmission of registration information. Texas is now one of at least 10 states that has at least partially automated the registration process between DPS and election officials. What that means is that the agency transmits at least some registration information electronically, eliminating the need for local data entry. One idea would be to expand this automated registration process to social service agencies, including those agencies serving individuals on public assistance.

3. **Making ID’s more widely available** – SB 14 is modeled after the Indiana voter ID bill. The U.S. Supreme Court, in upholding the Indiana photo ID bill, made it clear that there could still be statutory and/or constitutional violations in certain situations as the law is implemented. I am assuming Republicans will argue that since the Indiana law has been given Supreme Court approval, it must be good law. So, the idea is to emphasize how the differences in applying the “Indiana law” to Texas will lead to violations of the Voting Rights Act or even constitutional principles. For example, when one compares “rural” Indiana to “rural” Texas, there are, needless-to-say, significant differences particularly in the vast distance between voters and access to a DPS office where they can obtain a photo ID. Based on our Friday meeting, I believe several offices are already working on ideas in this category, such as requiring enough DPS offices to make it easier to obtain an ID, as well as requiring extended hours for DPS offices, including early mornings, evenings and weekends, especially in the period leading up to an election.

Hope this is helpful.
Ray Martinez  
Chief of Staff and General Counsel  
Director, Senate Higher Education Committee  
Office of Senator Judith Zaffirini  
Texas State Capitol, Rm. 1E.14  
(512) 463-0121

From: Amber Hausenfluck  
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 6:29 PM  
To: Harold Cook; David Edmonson  
Cc: Jason Hassay; Debra Gonzales; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: RE: Amendments request por favor?

Van de Putta discussed two additional amendments, although I'm not quite sure how to word them yet. Luis is working on it for me. These two potential amendments are:

1. Mandating the poll workers check ID's for the sole purpose of identity and not to check where one lives.
2. Prohibiting poll workers from denying a person the right to vote because their name on their ID does not exactly match up.

Amber Hausenfluck  
Deputy Legislative Director  
Senator Van de Putte, R.Ph.  
E1.610  
512-463-0126  
amber.hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]  
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 6:23 PM  
To: David Edmonson  
Cc: Jason Hassay; Debra Gonzales; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Re: Amendments request por favor?

actually group, #2 on David's list is important...when the Republicans vote against that amendment, whoever takes the lead in opposing pre-clearance will be able to show that the exact sort of data DoJ would most want to know about could have been gathered, but that the legislature rejected gathering it.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 5:40 PM, David Edmonson wrote:

As of right now, Sen. Ellis is concentrating on three amendments:

1. **Election day registration** - can register to vote at a polling place on election day
2. **Disparate impact report** - require the Secretary of State to produce an annual report determining whether the changes in law instituted via SB 14 produce a disparate impact on any population subgroups in our state. It would also make the effective date of SB 14 contingent upon a determination by the Secretary of State that there would not be a disparate impact on any group.
3. **Sunset dates** - a two year sunset date on SB 14. We're also drafting a traditional 12 year sunset. Not sure which he'll run with.
Thanks,
David

**From:** Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 23, 2011 5:36 PM  
**To:** Jason Hassay  
**Cc:** Debra Gonzales; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushama Smith  
**Subject:** Amendments request por favor?

Folks, if I could get a reply from each office on amendments each office has drafted for voter ID it might help the Senators’ conference call more productive. No huge explanation necessary, just one sentence summaries?

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:47 PM, Jason Hassay &lt;Jason.Hassay@senate.state.tx.us&gt; wrote:

We did an informal break down but only have our notes in pencil. Will work on typing them up to share.

-Jason

---

**Jason Hassay**  
Chief of Staff & General Counsel  
Office of Senator Carlos I. Uresti  
512-463-0119 phone  
512-463-1017 fax

**From:** Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 23, 2011 4:33 PM  
**To:** Debra Gonzales  
**Cc:** Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushama Smith  
**Subject:** Re: VID Working Group: Question of a side by side comparison of SB 14 & SB 362

At least 2 Senators have asked this very question, so somebody should sure tackle that project.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:28 PM, Debra Gonzales &lt;Debra.Gonzales@senate.state.tx.us&gt; wrote:

Hello

I was wondering if anyone had already done a side by side comparison of SB 14 and SB 362 (senate engrossed version from the 81st)? If so...may I please have a copy?  
If not I will be working on one and will share it if anyone wants a copy...  
Thanks!
Debra Gonzales
Legislative Director
Senator Gallegos
512-463-0106 office
512-463-0346 fax

