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JUDGE COLLYER: Good morning everyone. I'm sorry, we are a few minutes late. We were trying to figure out, I need as you remember, I have to leave here just before 9:30 to run to another courtroom which turns out to be two floors down in order to hold a very short criminal matter at which time I'll return. So I'll probably be gone ten minutes, okay.

So Ms. White is going to leave to make sure that that's all set up and everybody is waiting, you know, the Judge never comes out until everybody is waiting. You have to keep people waiting or they don't have, you know proper -- any way, so if they're all waiting she will come back and I'll take off and you'll just sort of pause for a moment and then I'll be back. I apologize to you for that.

The next thing I want to say is that we would like for all defendants by noon before we break a list of every district that you think this Court needs to address. Senate, I assume you all know Senate District 10. So let's talk about well, Senate District 10. Luckily, there's only one of them. The House Districts, and the Congressional Districts that you think are at issue in some fashion.

If you told us what the fashion was that would be nice, but since you're sitting here in trial, we don't actually require that, we just want to know which ones.

JUDGE HOWELL: We do have a ten minute break.

JUDGE COLLYER: Absolutely, I forgot that. They do
have a ten minute break, yes, they can consult and come up with a list. Because we need to know that by noon.

I will say that we are, in light of the Western District of Texas' request, we are in the process of trying to figure out what we might best do, if anything, to be responsive to them and to you. I mean, this is beyond my can at this very minute, so I'm just saying we're trying to figure it out.

One of the things we might be doing is changing the date for closing arguments, and $I$ just want to warn you all, you are all grown, you will all say $I$ can't possibly be there, I have to be somewhere else, well, you know, so do we.

Yes, sir?
MR. GARZA: Just a point of clarification, Your
Honor. Jose Garza for the Mexican American Legislative Caucus.
In terms of designating districts is that for
retrogression or districts that we believe should be looked at on the intent issues as well?

JUDGE COLLYER: On both.
MR. GARZA: On both.

JUDGE COLLYER: If you could separate them that would be most helpful because the analysis is different. But on both.

MR. GARZA: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE COLLYER: So that we'll have an idea how broad a swarth of geography we're talking here other than the entire

State of Texas which is a broad swarth.

Are we ready? Is there anything else that I should add?
Well, we need to clarify this with Judge Griffith's
schedule. But the closing argument that we're aiming for is on Tuesday rather than Friday, so that would be the 31st. That's what we're aiming for.

Now you have to understand I have a trial that starts on the 30th. So this is not the smoothest way for me to endear myself to a jury of 16 people, but I can't let the Judges in need go unrecognized.

You guys, I know you have needs, but Judges in need, I mean, never mind, I didn't say that.

If there's any reporter here who reports me on this, I'm going to be --

Yes, sir, I'm sorry, Mr. Devaney.
MR. DEVANEY: Good morning, Your Honor, John Devaney for Gonzalez intervenors.

As mentioned last night that we have a brief on
coalition districts. I now have hard copies.
JUDGE COLLYER: Very good.
MR. DEVANEY: Shall I approach?

JUDGE COLLYER: You can give them to Ms. White and if
you give us two and give them to the clerks who are the brain
trust, we'll be very happy.
Thank you, sir.

All right, what can we do next?
MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, if that takes care of all of your business, the State of Texas is ready to call Senator Kel Seliger. He filed as you know a written direct testimony. JUDGE COLLYER: Yes, sir.

MR. HUGHES: So he gets the opportunity to sit for cross examination.

JUDGE COLLYER: Senator Seliger, if you're here,
could you come forward, please.
PLAINTIFF WITNESS SENATOR KEL SELIGER SWORN

JUDGE HOWELL: Good morning.
MS. PERALES: Good morning, Your Honor.
Nina Perales for the Latino Task Force.

May I approach the witness to give him clean copies of his prior depositions?

JUDGE COLLYER: Yes, ma'am.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MS. PERALES:
Q. Good morning, Senator.
A. Good morning.
Q. I should call you Chairman. Good morning, Chairman?
A. No, you don't have to.
Q. I'm going to ask you questions about Congressional

Redistricting. And you chaired the Senate select committee on redistricting in the Senate, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And your committee worked on and eventually voted out a Congressional Redistricting plan, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Torrey, I know it's early in the morning, but can you give me C 100 on Red Viewer -- DistrictViewer.

We talked before in your deposition and when we talked about what districts were Latino opportunity districts in the benchmark for congressional, you gave me the numbers of the districts that you felt were Latino opportunity districts, and so if we can just zoom in to the bottom half of the State.

It is correct that you identified as Latino opportunity districts moving from the west Congressional District 16 and El Paso, Sylvester Reyes, big West Texas 23, Congressional District 28, out of Laredo, Henry Cuellar, Congressional District 20 out of San Antonio, Charley Gonzalez.

Congressional District 15 out of Hidalgo County, Ruben Hinojosa. Congressional District 27 out of Brownsville, Corpus Christi held by Blake Farenthold, and then the last one would be all the way over in Houston Congressional 29, Gene Green.

Is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes, ma'am.
Q. You talked with me in your deposition also, you said that you believe in the benchmark plan Congressional District 23 was an opportunity district for Latinos, correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And also with respect to 23, you believed that a district
is a Latino opportunity district if it elects the Latino
preferred candidate two out of three times, correct?
A. I don't know if $I$ recall that was my exact response.
Q. If you can pull your deposition from September 1?
A. Okay.
Q. Go ahead and take a look at page 20?
A. Okay.
Q. And line 16 through 23 you were very humble about it. You said -- is it true that you said based upon my body of knowledge, meager though it is, yes, I think that's a logical conclusion?
A. Okay.
Q. And when you set out to make changes to Congressional

District 23, in this redistricting process, you testified that
your goal was to figure out if there was any way in political
terms you could help Congressman Canseco hold that seat,
correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Congressman Canseco is the incumbent of 23 right now, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And he was elected in the year 2010?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. With respect to your attempt in the Senate to meet that goal of making the district politically safer for Mr. Canseco, you testified that on your side, on the Senate side we didn't really do a good job, we just couldn't satisfy ourselves, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you further testified that you hadn't done a really good job with 23 because in order to keep it as an opportunity district, we just couldn't piece it together where it served Congressman Canseco and we wanted to if we could?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you.

And during these efforts you formed the impression that if you made Congressional District 23 too much of a sure thing for Mr. Canseco, then you would be compromising its status as an opportunity district and you couldn't do that, correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Can we keep the same view, but change the map to C 185, please.

I want to make sure that you have something to look at.
A. Thank you.
Q. So after your efforts in the Senate to draw a congressional map you testified that the House came up with their design for Congressional 23 and you thought it was good, so you agreed to it, correct?
A. Yes, ma'am, I believe this is it, is it not?
Q. Yes.
A. Thank you.
Q. This is the enacted Congressional 23 plan, the one that finally passed.

You also testified that the architecture for District 23
came over from the House, correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. When we talked about this in your deposition you testified
that although you believed that Mr. Canseco was also the
preferred candidate of Latino voters, and 23 was in the
benchmark, a majority Latino district, you did want to change
it to make it safer for Mr. Canseco, yes?
A. If possible, yes.
Q. And you wanted to make it safer you explained because you thought that the 2010 election in which he was elected to this district was a bit of an aberration and you didn't know if District 23 was reliable for Mr. Canseco, correct?
A. Or any republican.
Q. Okay, but particularly for the incumbent that was there?
A. The incumbent, yes, ma'am.
Q. And you also testified that you thought it was possible Mr. Canseco might lose Congressional District 23 in the 2012 election if the district was not reconfigured in some way, correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And you testified while you were working on the Senate side on the draft of Congressional 23 you looked at voting patterns and you looked at ethnicity, and you would go into various counties and see what you could do to change the district, correct? That's on page 15 of that same deposition?
A. Yes, I believe so.

Page 15 did you say?
Q. Page 15. Go ahead, I want you to be comfortable?
A. Thank you.
Q. Lines 12 through 20 .
A. Okay, thank you.
Q. It's true that you looked at voting patterns and ethnicity and you would go into various counties to see what you could do to change the district, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You even looked at splitting Webb County to reach your goal of Congressional 23. And let me see if this works. Okay. I'm circling Webb County for you badly on the monitor. You said you even looked at splitting Webb County to reach your goal for 23, but you didn't do that in the end because the Supreme Court had criticized the Webb County split in LULAC v. Perry, correct?
A. Correct.

JUDGE COLLYER: And Webb County is the one with 28 on
it down in the Southern Texas?

MS. PERALES: That's correct. Yes.
BY MS. PERALES:
Q. In the final version, Chairman, Webb County was not included in Congressional District 23; is that correct?
A. I believe that's correct, yes, ma'am.
Q. Can you zoom in a little bit to Maverick County, just a little. Oh, no, just come in a little closer to 28.

Thank you.
But you did end up in the final plan splitting neighboring
Maverick County; is that correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.

JUDGE COLLYER: And Maverick County I would note for the record is northwest of Wells County, Wells County being Number 28, District 28 and Maverick County being immediately Northwest of it.

MS. PERALES: Your Honor, if I might Webb, that is Webb County. W-E-B-B.

JUDGE COLLYER: Oh, Webb. You said Webb, I said Webb then I looked at this and thought it, sorry.

You are correct, of course.
BY MS. PERALES:
Q. With respect to Congressional 23 in the adopted plan, you understood that Congressional 23 was a Latino opportunity in the new plan, adopted in the new plan?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. You testified that nobody ever told you in the Congressional District 23 in the adopted plan was predicted to elect the preferred candidate in one out of 10 elections, correct?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Your testimony was that no one ever told you that, correct?
A. Right.
Q. You also testified that if you had understood that Mr. Canseco was not the Latino preferred candidate, but you knew that you were taking steps to make this district safer for Mr. Canseco that would have created a concern in your mind regarding compliance with the Voting Rights Act, correct? A. Yes, it would.
Q. You further testified that it was your understanding from counsel that you were required to build the districts that can elect the candidate of choice, and if somebody had told you clearly that Canseco was not the candidate of choice to you this would have been a violation of the Voting Rights Act, correct?
A. In a layman's view, yes, ma'am.
Q. I think it's a very good layman's view, Senator. You
don't know why some of these West Texas -- if we can just go to District 23, please.

You need to zoom out a tiny bit because it is a big district.

Senator, you don't know why some of these West Texas counties north of the Pecos River, and here I'm going to indicate the Pecos River. I know you're from a little bit further north of that in Maryland.

You don't know why some of these counties north of the Pecos River were added to Congressional 23? I mean, like Loving, Ward, Winkler, Crane, Upton and Regan that was down by your House counterparts?
A. That's correct.
Q. You don't know why Maverick was cut in the new plan while it was previously maintained whole in the benchmark?
A. That's correct.
Q. You don't ever recall exploring whether the changes to Congressional 23 would impact Mr. Canseco's ability to be nominated in a contested republican primary, correct?
A. I asked if the map that we were going to vote on was going
to be legal and the answer was, I don't know if it was unequivocal, but it was certainly yes.
Q. But while you were changing and altering Congressional 23 for the benefit of Mr. Canseco, you were not examining what changes might have been occurring in the dynamics of the republican primary that might have made it either easier or more difficult for him to win a contested primary, correct?
A. I didn't do the changes and alterations.
Q. So you didn't look into any primary effects, correct?
A. No, ma'am. I simply asked the question.
Q. Okay?
A. What the effect was and was it legal or not.
Q. I'm going to show Chairman a demonstrative exhibit. It is Defendant's 745 and it is a comparison map although $I$ can't get the whole thing on here, so I'm going to have to ask you these questions one at a time.

The top half is the benchmark and the bottom half is the State's enacted plan so we can look at them side by side.

I'd like to turn with you to Congressional District 27 on
the gulf coast. The incumbent of Congressional District 27 is Blake Farenthold who won in 2010 , correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And Mr. Farenthold defeated a 27 year incumbent Mr.

Solomon Ortez, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Farenthold squeaked through that election with a margin victory of 722 votes didn't he?
A. I wasn't aware of the margin.
Q. You knew it was small?
A. I knew it was small.
Q. You testified that you believed Mr. Farenthold was not the Latino candidate of choice, correct?
A. I believe that's correct, I don't think he was.
Q. Now in terms of what was done to Congressional District 27 from the benchmark plan to the enacted plan, if you can see in the benchmark plan Nueces County is in Congressional District 27, right?
A. Right.
Q. In the enacted plan Nueces County has been placed into the yellow district, the new 27, which is much farther north and then there's another District 34 that comes up out of Cameron County and sort of wraps around and goes up to the north of Nueces, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you described to me that you made this change after meeting with the republicans in the Congressional 23 delegation and they asked you would you mind looking if there is a way to give Mr. Farenthold a good chance to hold that district, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you described Congressional District 27 in the benchmark as clearly an opportunity district, correct?
A. Did I call it clearly an opportunity district?
Q. Page 25. Lines 22 and then flowing over to the next page.
A. Okay.
Q. So you said in your mind it was clearly an opportunity district in the benchmark, yes?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And you believed that with respect to the new configuration of District 27 where Nueces County is now matched up with northern counties that this is a district that Representative Farenthold can hold, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You created this as what is showing on the exhibit as a brown district, you created 34 because you said you felt you were clearly required to create an opportunity district coming out of the valley, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And just to clarify for the Court, Mr. Farenthold lives in Nueces County doesn't he?
A. Corpus Cristi, yes, ma'am.
Q. I'm now showing Defense Exhibit 746 .
A. I didn't draw this did I?
Q. No, but $I$ did share it with counsel for the State last night to make sure that we weren't to going have any problems here.

I will represent to you that this map with the backup data that goes behind it simply shades counties that are either over 50 percent or under 50 percent Hispanic citizen voting age population.

And you testified in your deposition that you are aware that Nueces County is a majority Latino county, correct?
A. I believe that's correct, yes, ma'am.
Q. I'm showing Defendant's 744 now which is a map of the South Texas Latino majority districts in the enacted plan C 185. You agree with me when we talked about it in your deposition --

Let me just point out Nueces County which is part of the new 28 is no longer within this configuration of South Texas Latino majority districts.

You agree with me instead of taking all of Nueces County and placing it up out of the South Texas Congressional 23 Latino district configuration, it would have been possible to take Mr. Farenthold's neighborhood there along Gulf Shore Drive in Corpus Christi and pair it with counties to the north and make him a safer district and leave the remainder of Nueces County's population in the district that runs down to Cameron County, didn't you?
A. I'm sorry, I don't recall that. I lost that. Can you point that out to me in the deposition?
Q. Yes, it's just a little bit further in your deposition, page 27. Lines 16 through 22.
A. Okay.
Q. So with respect to whether -- Mr. Farenthold, he lives right along Gulf Shore Drive, a very lovely area of Corpus Christi. When we talked about this, you said conceptually it was possible to basically take his neighborhood in Nueces

County which is right there in the blue dot on the map and match that up with some northern counties to make him a safer district, but it was also possible to have left the remainder of the Nueces County population in the South Texas configuration, correct?
A. Conceptually.
Q. If you would turn with me back again -- no, I'm going to skip that one. We'll go faster, Senator.

When we talked about the addition of some of these West
Texas counties that we talked about a moment ago north of the Pecos River and these Loving, Ward, Crane, Winkler, when we talked about the addition of those counties to Congressional 23 you agreed with me that because Congressional 23 was overpopulated, it was certainly possible to have simply pulled Congressional 23 closer down towards the border and not have gone into those northern counties, correct?
A. I think conceptually, correct.
Q. You agree with me that if the State had pulled

Congressional District 23, contracted it down closer to the border Latino voters in that situation would have also
determined the outcome of the election, correct?
A. Did $I$ not say in there that it would clearly be a more democrat outcome?
Q. No. Take a look at page 38.
A. Thirty-eight?
Q. Yes. Is there a 38 in your deposition? I surely hope so. Take a look at 38, lines 15 through 19.

And I asked you: Okay, if you had pulled the district down closer towards the border, Latino voters in that situation would they have also determined the outcome of the election and you testified I think they would?
A. Right.
Q. But you testified that you never asked your staff to explore the possibility of arranging the South Texas districts to make 23 a district in which Latino voters had a significantly greater share of the voter registration than they did in the benchmark, correct?
A. I asked the staff if the map here was legal to everyone.
Q. You testified that you never looked at whether it was possible to draw the South Texas configuration to include this new I-35 district here, this is a new district, and still have all of the districts elect a Latino preferred candidate the majority of the time, correct?
A. Would you ask that again, please?
Q. Yes. Let me ask it the way $I$ wrote it down.

You testified that you never looked at whether it was possible to draw the South Texas configuration from the gulf coast all the way to El Paso to include the new Latino District 35 and still significantly increase the Spanish surname voter registration in District 23 , correct?
A. Clearly we drew 35, but you're asking did we look at 35 as part of 23?
Q. I'm asking whether you looked at the whole group of districts together so adding the new 35 but also making sure that 23 had the ability to elect a Latino preferred candidate the majority of the time or draw the new I-35 district and then in this configuration, in this group of districts that I'm showing you here make sure that 23 had a very strong Spanish surname voter registration?

It's correct that you didn't really look at them that way?
A. I don't think so because it appeared evident that 23 was going to be, have a very high, be a Spanish surname voter registration or Hispanic citizen voting age population. It was going to be that way in any case.
Q. So on this map which gives the Spanish surname voter registration of 54.8 you didn't look at creating a configuration of all of these South Texas districts where 23 would have a higher surname voter registration than 54.8, correct?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. So my statement is correct?
A. I guess so. The goal was in 23 and as we sat around and talked about this is that Judge Higginbotham had set the benchmark and that would be a good goal. It was judicially set that seemed reliable, that was the intent. So in my mind that
was our goal.
Q. And so did you --

JUDGE COLLYER: I'm sorry, excuse me. I didn't
understand that.

You said the goal as we sat around and talked about it Judge Higginbotham said that was our goal.

THE WITNESS: No, Judge Higginbotham at that time had set the benchmark.

JUDGE COLLYER: What was that? What do you mean by that?

THE WITNESS: In 2000 --
JUDGE COLLYER: I understand the time. What was the benchmark that Judge Higginbotham set?

THE WITNESS: My understanding is that it was the percentage that we needed to give either in this case Hispanic voting age population.

JUDGE COLLYER: What percentage was that?
THE WITNESS: My assumption was in this 54.8 percent. JUDGE COLLYER: I'm sorry, excuse me for interpreting you.

I'm just trying to figure out how Judge Higginbotham's decision guided your analysis here.

Did he say majority, did he say at least 53 percent?
What was it that you and, of course, sir, you understand this is not our profession?

THE WITNESS: Right.

JUDGE COLLYER: A Senator, that's okay. So I'm
dealing with what do you think we're dealing with rather than reality. I don't even know what Judge Higginbotham said, I can't remember right now.

What is it that you said he had said that would guide you?

THE WITNESS: My impression of it was that he had set the benchmark and that's what we should aim for.

JUDGE COLLYER: But what was the benchmark?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I don't recall precisely
what it was.

JUDGE COLLYER: I'm sorry. I have to run. I have another matter but $I$ promise $I$ won't be very long, I just need to get it started, okay.
(Witness excused.)
(Recess at 9:30 a.m.)
(Proceedings resumed at 9:45 a.m.)
(Witness resumes the stand.)

JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you everybody, I appreciate
your courtesy.

MS. PERALES: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE COLLYER: Ms. Perales.

MS. PERALES: I'm ready.

BY MS. PERALES:
Q. So would it be fair to say then that while you were working on the South Texas portion of the congressional map and you had added in the new Congressional District 35, did you look at whether it was possible to increase the Spanish surname voter registration of Congressional District 23 above the benchmark or significantly above the benchmark?
A. I do not recall doing that.
Q. Do you understand this region generally had become more populous and more Hispanic since the redrawing of this map after the Supreme Court case?
A. My impression was more Latino, more populous because it included so much of those sparsely populated counties in Texas. No, I was not aware of that.

JUDGE HOWELL: Senator Seliger, did I understand you correctly that you relied on House map drawers for the Congressional District 23 drawing?

THE WITNESS: Actually, for most of the Congressional map.

JUDGE HOWELL: For most of the congressional map you relied on the House to provide that to you?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
We both did drafts and when we got them together to talk about them, we decided that the House product was a better one, so I agreed with the House Chairman that we'd work off that map. They asked us to change anything we wanted to change and
so we relied on their word to a very good extent.
JUDGE HOWELL: Do you know whose work it was from the House side that in drawing these maps that you relied on?

THE WITNESS: Gerardo Interiano and Ryan Downton were the ones along with Mr. Davis that I spoke with along with my staff.

JUDGE HOWELL: I can tell from your testimony in your prefile declaration that you were very concerned with compliance with the Voting Rights Act?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
JUDGE HOWELL: So in your discussions with them did you ask, in terms of Section 5 compliance, what the number of minority ability to elect districts were that was your target for Voting Rights Act compliance for the congressional plan? THE WITNESS: I did not, Your Honor.

I asked them what they had drawn was it legal under the Voting Rights Act.

JUDGE HOWELL: But you never got actual numbers? THE WITNESS: No, ma'am. JUDGE HOWELL: Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: They might have showed me the numbers and things like that, but in the end, I wanted to know the end result was it legal or not legal. That's how I was going to make my judgment as to whether it should be included in the map.

JUDGE HOWELL: Even if you didn't get numbers, this is the total number of ability to elect Hispanic ability, minority ability to elect districts into the House plan, the Senate plan, the Congressional plan.

Did you understand that they were using HVAP as the demographic statistic that they would apply to evaluate whether there was a minority ability to elect district?

THE WITNESS: You know, in a lot of them I looked at those statistics they would show it to me. In RedAppl there is a data bar that goes under the map or over the map that shows those things and so it was available on all those maps on the RedAppl.

JUDGE HOWELL: So which statistic were you particularly focused on?

THE WITNESS: I didn't focus necessarily on the statistic, but the opinion on our legal counsel as to whether or not it met legal muster. I wasn't going to do the calculation.

JUDGE HOWELL: I thought I heard you say that you looked at each VAP.

THE WITNESS: It's one of the things we looked at. HVAP, Black VAP and Spanish surname voting registration, I'm sure there are some other statistics there that were on there.

JUDGE HOWELL: All right. Thank you. Sorry.

BY MS. PERALES:
Q. Senator, is it fair to say that the map -- well, let me ask you this.

Are you aware that Nueces County has about 340,000 people in it?
A. I am.
Q. That's roughly half the size of the Congressional District in the new plan, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is it fair to say that the final product enacted by the State for the South Texas configuration of districts cuts Nueces County, the Latino majority Nueces County, which is almost half the size of a Congressional District, out of the configuration and as a result, we have a Congressional 23 that elects the Latino preferred candidate only one out of ten times?
A. Are you asking did I know that doing that with Nueces County had the resulting effect in District 23, no, I'm sorry not.
Q. But we do see that the final plan does cut Nueces County out and that Congressional 23 has a Spanish surname voting registration of 54.8, correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. I would like you to keep that number in your mind, the 54.8 for Congressional 23 and take a look at this map which is
Defendant's 743.

This is, these are the Latino South Texas configuration districts for plan C 131. Is it correct to say that the Senate select committee considered a proposed alternative Congressional map from the vice chair of the committee, Senator Gallegos.

Do you recall that?
A. I recall that he offered an amendment specifically which map I don't, I'm sorry.
Q. It was actually I believe, Senator, on the floor, do you remember Senator Gallegos, Senator Lucio and Senator Uresti together offering an amendment on the Senate floor, plan C 131, and that would have been June 6 th around the time that you were passing this plan out to the Senate?
A. I remember them offering amendments. Specific amendment I'm sorry, I don't.
Q. So were you aware that in this configuration Congressional District 23 elects the Latino preferred candidate ten out of ten times?
A. I don't know if that was offered in debate. I'm sure it was.

JUDGE COLLYER: You say Congressional 23, but in this configuration it's labeled 28?

MS. PERALES: That's correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE COLLYER: Okay. The area that is Congressional

23, the past Congressional map 185 is on this -- what document was this?

MS. PERALES: This is Defendant's 743.
JUDGE COLLYER: -- 743 is actually labeled

Congressional 28 and it has a Spanish surname voter registration of 68.7 percent.

MS. PERALES: Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE COLLYER: And it doesn't include the counties north of the Pecos River?

MS. PERALES: It does not, Your Honor.
BY MS. PERALES:
Q. Mr. Chairman, I will direct your attention to the big West Texas district in this map, and I need to compare it to the Congressional 23 in the enacted map. Although in this map it happens to have a different number on it.

Do you remember that these amendments that were offered by the vice chair Senator Gallegos were not passed on the Senate floor that day?
A. I do recall.
Q. And to follow up on a question asked by the Court I know that you were concerned about Section 5 retrogression and that appears to be the reason that you included an offset district here, District 34 for the loss essentially of Latino opportunity in 27 , correct?
A. I don't know if that was the calculation. I thought we
were required to put in the district.
Q. Okay. So you weren't really thinking about it in terms of well, we've lost 27, we need to make sure we have 34 to offset it?
A. No, ma'am. I think it was required by on its own merits. Q. And so that's what I wanted to get to with you. Is that if we're just looking not no longer under retrogression or under Section 5, but if we're looking under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and how many districts overall should be drawn to provide Latino opportunity, did you ever form a concern that you may not have been drawing enough opportunity districts in South Texas?
A. I had asked the staff to ensure that we drew every district we were required to draw under Section 2.
Q. I don't think that $I$ have any more questions for you, Senator, on this exhibit which is C 131.

But I did want to talk to you for a minute about republicans and democrats. We had a good conversation in your deposition about that.

You agree with me that Latino voters can vote republican
don't you?
A. Certainly.
Q. And it's your opinion that perhaps at the moment more Latinos don't vote republican because republicans haven't done a very good job of reaching out to Latino voters, correct?
A. I agree with that.
Q. And you testified that it was your opinion that more republicans hadn't done a very good job of reaching out because they'd quote keep coming up with proposals to declare English the official language of Texas to no good end and things like that, yes?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And you also mentioned that some of the positions related to immigration might have been not such a good job of reaching out to Latinos, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you think it is possible, don't you that a Latino
majority district could prefer a republican candidate in the general election, couldn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. But then you also testified that in your mind if the State created a new Latino opportunity district that was not required by the Voting Rights Act that in your mind that meant creating a democratic district, correct?
A. That's a motivation I would ascribe to the folks who offered that district, yes.
Q. All right. And if you would look at your deposition on page 11 near the bottom, page 11, line 22 over to page 12 , line 15.

Is it fair to say that at least then you said that creating
a non-required Latino opportunity district was in your mind
creating a democratic district?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And is it fair to say that you didn't want to create any
more of what you thought of as democratic districts unless you
had to, correct?
A. I think that's fair to say.
Q. Okay. Now moving over just a couple of questions on the
process. Is it correct to say that the Senate select committee
on redistricting did not hold any hearings on proposed
Congressional Redistricting plan during the regular session?
Your committee regular session that you had no hearings on the
proposed Congressional plan during the regular?
A. That's correct. We scheduled one, cancelled it I believe.
Q. Yes, and that was May 19th. Scheduled then cancelled,
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then during the special session which happened after
the regular session the bill for the Congressional map moved
through the special session passing through the House and
Senate in about two weeks, correct?
A. I think that's correct.
Q. And my last question is on the Texas House. Other than
getting a reassurance from Chairman Burt Solomons that the
Texas House map sent for your consideration complied with the

Voting Rights Act, is it fair to say that you didn't make any analysis of the House map to see whether it confirmed with the Voting Rights Act?
A. That is correct.

MS. PERALES: Thank you.
I pass the witness. Thank you very much, Senator. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. HEBERT: May I proceed, Your Honor? JUDGE COLLYER: Please go right ahead, sir. CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. For the record, the Senator's sworn declaration which constitutes his direct testimony is Plaintiff's Exhibit 162. We have just marked that.

So that I want to start with that, Senator Seliger, and I noticed on the last page of your sworn statement you have a paragraph 19 in which you discuss the fact that you were made aware of Latino population growth in Texas, and that when you heard about the growth it says you asked your counsel on redistricting if growth alone was enough to compel the drawing of districts under the Voting Rights Act, and then it says based on his advice $I$ concluded it was not that simple, that's your testimony, is that right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I want to talk with you about that growth and I would like
to bring up if $I$ could the Tarrant and Dallas County areas of the Congressional map, so if we could bring up Defendant's 107, please, and focus on the upper right corner of that.

Senator Seliger, are you aware of the fact that the population growth in this two county area according to the 2010 census indicates that there are now 2.1 million black and Latino persons living in this two county area? You know that don't you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you're also aware that in the Harris County area there are also approximately 2.1 million black and Latinos? You are aware of that too according to the 2010 census?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many ability to elect districts are there in Harris County Congressional districts? There's Sheila Jackson Lee, would you agree with me there?
A. I would.
Q. Gene Green?
A. Yeah, Gene Green.
Q. And Al Green?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's three. How many under the proposed State plan, Congressional plan, how many ability to elect districts are there in the Tarrant Dallas County area?
A. None.
Q. Eddie Bernice Johnson?
A. Eddie Bernice Johnson, I'm sorry.
Q. So there's only one even though they both have roughly, those two areas of the State have roughly the same numbers?
A. That's right.
Q. I'm showing you here a map which was proposed during the legislative session by I believe Senator West a Congressional map. It's C 192.

Again, Your Honors, this Exhibit Number is 107.
Now this, these Districts 34, and 35 were proposed as ability to elect minority districts, correct, and if we could, could you scroll down?
A. I can't tell you that, $I$ didn't draw it.
Q. Do you know what the racial composition is of these two districts?
A. I do not.
Q. According to Exhibit 107, District 34 -- we want to go down to the bottom of the exhibit where the statistics are, please, and we'll look it up District 34, and District 35. JUDGE COLLYER: It's very gratifying when the lawyer
has to go tell the techees, it hardly ever happens.
MR. HEBERT: Especially in my case. JUDGE COLLYER: No, no, I'm very impressed.

You understand that don't you, Senator? THE WITNESS: I do.

JUDGE COLLYER: Yes.

THE WITNESS: If we could just find a 12 year old.
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. If we could blow that up a little bit so that we could focus in on 34 and 35 in particular.

On the far right five columns we have the percentage Anglo, percentage black, percentage Hispanic, percentage black Hispanic and percentage other.

Do you see that, Senator?
A. I do.
Q. On this exhibit, if you look at District 34 and then go to the far right it shows that the voting age population percentage which is the bottom of the dark shaded area shows that District 34 is only 20 percent Anglo and a combined 77.1 percent black and Hispanic.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. All right. Then if you look below that on District 35 you see that District 35 is only 33.6 percent Anglo and it's 59.5 percent black and Hispanic.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So these are two new proposed majority minority districts in the Dallas Fort Worth area, correct?
A. Right.
Q. And the Senate rejected this map, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And was that along a party line vote?
A. I believe there was.
Q. And all minorities in the Senate, all of the minority Senators, by minorities I don't mean political, no, I mean racial ethnic minority, they voted for this map?
A. All of the democrats did.
Q. And all of the minority did?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Racial and ethnic minority?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. In the Tarrant County area, just Tarrant now, not Dallas. Let me stop at Dallas, you are aware of the fact that according to the 2000 census, Dallas County lost 200,000 Anglos?
A. From the 2000?
Q. I may have misspoke. From 2000 to 2010 a comparison of the census showed that Dallas lost approximately 200,000 Anglos over the course of the decade, are you aware of that fact?
A. I might have been told it, no, sir.
Q. Do you have any reason to disagree with that?
A. I have no knowledge to the contrary.
Q. With regard to Tarrant County do you happen to know, are you aware of the fact that of the growth in Tarrant County over the course of the last decade only four percent of that growth
was Anglo?
A. It might have been pointed out in debate, but no, I don't know it.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that in Tarrant County over the course of decade the growth of blacks in Tarrant County was 48 percent, are you aware of that?
A. No.
Q. According to the census in Tarrant County the growth of Hispanics was 70 percent of the growth, are you aware of that?
A. No, sir.
Q. So if those statistics are what the census shows, you don't have any reason to contradict those, you don't know?
A. I don't know.
Q. Now I want to stick with the Congressional map for a minute. I want to bring up if I could an Exhibit 788, please.

I want to ask you a question about this exhibit. You don't need to read it yet or you can listen to my question first, and I'll give you an opportunity to read it, I promise.

What I wanted to know is did you ever talk to Doug Davis and he was your staff director, right?
A. He was the committee director, yes, sir.
Q. Did you ever tell him that, did you ever ask him to bring up an idea with the House lawyers Mr. Interiano or Mr. Downton that if after you passed the Congressional map if you filed in D.C. and drew a bad panel of Judges up here that you could
always call, ask the governor to call another special session, did you ever talk with Mr. Davis about that possibility? A. No, sir.
Q. All right. I want you to now look at Exhibit 788 and $I$ want you to see here where Mr. Interiano says, and this is the paragraph that says talked to Doug again and he is still hinting that this would force us to go to conference, and that's Doug Davis, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. He thought, his thought was having the House leave it as is and if you guys decide that it's best to change it, then have the Senate send us to conference.

He then goes on and this is the question $I$ want to ask you. A. I'm sorry, where are you reading? Is it okay if I follow along?
Q. Yes, the paragraph that begins with also talked to Doug? A. Okay.
Q. The third sentence says the other issue that Doug brought up that we hadn't considered is that if we get a really bad panel and have serious concerns about the direction that things are going that we can try to appeal to the governor and call another special. Period.

And then he says Daniel, I agree that that is extremely unlikely but nonetheless, we didn't consider it, and that's in a parenthetical.

So my question to you, Senator, is well first, who is Daniel Hodge?
A. He is a first Assistant Attorney General State of Texas. Q. And there is three lawyers listed there with the law firm
of Baker and Botts also to whom this e-mail was sent?
A. I'm sorry, I wouldn't know.
Q. You don't see the Bakerbotts.com e-mail on there?
A. Yes.
Q. Stacey Napier she's seated here at counsel table for the
State of Texas, correct?
A. She is.
Q. Did you ever have any discussion with Mr. Doug Davis about
the fact that hey, if things are going bad up here in D.C. we
can always get the governor to change our plan and come up with
a new one?
A. Never.
Q. Now also in your direct testimony you said that you relied
on Mr. Doug Davis to draw the maps for the senate committee,
correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You didn't actually hire Mr. Davis, did you?
A. Yes, I did as committee director.
Q. Did you interview him for the job?
A. No because he works for the Texas Senate, I knew him
anyway and, and he had experience in redistricting 2001, 2003.

The members of the committee seemed to be amenable to the idea, so I hired him.
Q. And did you hire him after the session started?
A. No, I hired him before the session started.
Q. Okay. But you weren't the committee chair until after the session started or before?
A. I was named committee chair in late summer, early spring of 2010.
Q. Now the, you have never had prior to this round of
redistricting, you had no experience in redistricting?
A. No, sir.
Q. And in fact, you entered the legislature in 2004; isn't that's correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you are not an attorney?
A. I am not.
Q. You are a businessman?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now do you know how Mr. Davis came to your attention?
A. I don't know who first recommended to me that we hire Doug.
Q. All right. Now at the time that you retained him as your director, he was working for the Lieutenant Governor David Dewhurst, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The Senate parliamentarian, who is that?
A. Karina Davis.
Q. Is Karina Davis -- what's the parliamentarian's jobs,
duties, just one or two sentence description?
A. To see that the proceedings of the Texas Senate follow the
Constitution and the rules of the Senate.
Q. Is a parliamentarian suppose to be only helping one side
of the aisles or a parliamentarian for all of the Senators?
A. The parliamentarian for all of the Senators.
Q. And Karina Davis is actually the wife of Doug Davis isn't
she?
A. She is.
Q. And she was involved in the redistricting of the State
Senate wasn't she?
A. Not in my level. I never spoke about a redistricting
issue with her until it was, until parliamentary matters
regarding the bill came up.
Q. But you know Doug Davis spoke with her about Senate
redistricting didn't you?
A. I did not know that. I assume he spoke with his wife.
Q. But you don't know that David Hanna spoke to Karina Davis
about redistricting?
A. No, sir, not at all.
Q. Okay. We're going to get to that in a bit.
Defendant's Exhibit 633, please -- I'm sorry, 637.

Now what's a pre-enrolled bill, Senator Seliger?
A. I'm not sure $I$ can give you the exact definition of a pre-enrolled bill.
Q. Have you ever heard the expression pre-enrolled?
A. Maybe one time in the past.
Q. Did it come up in the Senate redistricting process this time around, do you know?
A. Not to me.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that Mr. Doug Davis and Karina

Davis and David Hanna exchanged an e-mail regarding a
pre-enrolled, having the Senate have a pre-enrolled bill for a redistricting plan?
A. I read a news account of that last week but prior to that absolutely not.
Q. Mr. Davis operated as the staff director of the Senate Redistricting Committee under your direction and control, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now the minority members of the Senate Redistricting Committee, the vice chair of the committee was Senator Mario

Gallegos?
A. Correct.
Q. And he is a Latino?
A. He is.
Q. Who are the other minorities on the Senate Redistricting

Committee?
A. Senator West, Senator Zaffirini, I believe Senator Uresti.

I'm not sure I remember the rest of the committee members.
Q. And they asked you to consider the possibility of them being allowed to hire their own counsel during the redistricting process, correct?
A. Only Senator Gallegos suggested early on in our organizational stage to hire a minority majority counsel and he wanted to hire a Rolando Rios.
Q. And you did not agree with that and did not and you rejected that as committee chair?
A. I did.
Q. Didn't Senator Gallegos say to you that he was asking on behalf of the minority members of the Senate?
A. He may very well have. I do not remember that exact exchange.
Q. Have you had any experience with Voting Rights Act issues prior to the time you took on Senate redistricting?
A. I had sat through the debate committee on the floor on voter ID but as it related to elections no, sir.
Q. And that debate was when?
A. It would have been 2009 session.
Q. In fact, the legislature enacted a voter ID bill in 2011 session?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. That was a racially charged bill?
A. It was.
Q. And redistricting was a racially charged issue as well, correct?
A. I think that's an accurate description.
Q. And minorities voted against, all of the minorities in the Senate voted against the voter ID bill, correct?
A. I don't recall the exact vote.
Q. Now the formal process of redistricting in the 2011
session, you actually began drawing maps really from day one, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. And you consulted with your colleagues about the maps?
A. I did not a lot before the session.
Q. No, I meant during the session?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I want to focus on the period from January to May of 2011?
A. Okay.
Q. You drew maps, proposed maps on computers with Mr. Davis from really day one?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. At one point Senator Wendy Davis asked you if you could show her her district and you told her that you would eventually, but you were having problems resolving Senator

Nelson's overpopulation.
Do you remember that, telling her that?
A. I don't recall telling her it was Senator Nelson's population because there were a lot of issues in the Dallas Fort Worth area, but certainly that was one of them. JUDGE COLLYER: Can I ask a question?

What is the population criterion for a Senate District? THE WITNESS: The ideal number is 800, 11,000. JUDGE COLLYER: Eight hundred eleven? THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. JUDGE COLLYER: And you are allowed to go plus or minus five or ten percent?

THE WITNESS: Plus or minus five percent.
JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you.
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. Senator Davis, her district was within the five percent range of deviation when the census came out, correct?
A. I believe that is correct.
Q. It was around two percent over?
A. It may very well have been.
Q. And so technically at least for one person one vote purposes her District didn't need to change in order to comply with that requirement, correct?
A. I think I was advised of that, yes.
Q. Now how did you determine, now you're the chairman, how
did you determine which Senate districts in the plan would be protected under the Voting Rights Act against retrogression?
A. I asked legal counsel which districts would be protected.
Q. What was your understanding of that?
A. That the ones currently represented by minority members, that was my understanding.
Q. So your understanding was that only if a district was held by a minority that it would be protected under the Voting Rights Act?
A. Well, not entirely because that doesn't address Gene Green's District in Houston. But given the way I asked the question, it was that we had to look at those that were currently represented by minorities.
Q. Those would be the protected districts?
A. Yes.
Q. So if Wendy Davis were African American then you would have determined that Senate District 10 was a protected district?
A. I would have asked. I would not have made that determination just because she was minority.
Q. You told me just now that if it was represented by a minority that it would be a protected district?
A. No, sir.

I would have asked legal counsel if it was protected and that was my understanding going forward that certainly the
districts that were represented by minority districts had to be viewed in that fashion.
Q. Why is it that a district has to be represented by a minority in order to be protected under the Voting Rights Act? A. Clearly it doesn't if one looks at Congressional Districts by Representative Gene Green in Houston.
Q. What about the fact that does a district have to be a majority black district or majority Latino district in order to be protected under the Voting Rights Act in your view as a layman?
A. You are asking for a legal judgment and the clearest view for a layman is if it's a majority minority district, then it may very well be protected.
Q. A majority minority district may very well be protected, is that your testimony?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. It doesn't have to be majority black, it can be a combination of black and Latino, is that your understanding? A. You are asking me now about the legality about the coalition district. I have no such legal judgment there. Q. I'm asking you as a Senate Redistricting Committee chair if your understanding during the process was that a district in which blacks and Latinos together constituted over 50 percent of the voting age population in the district would such a district have been protected under the Voting Rights Act?
A. My understanding of my legal advice that that coalition district was not in most cases compelling in that respect. Q. And why would that be? What was your understanding of that?
A. Because coalition districts are not -- I don't know what best way to put it.

I don't know if they're not recognized or there is no compulsion to create or maintain what would be a coalition district.
Q. So is it your testimony then that because neither blacks nor Latinos in the coalition district exceed 50 percent of the population by themselves either group that that would automatically mean that that's a coalition district and not entitled to protection under the Voting Rights Act?

Is that your understanding?
A. I'm sorry, you are asking me automatically and nothing was automatic.
Q. Well, take out the word automatically.

Would a district that neither blacks nor Latinos constituted over 50 percent by themselves then, but together exceeded 50 percent, would such a district in your view be protected under the Voting Rights Act?
A. I don't have a view. That's why I have legal counsel.
Q. So you don't know as a layman whether or not a district
that is say 23 percent -- I mean 41 percent black and 39
percent Latino and therefore, about almost 80 percent minority whether that kind of a district would be protected under the Voting Rights Act?
A. Unless $I$ was informed by legal counsel and if $I$ was then sobeit.
Q. In fact, isn't that the composition of Senator West, an African American's district in District 23 in the Senate plan?
A. I can't tell you.
Q. Isn't it a fact that Senator Ellis' district, who
testified here the other day, District 13, that his district is
only 48 percent VAP and 28 percent Hispanic VAP?
A. I'm sorry, I don't have the statistics.
Q. And there are heavily minority districts and yet neither the blacks or Latinos constitute a majority in either of those districts do they?
A. Apparently not.
Q. And yet you deemed those districts protected under the Voting Rights Act, correct?
A. I was advised so.
Q. You took that advice and you followed it?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you maintained those districts as opportunity or ability to elect districts, didn't you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But you didn't do that with regard to Senate District 10?
A. Correct.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that Senate District 10 under the 2010 census is a majority minority district in total population?
A. I was told by legal counsel it was not a majority minority district.
Q. I asked you about total population, are you aware of the fact that it was 52.4 percent total population minority in that district?
A. I'm sure I was advised if that is the fact at some point. I don't recall it.
Q. Let's go back to 2010?

JUDGE COLLYER: I have a question.

So when it comes to Senate District 10 , who or how did you think that Senator Davis was elected?

Who voted for her?

THE WITNESS: I can't tell you exactly who voted for
her.

I can tell you that it was a year of $I$ think substantial turn out in populations that had not voted before. Senator Davis ran a very good campaign and worked very hard at it.

Her opponent didn't run nearly as good a campaign.

That's how she got elected.

JUDGE COLLYER: So you don't have any idea as to the persons who voted for her?

THE WITNESS: No, ma'am.

JUDGE COLLYER: Senator, I have to say you're a very smart man. You have been a Senator in this State of Texas a very long time.

It's hard for me to credit your answer that you don't know, that you don't know just automatically who elected whom. Of course you know. Everybody would know. Everybody in the Senate would know who and how people got there because you are all politicians and you need to know.

Now I find it very hard to take your -- I mean, I can, I have no reason except that it is not sensible to me that you would not know. I can't believe that. Everybody knows.

The Dallas Tribune, everybody in the whole place knows and knew then. So how do you not know? And how did you not know in 2010 and 11?

THE WITNESS: Because $I$ didn't ask for that analysis, she won the election.

JUDGE COLLYER: You didn't need to ask, you already knew didn't you?

THE WITNESS: If the question is do I think most of the minorities voted for Senator Davis? Well, that would be my presumption.

JUDGE COLLYER: Okay.

THE WITNESS: But my question when composing the
district --

JUDGE COLLYER: No, no, no. I'm not asking about composing the district.

I'm asking about common political sense in the State of Texas. How did Wendy Davis get elected to the Senate?

THE WITNESS: For the reasons that I pointed out.
She got, I think she got a lot of independent vote. I think I was told that she was successful in the minority population as democrats are in Dallas Fort Worth.

JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you, sir.
Go ahead.

BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. Are you aware of the fact in following up on the Court's question, you were aware of those facts about that she had attracted a lot of Fort Worth minority voters and that was how she got elected, you were aware of that fact when you drew the Senate map, correct?
A. Specifically then? No, sir.
Q. Mr. Davis was though, wasn't he and he --
A. Quite likely, yes.
Q. He was, wasn't he?
A. Quite likely, yes.
Q. And did you or Mr. Davis -- let me start just with you. If you know if Mr. Davis did, please bring that to my
attention. But do you know, did you particularly look -- let me go back.

You knew going into the Senate redistricting process that the issue about Senate District 10 was going to be a big issue, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you knew that because people had come to you and said, republicans, one of the major goals of redistricting should be to get rid of Wendy Davis didn't they?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You said I see or I understand when they told you that
didn't you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And in fact, that was a goal that you pursued in the
redistricting wasn't it?
A. A fact what?
Q. In fact, you accomplished that goal?
A. No, I don't concede that.
Q. But you made her district more difficult politically for her, would you concede that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. By making it more difficult for her politically one way to do that would be to take out her most reliable voters wouldn't it?
A. We were looking at taking out democratic voters.
Q. You looked at taking out Southeast Fort Worth in particular didn't you? In fact, you did take out Southeast

Fort Worth?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You ran it down in District 22 in Senator Birdwell's District?
A. Correct.
Q. You knew they were African Americans, the voters that you were moving? You knew that they were democrats?
A. I was told that they were democrats. That was really my focus.
Q. You never really were told that Fort Worth, the third largest concentration of African Americans in the State that when you were moving them out of Senate District 10 your testimony under oath today is that you didn't know that that was a black area?
A. No, sir. I was told that it was largely African American at some point.
Q. During the session?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you were aware of communities like Everman and Forest Hills and others in there that were being moved out and you knew that those were minority neighborhoods?
A. I was told that they were.
Q. You knew all that but despite knowing all of that and knowing that Senate District 10 was going to be a focal point, you went ahead and put those minority voters in the district
that goes past Waco another more than a hundred miles away?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And that's an Anglo dominated district, Senate District 22?
A. I think it is majority Anglo but $I$ don't know what the figure is.
Q. What percentage of minorities are in your district, do you know that?
A. I don't.
Q. You don't know what the percentage of Latinos are in your district?
A. No. I think it's 30 to 40 percent.
Q. What percentage of blacks are in your district?
A. I don't, I think it's somewhere between 12 and 20.
Q. Twenty percent, 12 to 20 percent?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Would you be surprised to learn that it's only 5 percent, Senator?
A. Yes, I would be a little surprised.
Q. Well, that's what the exhibit shows and I'll get that number for you. Exhibit 151, Defendant's Exhibit 151.

JUDGE COLLYER: So your testimony would be on your own understanding of the population of your district that it has a majority of minorities, blacks and Hispanic? Were those the numbers you just gave?

THE WITNESS: Incorrectly, yeah, I thought it could possibly be.

JUDGE COLLYER: Where are you from?

THE WITNESS: I'm from Amarillo.

JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you.

BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. That's essentially a panhandle district?
A. Mostly Panhandle goes all the way through the South Plains and into the Crane, Odessa.

JUDGE COLLYER: Into the where? I am sorry. THE WITNESS: Into the Premier basin, Midland, Odessa, Crane County.

BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. Now in fact, the redistricting hearings that you had back in the fall of 2010, you did not conduct any hearings in Fort Worth at all, did you?
A. We had a joint hearing with the House in Arlington.
Q. And that was a joint hearing so that was a Senate and

House hearing?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And wasn't it a fact that you were requested by certain minority members from Tarrant County of the legislature to hold a hearing in Fort Worth?
A. I'm sorry, I don't recall that.
Q. You don't remember that.

Now in your, in the Arlington hearing Senator Davis actually had her district director, because she was out of state, read a letter expressing her views as to what she thought should happen with her district.

Do you remember that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Did you attend that hearing?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Do you recall what those concerns were?
A. The only one $I$ recall was that the district be located completely in Tarrant County.
Q. You don't remember that she asked that the minority
communities not be broken up?
A. No, sir, I don't.
Q. And you don't remember also that she asked particularly
about having Lake Como restored to Senate District 10 because it had been taken out in 2001?
A. No, sir.
Q. You don't remember that either?
A. No, sir.
Q. So the only thing that you remember about her statement is the fact that her district wanted to be in Tarrant County?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. In fact, Senator, when you drew the map Senate District 10 the only thing that you complied with regard to Senator Davis'
request in the fall hearing and throughout the session was that her district still be in Tarrant County? That was the only thing that you were able to honor?
A. That is correct.
Q. You couldn't honor all of the other requests about protecting the minority populations, correct?
A. No, sir.
Q. Now you say in your statement that in fact the House, the Senate passed the plan by a vote of 29 to 2 on page 9 of your statement which was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 162.

Do you remember that? It's on paragraph 9, sir, of your statement?
A. I'm sorry, line what?
Q. I'm sorry, it's actually not your deposition, sir. This is your sworn statement.
A. Oh, okay, I'm sorry.

MR. HUGHES: I don't think he has copy. You can just
ask him.
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. What I'm asking you is you said in your statement that plan 148, the Senate plan, that you had passed, passed the Senate by a vote of 29 to 2.
A. On at least one of the votes, yes.
Q. I believe it might have been on final passage it was 29 to 2.

Do you remember that?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. In fact, you don't mean to create the impression that with regard to those 29 people who voted in favor of it that all 29 who voted to pass the plan did so because they supported what was done to Senate District 10 , do you?
A. No.
Q. In fact, all of the democrats in the Senate issued a statement before the final vote which included all of the minorities in the Texas Senate saying that specifically they opposed what was being done to Senate District 10 and supported Senator Davis' and Senator Zaffirini's amendments to change District 10 back to, put all of the minorities back together, correct?
A. They did, contradicting their vote.
Q. And they expressed the view also that they didn't want it to go to the LRB and that's why they were voting on final passage. They also said that didn't they?
A. They did say that.
Q. You say it passed the Texas House by a vote of 96 to 47 .

Are you aware of the fact that all of the democratic
members of the House voted against the Senate map?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. Are you aware of the fact that the only minorities to vote yes on the map were a handful of republican
A. I believe I do recall it, yes.
Q. Isn't it a fact that what is kind of standard operating
procedure or the usual practices that you don't mess with the
House map and they don't mess with the Senate map?
A. I was told that was tradition, yes, sir.
Q. And yet that tradition was broken in 2011 wasn't it?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. It was broken in the House because minorities tried to put
the Senate District 10 back together again didn't they?
A. I don't know what their total motivation was in the House.
A lot of people wanted to run for the Senate, and there are
certain configurations that would probably help them.
Q. Representative Veasey put forward a map in the House to
fix Senate District 10 and restore it to a minority ability to
elect district, right?
A. We saw it as a map that would allow Senator Davis to be
reelected.
Q. And that would have been an ability to be reelected
because the minority communities in Senate District 10 would
have been rejoined, correct?
A. I can't tell you what his motivation was.
Q. I'm not asking his motivation. I'm asking what the plan,
the plan that was offered in the House was similar to the plan
that had been offered in the Senate in the sense that it put
the minority neighborhoods back together in Senate District 10?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. And that was voted down in the House, correct?
A. Yes, sir.

JUDGE HOWELL: I just want to be absolutely clear
based on a line of questions.
You understood that the neighborhoods being removed from
Senate District 10 were largely black neighborhoods if I understood your testimony correctly on that?

THE WITNESS: I think there was one I was informed on
in the part of the districts that went into District 22.
JUDGE HOWELL: Okay, so you just knew that there was
only one, your understanding was that the change to Senate
District 10 was that there was only one largely black neighborhood that was being removed?

THE WITNESS: It's more of an area than just a
neighborhood in that it goes up into District 10.
I was told that at some point during the proceeding that was largely African American.

MR. HEBERT: If I may follow up, Your Honor.
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. You were also informed that you, that the north side neighborhoods also known as the Stockyards area that in fact that's a highly Latino area? You were informed of that too?
A. I believe at some point $I$ was told that.
Q. You took that area out of Senate District 10 and put it into Senate District 12 which is now dominated by Denton County?
A. Right, Senator Nelson's district.
Q. You knew that in the black area, you knew that Hispanics were being taken out on the north side?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did you ever look at the political dynamics of what happened in the 2008 race between Senator Davis and Senator Brimer?
A. No, sir, I did not.
Q. Is it not a fact that the whole District 10 was going to be the big issue in redistricting, you didn't go back and look at how the people voted in the district?
A. No, sir.
Q. You didn't know that the get out and vote was in the district?
A. No, sir.
Q. Did you look at how much money was spent by the candidates in that race?
A. No, sir.
Q. Did you look at what Senator Davis did to mobilize her voters in that district?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at the fact that there was population growth
in that district?
A. I think I was aware that there was population growth.
Q. So at least you were aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you look at the voter turn in that race?
A. I'm sure I saw a percentage voter turn out at some point,
sure.
Q. Did you review the 2001 submission by the state of Texas in which they predicted that the district would grow into a possible minority opportunity district?
A. No. I saw that after the redistricting process.
Q. You didn't look at any of that stuff?
A. No. I was on the ballot in 2008 too. That's what $I$ was concentrating on.
Q. I'm talking about in 2011 when you were redrawing the maps you didn't go back and try to get any of that?
A. How much money that a candidate spent and what flare getting out, what their effort looks like was of no interest to me.

JUDGE HOWELL: Can I stop you for just a second on
the voter turn out.

You did say that you were aware that part of the reason that Senator Davis won was because she run a good campaign? THE WITNESS: Yes.

JUDGE HOWELL: And she had gotten a lot of voter turn
out in the communities that there hadn't been a turn out before?

THE WITNESS: Not ones in the communities who had voted before but voters who had not voted before.

JUDGE HOWELL: Voters who had not voted before? THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

JUDGE HOWELL: Do you think that it has an impact on voters on whether or not they turn out to vote, take time out of their day to do it if they think they're going to have an impact? If their vote is really going to have an impact on the vote?

THE WITNESS: I think that's motivation for all
voters.

JUDGE HOWELL: Right. So do you think it's going to have an impact on voters in these black and Latino communities that have been moved out of S D 10, being moved into more Anglo communities, do you have a, do you think it's going to have an effect on their voter turn out in their new districts?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, would you ask that again?
JUDGE HOWELL: Do you think it's going to have an
impact on these voters who had, were new voters who were turning out, you know, for the first time let's say for Wendy Davis? I think that was your testimony.

She had gotten voters who weren't turning out before to turn out and vote for her election in S D 10, and some of those
voters maybe in the Latino neighborhoods and the black neighborhoods that are now being moved to more Anglo districts, do you think that's going to have an impact on their turn out in these new more Anglo districts?

THE WITNESS: No, ma'am because I think the biggest motivator for those voters was the fact that President Obama was on the ballot and also running a very good campaign.

JUDGE HOWELL: So the voter turn out you think in 2010 had to do with the presidential election or 2008 was the presidential election?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, 2008. Yeah.
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. Senator Seliger, $I$ know we are getting close to a break I believe.

JUDGE COLLYER: We're not going to break until
eleven. We actually had a break earlier and since broke for and you all were courteous to let me, I thought we would go to eleven.

MR. HEBERT: Thank you for that.
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. I believe you testified in your deposition that at one point you brought maps to Senator Shapiro, Senator Nelson, and Senator Harris.

Do you remember that testimony?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. So you actually visited them in their offices with a map, correct?
A. I did.
Q. And nobody ever brought a map to Wendy Davis though did they?
A. Doug Davis went to her office to talk to her. I don't know whether or not he brought a map or worked off a map that she had.
Q. We have testimony from Mr. Davis in this case, he has already testified. We have testimony from Senator Davis.

You are not aware that any map was ever brought by Doug Davis to Senator Davis?
A. I'm not.
Q. Okay. But you brought maps to those other three Senators?
A. I worked off Senator Nelson's computer and brought the map to Senator Shapiro.
Q. And you also showed it to Senator Harris?
A. Senator Harris, yes.
Q. And they're all Anglos aren't they?
A. Yes.
Q. And they all represent that majority Anglo don't they?
A. I believe they are.
Q. Now I want you to identify for me, sir, if you can the commonalities of interest that are within Senate District 10 under the benchmark map?
A. I don't know if they're commonality of interest, if there is a commonality of interest.
Q. So your definition of a commonality of interest is Tarrant County and that's how you would describe it?
A. To talk about some of them that's the one that I think most obvious all of those people live in Tarrant County.
Q. What other commonality of interest do they have other than being residents, I'll add one Texas, they live in Texas, right? A. Yes.
Q. So what other values or interests, particularized needs do the voters within Senate District 10, what are their commonality of interest?
A. I'm sorry, I don't live there. I wouldn't know that I can characterize District 10 accurately.
Q. Did you actually try to identify communities within Senate District 10 to protect in the redistricting?
A. No, sir.
Q. You never did that?
A. No.
Q. All right. Isn't it a fact that one of the criteria that
the Senate said it was going to follow in 2011 was to protect communities of interest, that was one, and respect them, wasn't that true?
A. Yes, but that wasn't the only motivation.
Q. And yet notwithstanding the fact that you had as a
criterion to protect communities of interest you never even
undertook an evaluation of interest of communities within
Senate District 10, correct?
A. No.
Q. Can we bring up that exhibit, please? I do have a correct
number. Exhibit 63, page 5.

This is when $I$ was asking you earlier about Karina Davis, do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. We are going to do that next. If you can. Thank you.

Here is an e-mail from David Hanna to Karina Davis with a carbon copy to Doug Davis entitled pre doing the committee report.

It says, this is Mr. Hanna talking, no bueno. RedAppl time stamps everything when it assigns a plan. Doing it Thursday would create a paper trail that some amendments would not be going to be considered at all. Don't think this is due deed (sic) for preclearance is the best approach to do afterwards and we'll go as fast as possible, do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. The fact is in your testimony $I$ want to make sure that $I$ understand it. Your testimony is that you never knew anything about this?
A. Nothing.
Q. And yet the hearing was going to be the next day,

Thursday, May the 12th?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, you had the committee hearing that day and voted out the plan?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You knew by May 11th that none of the amendments that Senator Davis was going to offer was going to pass? You knew that you had the votes or you wouldn't have had the hearing?
A. Yeah, yes. There were, there were other amendments though.
Q. Pardon me?
A. There were other amendments though.
Q. Right, right. But with regard to Senator Davis' amendments, none of those other amendments were to put Senate District 10 back together with regard to the minority population, were they?
A. No.
Q. You said Karina Davis was the parliamentarian, where were, would Mr. Hanna -- what's the procedure for going to the parliamentarian in the Senate? Do you know that?
A. Anyone in the Senate can go to the parliamentarian. His motivation to hers, $I$ don't have a clue.
Q. But did you ever instruct Mr. Davis to ask the parliamentarian how you could precook this so that it would be a fate of complete by the time you got to the committee
hearing?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. But it appears here that Mr. Hanna is responding to a
request to do exactly that because he entitles it pre doing the
committee report.
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. We don't know what was sent to him because the State
hasn't produced that e-mail. So you don't know what Mr. Hanna
is actually responding to do you?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. But he's not giving it approval because he's using the
term no bueno?
A. Right.
Q. And that means not good?
A. Right.
MR. HEBERT: I have nothing further.
Thank you for the time, Senator.
JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you very much.
Does anybody else have questions for the Senator?
Mr. Devaney.
MR. DEVANEY: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll be brief.
JUDGE COLLYER: Good morning.
CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. DEVANEY:
Q. On behalf of the Gonzalez intervenors.

Sir, John Devaney, nice meeting you.
A. Nice meeting you.
Q. I just want to follow up on a discussion you had with Mr. Hebert about coalition districts.