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2011 6:06 PM
To: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keevers; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keevers SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalez Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: VID Working Group: add'l materials from Luis Figueroa

Luis Figueroa sent some requested items to several of the group so I wanted to share with all.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Luis Figueroa" <lfigueroa@MALDEF.org>
Date: January 22, 2011 5:33:42 PM CST
To: "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com>, "David Edmonson" <David.Edmonson@senate.state.tx.us>, "Amber Hausenfluck" <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>, <richard.sooksiasian@senate.state.tx.us>
Cc: "Laurie Vanhoose" <austintransplant@gmail.com>
Subject: Additional materials for Voter ID Senate Committee hearing

Attached:

1) Crawford v. Marion County- Supreme Court ruling that upheld Indiana's strict voter id legislation.
   Distinguishing points:
   1) Texas is a section 5 state with a much larger minority population than Indiana
   2) Indiana provided a 10 day cure period after the election where as SB 14 only provides 6 days
3) Deceptive Elections Flyer given to minority voters in Tarrant County in 2007. Example of fraud that is substantiated and unprosecuted because there is no law on the books to address.
4) Voter Id power point. Pages 4-8 layout the studies demonstrating impact of voter identification laws on minority electorate.

5) Maricopa County Analysis of Conditional Provisional Ballots in Arizona after their implementation of a voter id(proposition 200) that mirrored last year’s Tx Senate Voter ID Bill (SB 364). Conditional Provisional Ballots were given to voters that lacked the ID documents in Arizona meaning these ballots are separate from regular provisional ballots.

Luis Figueroa
MALDEF
Legislative Staff Attorney
110 Broadway
Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
LFigueroa@maldef.org
210-224-5476 ext. 212
And this is a brief comparison of SB 14 vs Indiana Voter ID law.

Dan Buda
Chief of Staff
State Senator Wendy Davis
(512)463-0110
dan.buda@senate.state.tx.us

Here it is....I haven't even read it yet...

Debra Gonzales
Legislative Director
Senator Gallegos
512-463-0106 office
512-463-0346 fax
Retired nuns barred from voting in Indiana

At least 10 retired nuns in South Bend, Indiana, were barred from voting in today's Indiana Democratic primary election because they lacked photo IDs required under a state law that the supreme court upheld last week.

John Borkowski, a South Bend lawyer volunteering as an election watchdog for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, said several of the retired nuns had been voting all of their lives but were told they lacked the required identification cards and could only file provisional ballots.

Since 2005, Indiana's toughest-in-the-nation law requires every voter to produce a state or federal photo ID card. The supreme court, after weighing scores of legal briefs from conservatives who backed the statute and liberals who opposed it, upheld the law by a 6-3 vote, saying there was little evidence that it was unduly burdensome for voters.

Borkowski said Sister Julie McGuire, one of several nuns on poll duty, wasn't pleased to turn away the nuns, some of whom were in their 80s and 90s and no longer had driver's licenses.

"Here's the supreme irony," Borkowski said. "This law was passed supposedly to prevent and deter voter fraud, even though there was no real record of serious voter fraud in Indiana. Here you have a bunch of nuns whose votes can't be accepted by a bunch of nuns ... who live with them in the polling place in their convent because they don't have an ID."

At least six other people also were relegated to filing provisional ballots at the polling place on the ground floor of the Congregation of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, said Amy Smessaert, a spokeswoman for the convent.

Among them was Lauren McCall, an 18-year-old freshman at St Mary's College in South Bend, who said she got "teary-eyed" and then angry at being rejected the first time she was old enough to vote.

"The nuns and this young woman are the face of the supreme court case," said Jonah Goldman, who directs the Lawyers Committee's Campaign for Fair Elections. He said his group, which has bird-dogged polling places in primaries across the country over the past three months, also has found widespread confusion in other states over voter identification requirements.

"We've seen people in every contest that we've covered being disenfranchised by a perceived, incorrect or illegal restrictive identification requirement," partly because some poll workers have demanded more identification than was required by law, Goldman said.

Indiana secretary of state Todd Rokita, who's charged with overseeing the new law, issued a statement today that didn't directly mention the nuns.
"The Indiana voter ID law applies to everyone," Rokita said. He said a "safety net" allows voters ages 65 and older to vote by absentee ballot and that those limited to filing provisional ballots have 10 days to "show their proper photo ID".

Borkowski said that two of the nuns with whom he spoke were very frustrated and so upset that they refused to cast provisional ballots. He said one of the nuns told him that many others among the 137 retired sisters living at the Congregation of the Sisters of the Holy Cross convent were dissuaded from voting upon learning that several had been turned away.

McCallick, the student, said she was forced to cast a provisional ballot because she could produce only a California driver's license and a college identification card.

"I was really upset," she said. "I went to see [Democratic presidential candidate Barack] Obama when he visited a high school near South Bend. My roommate and I waited in line to see him. I was just excited about the whole process."

Under the Indiana law, McCallick has 10 days to show up at the county clerk's office with proper identification, but she's due to leave town in three days.

When a poll worker told her she lacked the right identification, McCallick said: "I thought she was joking."

A native of Placentia, California, McCallick said she had a final examination in her political science class later in the day.

"I was thinking about writing an entire essay about this," she said. "Part of my essay is supposed to be about the supreme court."
Sean Griffin

From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheiba; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: reward

I'll buy a round of drinks for the Senator who forces that witness to say "I would have to defer to the Indiana Secretary of State for that answer." :}

1
Sean Griffin

From: Amber Hausenfluck
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 6:29 PM
To: Harold Cook; David Edmonson
Cc: Jason Hassay; Debra Gonzales; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: RE: Amendments request por favor?

Van de Putte discussed two additional amendments, although I'm not quite sure how to word them yet. Luis is working on it for me. These two potential amendments are:

1. Mandating the poll workers check ID's for the sole purpose of identity and not to check where one lives.
2. Prohibiting poll workers from denying a person the right to vote because their name on their ID does not exactly match up.

Amber Hausenfluck
Deputy Legislative Director
Senator Van de Putte, R.Ph.
E1.610
512-463-0126
amber.hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 6:23 PM
To: David Edmonson
Cc: Jason Hassay; Debra Gonzales; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Re: Amendments request por favor?

actually group, #2 on David's list is important... when the Republicans vote against that amendment, whoever takes the lead in opposing pre-clearance will be able to show that the exact sort of data DoJ would most want to know about could have been gathered, but that the legislature rejected gathering it.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 5:40 PM, David Edmonson wrote:

As of right now, Sen. Ellis is concentrating on three amendments:

1. Election day registration - can register to vote at a polling place on election day
2. Disparate impact report - require the Secretary of State to produce an annual report determining whether the changes in law instituted via SB 14 produce a disparate impact on any population subgroups in our state. It would also make the effective date of SB 14 contingent upon a determination by the Secretary of State that there would not be a disparate impact on any group.
3. Sunset dates - a two year sunset date on SB 14. We're also drafting a traditional 12 year sunset. Not sure which he'll run with.

Thanks,
David

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Jason Hassay  
Cc: Debra Gonzales; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith  
Subject: Amendments request por favor?

Folks, if I could get a reply from each office on amendments each office has drafted for voter ID it might help the Senators' conference call more productive. No huge explanation necessary, just one sentence summaries?

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:47 PM, Jason Hassay <Jason.Hassay@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

We did an informal break down but only have our notes in pencil. Will work on typing them up to share.

-Jason

Jason Hassay  
Chief of Staff & General Counsel  
Office of Senator Carlos Uresti  
512-463-0119 phone  
512-463-1017 fax

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]  
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 4:33 PM  
To: Debra Gonzales  
Cc: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith  
Subject: Re: VID Working Group: Question of a side by side comparison of SB 14 & SB 362

At least 2 Senators have asked this very question, so somebody should sure tackle that project.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:28 PM, Debra Gonzales <Debra.Gonzales@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

Hello

I was wondering if anyone had already done a side by side comparison of SB 14 and SB 362 (senate engrossed version from the 81st)? If so...may I please have a copy?  
If not I will be working on one and will share it if anyone wants a copy... Thanks!