Did you recall that you had that discussion?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you said for legal advice you relied on Mr. Doug Davis; is that correct?
A. Doug Davis and committee counsel Michael Morrison, David Quinn and Robert Heath.
Q. It's my understanding that Mr. Davis instructed you the coalition districts are not protected under the Voting Rights Act, is that correct?
A. I don't know that he made that exclusive statement, but that was largely what $I$ took from that, yes.
Q. So all of the work that you performed on the Congressional
map, the Senate map, you assumed the coalition districts were not protected; is that correct?
A. Unless told otherwise.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Unless told otherwise by counsel.
Q. Did anyone else tell you otherwise?
A. No.

MR. DEVANEY: Thank you. That's all I have. Thank you.

JUDGE COLLYER: You're welcome.
Any further questions from the state of Texas?

MR. HUGHES: Yes, Your Honor.
(Pause.)

JUDGE COLLYER: This is redirect.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

JUDGE COLLYER: You're welcome.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, if you'll bear with me one
moment while $I$ test my tech savvy.
(Pause.)

May I proceed?

JUDGE COLLYER: Yes, please go right ahead, sir.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Good morning, Senator.
A. Good morning.
Q. Senator Seliger, I would like to talk with you first about the vote in the Senate on the final Senate map. I think you talked with Mr. Hebert about that and that you testified the vote was a 29 for, 2 against?
A. Right.
Q. Do you recall who the two against were?
A. Senators Davis and Ellis.
Q. Other than Senators Davis and Ellis, all of the democrats and all of the democrats that represent minority voters voted for the Senate map; is that right?
A. They did.
Q. And you talked about this with Mr. Hebert. At the same time those Senator voted for the Senate map they put a letter into the record expressing some concerns with the Senate map; is that a fair description?
A. Yes.
Q. In that letter included statements that the map that they were voting for violated the Voting Rights Act and the U.S. Constitution and so forth?
A. Right.
Q. And the justification put in that letter for why those Senators voted for the map, notwithstanding the conclusions that they supposedly reached about whether the map violated the Voting Rights Act of the Constitution, the justification is that those Senators didn't want the LRB to draw the map; is that right?

MR. HEBERT: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the question. The exhibit speaks for itself, it's part of the record.

JUDGE COLLYER: It is, but it's okay, since it does and we're in a truncated trial.

But don't lead your own witness. I mean, this is a very leading process, so far. So don't lead your own witness, okay. MR. HUGHES: Just trying to get to the punch line. JUDGE COLLYER: I understand. MR. HUGHES: Much like has been done in the past but I will. JUDGE COLLYER: You understand -MR. HUGHES: I understand. JUDGE COLLYER: -- this is your witness as opposed to their witness.

But $I$ agree with you that this is sort of foundational, so go ahead.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. What is the LRB, Senator?
A. Legislative Redistricting Board.
Q. What circumstances would cause the Legislative Redistricting Board to have to draw the Senate map?
A. If the legislature cannot pass a map, a legislative map or State Board of Education, it defaults to the Legislative Redistricting Board which is statewide officials.
Q. Is it the idea there that if there aren't enough votes to get a map out of the Senate and House then whatever map doesn't get through in the regular session, then what happens?
A. We still have to have a map and pass, we still have to
have a map and so it has to default somewhere if the
legislature can't do it, and so the Texas Constitution it goes to the Legislative Redistricting Board.
Q. So to avoid the Legislative Redistricting Board, the Senate map had to pass in the Senate, right?
A. Yes.
Q. The vote was 29 to 2. There's a rule in the Senate to get something to a floor, how many votes do you need to get a bill to the floor in order to have consideration for final passage?
A. Two-thirds of the members present. With everyone present that's 21.
Q. Once the bill is actually on the floor and up to a vote for final passage, how many votes are required in that instance?
A. Simple majority, 16 votes.
Q. So is it true that every single democrat in the Senate could have voted against this bill as, and it still would have avoid the Legislative Redistricting Board?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Now you were asked by Mr. Hebert about whether, whether you knew the amendments Senator Davis wanted to her district were going to fail. I think you said you did, you knew you had the votes and then you offered there were other amendments, but I don't think you were able to talk about those.

Can you tell us what those other amendments were?
A. I had an amendment. I believe Senator Fraser had an amendment, and there might have been another, but a couple of amendments went on in committee $I$ believe.
Q. Do you recall that Senator Zaffirini had an amendment to her district?
A. Yes, but I thought that amendment went on on the floor.
Q. Okay. Did Senator Zaffirini have an amendment to her district on the floor?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that pass?
A. It did, but it might have been offered by either Senator Watson or Senator Uresti because it effected all three of them.
Q. What is the party affiliation of those Senators?
A. They're all democrats.
Q. And the amendment offered on the floor for those Senators
to some of their districts, what happened to them?
A. I accepted the amendment.
Q. Now you testified about or talked with Mr. Hebert about Doug Davis?

JUDGE COLLYER: I'm sorry, forgive me for
interrupting.

What was the jest of the amendment posed by Senator Zaffirini?

THE WITNESS: In constructing Senator Zaffirini's
district she had a small part of Bexar County, San Antonio.

When we drew that map she moved out of Bexar County into Travis County, she wanted it back into Bexar County. I forget what Senator Uresti wanted, but it would come out of his district. And then when Senator Watson and then when we drew that map Uresti that's why it's sort of a three way agreement. JUDGE COLLYER: Okay. So the three of them agreed to various swamps among them? THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. JUDGE COLLYER: And on that basis everybody said fine?

THE WITNESS: Everybody said fine. The lawyer said that, particularly with Senator Zaffirini and Senator Uresti I know I had to be careful it was acceptable there.

JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you. MR. HUGHES: May I proceed? JUDGE COLLYER: Yes. MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. You talked with Mr. Hebert about Doug Davis, and can you describe the relationship that Doug Davis had with you and the Senate Redistricting Committee?
A. I can't comment on his relationship with the rest of the committee. He was our committee director, he was in charge of the business committee, the conduct, the information disseminated, all of that sort of thing.

His relationship with me we talked almost every day.
Q. And you testified that Mr. Davis, that this witness', his first time in redistricting he had had a prior experience in redistricting; is that right?
A. Yes, sir, in 2001 and 2003.
Q. And who made the decision to bring Mr. Davis on to work for the Senate Redistricting Committee on drawing the maps?
A. I did.
Q. And did any of the democrats on the Senate Redistricting Committee oppose that decision that you made?
A. They did not.
Q. Now talking about the procedures for passing the Senate map and the Congress map, were there any procedural irregularities in connection with passing the maps out of the Senate?
A. I'm not, because I wasn't there when they passed before, I'm not sure what would be considered irregularity because there's always debate and descent and things like that.

Going to a special session to the Congressional map, I think -- well, it happened in 2003. But in terms of irregular, no.
Q. Senator Seliger, I think Mr. Hebert asked you whether the democrat members of the Senate Redistricting Committee were permitted or were permitted to hire their own outside counsel. Do you recall that discussion you had with Mr. Hebert?
A. Right.
Q. Did the Senate Redistricting Committee hire outside counsel in connection with the redistricting process?
A. Yes.
Q. And did it hire some law professor from Baylor University?
A. Yes, sir. Mr. Heath who is an adjunct professor at the University of Texas.
Q. Were those outside counsel just hired by the republican members of the committee or were they hired by the committee? A. They were hired by the committee.
Q. Did every single member of the Senate Redistricting Committee, if they wanted to, have access to talk to those outside counsel about redistricting?
A. Yes, but that discussion was really held with only one other member.
Q. Who was that other Senator West?

JUDGE COLLYER: What was the role of these particular professors?

THE WITNESS: They were general counsel and they don't draw maps. They were there to vet the maps as we drew them and to inform me or anyone else on the committee whether they were legal or not.

JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you.
Sir, we're at eleven so I'm going to break now, okay. MR. HUGHES: Perfect. Thank you.

JUDGE COLLYER: We have been running this on a time basis, Senator, so we're going to break at eleven and we'll be back in 15 minutes, okay.

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
(Witness excused.)
(Morning recess at 11:00 a.m.)
(Proceedings resumed at 11:15 a.m.)

JUDGE COLLYER: Whenever you're ready, Mr. Hughes.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Cont'd)

BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Welcome back, Senator Seliger.
A. Thank you.
Q. We're almost finished.

I want to now shift gears back to an hour or so ago when you were talking with Ms. Perales, and she asked you a number of questions about Congressional District 23. Do you recall having a discussion about that?
A. Right.
Q. And one of the things that came up during that testimony was that you talked about how this was a -- that Congressional

District 23 was a court-drawn district, and that Judge

Higginbotham had drawn it to a certain benchmark. Do you
recall that testimony?
A. I do.
Q. And was the benchmark that you were referring to in that testimony, does that refer to the demographic characteristics of Senate District -- Congress District 23 as drawn by Judge Higginbotham in terms of Hispanic citizen voting age population and SSVR and things like that, is that the benchmark you're referring to?
A. That's my understanding of it, yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And when drawing the map, did you and those working on your behalf attempt to maintain those benchmark demographic levels that had been characteristic of the congressional district as drawn by Judge Higginbotham?
A. They told me that's what they were trying to do.
Q. Okay. And you talked about how -- that you at times would look at the computer what the RedAppl on it, and you could see an output of some of this different demographic data at the bottom or the top of the screen; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so you're familiar that RedAppl has a demographic data for the different districts in the maps so you can see what SSVR is, what HCVAP is, you're familiar with them?
A. Yes.
Q. And so I'd like to just, so it's clear for everybody, because I thought there was a little confusion, I want to look at that data for Congress District 23 in the benchmark. And this is Plaintiff's Exhibit 11, page 10.

And Senator Seliger, you see at the top of this exhibit page that it refers to the Congressional District's Plan C100? A. Yes.
Q. Do you understand that's the benchmark plan?
A. Okay.
Q. And down here, do you see where it says 23, can you see that or is it too small? Should I try to make it --
A. No, I can see it.
Q. Okay. And you understand this is the RedAppl output for demographic data for Congressional District 23?
A. Right.
Q. What do you see for HCVAP for Congressional District 23 as drawn by Judge Higginbotham?
A. Fifty-eight point four.
Q. What do you see for SSVR for Congressional District 23 as drawn by Judge Higginbotham?
A. Fifty-two.
Q. And now I'd like to look at the same data as -- for the Congressional District 23 as enacted, and that's Plaintiff's Exhibit 12, page 11. And you see we're looking at same basic thing, just for Plan 185; right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And you see -- I apologize to you and the court that the font is so small, but you see down here Congress District 23?
A. I do.
Q. And what is the HCVAP for the enacted Congress District 22?
A. Fifty-eight point five.
Q. And what about the SSVR?
A. It's 54.8.
Q. Okay. And having looked at all of this demographic data and the demographic data for the district as drawn by Judge Higginbotham, what do you see in that data?
A. It would seem to me to be consistent.
Q. Now, when you were working on the map and talking to your advisors, think about the Congress map, did you ask your advisors whether the map was legal as a whole?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have confidence that they provided you candid advice about whether they thought the Congressional map was legal as a whole?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what did they tell you about whether the map was legal as a whole?
A. They told me that -- that it was a legal map, that they also told me there was no sure thing and it would be a contest, and that was it.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Hebert, since I'm next with Professor Alford, I will
just leave my computer here if that doesn't interfere with you. JUDGE COLLYER: Did you want to do recross?

MR. HEBERT: Recross. Five minutes.
MR. HUGHES: I don't think that we've had that yet. I'm not sure it's appropriate. I'm just trying to cover what was brought up in the cross-examination, Your Honor.

JUDGE COLLYER: What would you address?
MR. HEBERT: I want to address the issue of the
hiring of these law professors that were just referenced in the cross with a couple of points from their prior work with the committee and address that one issue.

And I also want to talk about very quickly the statement of the senators as to why they voted 29 to 2 , which was also brought up in cross.

And then the final issue was the committee counsel, the law professors again in the Senate on the Congressional map. I want to bring to the Court's attention the fact that they -they answered questions from Senator Jackson Lee that, in fact, they didn't even get to see the Congressional map. JUDGE COLLYER: Okay.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I think this is all outside the scope of what I covered in my redirect. As to the law professors, I merely asked whether the democrats had access to them because there was an implication that maybe they were shut out of the outside counsel process, and everything else he has
identified has nothing to do with what I asked him. Sort of what I asked during cross-examination.

JUDGE COLLYER: I'm going to let him use his own
time, it's his time that he's using, so.
MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you, sir.
MR. HEBERT: I believe my recross will be about five minutes, hopefully.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. The professors that were hired you said Quinn, Larson, and Mr. Heath?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And he's a adjunct professor at UT?
A. Right.
Q. And those are the same people who had been hired by, your understanding is they were the same law professors and legal counsel, outside counsel that were hired in 2001; correct?
A. Was not aware.
Q. You weren't aware?
A. No, I wasn't there.
Q. I thought you testified that the reason they were here this time or they were -- maybe it was Mr. Davis.
A. Okay.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that they were legal counsel in
A. I am now.
Q. And are you aware of the fact that the House map in 2001
that came over to the Senate was approved was actually objected
to by the Justice Department, that those law professors gave a
stamp of approval to?
A. No, actually I'm not aware of that.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that the Senate map passed in
2001 and was challenged in court by minority voters as a
violation of the Voting Rights Act?
A. I know it was challenged.
Q. All right. Are you aware of the fact that in 2003, these
same three lawyers also advised the state with regard to
redistricting when the redistricting of the congressional
districts took place?
A. No, sir, I was not aware.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of the fact that that plan adopted in
2003 was eventually struck down by the United States Supreme
Court in part?
MR. HEBERT: I'll try to go a little slower, I
apologize.

JUDGE COLLYER: Only if you want a record.
THE WITNESS: Would you ask it again? I think the answer is no. I'm really not aware of it.

BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. You're not aware of the, in 2003, the redistricting of Congressional District's Plan, that that plan was struck down by the Supreme Court in LULAC v. Perry?
A. Okay, yes.

MR. HEBERT: Could we bring up Plaintiff's Exhibit
159? And I'd like to go to page 24 of the exhibit, please. I'm sorry, no -- yes, page 24 of the exhibit.

Exhibit 150 -- Defendant's Exhibit 159 and go to page 24 of that document.

BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. Now, at the very first paragraph, this is the statement of the democratic senators in the Senate expressing why they would vote in final passage or why they would vote to bring the bill up, isn't it?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. This is the May 17 th Senate Journal. And paragraph, the first full paragraph says that, "Each of us represent majority/minority districts where minority citizens have demonstrated the ability to elect their candidate of choice." They go on to talk about how they accept that responsibility to protect minority voters, and then it says, "In light of this, we want to make clear that any vote by any of us to suspend the rules, or to vote in support of CSSB 31," that was the Senate plan; correct?

```
A. Yes, sir.
```

Q. "Either on passage to end grows every or on final passage should not be interpreted as endorsement as the practice used to develop the plan or the configuration of the plan in all parts of our state." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Do you remember that statement being entered into the record?
A. I did.

MR. HEBERT: If we could scroll down, please, to the
next page. I'm sorry, to that same page. I'm sorry. The bottom of the -- the bottom -- yeah, right there. Thank you. BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. And it says, the paragraph that begins, "We all know." It actually notes in the second sentence, doesn't it, Senator, these senators noting that by reconfiguring District 10 as an Anglo controlled district, the ability of senators who represent minority opportunity districts to form a coalition to block retrogressive provisions harmful for our constituents would be reduced, and they note that at the same time the clout of senators representing Anglo controlled districts would be enhanced.

You remember that statement, don't you?
A. I do.
Q. And so notwithstanding the fact that that -- that was brought to your attention, all of the Anglos on the republican
side voted to enact the Senate map notwithstanding these
concerns?
A. They did.
Q. Okay.
MR. HEBERT: Now, could you scroll to the next page
so we can just see who signed that?
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. If you'll look at the top, you see all of the names of the
senators who were there. Those are all of the 12 democrats in
the Senate?
A. They are.
Q. And Senator Gallegos you said was Vice Chair of the
committee, he signed?
A. Sure.
Q. Senator West was on the committee, he signed?
A. Yes.
Q. Senator Uresti was on the committee, he signed?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And Senator Zaffirini, she also signed?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Defendant's Exhibit 370, we've got one last, then we will
be finished.
Now, with regard to these professors, Morrison, you said?
A. Yes, sir.
MR. HEBERT: If we could go to page -- I'm sorry,
I'll wait till it comes up. Defendant's Exhibit 370.
BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. Isn't it a fact that Senator West asked Mr. Morrison when
the congressional plan, we're talking congressional, so let me
make sure that we don't get confused.

And that was in June of 2011 that, in fact, when the Congressional map was being considered in the Senate, isn't it a fact that Senator West asked Professor Morrison when he saw the plan, and he said, "I just saw it just now, the same time you did"?
A. Right.
Q. All right.

MR. HEBERT: And if we could, can you go to the page 3 of that exhibit, please?

And if you could go to the next page, please. Is there a next page? Could you go to page 2?

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm not sure what this exhibit is. It does not appear to be a full transcript of the hearing. It appears to be excerpts, maybe some foundation could be laid or some explanation. I'm not sure what we're looking at. And I would hate to have something partially excerpted.

JUDGE COLLYER: Well, it's Defendant's Exhibit 370.
How long has it been anticipated that this would be an exhibit? It's got a low number.

MR. HEBERT: That was disclosed earlier, last week, you know, when we were disclosing exhibits to the other side. BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. This is an excerpt from a committee hearing. And I can ask the witness, I'm happy to lay a foundation by saying you were at the committee hearing in June, a congressional hearing? A. I was.

MR. HEBERT: And there's a statement there by

Mr. Morrison which is at 4:51:42, if we could blow that up. BY MR. HEBERT:
Q. Mr. Morrison was the outside one of the professors?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And he talked about how the process had been really different this time, didn't he?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And he talked about how the -- nobody has had the opportunity to study the redistricting plans as has been done in the past or what you would want to do ideally, didn't he? Do you remember him telling the committee that?
A. Right.
Q. And finally, when Senator West said, "Well, remind me how we did it in 2003," he says, "Yeah, we went all over the state."

Do you see that as you said earlier today, "We spent 16 hours in one place and 20 in another." Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Senator Zaffirini actually got him to acknowledge that, as well as Senator West, that, in fact, the professors never really saw the Congressional map until that morning; correct?
A. Right.
Q. So you went and sought the advice of the professors when you thought it gave you the answer you wanted, but when it came to an answer with the map that they didn't comply with, you
didn't go to them; isn't that true?
A. No, sir, it's not.

MR. HEBERT: No further questions.

JUDGE COLLYER: Anything further?

MR. HUGHES: No, Your Honor, no further questions. JUDGE COLLYER: All right. Senator Seliger, thank you for coming. You're excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Witness excused.)

JUDGE COLLYER: Go ahead, sir, who do want to call?

MR. HUGHES: We call, Texas calls Professor Alford.

JUDGE COLLYER: All right.

MR. HUGHES: As you know, he submitted written direct
testimony, but I think I have negotiated for 19 minutes --

JUDGE COLLYER: Nineteen minutes, oh, my.

MR. HUGHES: -- with Your Honor yesterday. But maybe
you can begrudge me an extra minute or two if necessary.

JUDGE COLLYER: Come forward, if you would, please, Professor, right over here.

PROFESSOR JOHN ALFORD, PLAINTIFF WITNESS, SWORN

THE DEPUTY CLERK: You may be seated.

JUDGE COLLYER: Go right ahead when you're ready. MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Good morning, Professor Alford.
A. Good morning.
Q. Could you introduce yourself to the Court, please?
A. I'm Professor John Alford from Rice University.
Q. Would you give the Court a brief background of your experience in redistricting?
A. I have been involved in redistricting for 25 years or so. I've worked for states localities, I've drawn districts. I've been involved in court challenges to districts. I've worked for plaintiffs and defendants. I work primarily for jurisdictions.
Q. Professor Alford, before we get to the sulbstance of your analysis in this case, can you just tell us your political party affiliation?
A. Yes, this actually comes up in redistricting quite a bit so when I went to work for the State of Texas in 2001 for then

General, Attorney General John Cornyn, now Senator Cornyn. One of the questions was why they should hire me because I'm a democrat, liberal democrat. We had a nice discussion about that. I convinced him it was a good idea. He probably regretted it when I testified against the state in 2003 after the redistricting and then somehow despite that, the state has hired me again, and so I think that's -- I don't know if that's an indication of the wisdom of the state or what that might be, but I have had an on again/off again history with the State of Texas.
Q. Professor Alford, let's now turn to -- I want to just give the Court a brief overview of your analysis before you're turned over for cross-examination.

Did you primarily focus your analysis in this case on the issue of whether the Texas House and Congress maps decreased the ability of Hispanic voters to elect their candidates of choice?
A. I did. The time has been brief here, and there is not, as I understand and clearly the analysis of the Black districts is really not at issue here. There's not a question about their retrogression raised by the Department of Justice, and so I thought it was appropriate to focus analysis where there is clearly dispute about the maps.
Q. And let's -- using the -- I know you looked at all three of them, the maps; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Using the House map, Texas House map as an example, once you decided to look at Hispanic voters' ability to elect their candidates of choice, did you look at a subset of districts in the House map to analyze that issue?
A. Yes, the first thing that you have to do when you've made a decision so we're going to take a look and see how this does with regard to the Hispanic districts is we have to decide which districts in the state to look at. We need a subset, we can't look at all 150 districts to do this effectively.

There are a variety of ways you can draw that line. I followed the decision made by Professor Handley and drew the line where she was the Department of Justice expert, she draw the line at Hispanic voting age majority, so I used that same line to distinguish the districts we should be looking at as opposed to the ones that would be left out.
Q. And, Dr. Handley is whose expert?
A. Department of Justice.
Q. And once you decided to use the districts selected by the Department of Justice's expert as relevant to the Hispanic voters' ability to elect, what analysis did you perform on those districts for the benchmark and enacted plans?
A. The reconstituted election analysis, which is the same analysis, basic procedure used to compare maps by both the Department of Justice expert and in the past redistricting, as
well as by typically used to compare proposed plans in the redistricting process.
Q. And the Court has heard some explanation of reconstituted election analysis already, so very briefly explain the reconstituted election analysis that you did here in this case. A. I think the most important thing to recognize is that reconstituted elections are not sort of academic projections of what might have happened. They are -- we take a contest that took place statewide. And that way we know that we'll have the same candidates being presented to all the voters in every precinct in the state.

And with that, we can then draw any map we want. And then we capture a set of precincts, we then total that election up as if it took place in that set of precincts.

And so, for example, the race for lieutenant governor, Chavez-Thompson in that race loses statewide. Well, there are numerous districts you could form out of precincts where she would do better or worse. And so you can draw that, you can say, well, if that -- this is very much like the spirit of a single member district analysis in the Section 2 case.

You say, well, wait a minute. But let's say we draw the district here, what would have happened. When we say what would have happened, we don't mean let's use our imagination. We mean let's look at the actual precincts, the actual votes cast, and let's see whether that candidate of choice, in this
case Chavez-Thompson, would have won that election, by how much they would have won that election.

And so we are taking actual elections that took place with actual candidates of choice in the state, and then we are just simply adding the numbers up to tell us what the voters in that district really did in that election faced with an actual candidate of choice running, in the case of these races, against an Anglo on the other side.

So these are very solid indicators. And they are very useful indicators because when we make those comparisons, we're comparing exactly the same contest on the exact same date across those voters. So that even if I'm comparing a district in West Texas to East Texas, it's the behavior of the actual voters in those precincts on that day and in 2002 when they went to the polls, or in modern terms also their early vote and so forth.

So these are not hypotheticals in any sense. They're not projections in any sense. They're actual election results that had they been taking place in that particular proposed or benchmark district, whatever results in an actual success. So I treat those results as successes because that's exactly what they would have been had we decided that election based on those voters' actual voting behavior.
Q. Professor Alford, to run a reconstituted election analysis, you've got to select elections to use for the
analysis, how did you select the elections you used for the analysis that you're presenting here?

JUDGE COLLYER: He just told us. He used the
elections that Professor Handley used, didn't he?

MR. HUGHES: He may have said that.
JUDGE COLLYER: Didn't you say that? I'm sorry. If you didn't say that, is that true?

MR. HUGHES: There's more to the story than that. THE WITNESS: If I didn't say it, I'll say it now. I used the elections that Professor Handley used. So there are a variety of ways you could select these elections. Professor Handley chose to select a single election from each of the election years over the last decade. And that is not necessarily what I would choose, because I wouldn't necessarily choose that as the set of elections, but I think it's a defensible choice. She defended that choice.

And importantly, it's a choice, I think one of the most important things here is to allow the Court to make factual comparisons and not wonder about is this because $I$ chose a different set of elections, so I mean, it's very important wherever we can to keep as much similar so that we can see what the real differences are. So that's -- the first thing is to use that index and see what the answer is with that precise set of elections.

I also used what's called the OAG 10. This is a set of
ten elections which includes all five of the elections selected
by Professor Handley. I included it because it's the election
index that was actually used in the redistricting process in
Texas. At least that's my understanding.
I was shown result, reconstituted election results using
that index before the adoption of plans in Texas. So it's my
assumption that it was, in fact, utilized to some extent. And
it did exist prior to the adoption of the plans. And also is a
larger index, which I think is generally appropriate. The more
elections we can get in.

My first take of this I used 48 elections, which is a very large election index. And I still think there's good argument for that. But I accept the argument that it may be more straightforward to focus on races that actually involve minority candidates. And so I again used the Handley 5 index, I used the OAG index, which is broader, includes the Handley elections as well as some other minority contests.

And then also looked at a five election index that focuses on the five most recent contests, that covers the 2008, 2010 cycle. That's an on year/off year cycle. The most recent plays out with the voters. The closest set of voters are the voters that actually are in Texas now, we know there's been a population change.

So just as when we do cohesion analysis, we typically use 2010 or maybe 2010 or 2008 . There's some value in seeing
if we look at what's happening in the most recent pair of on year/off year elections, does that really look different. And we can easily miss something in the index, for example, that was telling us maybe about how things were in 2002, 2004, and so I think it's a good sort of a check of our analysis to know if that was also true if we used the most recent election pair. BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Professor Alford, have you compiled a table in the submission you gave to the Court that compiles the results of the reconstituted election analysis for the elections that you just described?
A. Yes, and that's the table you'll see on the screen.
Q. And what --

JUDGE HOWELL: Can I just stop for a second? MR. HUGHES: Yes.

JUDGE HOWELL: As you're picking the elections, I mean, clearly I think we all understand that, you know, your results are only as good as what goes in to formulate those results.

I mean, isn't it sometimes important in doing this reconstituted election analysis to also mark trends? I mean, I didn't actually see sort of trending information in your report so that if you did use 48 elections, let's say over the past decade, not only what you get sort of the percentage one by one group versus another, could you also track how it was trending
over time, and is that -- does that play a role at all in this reconstituted election analysis?

THE WITNESS: There's a great deal you can do with reconstituted election analysis. And certainly the notion of having at least one index that's sort of forward weighted gets at some of that.

And certainly it's true, I'm pleased you like my 48 election index, it's true that if you broaden that, you also would have more data points to look at those kinds of details within districts. I just think that here the time constraints have been such. This is not really the normal way experts work or courts or the lawyers work. And I think that's -- we know all that, we're all under those kinds of time constraints. So we --

My concern was that if $I$ stayed with the 48 election index, which I have reason to be happier with, we would end up here with you looking at a result from a 48 election index and a result from Dr. Handley's 5 index, and so, wait a minute, how much of this is the choice of elections.

The other point that is very important is, as you'll see in this analysis, it actually does not matter a great deal what elections. The smaller the number of elections, the greater chance that one election might actually make a difference in the district. But if we use the reconstituted election analysis properly, and if we look at it across as we did here,
different sets of elections, it is surprisingly stable, and it's surprisingly stable because what we do with the index, whatever elections we chose to put in it, we compare the two plans on those elections, then we look at the difference between them.

And so while it's true that if I use, say, the Bill White governor's race, $I$ might get a different index value for a particular district. Bill White's a popular democrat, top of the ticket. So, I mean, he did better in these districts than, say, Chavez-Thompson did. His democratic performance was better.

So it's true that I would get a higher number if I used Bill White. But $I$ would also get a higher number on the benchmark plan, for example, if I used. So the number would go up on both the benchmark and proposed, and you would tend to subtract out.

So the fact that we're using it comparatively means we're really -- the absolute value of the index is not as important as the comparative value. And that doesn't solve all of the problems. There are districts, as we move across the state and different races played out differently. Bill White did better in Harris County, he's from Houston, than he did in El Paso.

JUDGE HOWELL: I think -- I think -- let me see if I can make my question better.

It seems like the reports we're getting from the reconstituted election analysis is very static. This group won five out of five elections, this group won four out of four elections over the past decade. I guess my question is, is it simply not part of the reconstituted election analysis to do trends that they may have won five out of the last ten elections, but it's really important to note that the five they've won were in the last two years or the last four years so that the trend is that this particular group was gaining voting strength, is that not relevant?

THE WITNESS: I think it is relevant. In some of the analysis, and again I apologize that I might be confusing San Antonio with here, because for me it's just -- I'm doing reports, but there's certainly been discussion of that, you certainly see that in the reconstituted elections in the $23 r d$ District, for example, you see trends in the $23 r d$.

And I think one way -- I guess my view of that is we certainly would want to be cautious if there are trends that would make current election results give us a very different picture than, say, results from 2002, 2004.

If it's the case that basically just a static stay on analysis gives us a different result, then you should see that result highlighted by an index that equally weights 2002 and 2010, which would be the Handley 5 election index.

And then if you compare that to election index, the five
elections all in 2008, 2010, so it's the change in the population of Texas has made those elections different, then where you'll see that is in the difference between using the most recent five elections and evenly split, evenly distributed Handley index.

And in theory, the OAG would be somewhere in between. The OAG tends to weight a little bit forward. It's a little more future weighted than the Handley index. But that would be the difference. If this -- sort of if the plan is
retrogressive now, but wouldn't have been in the past, you'll see that in the contrast between the Handley index and the -the most recent five OAG index.

JUDGE HOWELL: Okay.
BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Professor Alford, I have on the screen a table from your report, I believe -- or from your written direct testimony, which I believe is Plaintiff's Exhibit 175. Does this table from your report show the results of your reconstituted election analysis both for the election selected by Dr. Handley, the OAG 10, and the most recent five elections that you were just talking about with Judge Howell?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And what do each of the numbers in this table represent? Do they represent instances where Hispanic voters were able to elect the candidate of their choice?
A. Yes. I think that's -- we've experimented a bit and there's -- about the format of tables as back and forth, I guess, as we move through this in the sense of initially adopted the format used by Professor Handley, and I ultimately ended up with this format because I think it's the least amenable to misunderstanding.