Debra Gonzales  
Legislative Director  
Senator Gallegos  
512-463-0106 office  
512-463-0346 fax
From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2011 6:06 PM
To: Amber Hausenflick; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David
Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez;
Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza;
Sushma Smith
Subject: VID Working Group: add'l materials from Luis Figueroa

Luis Figueroa sent some requested items to several of the group so I wanted to
share with all.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Luis Figueroa" <lfigueroa@MALDEF.org>
Date: January 22, 2011 5:33:42 PM CST
To: "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com>, "David Edmonson"
<David.Edmonson@senate.state.tx.us>, "Amber Hausenflick"
<Amber.Hausenflick@senate.state.tx.us>,
<richard.sookiasian@senate.state.tx.us>
Cc: "Laurie Vanhoose" <austintransplant@gmail.com>
Subject: Additional materials for Voter ID Senate Committee
hearing

Attached:

1) Crawford v. Marion County- Supreme Court ruling that upheld Indiana's strict voter id
legislation.
Distinguishing points:
   1) Texas is a section 5 state with a much larger minority population than Indiana
   2) Indiana provided a 10 day cure period after the election where as SB 14 only
      provides 6 days

2) Texas Voting Rights Act Report page 8-13 describes the history of voting
discrimination in Texas.

3) Deceptive Elections Flyer given to minority voters in Tarrant County in 2007. Example
   of fraud that is substantiated and unprosecuted because there is no law on the books to
   address.

4) Voter Id power point. Pages 4-8 layout the studies demonstrating impact of voter
   identification laws on minority electorate.

5) Maricopa County Analysis of Conditional Provisional Ballots in Arizona after their
   implementation of a voter id(proposition 200) that mirrored last year's Tx Senate Voter ID
   Bill (SB 364). Conditional Provisional Ballots were given to voters that lacked the ID
   documents in Arizona meaning these ballots are separate from regular provisional
   ballots.
Luis Figueroa
MALDEF
Legislative Staff Attorney
110 Broadway
Suite 300
San-Antonio, TX 78205
L.Figueroa@maldef.org
210-224-5476 ext. 212
Case 2:13-cv-00193   Document 802-7   Filed in TXSD on 11/20/14   Page 56 of 79

Sean Griffin

From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 6:23 PM
To: David Edmonson
Cc: Jason Hassay; Debra Gonzales; Amber Hauserfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Re: Amendments request por favor?

actually group, #2 on David's list is important... when the Republicans vote against that amendment, whoever takes the lead in opposing pre-clearance will be able to show that the exact sort of data DOJ would most want to know about could have been gathered, but that the legislature rejected gathering it.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 5:40 PM, David Edmonson wrote:

As of right now, Sen. Ellis is concentrating on three amendments:

1. **Election day registration** - can register to vote at a polling place on election day
2. **Disparate impact report** - require the Secretary of State to produce an annual report determining whether the changes in law instituted via SB 14 produce a disparate impact on any population subgroups in our state. It would also make the effective date of SB 14 contingent upon a determination by the Secretary of State that there would not be a disparate impact on any group.
3. **Sunset dates** - a two year sunset date on SB 14. We're also drafting a traditional 12 year sunset. Not sure which he'll run with.

Thanks,
David

---

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Jason Hassay
Cc: Debra Gonzales; Amber Hauserfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Amendments request por favor?

Folks, if I could get a reply from each office on amendments each office has drafted for voter ID it might help the Senators' conference call more productive. No huge explanation necessary, just one sentence summaries?

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:47 PM, Jason Hassay <Jason.Hassay@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

We did an informal break down but only have our notes in pencil. Will work on typing them up to share.

-Jason
Jason Hassay  
Chief of Staff & General Counsel  
Office of Senator Carlos L. Uresti  
512-463-0119 phone  
512-463-1017 fax  

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]  
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 4:33 PM  
To: Debra Gonzales  
Cc: Amber Hausernfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith  
Subject: Re: VID Working Group: Question of a side by side comparison of SB 14 & SB 362  

At least 2 Senators have asked this very question, so somebody should sure tackle that project.  

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:28 PM, Debra Gonzales <Debra.Gonzales@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:  

Hello  

I was wondering if anyone had already done a side by side comparison of SB 14 and SB 362 (senate engrossed version from the 81st)? If so...may I please have a copy?  
If not I will be working on one and will share it if anyone wants a copy... Thanks!

Debra Gonzales  
Legislative Director  
Senator Gallegos  
512-463-0106 office  
512-463-0346 fax  

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]  
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2011 6:06 PM  
To: Amber Hausernfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith  
Subject: VID Working Group: add'l materials from Luis Figueroa  

Luis Figueroa sent some requested items to several of the group so I wanted to share with all.  

Begin forwarded message:  

From: "Luis Figueroa" <lfigueroa@MALDEF.org>  
Date: January 22, 2011 5:33:42 PM CST  
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To: "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com>, "David Edmonson" <David.Edmonson@senate.state.tx.us>, "Amber Hausenfluck" <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>, <richard.sooksiasian@senate.state.tx.us>
Cc: "Laurie Vanhoose" <austintransplant@gmail.com>
Subject: Additional materials for Voter ID Senate Committee hearing

Attached:

1) Crawford v. Marion County- Supreme Court ruling that upheld Indiana's strict voter id legislation.
   Distinguishing points:
   1) Texas is a section 5 state with a much larger minority population than Indiana
   2) Indiana provided a 10 day cure period after the election where as SB 14 only provides 6 days


3) Deceptive Elections Flyer given to minority voters in Tarrant County in 2007. Example of fraud that is substantiated and unprosecuted because there is no law on the books to address.

4) Voter Id power point. Pages 4-8 layout the studies demonstrating impact of voter identification laws on minority electorate.

5) Maricopa County Analysis of Conditional Provisional Ballots in Arizona after their implementation of a voter id(proposition 200) that mirrored last year's Tx Senate Voter ID Bill (SB 364). Conditional Provisional Ballots were given to voters that lacked the ID documents in Arizona meaning these ballots are separate from regular provisional ballots.

Luis Figueroa
MALDEF
Legislative Staff Attorney
110 Broadway
Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
Lfigueroa@maldef.org
Sean Griffin

From: Amber Hausenfluck
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 6:11 PM
To: Harold Cook; Jason Hassay
Cc: Debra Gonzales; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: RE: Amendments request por favor?

1. Strike "70 years of age or older" and substitute "65 years of age or older"
2. 2 alternative forms of ID (taken from SB 382 from the 81st)
3. Changes in the law do not take effect unless the comptroller determines that the legislature has appropriated the amount of money appropriate entities that is necessary to fully fund the implementation of this Act. The Changes in law do not take effect unless the Secretary of State has received certification from every county that they have completed the training and outreach designated in SB 14.
4. A student at an institution of higher education in which their permanent address is different than their address used for voter registration can use their photo ID and another form of ID that has their school address listed (utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, etc).

Amber Hausenfluck
Deputy Legislative Director
Senator Van de Putte, R Ph.
E1.610
512-463-0126
amber.hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Jason Hassay
Cc: Debra Gonzales; Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Amendments request por favor?

Folks, if I could get a reply from each office on amendments each office has drafted for voter ID it might help the Senators’ conference call more productive. No huge explanation necessary, just one sentence summaries?

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:47 PM, Jason Hassay <Jason.Hassay@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

We did an informal break down but only have our notes in pencil. Will work on typing them up to share.

-Jason

Jason Hassay
Chief of Staff & General Counsel
Office of Senator Carlos I. Uresti
512-463-0119 phone
512-463-1017 fax

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 4:33 PM
To: Debra Gonzales
Cc: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay;
Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo
Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Re: VID Working Group: Question of a side by side comparison of SB 14 & SB 362

At least 2 Senators have asked this very question, so somebody should sure tackle that project.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:28 PM, Debra Gonzales <Debra.Gonzales@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

Hello

I was wondering if anyone had already done a side by side comparison of SB 14 and SB 362 (senate engrossed version from the 81st)? If so...may I please have a copy?

If not I will be working on one and will share it if anyone wants a copy... Thanks!

Debra Gonzales
Legislative Director
Senator Gallegos
512-463-0106 office
512-463-0346 fax

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2011 6:06 PM
To: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David
Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith  
Subject: VID Working Group: add'l materials from Luis Figueroa

Luis Figueroa sent some requested items to several of the group so I wanted to share with all.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Luis Figueroa" <lfigueroa@MALDEF.org>  
Date: January 22, 2011 5:33:42 PM CST  
To: "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com>, "David Edmonson" <David.Edmonson@senate.state.tx.us>, "Amber Hausenfluck" <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>, <richard.sooksiasian@senate.state.tx.us>  
Cc: "Laurie Vanhoose" <austintransplant@gmail.com>  
Subject: Additional materials for Voter ID Senate Committee hearing

Attached:

1) Crawford v. Marion County- Supreme Court ruling that upheld Indiana's strict voter id legislation.

Distinguishing points:

1) Texas is a section 5 state with a much larger minority population than Indiana

2) Indiana provided a 10 day cure period after the election where as SB 14 only provides 6 days

3) Deceptive Elections Flyer given to minority voters in Tarrant County in 2007. Example of fraud that is substantiated and unprosecuted because there is no law on the books to address.