Each of those numbers represents an actual reconstituted election in that district in which the Hispanic candidate of choice would have been elected in that district by totaling up those votes. So if we look at District 33 in the benchmark, there are five elections in the Handley index.

In three of those five elections, the Hispanic candidate of choice would have been elected had District 33 been the constituency for each of those five statewide elections. So that would be a -- that's a three out of five, but it represents three actual elections.

One of the things I think this makes clear is that one of the questions that comes up a lot and confusingly is about our ability to elect districts. And I think it's really important to remember that before we get to this stage in the table, we have already taken out all the districts that are not majority voting age population Hispanic districts. So they have a kind of demographic potential to elect already.

And if you look at the table, you'll see that down that benchmark line, you'll see that every one of them has at least
one election in which the district actually would have elected a Hispanic candidate of choice.

So the one thing that should be clear, at least, is that all of the benchmark districts that we're looking at are districts that have, in fact, demonstrated an ability to elect at least one time a Hispanic candidate of choice. So we're talking really here about relative ability to elect, not whether there was an ability to elect or not.

I'd contrast that by looking in adopted District 33.
JUDGE HOWELL: Well, I mean, I'm glad you put this chart up because this actually is -- I was actually interested as I was reading all these expert reports, because it seems to me we're dealing with Texas has had this population explosion over the last decade. So looking at what happened in elections, even statewide in 2002, are interesting. But isn't it, given the huge population growth, more interesting, more relevant in assessing ability to elect to look at, let's say elections that are more recent, which is this five most recent election in the 0AG because Handley goes back to 2002, 2004.

So that's, given this huge population explosion, it seems like a little dated. But I mean, I -- anyway, that's -so isn't it, if you're interested in a state with the specific facts we have in this case with a population explosion, isn't it most relevant to look at these last columns of the five most recent elections?

THE WITNESS: I would say generally in my experience in redistricting, we always start with the most recent elections, then we add past elections until we feel we have enough data to make a good analysis. And so very often we do go back an entire decade.

So if I was looking sometimes at the city council, for example, looking at a multi-member case. There may not be a minority contested election unless I go back six years or ten years. And so you would go back until you find some data you need.

It wouldn't be appropriate to basically say, well, I'll only look at the two most recent elections, they don't involve any minority candidates so $I$ can't do a polarization analysis. But there definitely is -- you do start with the most recent, and as you go back, you're disciplined by the fact you're going back.

So in my experience, typically courts do not particularly like to see information that's over a decade old with regard to elections, particularly in a state that's as dynamic as this.

On the other hand, I'm not sure why, Mr. Hughes is going to be angry with me, but, and the State of Texas gets angry with me all the time, we already know that, so.

The advantage of Dr. Handley's five election index is that it does not treat any particular election as more
important than another. And so I think, again, if we have only that index, I would want to see something more. And so here is something more.

And with having said that, $I$ think it's valuable to have that view as well, to know what an index that goes across that period tells us, that's as far back as we normally would want to go, that information is here. If we want to know that, we know it. And if you want to see something more current, you can see something more current, it may tell you something about the trend. So I guess that's my -- that's my view. BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Professor Alford --

MR. HUGHES: Did that answer your question, Your
Honor?
JUDGE HOWELL: Yes.
BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Professor Alford, just a couple more questions before I turn you over for cross-examination. You're only showing, I think ten districts here from the House. Are there more than that where -- that were identified as part of Dr. Handley's universe of a potential Hispanic ability to elect?
A. Yes, so the -- setting the standard at 50 or more Hispanic voting age population nets, I think 36 districts total. And there is in the appendix there's the full 36 . And what you see is that with the exception of these ten, there simply isn't any
change across any of these index, across any of the plans, and so the idea here is to focus on, this is really, this is the compass of what we're talking about.

And there was a question earlier about which districts we are really talking about. And for the purposes of the districts that are not coalition or multi-member, this is the compass of the issue with regard to Hispanic districts in the Texas House plan.
Q. Professor Alford, looking at the table --

JUDGE COLLYER: Wait, wait, wait. So sorry.

MR. HUGHES: That's okay.
JUDGE COLLYER: You mean these are the ones that are in dispute, and that -- I mean, because this isn't all 36. Everybody can see it's the rest, and these are the ones in dispute?

THE WITNESS: I guess I should be careful because I think I answered a legal question.

JUDGE COLLYER: No, no.

THE WITNESS: I really do.
JUDGE COLLYER: It's a fact question, I promise, so you're welcome to, to tell me what --

THE WITNESS: In my experience in the Texas case, you could pull any district out of a state and put it in dispute.

But I guess what $I$ meant to say and didn't say clearly was, these are the districts in which there is on anyone's
index, there is a change in the exogenous performance of the district. So the other districts all either don't perform at all or perform uniformly at some level.

And so from my view, the districts you will need to be looking at to understand the difference between the benchmark and the adopted plan are the districts in which there is a functional perform -- election performance change between the benchmark and the adopted plan.

And so the other districts are there, if you want to assure yourself when someone raises a district number that, in fact, nothing changed in that district, those are in the full 36 table. But this all fits on a screen. And it happens to be most of what we would, $I$ hope we really want to talk about. BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Professor Alford, looking at the table that's on the screen and the election successes reported on the table for the three different sets of analysis that you did, what does that lead you to conclude about the impact that the enacted Texas House map had on Hispanic voters' ability to elect their candidates of choice?
A. It leads me to believe that on a functional basis taken as a whole, the plan for the Texas House does not retrogress the ability of Hispanic voters to elect candidates of choice. It also allows us to see exactly why or exactly how that was achieved in the plan. I think this is maybe -- so let me just
say quickly, that that -- the summary number for that result is that in the Handley 5 index, there are 34 wins under the benchmark, 34 under the adopted, so there's no change.

In the OAG 10, there are 66 and 70, there are ten, it's a ten election rather than five, so that looks bigger, but basically it's in about the same range. That means on that index there are actually a gain of four elections which would be the equivalent of two, I guess, on a five election index.

And then in the most recent two, the pair of on year/off year, the most recent, using the OAG 10 races, there are 28 in the benchmark, 34 in the adopted, so it's a gain of six.

The next thing you can look at is you can just look at the -- that sum number, and you can see immediately where, at least I think where this impact comes from, and I think it's particularly useful to compare the Handley 5 to the OAG 5 most recent. Because what you see is that it doesn't change in the score of the adopted plan at all. The adopted plan looks just the same under the Handley 5 as it does under the OAG 10.

What's different is that the benchmark plan looks much less effective in providing actual election success in the most recent elections than it looks in the benchmark, which tells me something that you might not have expected, which is that as this change over time has resulted in the benchmark plan being -- having somewhat less performance than it had at the beginning of the decade. And I think we see actual examples of
that as we all know going district by district of changes in more recent elections. But --

JUDGE COLLYER: Well, heavens, there was apparently a huge change in 2010; right?

THE WITNESS: 2010 is a, again --
JUDGE COLLYER: Isn't that part of the issue here, that 2010, there was a huge change so different people are running things?

THE WITNESS: That's a really important point, but two things to remember. The index has both 22 in 2008, 2008 is a great democratic year. 2010 is a great republican year, so it pairs an on year/off year cycle. Good year/bad year. And then, the most important thing to remember, it's easy to say that, of course, that would be this way because 2010 was a really great year for republicans. It was a really great year for republicans in the benchmark plan and in the adopted plan.

But when we're comparing one plan to another, we're comparing them with the same set of elections. So it's true that republican numbers will go up in 2010, but the advantage of comparing apples to apples on re-elections across the entire state is that that plugs all of the votes; right? JUDGE COLLYER: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: That comes up, when we subtract the two, it's gone. It really is fairly invariant to that kind of -- that kind of a change. So I would say that about the --
about the baseline.

And the other thing is I think I would be -- I am reassured that basically you can reach this conclusion in terms of the adopted plan on the basis of either of the indexes. On the basis of either index, you would get that result.

In fact, if you take the -- for the benchmark, you just say, look, let's put our thumb on the scale just a little bit. Let's score the benchmark with its worst score under any of the three indexes. All right. So let's make --

I'm sorry, it's best, right, let's make the benchmark as strong as we can possibly make the benchmark. And let's make the adopted as weak as we can possibly make the adopted. And if you -- you're sorting of letting your indexes provide that, you still get the same result. This is not -- it is not -- the choice of the index here is not what determines the outcome because all of the indexes show us that same basic result.

And then the other thing I would highlight is that if you want to know where that result came from, this -everything about the districts and their change is here in this table. So if we look at the first line, what happened in District 33? District 33 had three out of five actual election successes and it went to zero. This is what's called blowing up a district. This district is no longer a majority district, and it no longer has any ability to elect.

So that's what happened in 33, it's right there on the
index. It's three to zero, it's six to zero, it's two to zero. I don't care what elections you look at, that's the district that was there and went away.

And if you look at what happened in the 34th, the 34 th is a slightly stronger district than it was prior. It went from three wins to four, in the Handley index from six to nine, in the OAG from two to four in the most recent election. So there was a substantial improvement in ability to elect in District 34, particularly when we look at recent elections. This is the most -- the most recent kinds of elections we have, this is a much more secure district. So you gain some security there.

That kind of information, as I understand the OAG standard, which I think is an appropriate one, that we take a functional look, and then we make that, we look across the plan. It just seems to me if you're going to talk about the ability to offset a change, one area of the plan, somewhere else in the plan, you need to know what actually changed everywhere in the plan. Then you can look at that district by district.

You can still reach a decision independent of that about what you think about the appropriateness of those changes, but it's important to know what the net effect of these changes were. And that's what this tells you, the net effect and exactly where every bit of the improvement came from and where
every piece of the decline came from.
BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. Professor Alford, did you perform a similar analysis for
the Congressional map and the Senate map?
A. Yes, and that's included in my report.
Q. Okay.

MR. HUGHES: I thank you for the Court's indulgence, I think I used a few extra minutes, but I'll turn it over for cross-examination.

JUDGE COLLYER: Well, everybody has used a few extra minutes.

Who is going to do the cross-examination?
MR. SELLS: I am, Your Honor.

JUDGE COLLYER: Mr. Sells. All right.
When there were three judges here, we ran a very strict house, but now they say they're going finish a day early, and I'm going to hold them to it. A day, a whole day early.

THE WITNESS: I have to -- I can use that entire day.
I'm a college professor --

JUDGE COLLYER: So can I. So I have been warned, let me say this in the open court. I have been warned that I need to corral your willingness to speak at length, so if I corral your willingness to speak at length, do not be insulted. It's our time table.

THE WITNESS: I will take no offense, Your Honor.

JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you, sir, I appreciate that. Go ahead.

MR. SELLS: Thank you, Your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SELLS:
Q. And good afternoon, Dr. Alford.
A. Good afternoon, Mr. Sells.
Q. As you know, I'm Bryan Sells for the United States and Attorney General Eric Holder. It's nice to see you again. It's hasn't been very long.
A. Yes, indeed, I think we meet every couple of days for several hours of discussion under oath.
Q. I have seen you more than my wife in the last two weeks, I'll tell you that.
A. That does not seem to me to be a good choice.
Q. Okay.

Now, Dr. Alford, you have submitted a number of reports in
this case so far; have you not?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So I'd like to begin, if $I$ might, just by clarifying the record on the series of reports that you've submitted so we can see the evolution of your analysis.

MR. SELLS: Would you please show the witness

Defendant's Exhibit 319?

BY MR. SELLS:
Q. Dr. Alford, do you recognize Defendant's Exhibit 319 as
your initial report in this case?
A. That looks like the beginning of the initial report, yes.
Q. That's the first page of it?
A. Yes.
Q. And that report was filed, according to the time stamp at the top, on October 14th, 2011?
A. I see that.
Q. And you were then deposed in this case a short time later
on October 25th; do you remember that?
A. I remember I was deposed, I don't remember the time frame. MR. SELLS: Would you please show the witness

Defendant's Exhibit 790?

BY MR. SELLS:
Q. Now, Dr. Alford, do you recognize Exhibit 790 as your
supplemental report in this case?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And that report was dated Saturday, January 7th, 2012; is
that right?
A. Again, if that's -- I don't recall the time, exact day or time, so.
Q. Does that sound right to you?
A. It sounds right.
Q. Okay.

JUDGE COLLYER: Is it dated on the last page?

MR. SELLS: Can we show Dr. Alford the last page?
JUDGE COLLYER: Oops, not dated, never mind. You can tell you're not a lawyer or a judge.

Go ahead.
BY MR. SELLS:
Q. And, Dr. Alford, you were deposed about that supplemental report on Wednesday, January 11th, in Austin, Texas; correct?
A. Yes, I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. And then you submitted your pre-filed direct
testimony last Tuesday, January 17th, and I don't know that we got a PX number, but we have a DX number 801.

MR. SELLS: Can we show 801 to Dr. Alford, please?
And let's go to the first page, his portion of the report. One more page, please.

BY MR. SELLS:
Q. Does that look like your pre-filed direct testimony in
this case that was filed last Tuesday?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. You recognize that?
A. I recognize that page, yes.
Q. And you were deposed this past Sunday, January 22nd; correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You testified at your deposition on January 11th, in Austin, that the process of writing your supplemental report
was a, quote, collaborative effort, end quote. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was a collaboration between you, John Hughes, and Dr. Randy Stevenson, did I get those right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And who is Dr. Stevenson?
A. Dr. Stevenson is a professor at Rice University. He is an expert in the area of statistics, teaches our advance methods courses, and performs the data analysis, data formatting for this.
Q. And Dr. Stevenson's contracted separately by the state of

Texas as far as you understand; correct?
A. Yes, he does not work for me, he works for the state of Texas.
Q. And his name appears nowhere on any of your reports, does
it?
A. I don't know.
Q. Certainly not as an author?
A. No, he's not an author of the report.
Q. And John Hughes, who is a part of this collaborative effort, is esteemed counsel for the state of Texas, this good-looking gentleman over here?
A. Yes, he is.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Sells.

MR. SELLS: You're very welcome, friend.

JUDGE COLLYER: If I didn't know better, I'd say you guys are spending too much time together. Trials make strange friends, I know.

MR. SELLS: It's the Sunday morning deposition, and it was a bonding moment, Your Honor.

JUDGE COLLYER: Yes, hot coffee does that for people.
BY MR. SELLS:
Q. Now, Dr. Alford, do you remember that the three of you had convened in your office at Rice University on January 7th, 2012 to bang out that supplemental report? Do you remember telling me that?
A. Yeah, I would struggle again trying to figure out exactly what day it was because normally I work every day of the week, they don't really vary much, but I think that's what we agreed was the date and the place.
Q. And during that collaborative effort Mr. Hughes was doing the typing?
A. Mr. Hughes was doing the typing, that's correct.
Q. And Dr. Stevenson was handling the tabular material and the cohesion analysis?
A. I think the cohesion analysis was already done. The tabular analysis was already done. What he was doing was moving that into table format so that it could be placed in the document.
Q. And during your deposition in Austin, you couldn't identify which parts of the text of your supplemental report actually came from which person, could you?
A. I mean, we went around and, you know, through this at some length so I guess it would depend on what you meant by which part of the text came from which person.
Q. Well, didn't you tell me in your deposition on page 10 at line 22 through 25 that, in fact, you couldn't identify which parts of the text of your supplemental report came from which person?
A. I told you that I authored the report. And I told you that I could not pick out a particular paragraph or sentence and tell you whether that particular paragraph or sentence or word choice, whether it was -- might have been a suggestion from either Mr. Hughes or Dr. Stevenson in terms of choice of words or grammatical correctedness [sic] or something like that.

MR. SELLS: Your Honor, may I approach the witness with his deposition, please?

JUDGE COLLYER: Yes, go right ahead.
MR. HUGHES: Mr. Sells, which one are you showing?
MR. SELLS: It's January 11th, 2012.
BY MR. SELLS:
Q. Dr. Alford, do you see page 10 in front of you, lines 22 through 25? Do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see where my question is, "As we go through this report, would you be able to identify for me which parts of it came from which person?"

And you answered: "Again, I'm not sure I could do that accurately."

Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I would ask that the entire answer to the question be used for impeachment.

JUDGE COLLYER: I think that is all irrelevant. Why
don't you move on to something that's more important. Please. BY MR. SELLS:
Q. Dr. Alford, let's talk about your first report.
A. All right.
Q. Defendant's Exhibit 319. Would it be fair to say that your initial report is substantially different in its methodology, if not in its conclusions, from your supplemental report and your pre-filed direct testimony prepared after Texas hired its new legal team?
A. Well, $I$ think there is a central thread here. For me, at least, and maybe not as carefully or clearly expressed as possible. But there is a central thread that runs through my concerns in this case that began in San Antonio and follow all the way through.

There certainly, I've struggled in trying to make sure that's expressed as clearly as possible. I've struggled to make sure it is as closely compatible with the Department of Justice presentation as possible so that we know exactly what we're comparing here.

Certainly at the time I wrote the initial report I did not have Dr. Handley's report so I had relatively little guidance from the Department of Justice. I thought I was doing the right thing. I still believe I am looking at the right thing.

But what I have been trying to do over this process, taking both materials as they've come in, you know, in an unusually interactive fashion in this particular case, and gaining experience from basically trying to help you and Ms. Perales and others understand what $I$ was apparently not expressing very well. I think the report gets better as it goes along, but I don't think there's a change in the thread of the report.

I do move from the 48 election analysis mentioned earlier to staying with an election analysis that's more compatible. The, sort of the way in which those things are meshed together, the DOJ guidance, Dr. Handley's report, those other materials, I think are distilled in a way that's most helpful to the Court. And that does involve more changes across there, and that's all, obviously all laid out in the reports.
Q. Well, my question to you was, do you think it's a fair characterization to say that the methodology if not the
conclusions in your initial report are substantially different from your supplemental report and your pre-filed direct testimony, your methodology, Dr. Alford?
A. Well, I'm not looking at the initial report. But my recollection is the initial report relies on reconstituted election analysis to compare the benchmark and adopted that is what I consider my methodology.
Q. Well, isn't it true that you measured retrogression with a district counting approach in your initial report?
A. There is district counting in the initial report, yes.
Q. And isn't it true that that is how you measured retrogression?
A. Unless I'm confusing reports, I think if you'll go to the -- look at the entire report, you'll see that the discussion of how we -- how we basically, how we treat changes in districts. How we understand how an offset might be understood and a retrogression analysis is in the initial report. It is not at that point a fundamentally, a district counting approach. It certainly is not Dr. Handley's district counting approach.

I included all the way through an attempt to try to -there is a district counting approach being advanced here by the Department of Justice's expert, that's very important because this is how people will understand retrogression for the next ten years, if not longer. In Texas that's important
because we just took a lot during the decade. Quite seriously, this is important guidance.

And so I try to make it as clear as possible what sort of a district county approach looks like. What the advantage of having the reconstituted election analysis is, and letting us understand how offsets work across the plan. And then with Dr. Handley's actual district counting approach available, how that is distinct in several ways from what $I$ think is the most appropriate and useful way for jurisdictions and courts to fully examine what happens in the districting plan.
Q. Is it your testimony here today that you did not use a district counting approach in your initial report, yes or no? A. I always have trouble when questions are phrased in the negative and I want to be sure that I'm answering correctly. There is a district counting approach included in the report, in the initial report as well as in the other reports. Q. And district counting is how you measured retrogression in your initial report; correct?
A. It's one of the measures of retrogression in the initial report.
Q. Is there another measure of retrogression in your initial report?
A. Yes, and again, this is -- I had this discussion with the judges in San Antonio, so this well predates the issues here. The judges there were asking, already asking retrogression
questions, it's interesting. But that was the -- that was the
context of that discussion.

And what that was about was how do we not -- not is there a change or isn't there, but how do we understand, how do we sum up, then, changes that may not be simply yes or no answers, but matters of degree. And that's what we were struggling with, and that's what I struggle with throughout, throughout how best to express that, and that expression is included in the first report.

MR. SELLS: Can we show Dr. Alford page 4 of his
initial report, which is Defendant's Exhibit 319?
BY MR. SELLS:
Q. And, Dr. Alford, I'd like you to focus in on this sentence right there, beginning, "District 35 in the adopted plan for the Hispanic CVAP percentage of 51.9 counts as a new minority district." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it counts as a new minority district because you were using the state's population threshold approach from their former legal position; correct?
A. If I could just look at the -- this begins by saying this -- by the standard, so I want to make sure I know what standard I'm talking about.

All right, so yes, so I'm saying if we focus simply on whether there is in the district an outright majority of
registered voters that have Spanish surnames, and that's a very stringent test for a majority. That if we focus on that, and then -- and then ask in what sense that provides opportunity. One of the things I think has been confusing throughout all of this discussion is this sort of interchangeability of opportunity to elect, ability to elect, effective and performing. They sometimes all mean the same things, sometimes they mean different things.

All I'm intending to say here is that District 35 as adopted has a CVAP majority, and so it certainly would be a district to include in our, as in this case, eventually will include in our compass of Hispanic districts.

And if you want to, right, by that standard, if you want to judge this, the notion of opportunity solely on the basis of a kind of, like a sectionfied juos one (sic) which is that one baseline for looking at whether there's opportunity would be are the minority voters in the districts sufficiently numerous that all they have to do is vote at the levels of and with the degree of cohesion of the polarized Anglo voters to be able to still control the district, or to be able to win the district regardless of the level of turnout and cohesion of Anglos, as long as they turn out and are at the level of, and are at least as cohesive as the Anglo voters.

JUDGE COLLYER: I have a question for you.
You just said that by focusing, as long as we're
focusing on the outright majority, and I think that meant of a majority of the citizen voting age population, and then you said, "but that's a stringent test." What test would you advocate if not Hispanic citizen voting age population?

THE WITNESS: Again, if -- I would not advocate necessarily using that standard for which districts to look at. So we clearly are looking at districts here that are below that. There's a district that is in the table of districts, in the compass of districts that we're looking at here that is majority Hispanic voting age population, but is only 26 percent citizen Hispanic voting age population.

So again, if we were, in that sense, if we were looking at districts and said we want to see districts in which there is clearly a majority of one minority group, we want to question the standard that brought us down to 26 percent.

But on the other hand, I don't think we can set a bright line standard using CVAP, it is not available on a schedule that allows us to do that, and I think it's self --

JUDGE COLLYER: Could we set a bright line using
SSVR?
THE WITNESS: Certainly you can set -- you can sort of set an upper line. If you're the majority of the registered voters, then nobody can stop you. You own the district. I mean, when you said turn-out vote, if you're interested in getting a candidate elected, you turnout vote you win the
district.

All right, so in the sense that I think here it's important, sometimes an opportunity district is used to indicate that this a district that functionally performs and provides ability to elect. I think that's an unfortunate use of the word opportunity because it suggests that you don't have opportunity until it's actually been exercised. I think that's certainly a very high standard for opportunity.

So I think this is one way of looking at what you might consider to be, is there -- is there sort of a basic, in one sense, is there a basic opportunity there. I just don't think you stop there.

JUDGE COLLYER: Singles in Section 2 and we're
Section 5. So let me go back. What would you advocate as the right standard, if you needed a standard, if -- I mean, maybe you're saying there is no bright line standard, you have to look at an amalgam of things, in which case what amalgam of things? What is the test that you would advocate?

THE WITNESS: Well, there are two, there may be two
potential --

JUDGE COLLYER: Maybe I should ask the question
differently, fair is fair.
What was the measure instructed to you by Texas for you to use to identify districts in which there's a minority ability to elect and on which you base your analysis?

THE WITNESS: I was not instructed by Texas to take any particular approach with regard to a baseline number here. So as I indicated, I adopted Professor Handley's number in terms of which districts we would look for two reasons. One, because I think it clearly, I think going to population, and that brings up Senate 10, of course. If you go to population, you see a lot of districts that might come into population. Senate 10, for example, is, well, in population is a majority/minority district.

As soon as you move the voting age population, it is not. In citizen population, it's over 60 percent Anglo in citizen population. So I don't think it's really helpful to go out as far as population, but if Professor Handley had used population rather than voting age, I would have followed that same standard simply so that the Court has comparable sets of elections to look at.

That's an analytical task, I think, trying to decide how broadly to set that. The error of setting that too broadly is that maybe you'll look at some districts that you -- that aren't all that helpful. You can make that -- you can look at that and say this is all being driven by this district and it shouldn't be.

JUDGE COLLYER: Now, we've gotten to the point where I appreciate it, but we're out of time. We're not really out of time, but enough. Excuse me, sir, for being rude.

JUDGE HOWELL: Can I just follow up on one thing that you mentioned?

JUDGE COLLYER: Please.
JUDGE HOWELL: Because he brought up SD10, and that is, if you use as a baseline either HVAP or HCVAP, you're missing districts like SD10 where actual voters actually elected their candidate of choice; right? Isn't that one big gap in this analysis?

I mean, it's interesting to me that you start off by saying the really great thing about this retrogression analysis as you're talking about actual voters and how they actually voted and so on. And, in fact, you -- you're missing some coalition districts where actual voters actually came together to elect a minority candidate; right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, and so I think it's -- I think it's really important to say what we're doing at this stage in the analysis, so both Professor Handley and I began by saying here are the districts that are the Hispanic districts. Let's look at that and see what happened in the plan. Here are the districts that are Black districts, let's see what happened in the plan.

And then we proceed to examine the coalition districts. It's much harder to say exactly what the compass should be there. There are obviously disputes about that. What the Justice Department includes in the compass of that, does not
include some of the things, intervenors. We can look at all those districts as a separate category, but I think the first stage is to take, again, we agree in a variety of ways about what districts we should be looking at as Hispanic opportunity districts and what districts we should look at as Black opportunity districts.

Let's look at those and let's scrub the plan on that. At least we'll be clear, then, and one of the issues, I've struggled a bit with this myself. One of the things I want to just take in every district that's ever elected a minority candidate of choice in any election over a decade. I think it's important to realize what you'll be doing then in Texas. You will simply be taking in every district in which a democrat has ever won an election in the district.

And maybe that isn't a bad place to start in some sense. But I think it's not, from my view, it's not the best place to start a Voting Rights Act analysis. I think it should begin with the minority populations, looking first at the sole populations, looking secondly at the potential for coalition. And using the election analysis to inform ability to elect rather than the starting point that just says the starting point is all districts that -- where democrats are successful, and then let's kind of work backwards. I just think that's not -- to me, maybe it's esthetic, but I think it's not the best starting point.

JUDGE HOWELL: Okay.
JUDGE COLLYER: This is a good point at which to break. Sorry, Mr. Sells, we really interrupted you, but it's time to break for lunch.

I will remind everybody that at two o'clock we're gathering in Courtroom 5, which is on the second floor, it's not in the little cut-out where we are by the elevators, it's across the hall. That's where we're going to be for purposes of taking the testimony from somebody who's in San Antonio, whose name I -_

MR. MELLETT: Representative Farias.
JUDGE COLLYER: Representative Farias.
MR. MORTARA: Your Honor, my partner Ashley Keller
will be doing the cross-examination. He's not here, could I inquire of the time for direct?

MR. MELLETT: It will be approximately 20 minutes. MR. MORTARA: Our cross will be short. JUDGE COLLYER: Then he's not going to listen to the direct?

MR. MORTARA: No, he's going to be here at two -JUDGE COLLYER: I was making a joke. MR. MORTARA: Oh, I'm sorry. JUDGE COLLYER: All right. It's okay. We've had that experience.

Thank you, everybody. We'll see you at two.

Yes, sir.

MR. MELLETT: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I wanted to inquire in terms of the list of districts that you had wanted. JUDGE COLLYER: Yes.

MR. MELLETT: Did you want that to be filed?
JUDGE COLLYER: No, I want you to give me a list this very minute.

MR. MELLETT: Okay. Well, I can do that, Your Honor. Regarding the United States, the districts at issue, the -- in terms of retrogression in the House benchmark districts, the elimination of 33, District 33 and 149 are at issue because we contend there's no replacement in the proposed plan.

And then Benchmark Districts 35, 41 and 117, there is a reduction in the ability to elect.

Regarding intent in the House Plan, we believe that the districts in Harris County, and you know that's a drop-in map, and we really need to treat it as whole in terms of Harris County.

Nueces County with the elimination of 33, as well as the district's intent to retrogress regarding District 35, 41, 117, and we also contend that there's an issue of intent regarding the House plan up in Dallas, Tarrant Counties in District 93 and 105. And that's what we have for the House Plan.

In terms of the Congressional Plan, and this is both for retrogression and intent in the Congressional Plan, we
highlight District 23 and 27. And the -- and then for intent only, Dallas and Tarrant area, we would identify the Districts 6, 12, 26, 30 and 33 in the proposed plan.

And then we would add finally, Your Honor, that the failure to create an additional minority seat with the addition of four seats and the explosive minority population growth, also demonstrates intent in the Congressional Plan. JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you, sir.

MR. GARZA: The Intervenor Mexican-American
legislative caucus would join in the United States designation on retrogression in the Texas House Plan.

With regard to intent, however, MALC would point to the Court the allegation that we've made that use of population variance in terms of trying to meet one person/one vote was part of the evidence demonstrating intent, and that would be with regard to Harris County, Dallas County, Tarrant County, and Nueces County in particular.

The population variances in Harris County, Dallas
County, Tarrant County and Nueces County, in particular, we believe that the plan as a whole uses population variances to disadvantage Latinos, but.

JUDGE COLLYER: Okay, thank you.
MR. DEVANEY: Your Honor, John Devaney on behalf of the Gonzalez intervenors.

With respect to the retrogression analysis, in addition
to the districts listed by the Department of Justice, we would also include District 25, a coalition district that is a minority ability district under the benchmark plan.

With respect to intentional discrimination, the dismantling of CD25 and the districts created from that, which include 10, 17, 21 and 25, are evidence of intentional discrimination.

To the extent it hasn't been stated already, Districts 27 and 23 are also evidence of intentional discrimination. As is the lightning bolt in CD26 and its effect on CD12.

Thank you.
MR. TANNER: John Tanner with the Texas Legislative Black Caucus, Your Honor. Without repeating the many districts that others have mentioned, we would add Senate District 10 as retrogressive and also that retrogression was racially motivated.

In the House Plan, retrogression in House Districts 26, 106, 144 and 149. We would also note that the overpopulation of minority districts, Latino districts, particularly in Harris County, directly flows into the retrogression in 144.

As to racial purpose, we'd highlight in the Dallas/Fort Worth area the failure to create a coalition district, and the -- the purpose generally as to the plan, District 25, 23, 27. Also Congressional Districts 9, 18 and 30 for the reasons discussed by the members of Congress.

JUDGE COLLYER: I'm sorry, I've lost track. MR. TANNER: I apologize.