4) Voter Id power point. Pages 4-8 layout the studies demonstrating impact of voter identification laws on minority electorate.

5) Maricopa County Analysis of Conditional Provisional Ballots in Arizona after their implementation of a voter id(proposition 200) that mirrored last year's Tx Senate Voter ID Bill (SB 364). Conditional Provisional Ballots were given to voters that lacked the ID documents in Arizona meaning these ballots are separate from regular provisional ballots.

Luis Figueroa
MALDEF
Legislative Staff Attorney
110 Broadway
Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
Lfigueroa@maldef.org
210-224-5476 ext. 212
Case 2:13-cv-00193   Document 802-7   Filed in TXSD on 11/20/14   Page 64 of 79

Sean Griffin

From: Sara Gonzalez
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 5:45 PM
To: Harold Cook; Jason Hassay
Cc: Debra Gonzales; Amber Hauserfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keeever_SC; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: RE: Amendments request por favor?

Sen. Lucio's office requested drafts of the following:

1. Amendment requiring that notice be given to women about voter ID requirements when purchasing a marriage certificate (reason being that election clerks will now be confirming identity, and possible confusion when different last names appear on voter registration card vs. picture ID)
2. Require that posting of the ID changes in both English and Spanish appear at both county clerks offices and voting sites
3. Allowing 60 days use of an expired ID card, if using it for voting purposes and use of expired licenses permanently for voters over 60
4. Amendment changing the ID requirements on the bill to those used for obtaining a drivers license. (we're still talking through this one)

Thanks!
Sara

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Jason Hassay
Cc: Debra Gonzales; Amber Hauserfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keeever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Amendments request por favor?

Folks, if I could get a reply from each office on amendments each office has drafted for voter ID it might help the Senators' conference call more productive. No huge explanation necessary, just one sentence summaries?

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:47 PM, Jason Hassay <Jason.Hassay@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

We did an informal break down but only have our notes in pencil. Will work on typing them up to share.

-Jason

Jason Hassay
Chief of Staff & General Counsel
Office of Senator Carlos I. Uresti
512-463-0119 phone
512-463-1017 fax

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2011 4:33 PM
To: Debra Gonzales
Cc: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Re: VID Working Group: Question of a side by side comparison of SB 14 & SB 362

At least 2 Senators have asked this very question, so somebody should sure tackle that project.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:28 PM, Debra Gonzales <Debra.Gonzales@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

Hello

I was wondering if anyone had already done a side by side comparison of SB 14 and SB 362 (senate engrossed version from the 81st)? If so...may I please have a copy?

If not I will be working on one and will share it if anyone wants a copy... Thanks!

Debra Gonzales
Legislative Director
Senator Gallegos
512-463-0106 office
512-463-0346 fax

From: Harold Cook [mailto:hc@haroldcook.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 22, 2011 6:06 PM
To: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheibal; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David
Luis Figueroa sent some requested items to several of the group so I wanted to share with all.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Luis Figueroa" <lfigueroa@MALDEF.org>

Date: January 22, 2011 5:33:42 PM CST

To: "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com>, "David Edmonson" <David.Edmonson@senate.state.tx.us>, "Amber Hausenfluck" <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>, <richard.sookiasian@senate.state.tx.us>

Cc: "Laurie Vanhoose" <austintransplant@gmail.com>

Subject: Additional materials for Voter ID Senate Committee hearing

Attached:

1) Crawford v. Marion County- Supreme Court ruling that upheld Indiana’s strict voter id legislation.

Distinguishing points:

1) Texas is a section 5 state with a much larger minority population than Indiana

2) Indiana provided a 10 day cure period after the election where as SB 14 only provides 6 days

3) Deceptive Elections Flyer given to minority voters in Tarrant County in 2007. Example of fraud that is substantiated and unprosecuted because there is no law on the books to address.

4) Voter Id power point. Pages 4-8 layout the studies demonstrating impact of voter identification laws on minority electorate.

5) Maricopa County Analysis of Conditional Provisional Ballots in Arizona after their implementation of a voter id(proposition 200) that mirrored last year’s Tx Senate Voter ID Bill (SB 364). Conditional Provisional Ballots were given to voters that lacked the ID documents in Arizona meaning these ballots are separate from regular provisional ballots.

Luis Figueroa
MALDEF
Legislative Staff Attorney
110 Broadway
Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
L.Figueroa@maldef.org
210-224-5476 ext. 212
We're working on two:

-- striking the bill and instead increasing criminal penalties on those who actually commit voter fraud and impersonation.

-- and the Ogden amendment from last session, saying the bill will have no effect if an appropriation isn't made.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 5:36 PM, "Harold Cook" wrote:

Folks, if I could get a reply from each office on amendments each office has drafted for voter ID it might help the Senators' conference call more productive. No huge explanation necessary, just one sentence summaries?

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:47 PM, Jason Hassay wrote:

We did an informal break down but only have our notes in pencil. Will work on typing them up to share.

-Jason
At least 2 Senators have asked this very question, so somebody should sure tackle that project.

On Jan 23, 2011, at 4:28 PM, Debra Gonzales
<Debra.Gonzales@senate.state.tx.us> wrote:

Hello

I was wondering if anyone had already done a side by side comparison of SB 14 and SB 362 (senate engrossed version from the 81st)? If so...may I please have a copy?

If not I will be working on one and will share it if anyone wants a copy... Thanks!

Debra Gonzales
Legislative Director
Senator Gallegos
512-463-0106 office
512-463-0346 fax
Luis Figueroa sent some requested items to several of the group so I wanted to share with all.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Luis Figueroa" <lfigueroa@MALDEF.org>
Date: January 22, 2011 5:33:42 PM CST
To: "Harold Cook" <hc@haroldcook.com>, "David Edmonson" <David.Edmonson@senate.state.tx.us>, "Amber Hausenfluck" <Amber.Hausenfluck@senate.state.tx.us>, <richard.sooksiasian@senate.state.tx.us>
Cc: "Laurie Vanhoose" <austintransplant@gmail.com>

Subject: Additional materials for Voter ID Senate Committee hearing

Attached:

1) Crawford v. Marion County- Supreme Court ruling that upheld Indiana's strict voter id legislation.

Distinguishing points:

1) Texas is a section 5 state with a much larger minority population than Indiana

2) Indiana provided a 10 day cure period after the election where as SB 14 only provides 6 days

3) Deceptive Elections Flyer given to minority voters in Tarrant County in 2007. Example of fraud that is substantiated and unprosecuted because there is no law on the books to address.

4) Voter id power point. Pages 4-8 layout the studies demonstrating impact of voter identification laws on minority electorate.

5) Maricopa County Analysis of Conditional Provisional Ballots in Arizona after their implementation of a voter id(proposition 200) that mirrored last year’s Tx Senate Voter ID Bill (SB 364). Conditional Provisional Ballots were given to voters that lacked the ID documents in Arizona meaning these ballots are separate from regular provisional ballots.

Luis Figueroa
MALDEF
Legislative Staff Attorney
110 Broadway
Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
LFigueroa@maldef.org
210-224-5476 ext. 212
There's an elections administration strategy that has a $0.6 million reduction in GR. In that strategy is where election officials training is, so yes, the SoS might cut training.

I heard or read somewhere that funding for election worker training is cut in the House Budget. Is that true? Maybe the funding goes through the SoS office?

T/wk
Folks, the attached is a letter Senator Van de Putte sent to Senator Duncan late today. The members are aware of the letter.
Sean Griffin

From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2011 11:59 AM
To: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheiba; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: VID working group: suggestion FOR TODAY

Group, it has been pointed out to me by somebody who should know:

Unless a specific motion is made today during the debate on Duncan's resolution, the Committee of the Whole will NOT be broadcast through Time Warner to Austin cable subscribers.

Apparently the decision was made to only broadcast Senate sessions - the COW isn't a Senate session.

This issue was important enough to amend the long-standing two-thirds tradition in order to take up, and important enough for the Governor to declare an emergency. Surely this issue is important enough to merit broadcast to Austin viewers, as all the other Senate sessions are.

I think this is a great issue, which if the Republicans oppose the press might jump on. I recommend somebody make the motion that the COW be broadcast.

As I understand it, this decision is within the Senate's power to control - it's a deal with Austin ISD, in which unless my source is wrong, the Senate has a direct line to master control at Time Warner, and is empowered to broadcast anything they want.
From: Ray Martinez
Sent: Friday, January 21, 2011 6:07 PM
To: Will Krueger
Cc: Sean Griffin; Gonzalo Serrano
Subject: Voter ID Talking Points
Attachments: Voter ID.background.TPs.docx

WK:

You’ve probably seen the attached already…we need to develop something similar for Z for Monday, don’t you think?

T/Rm.