JUDGE COLLYER: No, no, you were talking, and I just didn't get it written down. I got as far as the failure to create a coalition district in Dallas --

MR. TANNER: In Dallas/Fort Worth, particularly

Tarrant County, Your Honor.

JUDGE COLLYER: I got that. Right. Okay. And then

I missed something, you gave me a list of something, and I missed it.

MR. TANNER: Those are more congressional districts, Your Honor, without belaboring the list already provided, I'd cite Districts 9, 18 and 30, the Congress persons from which have testified in this matter. Again, racial purpose in Senate District 10 and in House Districts 26, 54.

JUDGE COLLYER: Yeah, I got those. I got those. You listed those.

MR. TANNER: Fifty-four. Those were as to
retrogression, this is racial purpose, it's somewhat larger -JUDGE COLLYER: Racial purpose, 26, 54.

MR. TANNER: 106, 144, 149, and also the failure to create a district to recognize the naturally occurring minority concentration in the northeast Dallas County, in the area of District 107 of the interim court plan written by Texas.

JUDGE HOWELL: Mr. Tanner, I'm sorry, I missed

```
your --
```

MR. TANNER: I apologize.
JUDGE HOWELL: What were you saying about the intent or purpose part of the House Plan, which were the numbers?

MR. TANNER: Twenty-six, 54, 101, 106, 144, 149, and also the area of Interim Plan 107, the San Antonio Court's Interim Plan in northeastern Dallas County.

Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you.
MR. VERA: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm Luis Vera from the League of United Latin-American Citizens. We concur with all the speakers before us as to the areas, but we specifically again filed suit in District 10. We believe that both retrogression and intentional discrimination existed in the removal of Senator Wendy Davis in Senate District 10.

In Congressional District 23, of course, we challenge that for, not only in the retrogression, but I think the evidence shows the purposeful discrimination by swapping out high Latino districts precincts, voting precincts for low turn-out voting precincts and shows intention. And Your Honors, we, again, we support all the other speakers before us. Thank you.

JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you.
MS. PERALES: Nina Perales for the Latino Task Force

Intervenors.

With respect to retrogression, although the analysis is statewide, and there are a number of districts that could have been used as offsets, we would point specifically to the elimination of House District 33. And the reduction and the ability to elect in House District 117.

With respect to racial purpose, in the House, the failure to draw an additional district in Cameron and Hidalgo Counties. The elimination of House District 33. And the configuration of House District 78 in El Paso.

With respect to racial purpose in Congress, the south --
not just Congressional District 23, but the south Texas configuration of Latino majority districts, and the failure to create 7. And then in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, racial purpose and the configuration of Congressional District 26 and its interlocking districts.

Thank you.
MR. HEBERT: Your Honor, Gerald Hebert for the Davis Intervenors. Our districts that we're challenging have been identified previously. I'm happy to specifically identify them associated with our case.

For retrogression and congressional districts, we challenge 23, 25 and 27. And for retrogression in the Senate, we challenge, obviously, Senate District 10.

On intent, we challenge the, what Ms. Perales just referred to as the interlocking districts in the Dallas/Fort

Worth region, 6, 12, 26, 30 and 33.

And then we also challenge by way of intent Senate District 10's configuration.

Thank you.

JUDGE COLLYER: All right.
MR. VERA: Your Honor, I forgot to mention, Luis Vera for the League of United Latin-American Citizens, Congressional District 25, that was the subject of LULAC's big challenge in the Section 2 corridor. I know the record has plenty of evidence there, plus what the Court heard today, but District 25 is very concerned.

Thank you.
JUDGE COLLYER: Thank you.
All right, thank you, everybody. That's -- I don't know if that's helpful, but it's sort of helpful.

All right, we'll be back, two o'clock, downstairs.
THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
(Luncheon recess @ 12:40 p.m.)
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|  | 175 [1] 106/17 | 84/10 84/12 $84 / 15$ 84/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17th [2] 89/16 120/10 | 84/25 137/1 138/9 138/23 |
|  | 18-EZ]x 138/24 139/13 | 140/16 141/11 141/22 |
| 1/10 | 185 [4] $10 / 18$ 19/4 30/1 | 23 rd [2] 105/15 105/16 |
| -000 [1] 142/19 | 84/21 | 24 [4] $1 / 6$ 89/6 89/7 89/8 |
| / | 19 [3] 21/2 34/17 94/23 | 25 [11] $17 / 22$ 95/16 123/8 |
|  | 191 [1] 2/17 | 123/25 138/2 $138 / 6$ 138/23 |
| /s/Crystal [1] 144/12 | 192 [1] 36/8 | 141/22 142/8 142/11 |
| 0 | 1960 [1] 2/20 | 144/12 |
|  | 19th [1] 33/15 | 2548 [1] 1/24 |
| OAG [2] 108/19 113/15 | 2 | 25th [1] 119/10 |
| 1 | 2 [2] 35/6 35/11 | 26 [8] 130/10 130/15 |
|  | 2.1 [2] 35/6 35/11 | 137/3 138/17 139/15 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccc}10 & {[49]} & 4 / 17 & 4 / 18 & 14 / 4 \\ 48 / 17 & 51 / 25 & 52 / 2 & 52 / 14\end{array}$ | 20 [8] 8/16 $9 / 8$ 12/11 | 139/20 141/14 142/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}48 / 17 & 51 / 25 & 52 / 2 & 52 / 14 \\ 55 / 2 & 56 / 12 & 56 / 24 & 59 / 16\end{array}$ | 37/14 57/14 57/15 93/25 | 27 [16] 8/18 16/12 16/13 |
| 55/2 56/12 56/24 59/16 | 135/16 | $\begin{array}{cc}16 / 16 & 17 / 2 \\ 17 / 5 & 17 / 8\end{array}$ |
| 59/24 61/6 61/11 61/13 | 200,000 [2] 38/15 38/18 |  |
| 62/10 62/15 $62 / 2063 / 1$ | 2000 [4] 23/11 38/15 |  |
| 63/8 63/14 63/17 64/1 | 38/16 38/17 | 141/22 |
| 64/12 66/16 66/25 68/24 | 20001 [1] 3/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}28 & \text { [10] } & 8 / 15 & 12 / 25 & 13 / 8\end{array}$ |
| 69/11 69/14 69/16 70/3 | 20005-3960 [1] 2/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 13 / 15 & 13 / 15 & 19 / 7 & 29 / 23\end{array}$ |
| 71/15 83/25 90/15 100/25 | 2001 [8] 41/25 59/17 65/8 | 30/5 51/11 113/10 |
| 106/20 113/4 113/10 | 80/5 87/18 88/3 88/9 | 29 [9] $81 / 20 \quad 60 / 960 / 22$ |
| 113/18 $123 / 7123 / 24 \quad 132 / 6$ | 95/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}290 / 24 & 61 / 4 & 61 / 4 & 74 / 23\end{array}$ |
|  | 20015 [1] 2/6 | $77 / 7$ 86/13 |
| 140/13 140/15 141/23 | 2002 [6] 99/14 102/4 |  |
| 10's [1] 142/3 | 105/20 105/23 108/15 | 3 |
| 100 [1] 8/6 | 108/19 |  |
| 101 [1] 140/5 | 2003 [9] 41/25 80/5 80/20 | 139/13 142/1 |
|  | 88/1 88/12 88/18 89/1 | 300 [1] 2/9 |
| 106 [3] 138/18 139/21 | 93/22 96/5 | 30th [1] 6/8 |
| $140 / 5$ 107 | 2004 [4] 42/12 102/4 | 31 [1] 89/23 |
| $\begin{array}{rrrrr}107 & \text { [5] } & 35 / 2 & 36 / 9 & 36 / 17\end{array}$ | 105/20 108/19 | 319 [4] 118/24 119/1 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}139 / 24 & 140 / 6 & \\ 11 & {[5]} & 32 / 23 & 32 / 23 & 53 / 15\end{array}$ | 2008 [9] 64/9 65/13 67/9 | 124/16 128/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 & \text { [5] } & 32 / 23 & 32 / 23 ~ 53 / 15\end{array}$ | 67/11 101/19 101/25 106/1 | 31st [1] 6/5 |
| 83/25 84/20 | 114/10 114/10 | 33 [13] 107/10 107/13 |
| 11,000 $\left.11-1303{ }^{[1]}\right] \quad 47 / 8$ | 2009 [1] 45/22 | 108/9 115/21 115/21 |
| 11-1303 [1] 1/4 | 2010 [23] $9 / 24$ 11/16 | 115/25 136/11 136/11 |
| 110 [1] 2/9 | 16/14 $35 / 5$ 35/12 38/17 | 136/19 137/3 141/4 141/8 |
|  | 42/8 52/3 52/12 $53 / 15$ | 142/1 |
| 117 [3] ${ }_{141 / 5} \quad 136 / 13136 / 20$ | 58/15 67/9 101/20 101/25 | 33.6 [1] 37/19 |
| 141/5 | 101/25 105/24 106/1 114/4 | 333 [1] 3/8 |
| 118 [1] 143/10 | 114/5 114/7 114/11 114/14 |  |
| 11:00 [1] 82/6 | 114/19 ${ }^{1114}$ |  |
| 11:15 [1] 82/7 | 2011 [8] 45/23 $46 / 9$ 46/18 | $37 / 5$ 37/11 $37 / 14113 / 2$ |
| 11th [4] 71/6 120/7 | $\begin{array}{ll}62 / 7 / 75 / 15 & 69 / 21 ~ 92 / 6\end{array}$ | 113/3 $113 / 11$ 116/9 143/7 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}120 / 24 & 123 / 22 & \\ 12 & \\ 12 & \end{array}$ | 119/7 | 340,000 [1] 28/4 |
| 12 [10] 12/11 32/23 37/2 | 2012 [6] 1/6 11/23 119/18 | 34th [2] 116/4 116/4 |
| 57/14 57/15 64/2 84/20 | 122/10 123/22 144/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}35 & \text { [16] }\end{array}$ |
| 91/9 137/3 142/1 | 20530 [1] 2/4 | 22/1 $22 / 4 \quad 22 / 6$ 25/3 $36 / 10$ |
| 12548 [1] 1/24 | 21 [2] 77/11 138/6 | $36 / 19$ 37/5 37/18 $37 / 19$ |
| 12:40 [1] 142/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}21 & \text { [10] } & 17 / 22 & 19 / 20 & 32 / 23\end{array}$ | 128/14 129/9 136/13 |
| 12th [1] 71/1 | 56/3 57/4 63/11 85/3 | 136/20 |
| 13 [1] 51/10 | 114/10 123/8 123/24 | 36 [4] 110/23 110/24 |
|  | 22304 [1] 2/18 | 111/13 112/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}131 & \text { [3] } & 29 / 3 & 29 / 12 & 31 / 16\end{array}$ | 2260 [1] 3/4 | 370 [3] 91/21 92/1 92/23 |
|  | 22nd [1] 120/21 | 3743 [1] 2/6 |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}144 & {[4]} & 138 / 18 & 138 / 20\end{array}$ | 23 [67] 8/14 8/24 9/2 | 38 [3] 20/24 21/1 21/2 |
| 139/21 140/5 | 9/10 9/16 9/21 10/8 10/14 | 39 [1] 50/25 |
| 148 [1] 60/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 10 / 24 & 11 / 4 & 11 / 6 & 11 / 11\end{array}$ | 3960 [1] 2/15 |
| 149 [4] 136/11 138/18 | 11/18 $11 / 23$ 12/3 $12 / 18$ |  |
| 139/21 140/5 | $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 18 & 11 / 21 & 13 / 5 & 13 / 23 & 13 / 24\end{array}$ | 4 |
| 14 th [1] 119/7 | 14/3 $14 / 25$ 15/8 $15 / 16$ | 40 [1] 57/12 |
|  | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 21 & 17 / 14 & 19 / 10 & 20 / 12\end{array}$ | 405 [1] 2/18 |
| 12/9 21/2 32/24 $82 / 3$ |  | $41 \begin{array}{lllll}\text { [3] } & 50 / 25 & 136 / 13\end{array}$ |
| 150 [2] 89/8 97/10 | 21/25 22/2 $22 / 5 \quad 22 / 8$ | 136/20 |
| 151 [2] 57/21 57/21 |  | 4201 [1] 2/20 |
| 159 [2] 89/6 89/8 | $\begin{array}{llll} 25 / 16 & 28 / 14 & 28 \end{array} 18 \quad 28 / 21$ | 47 [1] 61/20 |
|  | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 28/25 } & 29 / 18 & 29 / 22 & 30 / 1\end{array}$ | $48 \quad[8] \quad 39 / 5 \quad 51 / 11 \quad 101 / 11$ |
| $19 / 20$ $77 / 15$ $93 / 24$ <br> 162   <br> $24 / 13$ $60 / 10$  | $30 / 14 \quad 50 / 25 \quad 51 / 7 \quad 82 / 17$ | 102/23 103/7 103/15 |
| 162 [2] 34/13 60/10 | $82 / 22 \quad 83 / 3 \quad 83 / 24 \quad 84 / 6$ | 103/17 125/17 |


| 4 | 96/16 97/3 97/21 107 | [35] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 108/5 108/7 108/8 108/17 | actually [35] 4/22 25/17 |
| 4:51:42 [1] 93/9 | 110/21 112/19 112/23 | 29/10 30/4 41/21 43/10 |
| 5 | 115/24 116/8 $116 / 17$ 129/6 | 46/10 59/2 60/14 67/16 |
| 50 [7] 18/22 18/22 49/23 | $\begin{array}{llll}131 / 5 & 131 / 25 & 134 / 20 \\ 136 / 14 & 138 / 3 & 141 / 5 & 14\end{array}$ |  |
| $50 / 11 \quad 50 / 20 \quad 50 / 21 \quad 110 / 22$ |  | $\begin{array}{llll} 88 / 4 & 88 / 7 & 90 / 14 & 94 / 2 \\ 95 / 24 & 101 / 3 & 101 / 14 & 101 / 22 \end{array}$ |
| 51.9 [1] 128/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 106/24 } & 124 / 3 & 129 / 19\end{array}$ | 102/22 103/21 103/23 |
| 52.4 [1] 52/8 | 129/20 | 108/1 108/11 108/11 113/7 |
| 53 [1] 23/23 | about [101] 4/17 7/23 8/8 | 116/18 123/3 131/7 133/6 |
| 530 [1] 2/21 | 9/10 11/9 19/4 19/24 20/9 | 133/11 133/13 |
| $54{ }^{[4]}$ [4] $1 / 20$ 139/15 $139 / 20$ | 20/10 $20 / 12$ 22/23 $23 / 5$ | ADAM [1] 1/17 |
| 140/5 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 25 / 23 & 28 / 4 & 30 / 21 & 31 / 2\end{array}$ | add [5] 6/2 69/8 109/3 |
| 54.8 [6] 22/16 22/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 17 & 31 / 19 & 33 / 21 & 34 / 19\end{array}$ | 137/4 138/14 |
| 23/18 28/22 28/25 85/6 | $34 / 25 \quad 39 / 1640 / 240 / 20$ | added [2] 15/8 25/3 |
| 59.5 [1] 37/19 | 41/12 $43 / 15$ 43/18 $43 / 22$ | adding [2] 22/4 99/5 |
| 6 | 46/13 49/7 49/19 49/19 | addition [4] 20/9 20/12 |
| 60 [1] 132/11 |  | $\begin{array}{ccc}137 / 5 & 137 / 25 \\ \text { additional } & \text { [2] } & 137 / 5\end{array}$ |
| 600 [1] 2/15 |  | 141/7 |
| 60610 [1] 1/21 | 73/6 74/20 74/22 75/6 | address [5] 4/16 48/10 |
| 63 [1] 70/6 | 75/17 77/20 77/24 78/18 | 86/7 86/8 86/11 |
| 633 [1] 43/25 | 78/18 79/19 80/12 81/13 | adjunct [2] 81/6 87/14 |
| 637 [1] 43/25 | 82/17 82/18 82/21 83/13 | adopted [20] 13/23 13/25 |
| 66 [1] 113/4 | 85/5 85/12 $85 / 16$ 85/19 | 14/3 88/17 $107 / 4$ 108/9 |
| 68.7 [1] 30/6 | 86/12 87/7 89/20 93/13 | 112/6 112/8 113/3 113/11 |
| 6 th [1] 29/13 | 93/16 96/3 96/20 96/23 | 113/17 113/17 114/16 |
| 7 | 100/19 102/4 106/21 107/2 | 115/4 $115 / 12$ 115/12 $126 / 6$ |
| 70 [2] 39/9 113/4 | 107/18 108/7 $110 / 9111 / 3$ | 128/14 129/10 |
| 700 [1] 2/14 | 111/4 $111 / 5$ |  |
| 722 [1] 16/20 | 116/16 116/21 116/22 | advanced [1] 126/22 |
| 73 [1] 143/7 | 120/6 124/14 128/3 128/23 | advantage [3] 109/24 |
| 74 [1] 143/6 | 133/10 133/11 133/24 | 114/19 127/4 |
| 7414 [1] 2/12 | 134/3 140/3 | advice [6] 34/22 50/1 |
| 743 [3] 29/1 30/3 30/4 | above [4] 25/5 25/6 144/3 | 51/20 73/9 85/16 94/7 |
| 744 [1] 19/2 | 144/6 | advised [4] 47/24 51/19 |
| 745 [1] 16/7 | absolute [1] 104/18 | 52/10 88/13 |
| 746 [1] 18/15 | absolutely [6] 4/25 44/14 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { advisors } & {[2]} & 85 / 12 & 85 / 13\end{array}$ |
| 77.1 [1] 37/14 | 63/5 72/2 72/11 77/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { advocate [4] } & \text { 130/4 } & 130 / 5\end{array}$ |
| 77068 [1] 2/21 | academic [1] 98/7 | 131/14 131/18 |
| 78 [1] 141/9 | accept [2] 89/20 101/13 | affiliation [2] 78/13 |
| 78205 [1] 2/10 | acceptable [1] 79/13 | 95/23 |
| 78205-2260 [1] 3/4 | accepted [1] 78/17 | African [6] 48/16 51/7 |
| 78711-2548 [1] 1/24 | access [2] 81/12 86/23 |  |
|  | accomplished [1] 55/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { after } & {[10]} & 10 / 22 & 17 / 13\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}790 & {[2]} & 119 / 13 & 119 / 15 \\ 7 \text { th } & \text { 2] } & 119 / 18 & 122 / 10\end{array}$ | according [6] 35/5 35/12 | 25/10 $33 / 18$ 39/24 42/3 |
| 7 th [2] 119/18 122/10 | $\begin{array}{llll}36 / 17 & 38 / 14 & 39 / 8 & 119 / 6\end{array}$ | 42/5 65/11 96/5 124/19 |
| 8 | account [1] 44/13 | afternoon [2] 118/6 118/7 |
|  | accurate [1] 46/5 | afterwards [1] 70/18 |
| 800 [1] $\quad 51 / 1 / 8$ | accurately [2] 69/14 | again [26] 20/7 21/19 |
| 801 [2] 120/11 120/12 | 124/6 | 36/9 40/6 62/10 66/19 |
|  | hiev | 86/16 88 |
| 9 | acknow7edge [1] 94/2 | 96/9 101/15 105/12 110/1 |
| 93 | across [11] 99/12 103/25 | 114/5 118/9 119/20 122/13 |
| 95 [1] 143/10 | 104/20 110/5 111/1 111/1 |  |
| 950 [1] 2/4 | 114/20 $116 / 15$ 125/22 | 134/3 139/14 140/13 |
| 96 [1] 61/20 | $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Act [25] } & 14 / 14 & 14 / 20 & 26 / 9\end{array}$ | again/off [1] 96/9 |
| 98209 [1] 2/12 |  |  |
| 9:05 [1] 1/6 | 34/1 34/3 34/21 45/17 |  |
| 9:30 [2] 4/3 24/17 | $\begin{array}{llll} 34 / 1 & 34 / 3 & 34 / 21 & 45 / 17 \\ 48 / 2 & 48 / 9 & 49 / 4 & 49 / 9 \\ 49 / 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 48 / 2 & 61 / 22 & 74 / 23 \\ 77 / 17 & 96 / 5 & 99 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| 9:45 [1] 24/18 | 50/14 $50 / 22$ 51/3 $51 / 18$ | 77/17 96/5 $18 / 22$ |
| A | 73/15 75/12 75/18 88/10 | 23/16 $37 / 1249$ |
|  | 134/17 | 97/14 107/22 110/23 130/2 |
|  | action [2] $144 / 8$ 144/10 | 130/4 130/10 130/11 |
| aberration [1] 11/17 | actual [19] 26/18 98/24 | 132/10 132/14 |
| ability [37] 15/16 22/5 | 98/24 99/3 99/4 99/6 | ago [2] 20/10 82/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 26/13 } & 27 / 2 & 27 / 2 & 27 / 3 & 27 / 7\end{array}$ | 99/13 99/18 99/20 99/23 | agree [10] 19/4 19/9 |
| 35/14 $35 / 23$ 36/11 $51 / 23$ | 107/7 107/16 113/20 | 20/18 31/20 32/1 35/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 14 & 35 / 23 & 36 / 11 & 51 / 23\end{array}$ | 113/25 115/21 127/7 133/6 | 40/23 45/10 76/11 134/3 |
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$\begin{array}{llll} & & \\ \text { alone [1] } & 34 / 20 & \\ \text { along [7] } & 19 / 12 & 19 / 23\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 5 & 26 / 5 & 38 / 3 & 40 / 15\end{array}$ 125/15
already [11] 53/18 68/10 98/4 107/21 107/23 109/23 122/22 122/23 127/25 138/8 139/12
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { also } & \text { [49] } & 8 / 23 & 9 / 2 \\ 11 / 6\end{array}$ 11/10 11/22 14/10 20/3
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78/7 78/15 78/17 78/22
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$\begin{array}{lllll}88 / 21 & 105 / 12 & 139 / 2 & 140 / 2\end{array}$
apparently [3] 51/16
114/3 125/14
appea1 [1] 40/21
appear [1] 92/18
APPEARANCES [3] $1 / 16$ 2/1
3/1
appeared [1] 22/11
appears [4] 30/22 72/3
92/19 121/16
appendix [1] 110/24
apples [2] 114/20 114/20
apply [1] 27/6
appreciate [3] 24/20
118/1 132/24
approach [14] 6/21 7/14
$\begin{array}{lllll}70 / 18 & 123 / 18 & 126 / 9 & 126 / 19\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}126 / 20 & 126 / 22 & 127 / 4 & 127 / 7\end{array}$
127/12 127/15 128/19 132/2
appropriate [6] 86/5
$96 / 22$ 101/9 109/11 116/14
127/9
appropriateness [1]
116/22
approval [2] 72/12 88/6
approved [1] 88/4
approximately [3] 35/11 38/18 135/16
architecture [1] 11/6
are [132] 4/2 4/20 5/3 5/4 5/9 6/2 6/23 13/21 18/21 18/24 27/23 28/4
$\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 17 & 29 / 2 & 35 / 4 & 35 / 6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 11 & 35 / 11 & 35 / 14 & 35 / 23\end{array}$
36/18 $37 / 23$ 38/14 $38 / 19$

39/11 40/14 40/21 41/13
$\begin{array}{llll}42 / 15 & 42 / 17 & 44 / 9 & 44 / 25\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}47 / 11 & 49 / 11 & 49 / 19 & 50 / 5\end{array}$
50/16 51/13 $52 / 2$ 52/7
$\begin{array}{llllll}50 / 1 & 54 / 8 & 54 / 12 & 57 / 7\end{array}$
57/10 57/13 58/3 61/21
17
$\qquad$
6
 ,
7

23

approach 1818 126/9 $126 / 19$
,

| A | assume $[2]$ assumed $[1] \quad 4 / 16 ~ 43 / 20$ $73 / 19$ | $\begin{array}{\|cccc} \hline \text { be }\left[\left.\begin{array}{ccc} 135] & 4 / 4 & 4 / 6 \\ 4 / 12 \\ 4 / 21 & 5 / 5 & 5 / 8 \\ 5 / 10 & 5 / 11 \end{array} \right\rvert\, \begin{array}{ll}  \\ \hline \end{array}\right] \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| are. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ [80] $61 / 24$ 62/12 | assumption [2] 23/18 |  |
| 67/2 67/13 68/11 68/22 | 101/7 | 8/20 10/15 12/9 15/16 |
| 68/24 69/11 70/10 73/14 | assure [1] 112/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 19 & 20 / 22 & 22 / 12 & 22 / 12\end{array}$ |
| 77/13 87/16 87/25 88/3 | attempt [3] 10/1 83/9 |  |
| 88/8 88/12 88/17 91/9 | 126/21 | 26/24 30/22 $31 / 942 / 1$ |
| 91/11 97/11 98/7 98/8 | attend [1] 59/7 | 43/7 48/1 48/3 48/8 48/14 |
| 98/16 99/3 99/4 99/9 99/9 | attention [5] 30/12 42/19 | 48/22 49/1 $49 / 3$ 49/4 49/7 |
| 99/17 100/10 100/22 | 54/24 86/17 90/25 | 49/9 49/13 $49 / 14$ 49/17 |
| 101/21 101/22 102/18 | attorney [6] 1/6 1/23 | 49/17 50/3 50/8 50/21 |
| 104/20 105/18 107/11 | 41/3 42/15 96/1 118/9 | 51/2 53/21 55/2 55/6 |
| 107/21 108/4 108/15 | attracted [1] 54/14 | 55/21 56/24 $47 / 17$ 57/19 |
| 108/18 $110 / 19111 / 5111 / 6$ | Austin [4] 1/24 120/7 | 57/22 58/2 59/10 59/13 |
| 111/12 111/12 111/14 | 120/25 123/1 | 59/22 60/2 62/17 62/19 |
| 111/25 112/6 112/9 112/11 | author [2] 121/19 121/20 | 63/5 64/13 70/16 70/17 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}113 / 2 & 113 / 4 & 113 / 4 & 113 / 7\end{array}$ | authored [1] 123/11 | 70/25 71/24 72/22 79/13 |
| 113/10 114/7 122/3 123/21 | automatic [1] 50/17 | 80/17 82/2 85/10 85/22 |
| 125/19 125/21 126/1 | automatical1y [4] 50/13 | 87/7 90/2 90/19 90/20 |
| 127/13 129/17 $129 / 22$ | 50/16 50/18 53/6 | 91/22 92/18 92/19 92/20 |
| 129/22 130/7 $130 / 7 \quad 131 / 19$ | available [3] 27/11 127/7 | 92/24 95/5 96/8 97/15 |
| 133/18 133/18 133/19 | 130/17 | 97/16 101/13 103/16 |
| 133/20 133/24 134/22 | Avenue [2] 2/4 3/8 | 105/12 105/18 105/24 |
| 135/7 136/11 138/6 138/9 | avoid [2] 77/4 77/18 | 106/6 106/8 107/15 108/3 |
| 139/11 141/2 | aware [39] 16/21 18/24 | 109/7 109/11 109/22 |
| area [23] 19/23 29/25 | 25/13 $28 / 4 \begin{array}{lllll} & 29 / 17 & 34 / 18\end{array}$ | 111/16 112/4 $112 / 12$ 113/8 |
| 35/5 35/7 $35 / 10$ 35/24 | 35/4 35/10 35/12 38/14 | 114/14 115/2 117/23 |
| 37/13 37/24 38/13 47/5 | 38/19 38/24 $39 / 4 \quad 39 / 6$ | 118/15 122/24 124/3 |
| 56/14 63/16 63/23 63/24 | 39/9 44/9 52/2 52/7 54/12 | 124/10 124/16 126/16 |
| 64/1 64/5 116/17 121/9 | 54/13 $54 / 15$ 56/19 61/21 | 127/14 128/5 129/10 |
| 137/2 138/22 139/23 140/6 | 61/24 65/2 65/3 65/22 | 129/16 129/19 129/20 |
| 141/13 | 68/11 87/19 87/20 87/25 | 131/10 131/19 132/22 |
| areas [3] 35/1 36/4 | 88/3 88/7 88/8 88/12 | 133/23 $134 / 4$ 134/8 134/12 |
| 140/12 | 88/16 88/17 88/24 89/1 | 134/13 $135 / 8135 / 14$ |
| aren't [3] 68/19 76/22 | away [2] 57/1 116/3 | 135/16 135/17 135/20 |
| 132/20 | B | 136/5 137/15 142/16 |
| $\underset{101 / 13}{\operatorname{argument}}$ [3] 6/4 101/13 |  | bear [1] 74/10 |
| 101/13 ${ }^{\text {arguments }}$ [1] 5/9 | back [27] 4/11 4/12 20/7 | because [61] 5/2 5/21 |
| arguments [1] 5/9 | 52/12 $54 / 25 \quad 58 / 14$ 61/13 |  |
| Ar1ington [2] 58/17 59/1 | 61/13 62/10 63/1 64/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 8 & 11 / 13 & 12 / 11 & 25 / 11\end{array}$ |
| around [7] 17/10 22/22 | 65/16 71/15 79/2 82/3 |  |
| 23/5 29/13 $44 / 747 / 19$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll}82 / 12 & 82 / 15 & 107 / 2 & 108 / 19\end{array}$ | 48/10 48/20 $40 / 5 \quad 50 / 10$ |
| 123/4 | 109/5 109/8 109/9 109/15 | 53/8 $53 / 16$ 55/5 $59 / 2$ |
| arranging [1] 21/9 | 109/16 110/6 131/14 | 59/16 61/5 62/9 62/20 |
| as [159] | 142/16 | 65/23 67/5 72/4 72/8 |
| ascribe [1] 32/20 | background [1] 95/14 | 72/12 78/12 80/16 80/17 |
| ASHLEY [2] 1/18 135/13 | backup [1] 18/20 | 83/23 86/24 96/2 99/10 |
| ask [22] 7/23 16/8 21/19 | backwards [1] 134/23 | 99/21 100/14 100/19 101/2 |
| 21/20 $26 / 12$ 28/3 $39 / 16$ | bad [5] 39/25 40/19 41/13 | 104/2 105/13 107/5 108/11 |
|  | 114/12 134/15 | 108/12 108/19 111/13 |
| 53/16 53/18 60/18 66/19 | bad7y [1] 12/19 | 111/16 113/16 114/14 |
| 71/23 85/12 88/23 93/5 | Baker [1] 41/5 | 115/16 122/14 126/24 |
| 124/9 129/3 131/21 | Bakerbotts.com [1] 41/7 | 127/1 $128 / 18131 / 6132 / 5$ |
| asked [28] 15/18 16/3 | ballot [2] 65/13 67/7 | 133/4 136/11 |
| $17 / 15$ 21/3 $21 / 8 \quad 21 / 13$ | bang [1] 122/11 | Beck [1] 1/19 |
| 25/25 26/16 30/20 31/13 | bar [1] 27/10 | become [1] 25/8 |
| 34/19 45/4 46/23 48/3 | Bartlit [1] 1/19 | been [51] 14/20 15/23 |
| 48/11 48/19 48/24 52/7 | base [1] 131/25 | 17/7 19/11 $29 / 13$ 31/11 |
| 59/12 59/15 77/20 80/22 | based [4] 9/11 34/22 63/6 | 32/9 38/20 39/2 45/22 |
| 82/16 86/23 87/1 87/2 | 99/22 | 47/20 49/25 53/3 59/17 |
| 92/3 92/8 | baseline [4] 115/1 129/16 | 60/24 62/19 62/21 62/25 |
| asking [16] 22/1 22/3 | 132/2 133/5 | 66/1 66/16 76/5 78/2 |
| 28/17 45/13 $49 / 11$ 49/19 | basic [5] 84/20 97/24 | 78/11 82/1 83/10 87/16 |
| 49/21 50/16 54/1 54/3 | 115/16 131/10 131/11 | 92/24 93/13 93/17 95/16 |
| 60/20 62/23 62/23 70/7 | basically [7] 19/25 | 95/18 $96 / 18$ 99/19 99/22 |
| 127/25 127/25 | 105/21 109/11 113/6 115/3 | 101/22 103/11 105/14 |
| assessing [1] 108/17 | 125/13 126/15 | 106/10 107/9 107/13 |
| assigns [1] 70/15 | basin [1] 58/11 | 107/13 117/20 117/21 |
| Assistant [1] 41/3 | basis [6] 79/9 82/2 | 118/10 123/14 125/10 |
| associated [1] 141/20 | 112/21 $115 / 4$ 115/5 $129 / 14$ |  |
| Associates [1] 3/3 | baylor [1] 81/5 | 141/18 |

before [22] 1/13 4/3 4/15 8/7 42/4 42/6 46/15 52/20 61/9 66/2 66/4 66/4 66/5 66/24 80/16 95/21 96/12 101/6 107/20 110/17 140/12 140/21
began [3] 46/10 124/24 133/17
begin [2] 118/20 134/17
beginning [3] 113/25 119/3 128/14
begins [3] 40/16 90/13 128/21
begrudge [1] 95/1
behalf [5] 45/14 73/2 83/9 137/23 143/3
behavior [2] 99/13 99/23 behind [1] 18/21
being [18] 13/14 13/15 45/5 56/20 61/11 63/7 63/15 64/6 66/16 67/2 69/8 90/6 92/7 98/10 113/24 126/22 132/21 132/25
belaboring [1] 139/12 believe [33] 5/16 8/24 $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 1 & 12 / 7 & 13 / 6 & 17 / 1 & 19 / 1\end{array}$ 29/10 33/14 $36 / 7 \quad 38 / 4$ $\begin{array}{llll}45 / 2 & 47 / 18 & 53 / 12 & 60 / 24\end{array}$ 61/2 62/2 63/2 63/25 67/14 67/21 68/22 78/1 78/3 87/7 106/16 106/17 112/21 120/8 125/9 136/15 137/20 140/13
believed [4] 9/2 11/10 16/24 18/2
below [2] 37/18 130/7
BENCH [1] 1/12
benchmark [47] 8/9 8/24
$\begin{array}{llll}11 / 12 & 15 / 13 & 16 / 10 & 17 / 3\end{array}$ 17/4 17/20 17/25 21/12
22/24 23/8 $23 / 13 \quad 24 / 9$
24/10 25/6 25/6 68/25
82/23 83/1 83/5 83/9
83/24 84/4 97/22 99/20
104/14 104/15 107/10
$\begin{array}{lllll}107 / 25 & 108 / 4 & 112 / 5 & 112 / 8\end{array}$ 113/3 113/11 113/19
113/21 113/23 114/16
115/6 115/8 115/10 115/11 126/6 136/10 136/13 138/3
benefit [1] 15/22
Bernice [2] 36/1 36/2
BERYL [1] 1/13
best [9] 5/5 40/11 50/6
70/18 115/10 128/7 134/16 134/25 144/3
better [8] 25/23 98/18 104/9 104/11 104/22
104/25 122/2 125/15
between [9] 57/14 64/9 104/5 106/3 106/6 106/11 112/5 112/7 121/4
Bexar [3] 78/25 79/1 79/2 beyond [1] 5/6 big [7] 8/14 15/1 30/12 $\begin{array}{lllll}55 / 2 & 64 / 13 & 133 / 7 & 142 / 8\end{array}$ bigger [1] 113/5 biggest [1] 67/5
bil1 [16] $33 / 19$ 43/17 44/1 44/3 44/11 45/23
46/1 46/7 77/8 77/12 77/17 89/13 104/6 104/8 104/13 104/21
Birdwe11's [1] 56/3
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { bit }[13] & 11 / 17 & 13 / 7 & 15 / 1\end{array}$ 15/5 19/19 37/4 43/24 95/24 106/7 107/1 115/7 116/25 134/9
black [21] 27/22 35/6
35/11 37/7 37/7 $37 / 15$ 37/20 $49 / 8 \quad 49 / 17$ 49/18 50/25 $56 / 14$ 63/8 63/14 64/5 66/15 67/1 96/19 133/20 134/5 138/13
b1acks [7] 39/5 49/23
50/10 50/19 51/14 57/13 57/24
Blake [2] 8/19 16/14
block [1] 90/18
blow [2] 37/4 93/9
blowing [1] 115/22
blue [1] 20/1
Board [7] 76/16 76/18 76/20 76/21 77/3 77/4 77/18
body [1] 9/11
bolt [1] 138/10
bonding [1] 122/6
border [3] 20/15 20/20 21/4
both [13] 5/18 5/19 5/22 25/22 36/3 97/24 104/15 106/19 114/10 125/11 133/17 136/24 140/13
bottom [8] 8/11 16/10 32/23 $36 / 18$ 37/13 $83 / 16$ 90/11 90/11
Botts [1] 41/5
Box [1] $1 / 24$
brain [1] 6/23
Brazil [1] 2/20
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { break }[10] & 4 / 15 & 4 / 24 & 5 / 1\end{array}$ 67/13 67/15 67/16 81/24 82/2 135/3 135/4
brief [5] 6/18 72/22 95/14 96/12 96/18
briefly [1] 98/4
bright [3] 130/16 130/19 131/16
Brimer [1] 64/10
bring [10] 35/1 35/2 39/15 $39 / 22$ 54/23 70/5 80/6 86/17 89/5 89/13
brings [1] 132/6
broad [2] 5/24 6/1
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { broaden [1] } & \text { 103/8 } \\ \text { broader } & \text { [1] } & 101 / 16\end{array}$

| broadly | $[2]$ | $132 / 18$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Broadway [1] 2/9
broke [1] 67/16
broken [3] 59/13 62/7 62/9
brought [12] 40/18 67/22 68/4 68/7 68/11 68/14 68/15 86/6 86/14 90/25 130/15 133/4
brown [1] 18/8
Brownsville [1] 8/18
BRYAN [2] 2/3 118/8
bueno [2] $70 / 14$ 72/13
build [1] 14/17
Building [1] 3/3
Burt [1] 33/24
business [2] 7/3 79/24
businessman [1] 42/17

## C

C100 [1] 84/2
CA [1] $1 / 4$
calculation [2] 27/18 30/25
cal1 [8] 7/3 7/21 17/21
40/1 40/1 40/21 94/19
94/20
called [2] 100/25 115/22
calls [1] 94/20
came [16] $10 / 23$ 11/7
42/19 43/17 47/17 82/20
88/4 94/8 115/18 116/25 117/1 123/3 123/6 123/9
124/4 133/13
Cameron [3] 17/9 19/15 141/7
campaign [4] 52/21 52/22 65/23 67/7
can [79] 5/1 5/6 6/22 7/1 $\begin{array}{llll}8 / 5 & 8 / 11 & 9 / 6 & 10 / 18 \\ 13 / 7\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 17 & 14 / 24 & 16 / 11 & 17 / 3\end{array}$
18/5 19/17 26/7 31/20
39/17 40/21 41/14 44/2
47/6 49/17 $52 / 19$ 53/10
60/17 65/20 68/23 69/13
70/5 70/10 71/21 77/25
79/19 83/20 84/6 84/8
91/6 92/13 93/4 95/1
95/22 97/11 98/12 98/18
98/18 100/21 100/21
101/10 102/3 102/14 103/3 104/25 110/9 111/14
113/12 113/12 $113 / 13$
115/3 115/11 115/12
116/19 116/21 117/18
117/20 118/22 120/1 $120 / 2$
120/12 128/10 130/16
$\begin{array}{llll}130 / 21 & 130 / 21 & 130 / 23\end{array}$
132/20 132/20 133/1 134/1 136/8
can't [13] 5/10 6/9 16/7 $\begin{array}{llll}24 / 5 & 36 / 13 & 51 / 8 & 52 / 17\end{array}$ 53/12 62/22 $77 / 2 \quad 79 / 22$ 97/10 109/13
cance11ed [2] 33/14 33/15
candid [1] 85/15
candidate [25] $\quad 9 / 4 \quad 11 / 11$
14/4 $14 / 11$ 14/18 $14 / 19$
16/25 21/17 22/5 28/15
29/18 32/13 65/17 89/19
98/25 99/7 106/25 107/8
107/12 108/2 108/6 130/25
133/7 133/14 134/11
candidates [9] 64/19
96/16 97/4 98/10 99/4
101/15 109/13 112/20
112/23
cannot [1] 76/19
Canseco [13] 9/18 9/21
$\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 2 & 10 / 10 & 10 / 15 & 11 / 10\end{array}$
11/13 11/18 11/23 14/11
14/13 14/19 15/22
Canseco's [1] 15/16
characterization [1] 125/25
characterize [1] 69/14 charge [1] 79/23 charged [2] 46/1 46/3 Charley [1] 8/16
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { chart [1] } & \text { 108/11 } & \\ \text { Chavez [3] } & 98 / 16 & 99 / 1\end{array}$
Chavez
104/10
Chavez-Thompson [3] 98/16 99/1 104/10
check [1] 102/5
Chicago [1] 1/21
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { choice [26] } & 14 / 18 & 14 / 19\end{array}$ 16/25 89/19 96/17 97/4 98/25 99/4 99/7 100/16 100/16 100/17 103/19 106/25 107/9 107/13 108/2 108/6 112/20 112/23
115/15 118/15 123/14
123/15 133/7 134/11
choose [2] 100/14 100/15
chose [3] 100/12 100/19 104/3
Christi [3] 8/19 19/13 19/24
circling [1] 12/19
circumstances [1] 76/17
cite [1] 139/13
citizen [8] 18/22 22/13 83/4 130/2 130/4 130/11 132/11 132/12
citizens [3] 89/18 140/11 142/7
city [1] 109/6
clarification [1] 5/13
clarify [2] 6/3 18/12
clarifying [1] $\quad 118 / 21$
CLAY [1] 1/17
clean [1] 7/14
clear [7] 63/5 83/22
$\begin{array}{llll}89 / 22 & 107 / 17 & 108 / 3 & 127 / 3\end{array}$ 134/8
clearest [1] 49/11
clearly [17] 14/19 17/20 17/21 17/24 18/9 20/22 22/1 49/5 96/19 96/23 102/17 111/24 124/22
$\begin{array}{lllll}125 / 2 & 130 / 7 & 130 / 14 & 132 / 5\end{array}$
clerks [1] 6/23
close [1] 67/13
closely [1] 125/3
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { closer }[4] & 13 / 8 & 20 / 15\end{array}$ 20/19 21/4
closest [1] 101/21
closing [2] 5/9 6/4
clout [1] 90/19
clue [1] 71/22
coalition [18] 6/19 49/20 50/1 50/5 50/8 50/11
50/13 73/6 73/14 73/19
$\begin{array}{llll}90 / 17 & 111 / 6 & 133 / 13 & 133 / 22\end{array}$
134/19 138/2 138/22 139/5
coast [2] 16/13 21/23
coffee [1] 122/7
cohesion [5] 101/24
122/21 122/22 129/19
129/21
cohesive [1] 129/23
Coie [1] 2/14
collaboration [1] 121/4
collaborative [3] 121/1 121/21 122/17 colleagues [1] 46/13 college [1] 117/19 COLLYER [1] 1/13 COLMENERO [1] $1 / 22$ COLUMBIA [2] 1/1 3/7 columns [2] 37/6 108/24 combination [1] 49/18 combined [1] 37/14
come [11] 4/11 5/1 7/9 13/8 41/14 44/6 55/5 79/3 95/2 125/11 132/7
comes [8] 4/9 17/9 52/14
92/1 95/24 107/18 113/14
114/23
comfortable [1] 12/9
coming [3] 18/9 32/4
94/16
comment [1] 79/22
committee [47] 7/24 8/2 29/4 29/5 33/9 33/12 39/21 41/18 41/22 42/1 42/5 42/7 44/16 44/20 44/20 45/1 45/3 45/11 45/19 49/21 70/12 71/3 71/25 72/5 73/11 78/3 79/21 79/23 79/23 79/24 80/7 80/10 80/23 81/2 81/9 81/9 81/10 81/12 81/21 86/11 86/15 91/13 91/15 91/17 93/4 93/6 93/19
common [1] 54/3
commonalities [1] 68/24
commonality [5] 69/1 69/2 69/3 69/7 69/12
communities [11] 56/19 59/13 62/20 66/1 66/3 66/15 66/17 69/15 69/22 70/1 70/2
Como [1] 59/16
comparable [1] 132/15
comparative [1] 104/19
comparatively [1] 104/17
compare [7] 30/13 97/24 98/1 104/3 105/25 113/15 126/6
comparing [6] 99/11 99/12 114/17 114/18 114/20 125/5
comparison [2] 16/7 38/17
comparisons [2] 99/10 100/19
compass [6] 111/3 111/7 129/12 130/9 133/23 133/25
compatible [2] 125/3
125/18
compel [1] 34/20
compelling [1] 50/2
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { compiled } & \text { [1] } & 102 / 8 \\ \text { compiles } & \text { [1] } & 102 / 9\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { complete [1] } & \text { 71/25 } \\ \text { completely [1] }\end{array}$
compliance [4] 14/14 26/9 26/12 26/14
complied [2] 33/25 59/25
comply [2] 47/22 94/9
composing [2] 53/24 54/2
composition [2] 36/14

| C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141/11 } 141 / 14 \quad 141 / 21 \\ & 142 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | $31 / 25 \quad 32 / 10 \quad 32 / 11 \quad 32 / 19$ <br> $33 / 6 \quad 33 / 9 \quad 33 / 14 \quad 33 / 16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Composition... [1] 51/6 | Congressman [3] 9/18 9/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}33 / 21 & 33 / 22 & 34 / 4 & 36 / 11\end{array}$ |
| compromising [1] 10/15 | 10/10 | 37/24 38/1 40/8 41/10 |
| compulsion [1] 50/8 | connection [2] 80/14 81/3 | 41/19 42/13 42/14 42/24 |
| computer [4] 3/10 68/15 | consider [4] 40/24 45/4 | 44/17 44/22 45/6 46/4 |
| 83/14 86/1 | 126/7 131/10 | 46/7 46/11 47/17 47/18 |
| computer-aided [1] 3/10 | consideration [2] 33/25 | 47/23 51/18 $52 / 1 \begin{array}{llll}\text { 54/16 }\end{array}$ |
| computers [1] 46/20 | 77/9 | 55/3 56/5 60/4 60/6 61/2 |
| concede [2] 55/16 55/18 | considered [5] 29/4 40/19 | 61/14 62/21 63/2 63/3 |
| concentrating [1] 65/14 | 70/17 80/17 92/7 | 68/2 70/3 70/5 73/10 |
| concentration [2] 56/11 | consistent [1] 85/10 | 73/15 73/20 87/13 87/18 |
| 139/23 | constituency [1] 107/14 | 89/24 94/5 120/7 120/8 |
| conceptually [3] 19/24 | constituents [1] 90/18 | 120/22 120/23 121/6 |
| 20/6 20/17 | constitute [1] 51/14 | 121/13 122/19 127/18 |
| concern [3] 14/13 31/11 | constituted [2] 49/23 | 128/20 144/2 |
| 103/15 | 50/20 | correctedness [1] |
| concerned [3] 26/8 30/21 | constitutes [1] 34/13 | correctly [4] 25/15 63/9 |
| 142/11 | Constitution [5] 3/8 43/6 | 124/7 127/14 |
| concerns [5] 40/20 59/9 | 75/13 75/18 77/2 | corridor [1] |
| 75/8 91/2 124/24 | constraints [2] 103/10 | could [43] 5/20 7/9 9/18 |
| conclude [1] 112/18 | 103/13 |  |
| concluded [1] 34/22 | constructing [1] 78/24 |  |
| conclusion [2] 9/13 115/3 | consult [1] 5/1 | $37 / 2$ 37/4 $37 / 4 \begin{array}{lllll}39 / 15\end{array}$ |
| conclusions [3] 75/16 | consulted [1] 46/13 | 39/25 46/23 58/1 71/24 |
| 124/18 126/1 | Cont'd [1] 82/10 | 77/17 83/14 89/5 90/9 |
| concur [1] 140/11 | contend [2] 136/12 136/21 | 91/5 91/25 92/13 92/15 |
| conduct [2] 58/15 79/24 | contest [3] 85/22 98/8 | 92/16 92/20 93/9 95/12 |
| conference [2] 40/7 40/12 | 99/11 | 98/17 100/11 102/25 |
| confidence [1] 85/15 | contested [3] 15/17 15/25 | 111/23 122/24 123/3 |
| configuration [18] 18/3 | 109/8 | 123/12 124/5 128/21 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}19 / 7 & 19 / 11 & 20 / 5 & 21 / 15\end{array}$ | contests [2] 101/17 | 130/19 135/14 141/2 |
| 21/22 22/7 $22 / 17$ 28/11 | 101/19 | couldn't [7] 10/4 10/9 |
| 28/14 29/2 $29 / 17$ 29/23 | context [1] 128/2 | 10/16 32/14 60/5 123/1 |
| 90/3 141/9 141/12 141/14 | continued [2] 2/1 3/1 | 123/8 |
| 142/3 | contracted [2] 20/19 | council [1] 109/6 |
| configurations [1] 62/13 | 121/12 | counse1 [26] 14/17 18/17 |
| confirmed [1] 34/2 | contradict [1] 39/12 | 27/16 34/19 41/9 45/5 |
| confused [1] 92/5 | contradicting [1] 61/15 | 45/8 $48 / 3$ 48/24 $50 / 23$ |
| confusing [3] 105/12 | contrary [1] 38/22 | 51/4 52/5 73/11 73/23 |
| 126/13 129/4 | contrast [2] 106/11 108/9 | 80/24 81/3 81/8 81/13 |
| confusingly [1] 107/18 | control [2] 44/16 129/20 | 81/19 86/15 86/25 87/18 |
| confusion [1] 83/23 | controlled [2] 90/16 | 87/18 87/25 121/22 144/7 |
| Congress [10] 80/13 83/3 | 90/20 | counterparts [1] 15/10 |
| 83/24 84/24 85/2 85/12 | convened [1] 122/10 | counties [15] 12/5 12/14 |
| 96/15 138/25 139/13 | conversation [1] 31/18 | 15/4 15/7 18/4 18/21 |
| 141/10 | convinced [1] 96/4 | 19/13 20/2 20/10 20/12 |
| congressional [98] 4/19 | copies [2] 6/19 7/14 | 20/16 25/12 30/8 136/22 |
| 7/23 8/3 8/9 8/13 8/14 | copy [2] 60/17 70/12 | 141/8 |
| 8/15 8/17 $8 / 18$ 8/20 8/24 | corner [1] 35/3 | counting [9] 126/9 126/10 |
|  | Cornyn [2] 96/1 96/1 | 126/19 126/20 126/22 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 4 & 11 / 23 & 12 / 3 & 12 / 18\end{array}$ | Corpus [4] 8/18 18/14 | 127/7 127/12 127/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 5 & 13 / 23 & 13 / 24 & 14 / 3\end{array}$ | 19/13 19/23 | 127/17 |
| 15/8 15/16 $15 / 2116 / 12$ | corral [2] 117/22 117/22 | counts [2] 128/15 128/18 |
| 16/13 $17 / 2$ 17/4 $17 / 14$ | correct [129] $7 / 258 / 3$ | county [73] 8/17 12/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 19 & 19 / 10 & 20 / 12 & 20 / 13\end{array}$ | 8/4 8/12 8/21 8/22 8/25 | 12/19 12/20 12/22 12/25 |
| 20/15 20/19 25/2 25/3 | 9/4 9/19 9/22 9/23 10/5 | 13/4 13/7 13/11 13/13 |
| 25/5 25/16 $25 / 17 \quad 25 / 19$ | 10/6 10/11 10/16 10/25 | 13/14 13/14 $13 / 15$ 13/18 |
| 26/14 27/4 $28 / 7 \quad 28 / 13$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 7 & 11 / 18 & 11 / 25 & 12 / 6\end{array}$ | 17/4 17/7 17/10 18/3 |
| 28/14 28/21 28/25 29/5 | 12/15 12/16 12/23 12/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 13 & 18 / 25 & 18 / 25 & 19 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 29/17 29/22 $29 / 25$ 30/1 | 13/2 13/5 13/6 13/11 | 19/9 19/16 20/1 20/4 28/4 |
| 30/5 30/14 33/11 33/13 | 13/21 14/5 $14 / 8$ 14/14 | 28/12 28/12 28/18 28/20 |
| 33/19 35/2 $35 / 15$ 35/23 | 14/21 15/11 15/14 15/17 | $35 / 1$ 35/5 35/7 35/10 |
| 36/7 39/14 $39 / 24$ 49/5 | 15/25 16/2 16/14 16/25 | 35/15 35/24 $38 / 13$ 38/15 |
| 73/18 80/19 82/17 82/21 | 17/1 17/11 17/12 17/17 | 38/23 38/24 39/4 39/5 |
| 83/10 84/2 84/10 84/12 | 17/18 17/20 18/5 18/6 | 39/8 58/12 58/22 59/11 |
| 84/15 84/19 85/16 86/16 | 18/10 $18 / 1118 / 2519 / 1$ | 59/22 60/2 64/3 69/4 69/6 |
| 86/19 88/14 89/2 92/4 | 20/5 20/16 20/17 20/21 | 78/25 79/1 79/2 79/2 |
| 92/4 92/7 93/6 94/4 117/4 | 21/12 $21 / 18$ 21/25 $22 / 10$ | 104/22 127/4 136/16 |
| 136/24 136/25 137/7 | 22/19 22/21 $28 / 8$ 28/9 | 136/18 $136 / 19$ 137/16 |
| 138/24 139/11 140/16 | 28/22 29/3 29/24 $30 / 24$ | 137/16 137/16 137/17 |


| C | D | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{d}[1] & 51 / 17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| county... [8] 137/18 | D.C [3] $1 / 5$ | defaults [1] 76/20 |
| 137/19 137/19 137/19 | Dallas [21] 35/1 35/24 | defeated [1] 16/16 |
| 138/20 $139 / 7$ 139/23 $140 / 7$ | 37/24 $38 / 13$ 38/14 $38 / 15$ | Defendant [1] 2/6 |
| county's [1] 19/15 | 38/18 47/4 53/13 54/8 | Defendant's [16] 16/7 |
| couple [5] 33/8 78/2 | 136/22 137/2 137/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 2 & 29 / 1 & 30 / 3 & 35 / 2 & 43 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 86/10 110/17 118/11 | 137/18 $138 / 21$ 139/5 $139 / 6$ | 57/21 89/8 91/21 92/1 |
| course [9] 13/21 23/24 | 139/23 140/7 141/13 | 92/23 118/24 119/1 119/13 |
|  | 141/25 | 124/16 128/11 |
| 114/14 132/6 140/16 | Dallas/Fort [4] 138/21 | defendants [5] $1 / 81 / 10$ |
| courses [1] 121/10 | 139/6 141/13 141/25 | 2/2 4/15 95/19 |
| court [28] $1 / 1$ 3/6 3/6 | DANIEL [3] 2/2 40/23 41/2 | defended [1] 100 |
|  | dark [1] 37/13 | Defense [2] 2/9 18/15 |
| 25/10 30/20 82/22 84/23 | data [15] 18/20 27/10 | defensible [1] 100/16 |
| 88/9 88/19 89/3 95/12 | 83/15 83/19 83/24 84/10 | definitely [1] 109/14 |
| 95/14 95/18 96/12 98/3 | 84/18 85/7 85/8 85/9 | definition [2] 44/2 69/3 |
| 100/18 102/9 117/21 | 103/9 109/4 109/9 121/10 | degree [2] 128/6 129/19 |
| 125/22 132/15 137/13 | 121/10 | delegation [1] 17/14 |
| 139/24 142/10 144/5 | date [5] 5/8 99/11 122/16 | democrat [7] 20/23 77/16 |
| Court's [4] 54/12 86/17 | 144/5 144/12 | 80/23 96/3 96/3 104/8 |
| 117/7 140/6 | dated [4] 108/21 119/18 | 134/13 |
| court-drawn [1] 82/22 | 119/25 120/2 | democratic [8] 32/19 33/2 |
| courteous [1] 67/17 | David [5] 42/23 43/21 | 33/5 55/23 61/21 89/12 |
| courtesy [1] 24/21 | 44/10 70/11 73/11 | 104/10 114/11 |
| Courthouse [1] 1/20 | Davis [62] 1/9 26/5 39/19 | democrats [13] 31/18 38/8 |
| courtroom [2] 4/4 135/6 | 40/2 40/8 41/12 41/18 | 54/8 56/7 56/8 61/8 75/2 |
| courts [3] 103/12 109/17 | 41/21 42/19 43/2 43/3 | 75/3 78/14 80/9 86/23 |
| 127/9 | 43/10 43/10 43/18 43/21 | 91/9 134/22 |
| COUTO [1] 2/8 | 44/9 44/10 44/15 46/20 | demographic [9] 27/6 83/2 |
| cover [1] 86/5 | 46/23 47/16 48/16 52/15 | 83/9 83/15 83/19 84/10 |
| covered [1] 86/22 | 52/21 53/21 54/4 54/18 | 85/7 85/8 107/23 |
| covers [1] 101/19 |  | demonstrated [2] 89/19 |
| Crane [4] 15/9 20/11 58/9 | 62/17 64/9 64/22 65/23 | 108/5 |
|  | 66/23 68/4 68/6 68/9 | demonstrates [1] 137 |
| create [10] 18/9 33/4 | 68/10 68/12 68/12 70/7 | demonstrating [1] 137/15 |
| 50/8 61/3 70/16 137/5 | 70/11 70/12 71/7 71/18 | demonstrative [1] 16/6 |
| 138/22 139/5 139/22 | 71/23 73/10 73/11 73/13 | Denton [1] 64/2 |
| 141/13 | 75/1 75/2 77/21 78/19 | Department [12] 2/3 88/5 |
| created [5] 14/13 18/7 | 79/19 79/20 80/2 80/6 | 96/21 97/13 97/18 97/20 |
| 18/8 32/17 138/5 | 87/23 140/15 141/17 | 97/25 125/3 125/8 126/23 |
| creating [4] 22/16 32/18 | Davis' [3] 59/25 61/12 | 133/25 138/1 |
| 32/25 33/2 | 71/13 | depend [1] 123/5 |
| credit [1] 53/5 | day [17] $1 / 7$ 30/18 46/10 | deposed [4] 119/9 119/11 |
| criminal [1] 4/5 | 46/21 51/10 66/9 70/25 | 120/6 120/21 |
| Cristi [1] 18/14 | 71/3 80/1 99/14 117/16 | deposition [19] 8/7 8/23 |
| criteria [1] 69/20 | 117/17 117/17 117/18 |  |
| criterion [2] 47/7 70/1 | 119/20 122/14 122/14 | 19/18 19/19 21/1 $31 / 19$ |
| criticized [1] 12/22 | days [1] 118/11 | 32/22 60/14 67/21 120/24 |
| cross [16] 7/7 7/17 34/10 | DC [4] $2 / 4$ 2/6 $2 / 15$ 3/8 | 122/5 123/1 123/7 123/19 |
| 72/24 86/6 86/10 86/14 | deal [2] 103/3 103/21 | depositions [1] 7/15 |
| 87/2 96/13 110/18 117/9 | dealing [3] $24 / 3$ 24/3 | descent [1] 80/18 |
| 117/12 118/4 135/14 | 108/13 | describe [2] 69/4 79/20 |
| 135/17 143/4 | debate [5] 29/20 39/2 | described [3] 17/13 17/19 |
| cross-examination [8] | 45/19 45/21 80/18 | 102/11 |
| 86/6 87/2 96/13 110/18 | decade [12] 38/19 38/25 | description [3] 43/4 46/5 |
| 117/9 117/12 118/4 135/14 | 39/5 100/13 102/24 105/4 | 75/9 |
| CRYSTAL [2] 3/6 144/12 | 108/14 109/5 109/18 | design [1] 10/24 |
| CSSB [1] 89/23 | 113/25 127/1 134/11 | designating [1] 5/1 |
| Cuellar [1] 8/15 | decide [3] 40/11 97/8 | designation [1] 137/10 |
| current [3] 105/19 110/8 | 132/17 | despite [2] 56/23 96/6 |
| 110/9 | decided [4] 25/23 97/3 | details |
| currently [2] 48/5 48/13 | 97/19 99/22 | determination [1] 48/20 |
| cut [3] 15/12 28/20 135/7 | decision [6] 23/22 80/6 | determine [2] 47/25 48/1 |
| cut-out [1] 135/7 | 80/10 97/7 97/12 116/21 | determined [3] 20/21 21/5 |
| cuts [1] 28/11 | declaration [2] 26/8 | 48/17 |
| CVAP [3] | 34/12 | determines [1] 115/15 |
| 130/17 | declare [1] 32/4 | DEVANEY [7] 2/13 6/15 |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { cycle } \\ 114 / 12}}{ }$ [3] $101 / 20$ 101/20 | decline [1] 117/1 decreased [1] 96/15 deed [1] 70/17 | $\left(\begin{array}{lll} 6 / 16 & 72 / 21 & 73 / 3 \\ 137 / 23 \\ \text { develop [1] } & 90 / 3 \end{array}\right.$ |