Ray Martinez
Chief of Staff and General Counsel
Director, Senate Higher Education Committee
Office of Senator Judith Zaffirini
Texas State Capitol, Rm. 1E.14
(512) 463-0121
From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 3:05 PM
To: Amber Hausenfluck; Steve Scheiba; Ray Martinez; Debra Gonzales; David Edmonson; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Dan Buda; Graham Keever; Micah Rodriguez; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Lara Wendler; Gonzalo Serrano; Oscar Garza; Sushma Smith
Subject: Wentworth's remarks

The study Wentworth is citing right now is specifically refuted in your talking points, which I handed out last Friday and emailed later that day.
From: Harold Cook <hc@haroldcook.com>
Sent: Friday, January 21, 2011 3:34 PM
To: Steve Scheiba; Amber Hausenfluck; Ray Martinez; David Edmonson; Debra Gonzales; Will Krueger; Jason Hassay; Lara Wendler; Micah Rodriguez; Dan Buda; Graham Keever_SC; Sara Gonzalez; Oscar Garza; Gonzalo Serrano; Sushma Smith
Subject: Voter ID Working Group: Complete set of files
Attachments:
Voter ID 09 exaggerated R claims.doc; Voter ID 09 vote suppression.doc; Voter ID 09 Voting Rights TPs.doc; THE VOTER ID BUREAUCRACY.doc; Voter ID 09 Summary of Facts from Studies.doc; Voter ID 09 Seniors.doc; Voter ID 09 rebuttals to R claims and myths.doc; Voter ID 09 GOP power grab.doc; Voter ID 09 No Voter Impersonation.doc; Hidalgo County Facts.doc; Voter ID 09 Editorial Opposition.doc; Voter ID 09 Polling Place Disenfranchisement.doc; Voter ID HseFloor Debate points and responses.doc; Voter ID Facts Voter Impersonation.pdf; Voter ID Women, students, less likely to have id.pdf; Voter ID Potential for discrimination.pdf

Folks:

The attached should represent all the sets of talking points and data already distributed at the staff meeting. I apologize for 3 of the files being in PDF form - I was unable to find the original files on my computer. THESE MATERIALS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.

Thanks!
Voter ID Facts: Photo ID Threatens Seniors’ Right to Vote

"Election fraud is virtually nonexistent in Texas. This (the Voter ID bill) would particularly hurt seniors, the kind of voters who vote most faithfully, and cast a chilling effect on the ability of many Texans to exercise their right to vote." Bob Jackson, AARP-Texas Director during the 2007 Voter ID fight. AARP opposes proposed Voter Photo ID legislation in 2009.

Note: Attempts to exempt voters of a certain age from Voter ID requirements effectively concede the problem with photo ID laws but wouldn’t “fix” anything. Any age exemption could be stricken because it may raise a constitutional equal protection problem. Besides, a proposed senior exemption could prove to be absolutely meaningless for affected voters, because those voters would presumably need to provide I.D. proving that the person is over a certain age to get the senior exemption.

- The pro-Photo ID Texas Conservative Coalition Research Institute admitted that 37% of Texans over the age of 80 did not have a driver’s license.

- The Georgia chapter of the AARP has estimated that about 153,000 Georgians older than 60 who voted in 2004 do not have government-issued photo ID. It has also estimated that 36% of Georgians over age 75 do not have a driver’s license.

- In 2006, the non-partisan Brennan Center for Justice found that 18% of citizens 65 and over have no photo ID. For many seniors, getting a state-issued photo ID is not only costly and time-consuming, it is also impractical.

- An estimated 23% of persons aged 65 and over do not have a Wisconsin driver’s license or photo ID (177,399 elderly persons), and 70% of these are women. 91% of the state’s elderly without a Wisconsin driver’s license are Anglo. (Source: http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/d/download_file_50902.pdf)

- Royal Masset, a former Political Director of the Republican Party of Texas, on the impact of Voter ID proposals on senior Texans: "When
voting in America is only allowed to healthy and wealthy people then the America I know is far sicker than my (91 year old) mother." Quorum Report, 4-23-07

- Elderly voters, who are less likely to have photo ID and have difficulty getting to the polls, could be denied the right to vote a regular ballot with only a valid voter registration card - like they always have. And given the confusion this would cause at the polling place, they would be less likely to go back home, search for ID, then return to vote.

- Many elderly and disabled voters cast ballots by mail, which does not require a photo ID. Passage of a photo ID law would establish different criteria for voting by mail and voting in person.