| D | disciplined [1] 109/15 | $44 / 7 \text { 45/15 47/2 } 51 / 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| deviation [1] 47/17 | disclosing [1] 93/1/2 | $\begin{array}{llll} 51 / 25 & 53 / 14 & 53 / 20 & 54 / 24 \\ 55 / 21 & 57 / 7 & 59 / 5 & 59 / 6 \\ 59 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| Dewhurst [1] 42/24 | discrimination [5] 138/4 | 60/11 61/1 $61 / 6 \quad 62 / 2 \quad 66 / 7$ |
| did [112] 11/12 12/8 | 138/7 138/9 140/14 140/18 | 66/9 66/14 66/17 66/17 |
| 13/10 17/21 18/16 18/17 | díscuss [1] 34/17 | 66/20 67/3 $67 / 967 / 24$ |
| 20/22 $21 / 12$ 22/1 $23 / 2$ | discussed [1] 138/25 | 67/25 69/7 69/10 70/5 |
| 23/23 23/23 25/3 25/14 | discussion [13] 41/12 | 70/8 70/10 70/18 70/19 |
| 25/22 26/11 26/15 27/5 | 73/5 73/7 80/25 81/14 | 70/20 71/20 72/4 72/6 |
| 28/17 31/10 $31 / 17$ 33/10 | 82/18 96/3 105/14 118/12 | 72/7 72/10 74/25 77/2 |
|  | 126/15 127/23 128/2 129/5 | 77/8 78/4 80/25 82/17 |
| 39/22 40/2 41/12 41/21 | discussions [1] 26/11 | 82/23 82/25 83/12 84/4 |
| 41/22 41/23 42/3 43/20 | dismantling [1] 138/5 | 84/6 84/12 |
| 44/6 45/10 45/10 45/12 | dispute [4] 96/23 111/13 | 85/9 85/15 86/2 87/1 90/4 |
| 46/15 47/25 48/1 52/14 | 111/15 111/23 | 90/5 90/6 90/23 93/18 |
| 53/14 54/4 54/22 54/23 | disputes [1] 133/24 | 93/19 93/24 93/25 94/19 |
| 54/24 55/25 58/15 58/16 | disseminated [1] 79/25 | 97/6 97/10 98/18 101/24 |
| 59/7 59/8 61/5 61/15 | distilled [1] 125/21 | 103/3 104/2 105/5 106/23 |
| 61/19 64/8 64/11 64/19 | distinct [1] 127/8 | 106/24 109/4 109/13 |
| 64/22 64/22 64/25 65/5 | distinguish [1] 97/15 | 109/14 109/17 111/19 |
| 65/8 65/22 68/3 68/4 | distributed [1] 106/4 | 117/12 117/23 119/1 |
| 69/15 69/18 71/23 73/7 | district [288] | 119/10 119/15 119/17 |
| 73/24 75/5 77/22 78/7 | district's [3] 84/2 89/2 | 121/1 122/9 122/11 123/24 |
| 78/10 78/11 80/8 80/9 | 136/20 | 123/25 124/2 124/6 125/10 |
| 80/11 81/2 81/5 81/11 | districting [1] 127/10 | 125/17 125/24 128/3 128/4 |
| 83/8 85/12 85/19 86/2 | districts [138] 4/19 4/19 | 128/4 128/16 129/18 |
| 90/8 91/3 92/10 93/22 |  | 130/18 136/8 |
| 96/14 96/18 97/4 97/21 |  | Docket [1] 1/4 |
| 98/5 99/6 100/1 101/8 | 19/8 21/9 21/17 $22 / 4 \quad 22 / 7$ | document [3] 30/1 89/9 |
| 102/23 103/25 104/9 | 22/17 $26 / 13$ 27/3 28/11 | 122/25 |
| 104/10 104/22 104/22 | 29/3 31/9 31/12 33/5 | does [26] 28/20 30/10 |
| 110/13 112/17 117/3 121/5 | 34/21 35/14 $35 / 15$ 35/23 | 49/7 72/20 75/24 83/2 |
| 124/7 125/6 127/11 136/5 | 36/10 36/11 36/15 37/23 | 92/18 97/7 102/2 103/1 |
| didn't [54] 6/12 10/3 | 48/1 48/3 48/14 49/1 49/1 | 103/21 106/17 106/22 |
| 11/17 12/21 16/1 16/2 | 49/5 50/5 51/13 51/15 | 109/25 112/17 112/22 |
| 16/20 18/16 $19 / 16$ 22/10 | 51/17 51/22 51/23 63/11 | 113/18 118/15 119/22 |
| 22/16 23/3 27/1 27/15 | 66/18 67/2 67/4 73/6 | 120/16 120/18 121/14 |
| $33 / 4$ 34/1 36/13 40/24 | 73/14 73/19 78/16 83/19 | 121/16 122/7 125/22 |
| 41/21 43/19 45/13 47/22 | 88/15 89/18 $90 / 17$ 90/20 | 133/25 |
| 51/23 51/25 52/22 53/16 | 95/17 95/18 96/19 97/4 | doesn't [10] 18/13 30/8 |
| 53/18 53/19 55/7 55/10 | 97/8 97/9 97/10 97/15 | 48/10 49/5 49/17 76/23 |
| 55/25 56/13 $61 / 16$ 61/18 | 97/19 97/22 98/17 103/10 | 86/1 90/14 104/19 113/16 |
| 62/10 64/13 64/16 65/12 | 104/9 104/20 107/19 | doing [15] 5/8 25/7 28/17 |
| 65/16 75/19 86/19 93/14 | 107/21 107/22 108/4 108/5 | 70/12 $70 / 15$ 72/4 102/20 |
| 93/18 94/9 94/10 100/4 | 110/19 110/23 111/4 111/6 | 105/13 122/17 122/19 |
| 100/6 100/7 100/9 102/22 | 111/7 111/25 112/2 112/4 | 122/23 125/8 133/16 |
| 111/24 122/2 123/7 139/4 | 112/6 112/9 $115 / 19$ 126/16 | 134/12 135/14 |
| difference [5] 103/23 | 129/12 129/17 130/6 130/7 | DOJ [1] 125/20 |
| 104/4 106/3 106/9 112/5 | 130/8 130/9 130/13 130/13 | dominated [2] 57/3 64/2 |
| differences [1] 100/22 | 131/24 132/4 132/7 132/19 | don't [94] 4/10 4/22 7/22 |
| different [19] 5/21 30/15 | 133/6 133/13 133/18 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}9 / 5 & 14 / 24 & 15 / 3 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 12\end{array}$ |
| 83/15 83/19 93/14 100/20 | 133/18 $133 / 20 \quad 133 / 20$ | 15/15 $15 / 1917 / 1{ }^{19 / 17}$ |
| 102/2 104/1 104/7 104/21 | 133/22 134/2 134/4 134/5 | 22/11 24/4 24/11 29/9 |
| 105/19 105/22 106/2 | 134/5 134/6 $134 / 22$ 136/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 29/16 } & 29 / 20 & 30 / 25 & 31 / 15\end{array}$ |
| 112/17 113/19 114/7 | 136/9 136/10 136/13 | 31/21 31/24 32/12 35/8 |
| 124/17 126/1 129/8 |  | $36 / 24 \quad 38 / 6 \quad 39 / 2 \quad 39 / 12$ |
| differently [2] 104/21 | 138/8 138/13 138/17 |  |
| 131/22 | 138/19 138/19 138/24 | 42/20 43/21 46/8 47/3 |
| difficult [3] 15/25 55/17 | 139/11 139/13 139/15 | 50/5 50/7 $50 / 23$ 50/24 |
| 55/20 | 140/19 141/2 141/12 | 51/12 52/11 52/24 53/5 |
| direct [13] 7/4 30/12 | 141/15 141/18 141/21 | 53/6 55/16 57/5 57/9 |
| 34/13 41/17 94/22 106/16 | 141/25 | 57/10 57/14 58/24 58/25 |
| 120/9 120/16 124/19 126/2 | DistrictViewer [1] 8/6 | 59/12 $59 / 14 \quad 59 / 15$ 59/19 |
| 135/15 135/19 143/4 | do [137] 4/24 4/25 5/5 | 60/17 61/3 62/4 62/5 |
| direction [2] 40/20 44/16 |  | 62/11 68/6 68/21 69/1 |
| directly [1] 138/20 | 12/14 12/21 16/1 $23 / 9$ | 69/13 70/17 71/22 72/8 |
| director [7] 3 39/20 39/21 | 24/3 $25 / 7{ }^{1} 25 / 8 \quad 26 / 2 \quad 27 / 17$ | 72/9 73/16 76/1 76/2 |
| 41/22 42/23 44/15 59/2 |  | 77/24 81/20 86/4 90/22 |
| 79/23 | 30/19 36/14 $36 / 16$ 36/25 | 92/5 96/7 98/23 109/12 |
| disadvantage [1] 137/21 | 37/9 37/10 37/16 37/17 | 112/2 116/2 119/11 119/20 |
| disagree [1] 38/21 | 37/21 38/21 38/23 42/19 | 120/10 121/18 122/15 |


| D | ear1ier [6] 67/16 70/7 93/1 $93 / 24$ 111/4 $125 / 17$ | $\text { 105/15 } 106 / 1 \quad 106 / 2 \quad 106 / 4$ $106 / 20 \quad 107 / 11 \quad 107 / 12$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| don't... [7] 124/12 |  | 106/20 $107 / 14$ 107/11 $108108 / 15$ |
| 125/16 130/16 131/6 | 99/15 117/16 117/17 | 108/18 108/25 $109 / 3109 / 3$ |
| 131/11 132/12 142/14 | easier [1] 15/24 | 109/12 109/19 113/7 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { done [10] } & 10 / 7 \\ 17 / 2 & 31 / 24\end{array}$ | easily [1] 102/3 | 113/21 114/2 $114 / 18$ |
| 32/3 61/6 61/11 76/5 | East [1] 99/13 | 114/20 116/2 116/9 116/10 |
| 93/17 122/22 122/23 | easy [1] 114/13 | 132/16 |
| dot [1] 20/1 | Eddie [2] 36/1 36/2 | elects [3] 9/3 28/15 |
| Doug [19] 39/19 40/6 40/8 | Education [1] 76/20 | 29/18 |
| 40/16 40/18 41/12 41/18 | Educational [1] 2/9 | elevators |
| 42/21 43/10 43/18 44/9 | effect [6] 16/5 28/18 | eleven [5] 47/9 67/16 |
| 68/6 68/11 70/12 73/9 | 66/18 116/23 116/24 | 67/18 81/24 82/2 |
| 73/11 78/19 79/19 79/20 | 138/10 | elimination [4] 136/11 |
| down [20] 4/4 13/1 15/9 | effected [1] 78/12 | 136/19 141/4 141/8 |
| 19/15 20/15 20/19 21/3 | effective [2] 113/20 | E11is [2] 75/1 75/2 |
| 21/20 36/12 36/18 56/3 | 129/6 | E11is' [1] 51/9 |
| 63/3 84/6 84/24 88/18 | effectively [1] 97/10 | else [7] 5/11 6/2 72/20 |
| 89/2 90/9 107/24 130/15 | effects [1] 16/2 | 73/24 81/21 86/25 116/18 |
| 139/4 | effort [4] 65/18 121/1 | employed [1] 144/8 |
| downstairs [1] 142/16 | 121/22 122/17 | enact [1] 91/1 |
| Downton [2] 26/4 39/23 | efforts [2] 10/13 10/22 | enacted [12] 11/4 16/11 |
| Dr [28] 97/17 103/18 | eight [4] 20/25 47/9 | 17/3 17/7 19/3 28/10 |
| 106/19 109/24 110/20 | 84/14 85/4 | 30/14 45/23 84/19 85/2 |
| 118/6 118/17 119/1 119/15 | either [13] 15/24 18/21 | 97/22 112/18 |
| 120/1 120/6 120/12 121/5 | 23/15 50/12 $51 / 14$ 59/19 | end [8] 12/21 13/10 26/22 |
|  | 78/11 90/1 112/2 115/4 | 26/22 32/5 90/1 103/16 |
| 122/20 123/15 123/24 | 115/5 123/15 133/5 | 121/1 |
| 124/14 125/7 125/20 126/3 | E1 [4] 8/13 21/23 104/23 | endear |
| 126/19 127/6 128/10 | 141/9 | ended [1] 107/5 |
| 128/13 | elect [37] 14/4 14/18 | endorsement [1] 90/2 |
| draft [1] 12/3 | 21/17 $22 / 5$ 26/13 27/2 | English [1] 32/4 |
| drafts [1] 25/22 | 27/3 27/7 35/14 35/23 | enhanced [1] 90/21 |
| draw [17] 10/22 18/16 | 36/11 51/23 62/16 89/19 | enough [5] 31/11 34/20 |
| 21/15 21/22 22/6 31/14 | 96/16 97/3 97/21 106/25 | 76/22 109/4 132/25 |
| 36/13 41/18 75/19 76/18 | 107/19 107/23 108/5 108/7 | enrolled [5] 44/1 44/3 |
| 81/20 97/11 97/13 98/12 | 108/8 108/17 110/21 | 44/4 44/11 44/11 |
| 98/18 98/21 141/7 | 112/19 112/23 115/24 | ensure [1] 31/13 |
| drawers [1] 25/15 | 116/8 129/6 129/6 131/5 | entered [2] 42/12 90/6 |
| drawing [7] 25/16 26/3 | 131/25 133/14 134/20 | entire [6] 5/25 109/5 |
| 31/11 34/20 46/10 80/7 | 136/14 141/5 | 114/20 117/18 124/9 |
| 83/8 | elected [13] 9/24 11/16 | 126/14 |
| drawn [10] 26/16 31/10 | 52/15 $52 / 23$ 53/6 54/4 | entirely [1] 48/10 |
| 82/22 82/23 83/3 83/11 | 54/15 107/9 107/13 108/1 | entitled [2] 50/14 70/12 |
| 84/13 84/16 85/8 95/17 | 130/25 133/7 134/10 | entitles [1] 72/4 |
| drew [10] 22/1 31/13 | election [63] 11/16 11/24 | equally [1] 105/23 |
| 39/25 46/20 54/15 59/24 | 16/19 20/21 $21 / 5$ 32/14 | equivalent [1] 113/8 |
| 79/1 79/4 81/20 97/12 | 53/17 66/25 67/9 67/10 | ERIC [2] 1/6 118/9 |
| Drive [3] 2/12 19/12 | 97/23 98/4 98/5 98/13 | error [1] 132/18 |
| 19/23 | 99/1 99/2 99/6 99/18 | Especially [1] 36 |
| driven [1] 132/21 | 99/22 99/24 100/12 100/13 | Esquire [17] 1/17 1/17 |
| drop [1] 136/16 | 101/2 101/5 101/12 101/18 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 1 / 18 & 1 / 18 & 1 / 22 & 1 / 23\end{array}$ |
| drop-in [1] 136/16 | 102/6 102/10 102/21 103/2 |  |
| due [1] 70/17 | 103/4 103/8 103/15 103/17 |  |
| DUNN [2] 2/19 2/20 | 103/23 103/24 105/2 105/5 | essentially [2] 30/23 |
| during [15] 10/13 33/11 | 105/19 105/24 105/25 | 58/7 |
|  | 106/19 106/19 107/8 108/1 | esteemed [1] 121/22 |
| 46/16 49/22 $56 / 17$ 63/18 | 108/19 109/8 109/24 | esthetic [1] 134/24 |
| 82/20 87/2 122/17 123/1 | 109/25 112/7 112/16 113/5 | et [1] 1/9 |
| 127/1 | 113/8 $113 / 20$ 115/21 116/7 | ethnic [2] 38/7 38/11 |
| duties [1] 43/4 | 125/17 $125 / 18$ 126/6 127/5 | ethnicity [2] 12/4 12/13 |
| DX [1] 120/11 | 134/11 134/14 134/20 | evaluate [1] 27/6 |
| dynamic [1] 109/20 | elections [55] 14/4 45/20 | evaluation [1] 70/2 |
| dynamics [2] 15/23 64/8 | 98/7 99/3 99/25 100/1 |  |
| E | 100/4 100/10 100/11 | 27/1 36/3 70/1 86/19 |
|  | 100/15 100/20 100 | 99 |
| $\begin{array}{rl} \text { e-mail } & {[5]} \\ 44 / 10 & 41 / 5 \\ 70 / 11 & 72 / 9 \end{array}$ | $101 / 1 \quad 101 / 1 \quad 101 / 10 \quad 101 / 11$ | evenly [2] 106/4 106/4 <br> eventual7y [4] 8/2 46/25 |
| each [6] 27/20 89/17 | $\begin{array}{lll} 101 / 1 / & 102 / 2 & 102 / 10 \\ 102 / 16 & 102 / 23 & 103 / 19 \end{array}$ |  |
| 100/12 106/23 107/7 | 103/22 103/22 104/1 104/3 | ever [17] 14/2 14/7 15/15 |
| 107/14 | 104/4 105/3 105/4 105/7 | 31/10 $36 / 21 \quad 39 / 19$ 39/22 |


| E | exogenous [1]  <br> expected [1] $112 / 1$ <br> $113 / 22$  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fashion }[4] \quad 4 / 20 \quad 4 / 21 \\ & 49 / 2 \quad 125 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ever... [10] 39/22 40/2 | experience [10] 41/25 | fast [1] 70/19 |
| 41/12 44/4 64/8 68/4 | 42/10 45/17 80/3 95/15 | faster [1] 20/8 |
| 68/11 71/23 134/10 134/14 | 109/1 109/17 111/22 | fate [1] 71/25 |
| Everman [1] 56/19 | 125/13 135/24 | favor [1] 61/4 |
| every [14] 4/15 31/13 | experimented [1] 107/1 | feel [1] 109/3 |
| 77/16 80/1 81/11 90/1 | expert [7] 97/13 97/17 | felt [2] 8/10 18/8 |
| 98/10 107/25 116/25 117/1 | 97/20 97/25 108/12 121/9 | few [3] 4/2 117/8 117/10 |
| 118/11 122/14 134/10 | 126/23 | Fifty [4] 84/14 84/17 |
| 134/13 | experts [1] 103/11 | 85/4 139/18 |
| everybody [15] 4/8 4/9 | explain [1] 98/4 | Fifty-eight [2] 84/14 |
| 24/20 53/7 53/7 53/12 | explained [1] 11/15 |  |
| 53/13 79/9 79/11 83/22 | explanation [2] 92/20 | Fifty-four [1] 139/18 |
| 111/14 117/10 135/5 | 98/3 | Fifty-two [1] 84/17 |
| 135/25 142/14 | explore [1] 21/9 | figure [7] 4/2 5/4 5/7 |
| everyone [3] 4/1 21/13 | exploring [1] 15/15 | $\begin{array}{cc}9 / 17 & 23 / 21 ~ 57 / 6 ~ 122 / 13\end{array}$ |
| 77/10 | explosion [3] 108/13 | filed [10] 7/4 39/24 |
| everything [3] 70/15 | 108/20 108/23 | 119/6 120/9 120/16 120/17 |
| 86/25 115/19 | explosive [1] 137/6 | 124/19 126/2 $136 / 5 \quad 140 / 13$ |
| everywhere [1] 116/19 | express [1] 128/8 | final [13] 13/4 13/10 |
| evidence [5] 137/15 138/6 | expressed [3] 61/16 | 28/10 28/20 60/24 61/9 |
| 138/9 140/18 142/10 | 124/22 125/2 | 61/17 74/21 77/9 77/13 |
| evident [1] 22/11 | expressing [4] 59/3 75/8 | 86/15 89/13 90/1 |
| evolution [1] 118/22 | 89/12 125/14 | finally [3] 11/5 93/21 |
| exact [6] 9/5 44/2 45/15 | expression [2] 44/4 128/8 | 137/4 |
| 46/8 99/11 119/20 | extent [3] 26/1 101/7 | financially |
| exactly [10] 52/17 72/4 | 138/8 | find [3] 37/2 53/10 109/9 |
| 99/11 99/21 $112 / 24 \quad 112 / 24$ | extra [3] 95/1 117/8 | fine [2] 79/10 79/11 |
| 116/25 122/13 125/4 | 117/10 | finish [1] 117/1 |
| 133/23 | extremely [1] 40/23 | finished [2] 82/14 91/22 |
| examination [16] 7/7 7/17 | F | firm [1] 41/4 |
| 34/10 72/24 74/16 82/10 |  | first [19] 39/17 41/1 |
| 86/6 87/2 87/9 95/8 96/13 | faced [1] 99/6 | 41/3 42/20 66/22 74/20 |
| 110/18 117/9 117/12 118/4 | fact [61] 34/17 35/4 | 80/3 89/11 89/17 97/6 |
| 135/14 | 38/14 38/19 38/24 39/4 | 100/22 101/11 115/20 |
| examine [2] 127/10 133/22 | 41/13 42/12 44/9 45/23 | 119/4 120/13 124/14 128/8 |
| examining [1] 15/22 | 49/7 $51 / 6 \quad 51 / 9$ 52/2 $52 / 8$ | 134/2 134/18 |
| example [7] 97/2 98/15 | 52/10 $54 / 12$ 54/15 $55 / 12$ | fits [1] 112/12 |
| 102/3 104/14 105/16 109/7 | 55/14 $55 / 15$ 55/25 58/14 | five [ 288 ] $37 / 6$ 47/12 |
| 132/8 | 58/21 59/22 59/24 60/8 | 47/13 47/16 85/4 86/3 |
| examples [1] 113/25 | 61/3 61/8 61/21 61/24 | 87/7 101/1 101/18 101/19 |
| exceed [1] 50/11 | 62/3 63/23 64/12 64/25 | 105/3 105/3 105/6 105/7 |
| exceeded [1] 50/21 | 67/6 69/20 69/25 70/21 | 105/25 106/4 106/12 |
| except [1] 53/11 | 71/3 86/17 86/18 87/25 | 106/20 107/11 107/12 |
| exception [1] 110/25 | 88/3 88/8 88/12 88/17 | 107/14 $107 / 15$ 108/18 |
| excerpt [1] 93/4 | 90/24 $92 / 3$ 92/6 92/8 $94 / 3$ | 108/24 $109 / 24$ 113/5 $113 / 8$ |
| excerpted [1] 92/22 | 101/7 104/17 108/5 109/15 | 115/21 |
| excerpts [1] 92/19 | 111/20 112/11 115/6 123/8 | fix [1] 62/15 |
| exchange [1] 45/16 | 133/12 | f7are [1] 65/17 |
| exchanged [1] 44/10 | facts [2] 54/13 108/23 | floor [11] 29/10 29/12 |
| exclusive [1] 73/16 | factual [1] 100/18 | 30/18 45/19 77/8 77/9 |
| excuse [3] 23/3 23/19 | fail [1] 77/22 | 77/12 78/6 78/8 78/15 |
| 132/25 | failure [6] 137/5 138/22 | 135/6 |
| excused [4] 24/16 82/5 | 139/4 139/21 141/7 141/12 | floors [1] 4/4 |
| 94/16 94/18 | fair [12] 25/1 28/2 28/10 | flowing [1] 17/22 |
| exercised [1] 131/7 | 32/25 33/4 33/7 34/1 75/9 | flows [1] 138/20 |
| exhibit [41] 16/6 18/7 | 124/16 125/24 131/22 | FM [1] 2/20 |
| 18/15 31/16 34/13 36/9 | 131/22 | focal [1] 56/24 |
| 36/17 36/18 37/11 39/15 | fairly [1] 114/24 | focus [12] 27/15 35/3 |
| 39/16 40/4 43/25 57/20 | fall [2] 58/15 60/1 | 37/5 46/18 56/9 96/14 |
| 57/21 57/21 60/10 70/5 | familiar [2] 83/18 83/20 | 96/22 101/14 111/2 128/13 |
| 70/6 75/22 83/25 84/1 | far [8] 37/6 37/12 76/2 | 128/24 129/2 |
| 84/20 89/5 89/6 89/7 89/8 | 110/6 118/18 121/13 | focused [1] 27/14 |
| 89/8 91/21 92/1 92/14 | 132/13 139/4 | focuses [1] 101/19 |
| 92/18 92/23 92/24 106/17 | Farenthold [9] 8/19 16/14 | focusing [2] 129/25 130/1 |
| 118/24 119/1 119/13 | 16/16 16/19 16/24 17/16 | folks [1] 32/20 |
| 119/15 124/16 128/11 | 18/5 18/12 19/22 | follow [8] 30/20 40/14 |
| exhibits [1] 93/2 | Farenthold's [1] 19/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 43/5 } & 63 / 20 & 69 / 21 & 73 / 5\end{array}$ |
| exist [1] 101/8 | $\text { Farias [2] } 135 / 11 \text { 135/12 }$ | 124/24 133/1 |


| $F$ | genera1$[8]$ $1 / 6 \quad 1 / 23$ <br> $32 / 14$ $41 / 3$ <br> $81 / 19$ $96 / 1$ | good [41] $4 / 16 / 166 / 20$ <br> $7 / 11{ }^{7} / 12$ $7 / 197 / 207 / 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| followed... [1] 132/14 | 96/1 118/9 | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 10 / 4 & 10 / 8 & 10 / 24 & 14 / 23\end{array}$ |
| following [1] 54/12 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { generally } & {[4]} & 25 / 8 & 101 / 9\end{array}$ | 17/16 22/24 26/1 31/18 |
| font [1] 84/24 | 109/1 138/23 | 31/25 32/3 32/5 32/ |
| force [3] 7/13 40/7 | gentleman [1] 121/23 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 52/21 } & 52 / 22 & 65 / 23 & 67 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 140/24 | geography [1] 5/25 | 72/15 72/23 $74 / 18$ 74/19 |
| foregoing [1] 144/2 | GERALD [3] 2/16 2/17 | 95/10 95/11 96/4 101/12 |
| Forest [1] 56/19 | 141/17 | 102/5 102/18 109/4 114/12 |
| forget [1] 79/2 | Gerardo [1] 26/4 | 118/6 118/7 118/15 121/23 |
| forgive [1] 78/20 | get [30] 16/7 24/15 27/1 | 135/2 |
| forgot [2] 4/25 142/6 | 31/6 40/19 41/14 43/24 | good-looking [1] 121/23 |
| form [3] 31/10 90/17 | 54/4 55/7 57/20 64/16 | got [17] 25/22 26/18 |
| 98/17 | 65/16 76/3 76/23 76/24 | 52/23 53/8 54/6 54/6 |
| formal [1] 46/9 | 77/7 77/8 86/19 92/5 | 54/15 71/25 91/21 92/25 |
| format [4] 107/2 107/4 | 95/21 101/10 102/24 104/7 | 94/2 99/25 120/11 139/4 |
| 107/5 122/24 | 104/12 104/13 107/20 | 139/8 139/16 139/16 |
| formatting [1] 121/10 | 115/5 115/14 $121 / 5$ 139/4 | gotten [3] 65/25 66/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { formed } \\ \text { former } & {[1]} & 10 / 13 \\ 128 / 20\end{array}$ | gets [4] 7/6 103/5 109/22 | 132/23 |
| former [1] 128/20 | 125/15 | governor [5] 40/1 40/21 |
| formulate [1] 102/18 | getting [5] 33/24 65/18 | 41/14 42/23 98/15 |
| Fort [13] 37/24 47/5 54/8 | 67/13 105/1 130/25 | governor's [1] 104/7 |
| 54/14 55/24 56/1 56/10 | give [13] 6/22 6/23 6/23 | grammatical [1] 123/16 |
| 58/15 58/23 138/21 139/6 | 7/14 $8 / 5$ 17/16 $23 / 15$ | gratifying [1] 36/20 |
| 141/13 141/25 | 39/18 44/2 95/14 96/11 | great [7] 103/3 103/21 |
| forth [3] 75/13 99/16 | 105/19 136/6 | 114/11 114/11 114/15 |
| 107/2 | given [3] 48/11 108/16 | 114/15 133/10 |
| forward [6] 7/9 48/25 | 108/20 | greater [2] 21/11 103/22 |
| 62/14 95/2 103/5 106/7 | gives [2] 22/15 105/22 | Green [5] 8/20 35 |
| foundation [2] 92/20 93/5 | giving [1] 72/12 | 35/19 35/20 49/6 |
| foundationa [1] 76/11 | glad [1] 108/10 | Green's [1] 48/11 |
| four [10] 38/25 84/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { go } & {[52]} & 6 / 10 & 9 / 8 & 12 / 4\end{array}$ | Griffith's [1] 6/3 |
| 105/3 105/3 105/8 $113 / 7$ |  | group [8] $\quad 22 / 3 \quad 22 / 7 \quad 50 / 12$ |
| 116/6 116/7 137/6 139/18 | 26/20 34/9 $36 / 17 \quad 36 / 21$ | 102/25 105/2 105/3 105/9 |
| frame [1] 119/11 | 37/11 40/7 47/11 52/12 | 130/14 |
| Fraser [1] 78/1 | 54/10 54/25 61/17 64/13 | grow [1] 65/9 |
| FREDERICK [1] $1 / 23$ | 65/16 67/17 70/19 71/21 | grown [1] 5/10 |
| FREEMAN [1] 2/2 | 74/14 76/12 88/20 89/6 | grows [1] 90/1 |
| Friday [1] 6/5 | 89/8 89/20 91/25 92/13 | growth [14] $34 / 18$ 34/19 |
| friend [1] 122/1 | 92/15 92/16 94/10 94/19 | $34 / 20 \quad 34 / 25 \quad 35 / 5 \quad 38 / 24$ |
| friends [1] 122/4 | 95/6 104/14 109/5 109/8 | 38/25 39/5 39/8 $39 / 9$ |
| front [2] 123/24 123/25 | 109/9 109/15 $110 / 7114 / 19$ | 64/25 65/2 108/16 137/6 |
| full [4] 89/17 92/18 | 118/2 120/4 120/13 123/20 | guess [9] 22/22 105/4 |
| 110/24 112/11 | 124/2 126/13 131/14 $132 / 6$ | 105/17 107/3 110/10 |
| fully [1] 127/10 | 132/12 | 111/16 111/24 113/8 123/5 |
| functional [3] 112/7 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { goal } & \text { [11] } & 9 / 17 & 10 / 2 & 12 / 18\end{array}$ | guidance [3] 125/7 125/20 |
| 112/21 116/15 | 12/21 22/22 22/24 23/1 | 127/2 |
| functionally [1] 131/4 | 23/5 23/6 55/12 55/15 | guide [1] 24/ |
| Fund [1] 2/9 | goals [1] 55/6 | guided [1] 23/22 |
| fundamentally [1] 126/18 | goes [12] 17/10 18/21 | gulf [4] 16/13 19/12 |
| further [11] 10/7 14/16 | 27/10 $40 / 13$ 57/1 58/8 | 19/23 21/22 |
| 15/6 19/19 $72 / 17$ 74/4 | 63/17 77/2 $102 / 18$ 108/19 | guys [3] 6/11 40/11 122/3 |
| 94/12 94/13 94/14 144/7 | 110/5 125/15 |  |
| 144/9 | going [55] 4/7 6/14 7/23 | H |
| future [1] 106/8 | 15/4 15/18 15/18 16/6 | had [84] 12/22 14/10 |
| G | 16/8 18/18 $20 / 7 \quad 22 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 18 & 20 / 18 & 21 / 3 & 21 / 10\end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |
| gain [3] 113/7 113/11 | 41/13 43/24 48/25 55/1 | 24/8 25/3 25/8 26/16 |
| 116/11 [2] 105/9 125/12 | 55/2 56/24 64/12 66/9 | 28/18 $31 / 13$ 31/18 33/6 |
| gaining [2] 105/9 125/12 | 66/10 66/14 66/17 66/20 | 33/12 41/25 42/9 42/10 |
| Gallegos [7] 29/6 29/11 | 67/3 67/15 69/21 70/10 | 45/17 45/19 48/12 49/1 |
| 30/17 44/21 45/7 45/13 | 70/17 70/25 71/7 71/7 | 52/20 54/13 55/5 58/14 |
| 91/12 | 71/19 75/21 77/22 80/19 | 58/17 59/2 59/17 60/21 |
| gap [1] 133/8 | 81/24 82/2 87/3 92/17 | 62/25 65/25 66/3 66/4 |
| GARZA [3] 2/11 2/11 | 97/7 109/15 109/21 114/1 | 66/5 66/21 66/24 67/9 |
| gathering [1] 135/6 | 116/16 117/12 117/16 | 67/16 68/8 69/25 71/3 |
| gave [6] 8/9 57/25 88/5 | 117/17 $132 / 5135 / 8135 / 18$ | 71/8 71/8 73/5 73/7 77/5 |
| 94/8 102/9 139/9 | 135/20 | 77/22 78/1 78/1 78/4 |
| gears [1] 82/15 |  | 78/25 79/13 79/20 80/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Gene } \\ 48 / 10 & {[5]} & 89 / 6\end{array}$ | Gonzalez [4] $6 / 17$ 8/16 | 80/3 80/25 82/23 83/10 |
| 48/10 49/6 | 73/2 137/24 | 86/4 86/23 87/16 93/13 |

H
had... [16] 93/16 96/3
96/9 99/19 99/22 107/13
108/13 112/19 113/24
115/21 122/9 125/7 127/23
132/13 135/23 136/3
hadn't [4] 10/7 32/3
40/19 66/1
half [5] 8/11 16/10 16/10 28/7 28/13
hal1 [1] 135/8
hand [2] 109/21 130/16
handful [1] 61/25
Handley [22] 97/12 97/17
100/4 100/10 100/12 101/2
101/15 101/16 105/24
106/5 106/8 106/11 106/20 107/4 107/11 108/19 113/2 113/15 113/18 116/6 132/13 133/17
Hand7ey's [8] 103/18 109/24 110/20 125/7 125/20 126/19 127/7 $132 / 3$ handling [1] 122/20 Hanna [7] 43/21 44/10 70/11 70/14 71/19 72/3 72/9
happen [2] 38/23 59/4 happened [13] 33/18 64/9 78/16 80/20 98/8 98/22 98/23 108/14 115/20 115/25 116/4 133/19 133/20
happening [1] 102/1 happens [5] 30/15 36/21 76/24 112/12 127/10 happier [1] 103/16 happy [3] 6/24 93/5 141/19
hard [4] 6/19 52/21 53/5 53/10
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { harder [1] } & 133 / 23 \\ \text { hardly [1] } & 36 / 21\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { harmful [1] } & 90 / 18 & \\ \text { Harris [11] } & 35 / 10 & 35 / 14\end{array}$ 67/23 68/17 68/18 104/22 136/16 136/17 137/16 137/18 138/19
has [33] 17/7 28/4 28/21 30/5 36/21 49/3 57/24 60/17 66/7 68/9 76/5 77/1 $\begin{array}{lllll}83 / 18 & 86 / 25 & 87 / 1 & 92 / 24\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}93 / 16 & 93 / 17 & 96 / 6 & 96 / 18\end{array}$ 98/3 106/2 107/25 108/13 113/23 114/10 115/24 117/10 129/4 129/10 132/15 134/14 142/9
hasn't [3] 72/9 118/10 138/8
$\begin{aligned} & \text { hate [1] } \\ & \text { have [167] } \\ & \text { haven't [1] }\end{aligned} \quad 31 / 24$ $\begin{array}{llll}\text { having } & {[10]} & 40 / 10 & 44 / 11\end{array}$ 46/25 $59 / 16$ 82/18 $85 / 7$ 103/5 110/4 113/24 127/5 HCVAP [4] 83/20 84/12 85/2 133/5
he [66] 7/4 7/6 9/24 $\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 16 & 16 / 20 & 17 / 1 & 18 / 13\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 22 & 23 / 23 & 23 / 23 & 24 / 6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}24 / 8 & 29 / 8 & 39 / 20 & 39 / 21\end{array}$
40/6 40/10 40/13 40/23
41/3 41/24 41/25 42/23
43/20 44/23 44/24 45/8 $\begin{array}{llll}45 / 13 & 45 / 15 & 54 / 18 & 54 / 18\end{array}$ 54/20 54/20 60/17 68/7
68/9 72/4 73/16 79/23
79/23 80/3 86/25 91/13
$\begin{array}{llll}91 / 15 & 91 / 17 & 92 / 8 & 92 / 9\end{array}$
93/13 93/14 93/16 93/18
93/22 94/22 96/4 100/3
$\begin{array}{lllll}100 / 3 & 100 / 4 & 100 / 5 & 104 / 9\end{array}$
104/22 121/8 121/14
121/14 121/24 122/23
133/4
he's [9] 72/12 72/12 87/4
87/14 104/22 121/20
135/14 135/18 135/20
heard [5] 27/19 34/19
44/4 98/3 142/10
hearing [16] 58/17 58/18
$58 / 19 \quad 58 / 23 \quad 59 / 1 \quad 59 / 7$
60/1 70/25 71/3 71/8 72/1
92/19 93/4 93/6 93/6
144/9
hearings [4] 33/10 33/12 58/14 58/15
Heath [3] 73/12 81/6 87/12
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { heavens [1] } & 114 / 3 \\ \text { heavily [1] } & 51 / 13 \\ \text { HEBERT [13] } & 2 / 162 / 17\end{array}$ 73/6 74/22 75/6 77/20 78/18 79/19 80/22 80/25 85/25 141/17 143/7
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { held }[3] & 8 / 19 & 48 / 7 & 81 / 14\end{array}$
help [3] 9/18 62/13
125/13
helpful [6] 5/21 125/21
132/12 132/20 142/15
142/15
helping [1] 43/7
Henry [1] 8/15
her [30] $43 / 1643 / 18$
46/24 46/24 46/24 47/2
47/3 47/16 47/22 52/16
52/18 $52 / 22 \quad 52 / 25 \quad 55 / 17$
55/18 55/20 55/21 59/2
59/3 $59 / 4 \quad 59 / 21 \quad 59 / 22$
60/2 64/22 66/25 68/6
68/6 77/21 78/5 78/7
here [60] $4 / 3$ 4/22 $5 / 25$
$\begin{array}{lllll}6 / 13 & 7 / 8 & 15 / 4 & 16 / 8 & 18 / 19\end{array}$
21/13 $21 / 16$ 22/8 $23 / 22$
$\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 23 & 36 / 6 & 39 / 25 & 40 / 5\end{array}$
41/9 41/13 $51 / 10 \quad 70 / 11$
72/3 84/6 84/24 86/1
87/22 95/3 96/18 96/20
$\begin{array}{llll}98 / 5 & 98 / 22 & 100 / 2 & 100 / 18\end{array}$
103/10 103/17 103/25
105/13 108/7 110/2 110/7
110/19 111/2 114/6 115/15
115/19 117/15 121/23
124/21 $125 / 5 \quad 126 / 22$
$\begin{array}{llll}127 / 11 & 127 / 24 & 129 / 9 & 130 / 7\end{array}$
130/9 131/2 132/2 133/18
133/19 135/14 135/20
Herman [1] 1/19
hers [1] 71/22
hey [1] 41/13
Hidalgo [2] 8/17 141/7


Higginbotham [11] 22/23 23/6 23/7 23/13 24/4 82/23 83/4 83/11 84/13 84/16 85/9
Higginbotham's [1] 23/21 high [3] 22/12 131/8
140/19
higher [3] 22/18 104/12 104/13
highlight [3] 115/17 137/1 138/21
highlighted [1] 105/23
highly [1] 63/24
Hills [1] 56/20
him [19] $7 / 14 \quad 15 / 25$ 19/14
20/2 $39 / 22$ 39/22 $41 / 23$
41/24 42/2 $42 / 3$ 42/4
42/22 60/18 72/8 87/1
87/3 93/19 94/2 96/4
Hinojosa [1] 8/18
hinting [1] 40/7
hire [10] 41/21 42/3
42/20 $45 / 5 \quad 45 / 8 \quad 45 / 9$
80/24 81/2 81/5 96/2
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hired } & {[10]} & 42 / 2 & 42 / 4 & 81 / 8\end{array}$
81/9 81/10 87/11 87/16 87/18 96/7 124/20
hiring [1] 86/9
his [22] $1 / 6$ 7/15 19/25
34/13 $34 / 22$ 40/10 $43 / 20$
51/10 62/22 62/23 71/21
79/3 79/22 80/1 80/2 87/3
87/4 104/10 120/13 121/16 123/19 128/10
Hispanic [35] 18/22 22/13
23/15 25/9 27/2 37/7 $37 / 8$
37/15 37/20 51/11 57/24 83/4 96/16 97/3 97/8
97/14 97/20 106/24 107/8
107/12 107/22 108/2 108/6
110/21 110/22 111/7
$\begin{array}{llll}112 / 19 & 112 / 23 & 128 / 15\end{array}$
129/12 130/4 130/10
130/11 133/18 134/4
Hispanics [2] 39/9 64/5
history [1] 96/9
Hodge [1] 41/2
hold [7] $4 / 5$ 9/18 $17 / 16$
18/5 33/10 58/22 117/17
HOLDER [2] 1/6 118/9
honor [50] 5/14 5/23 6/16
7/2 7/12 13/17 24/22 $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 15 & 29 / 24 & 30 / 7 & 30 / 10\end{array}$ 34/8 60/3 60/5 63/20 72/22 74/5 74/10 74/15 75/21 76/13 79/17 82/9 86/6 86/21 87/5 92/17 94/14 94/17 94/25 95/7 110/14 117/13 117/25 $\begin{array}{llll}118 / 3 & 122 / 6 & 123 / 18 & 124 / 9\end{array}$ 135/13 $136 / 2$ 136/8 $137 / 4$ 137/23 138/13 139/7 139/12 $140 / 8 \quad 140 / 10$ 141/17 142/6
HONORABLES [1] 1/13
Honors [2] 36/9 140/21
hope [2] 21/1 112/13
hopefully [1] 87/8
hot [1] 122/7
hour [1] 82/15
hours [2] $93 / 25 \quad 118 / 12$

$\qquad$



## 


/6
.


| H | $80 / 1680 / 1781 / 248$ | $103 / 18 \quad 104 / 2 \quad 104 / 7104 / 18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| house [52] 4/19 10/23 | $86 / 7$ <br> $89 / 7$ <br> $90 / 10$ <br> $10 / 10$ <br> $1 / 25$ | 106/5 106/8 106/11 106/12 |
| 11/7 15/10 $25 / 15$ 25/20 | 92/17 $92 / 17$ 92/20 $93 / 5$ | 107/11 109/24 110/2 110/5 |
| 25/23 25/24 $26 / 3 \quad 27 / 3$ | 95/13 96/2 99/12 100/6 | 111/1 $112 / 1113 / 2113 / 7$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 20 & 33 / 23 & 33 / 25 & 34 / 2\end{array}$ | 103/7 105/13 108/10 | 113/8 $114 / 10$ 115/5 $115 / 15$ |
| 39/23 40/10 $58 / 17$ 58/19 | 109/21 115/10 117/17 | 116/1 116/6 |
| 60/8 61/20 61/22 62/5 | 117/19 $118 / 8124 / 5 \quad 126 / 4$ | indexes [4] 115/4 115/9 |
| 62/9 62/11 62/14 62/24 | 126/13 127/14 128/23 | 115/13 115/16 |
| 63/3 76/23 $88 / 3$ 96/15 | 128/24 $129 / 9$ 135/22 $136 / 2$ | indicate [2] $15 / 5$ 131/4 |
| 97/2 97/2 97/5 110/19 | 139/1 139/25 140/10 | indicated [1] 132/3 |
| 111/8 112/19 112/22 | 141/19 | indicates [1] 35/6 |
| 117/16 136/10 136/15 | I've [8] 95/17 95/17 | indication [1] 96/8 |
| 136/22 136/23 137/11 | 95/17 95/18 125/1 125/2 | indicators [2] 99/9 99/10 |
| 138/17 $138 / 17139 / 15$ | 134/8 139/1 | indulgence [1] 117/7 |
| 140/4 141/4 $141 / 5141 / 6$ | I-35 [2] 21/16 22/6 | inform [2] 81/21 134/20 |
| 141/8 141/9 | I-N-D-E-X [1] 143/1 | information [5] 79/24 |
| Houston [5] 2/21 8/20 | ID [3] 45/20 45/23 46/7 | 102/22 109/18 11 |
| 48/11 49/6 104/22 | i dea [7] 5/24 39/23 42/1 | 116/13 |
| how [54] 5/24 23/21 26/23 | 52/24 76/22 96/4 111/2 | informed [4] 51/4 63/10 |
| 31/9 35/14 35/22 35/23 | ideal [1] 47/8 | 63/22 63 |
| 42/19 47/25 47/25 52/14 | ideally [1] 93/18 | initial [16] 119/2 119/3 |
| 52/23 53/8 53/14 53/14 | identified [4] 8/12 87/1 | 124/17 125/6 126/1 126/4 |
| 54/4 54/14 64/14 64/19 | 110/20 141/19 | 126/5 126/9 126/10 126/17 |
| 65/17 69/4 71/24 77/8 | identify [8] 68/23 69/15 | 127/12 127/16 127/18 |
| 77/13 82/21 83/13 89/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll}123 / 2 & 123 / 8 & 124 / 3 & 131 / 24\end{array}$ | 127/19 127/21 128/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}92 / 24 & 93 / 13 & 93 / 16 & 93 / 21\end{array}$ | 137/2 141/19 | initially [1] 107/3 |
| 97/7 99/1 100/1 102/4 | IL [1] 1/21 | inquire [2] 135/15 136/3 |
| 102/25 103/18 112/24 | imagination [1] 98/23 | instance [1] 77/14 |
| 126/11 126/15 126/15 | immediately [2] 13/15 | instances [1] 106/24 |
| 126/15 126/16 126/16 | 113/13 | instead [1] 19/9 |
| 126/24 127/6 127/7 127/17 | immigration [1] 32/9 | instruct [1] 71/23 |
| 128/3 $128 / 4 \quad 128 / 4128 / 7$ | impact [9] 15/16 66/7 | instructed [3] 73/13 |
| 132/17 133/11 | 66/10 66/10 66/15 66/21 | 131/23 132/1 |
| HOWELL [2] 1/13 106/21 | 67/3 112/18 113/14 | insulted [1] 117/23 |
| however [1] 137/12 | impeachment [1] 124/10 | intending [1] 129/9 |
| Hubbard [1] 1/20 | implication [1] 86/24 | intent [13] 5/17 22/25 |
| huge [4] 108/16 108/20 | important [19] 98/6 | 136/15 136/20 136/21 |
| 114/4 114/7 | 100/18 100/20 102/20 | 136/25 137/1 $137 / 7137 / 12$ |
| HUGHES [10] 1/18 82/8 | 103/20 104/19 105/7 | 137/15 140/3 141/24 142/2 |
| 109/21 121/4 121/21 | 107/19 110/1 114/9 114/13 | intention [1] 140/20 |
| 122/17 122/19 123/15 | 116/23 124/12 126/23 | intentional [4] 138/4 |
| 143/6 143/10 | 126/25 127/2 131/3 133/16 | 138/6 138/9 140/14 |
| huh [1] 114/22 | 134/12 | interactive [1] 125/12 |
| humble [1] 9/10 | importantly [1] 100/17 | interchangeability [1] |
| hundred [2] 47/9 57/1 | impressed [1] 36/23 | 129/5 |
| HVAP [3] 27/5 27/22 133/5 | impression [4] 10/13 24/8 | interest [10] 65/18 68/24 |
| hypotheticals [1] 99/17 | 25/11 61/3 | 69/1 69/2 69/3 69/7 69/12 |
| I | improvement [2] 116/8 | 69/22 70/1 70/2 |
|  | 116/25 | interested [4] 108/11 |
| I'd [9] 16/12 83/22 84/180 | Inc [1] 2/9 | 108/22 130/24 144/10 |
| 89/6 108/9 118/20 122/2 | include [8] 21/15 21/23 | interesting [4] 108/15 |
| 128/13 139/12 |  | 108/16 128/1 133/9 |
| I'11 [14] 4/5 4/6 4/11 | 138/2 138/6 | interests [1] 69/10 |
| 4/12 39/18 57/20 69/8 | included [11] 13/5 25/12 | interfere [1] 86/1 |
| 72/22 88/20 92/1 100/9 | 26/24 $30 / 22 \quad 61 / 9 \quad 75 / 11$ | Interiano [3] $26 / 4 \quad 39 / 23$ |
| 109/11 117/8 118/14 | 101/2 117/5 126/21 127/15 | 40/5 |
| I'm [99] 4/1 5/7 6/13 | 128/8 | interim [3] 139/24 140/6 |
| 6/15 $7 / 2312 / 1915 / 416 / 6$ | includes [3] 101/1 101/16 | 140/7 [3] 139/24 140/ |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllll}16 / 8 & 18 / 15 & 19 / 2 & 19 / 17\end{array}$ | 133/25 | interlocking [2] 141/15 |
| 20/7 22/3 22/7 $23 / 3 \quad 23 / 19$ | Incorrectly [1] 58/1 | 141/25 |
| 23/21 24/2 24/11 $24 / 13$ | increase [2] 21/24 25/4 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 24 & 27 / 22 & 28 / 18 & 29 / 9\end{array}$ | incumbent [5] 9/21 11/20 | interpreting [1] 23/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 29/16 } & 29 / 20 & 36 / 2 & 36 / 6\end{array}$ | 11/21 16/13 16/16 | interrupted [1] 135/3 |
| 36/23 40/14 41/6 43/25 | indeed [1] 118/11 | interrupting [1] 78/21 |
| 44/2 45/3 49/21 50/16 | independent [2] 54/6 | Intervenor [3] 1/10 2/5 |
|  | 116/21 | 137/9 |
| 58/4 58/24 60/13 60/14 | index [38] 100/23 101/3 | Intervenor-Defendants [1] |
| 60/16 60/20 62/23 62/23 | 101/6 101/9 101/12 101/15 | 1/10 |
| 65/6 65/15 66/19 68/13 | 101/16 $101 / 18$ 102/3 $103 / 5$ | intervenors [6] 6/17 73/2 |
| 69/13 73/22 75/21 78/20 | 103/8 103/16 103/17 | 134/1 137/24 140/25 |


| I | jobs [1] $43 / 3$ 41/23 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| intervenors ${ }^{\text {a }}$. [1] 141/18 | JOHN [13] $1 / 18$ 2/5 $2 / 13$ | 55/1 55/5 56/6 56/7 56/21 |
| interview [1] 41/23 | 6/16 73/3 95/4 95/13 96/1 | 56/23 63/12 64/5 64/5 |
| introduce [1] 95/12 | 121/4 121/21 137/23 | 70/22 71/6 71/7 77/21 |
| invariant [1] 114/24 | 138/12 143/9 | 77/22 |
| involve [3] 101/14 109/12 | Johnson [2] 36/1 36/2 | know [100] $4 / 8$ 4/10 4/17 |
| 125/22 | join [1] 137/10 | 4/23 5/2 5/11 6/11 $7 / 4$ |
| involved [3] 43/13 95/16 | joint [2] 58/17 58/18 | 8/5 9/5 $11 / 1714 / 2415 / 3$ |
| 95/18 | joke [1] 135/21 | $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 5 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 12 & 15 / 19\end{array}$ |
| irregular [1] 80/20 | JOSE [3] 2/11 2/11 5/14 | 24/4 $26 / 2$ 26/22 $27 / 8$ |
| irregularities [1] 80/14 | JOSEPH [1] 2/16 | 28/17 29/20 30/20 30/25 |
| irregularity [1] 80/17 | Journal [1] 89/16 | $35 / 7$ 36/14 38/23 39/3 |
| irrelevant [1] 124/11 | Jr [2] 3/2 3/3 | 39/12 $39 / 13$ 39/19 41/6 |
| is [324] | judge [17] $4 / 8$ 6/3 22/23 | 42/19 42/20 $43 / 18 \quad 43 / 20$ |
| isn't [22] 42/12 43/10 | 23/6 23/7 $23 / 13$ 23/21 |  |
| 51/6 51/9 62/3 69/20 | 24/4 82/22 83/3 83/11 | 50/24 $53 / 6$ 53/6 53/7 $53 / 7$ |
| 89/14 92/3 92/7 94/10 | 84/13 84/16 85/8 106/21 | 53/8 $53 / 9$ 53/12 $53 / 14$ |
| 102/20 108/15 108/22 | 120/3 129/14 | 53/15 54/23 54/24 56/13 |
| 108/23 110/25 111/13 | judges [7] 1/14 6/9 6/11 | 57/5 57/8 57/10 62 |
| 114/6 126/8 $126 / 11128 / 4$ | 39/25 117/15 127/24 | 64/16 66/22 67/13 68/7 |
| 133/7 134/15 | 127/25 | 69/1 $69 / 13$ 71/20 72/8 |
| issue [18] 4/20 40/18 | judgment [3] 26/24 49/11 | 72/9 73/16 79/13 88/11 |
| 43/16 46/3 55/2 55/2 | 49/20 | 90/13 93/2 $94 / 22$ 96/7 |
| 64/13 86/8 86/11 86/15 | judicially [1] 22/24 | 96/24 98/9 101/22 102/5 |
| 96/15 96/20 97/5 111/7 | June [3] 29/13 92/6 93/6 | 102/17 103/12 109/23 |
| 114/6 136/9 136/11 136/21 | juos [1] 129/15 | 110/5 110/7 110/8 114/1 |
| issued [1] 61/8 | jurisdictions [2] 95/20 | 115/18 116/18 116/23 |
| issues [5] 5/17 45/17 | 127/9 | 118/8 120/10 121/18 122/2 |
| 47/4 127/24 134/8 | jury [1] 6/9 | 122/4 123/4 125/4 125/11 |
| it [311] | just [74] 4/3 4/12 4/23 | 128/22 136/16 142/9 |
| it's [97] 8/5 12/13 14/23 | 5/7 5/9 5/13 8/11 10/4 | 142/14 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 19 & 22 / 10 & 27 / 21 & 29 / 23\end{array}$ | 10/9 13/7 $13 / 8$ 14/24 | knowing [2] 56/23 56/24 |
| $31 / 23$ 36/8 36/20 37/19 | 18/12 $19 / 619 / 19 / 19$ 23/21 | knowledge [2] 9/12 38/22 |
| 40/11 49/12 $53 / 5$ 57/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 14 & 31 / 7 & 33 / 8 & 34 / 14\end{array}$ | known [1] 63/23 |
| 57/14 $57 / 17 \quad 60 / 11 \quad 60 / 14$ | 37/2 $38 / 13$ 43/4 48/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { knows [2] } & \text { 53/12 } & \text { 53/13 }\end{array}$ |
| 63/16 66/14 66/17 66/20 | $\begin{array}{llll}48 / 21 & 53 / 6 & 54 / 22 & 57 / 25\end{array}$ | L |
| 73/13 75/22 75/24 79/5 | 60/17 63/5 63/12 63/16 | L |
| 83/22 85/6 86/5 87/4 | 65/20 73/5 76/3 81/8 | 7abe7ed [2] 29/23 30/4 |
| 92/23 92/25 94/11 99/13 | 83/22 84/21 86/1 86/5 | 1aid [2] 92/20 125/23 |
| 100/15 100/17 100/20 | 86/9 91/6 92/9 92/9 95/22 | Lake [1] 59/16 |
| 101/2 101/6 102/5 103/7 | 96/11 99/4 100/3 101/24 | 1 anguage [1] 32/5 |
| 103/8 104/2 104/6 104/12 | 102/11 102/14 103/10 | Laredo [1] 8/15 |
| 105/7 105/13 105/21 106/1 | 105/13 105/21 106/21 | large [1] 101/12 |
| 106/7 107/5 107/19 110/4 | 110/17 112/25 113/12 | largely [5] 56/15 63/8 |
| 111/14 111/20 113/4 113/6 | 113/17 $115 / 6115 / 7116 / 16$ | 63/14 63/19 73/17 |
| 113/11 113/14 114/13 | 118/20 127/1 128/21 | larger [2] 101/9 139/19 |
| 114/18 114/24 115/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}129 / 25 & 131 / 11 & 133 / 1\end{array}$ | 1 argest [1] 56/11 |
| 115/25 116/1 116/1 116/1 | 134/10 134/21 134/23 | Larson [1] 87/11 |
| 116/23 $117 / 23118 / 9$ | 139/3 141/11 141/24 | 1ast [20] 6 6/18 8/19 18/17 |
| 118/10 122/5 123/22 | Justice [10] 2/3 88/5 | 33/23 34/16 38/25 44/13 |
| 125/24 127/19 128/1 | 96/21 97/13 97/18 97/25 | 91/21 93/1 100/13 105/6 |
| 130/18 131/2 131/7 132/11 | 125/4 125/8 $133 / 25$ 138/1 | 105/8 105/8 108/14 108/24 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}132 / 12 & 133 / 9 & 133 / 15\end{array}$ | Justice's [2] 97/20 | 118/13 119/25 120/1 |
| 133/16 133/23 134/12 | 126/23 | 120/10 120/17 |
| 134/16 134/16 134/24 | justification [2] 75/15 | 7ate [2] 4/2 42/7 |
| 134/24 135/3 $135 / 6135 / 7$ | 75/18 | 1ater [1] 119/9 |
| 135/23 139/19 142/15 |  | Latin [2] 140/11 142/7 |
|  | K | Latin-American [2] 140/11 |
| 124/17 124/18 124/20 | Karina [8] 43/2 43/3 | 142/7 |
| 138/10 141/15 | 43/10 43/21 44/9 70/7 | Latino [46] 7/13 8/8 8/10 |
| itself [1] 75/22 | 70/11 71/18 | 8/12 9/3 9/3 11/11 11/12 |
| J | keep [6] 4/9 10/8 10/18 | 13/24 14/11 16/25 18/25 |
|  | 28/24 32/4 100/21 | 19/3 19/8 19/11 20/20 |
| Jackson [2] 35/15 86/18 | Ke1 [3] 7/3 7/10 143/5 | 21/4 21/10 21/17 21/23 |
| January [10] 1/6 46/18 | KELLER [2] 1/18 135/13 | 22/5 25/11 28/12 $28 / 15$ |
| 119/18 120/7 120/10 | kind [8] 51/2 62/3 107/22 |  |
| 120/21 120/24 122/10 | 114/24 114/25 116/13 | $31 / 20 \quad 31 / 25 \quad 32 / 12 \quad 32 / 17$ |
| 123/22 144/12 | 129/15 134/23 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { jest } & {[1]} & 78 / 22 & \\ \text { job [6] } & 10 / 4 & 10 / 8 & 31 / 25\end{array}$ | kinds [3] 103/9 103/13 | 49/8 $49 / 18$ 51/1 $63 / 24$ |
| job [6] 10/4 10/8 31/25 | 116/10 | 66/15 67/1 138/19 140/19 |


| L | 98/15 | 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | light [2] 5/3 89/22 | looks [8] 49 |
| Latino... [2] 140/24 | lightning [1] 138/10 | 113/5 113/17 |
| 141/12 | 1ike [29] 4/14 15/8 16/12 | 113/21 119/3 127/4 |
| Latinos [11] 8/25 31/24 | 26/22 28/24 32/5 34/25 | 1ose [1] 11/23 |
| 32/10 35/11 $49 / 23$ 50/11 | 56/19 65/18 74/20 76/5 | loses [1] 98/16 |
| 50/19 51/14 57/10 62/1 | 80/18 83/5 83/22 84/18 | loss [1] 30/23 |
| 137/21 | 89/6 98/19 103/7 105/1 | 1ost [5] $519 / 17$ 31/3 38/15 |
| law [9] 2/11 3/2 41/4 | 108/21 109/18 118/20 | 38/18 139/1 |
| 81/5 86/9 86/16 86/22 | 119/3 120/16 123/16 127/4 | 1ot [10] 27/8 46/15 47/4 |
| 87/17 88/5 | 128/13 129/15 133/6 | 54/6 54/14 62/12 65/25 |
| 1awyer [3] 36/20 79/11 | $7 \mathrm{l} \mathrm{l}^{\prime}$ ly [2] 54/19 54/21 | 107/18 127/1 132/7 |
| 120/3 | 1ine [18] 9/10 32/23 | 1ovely [1] 19/23 |
| lawyers [4] 39/23 41/4 | 32/23 38/3 60/13 63/6 | Loving [2] 15/9 20/11 |
| 88/13 103/12 | 76/3 97/11 97/13 97/14 | low [2] 92/25 140/19 |
| 7ay [1] 93/5 | 97/15 107/25 115/20 123/8 | LRB [3] 61/17 75/19 76/15 |
| 1ayman [3] 49/10 49/12 | 130/17 130/19 130/22 | Lucio [1] 29/11 |
| 50/24 | 131/16 | Luckily [1] 4/18 |
| layman's [2] 14/22 14/23 | lines [5] 12/11 17/22 | LUIS [4] 3/2 3/2 140/10 |
| lead [3] 76/1 76/2 112/18 | 19/20 21/2 123/24 | 142/6 ${ }^{\text {[ }}$ |
| leading [1] 76/2 | 1ist [6] 4/15 5/2 136/3 | LULAC [2] 12/23 89/3 |
| 1eads [1] 112/21 | 136/6 139/9 139/12 | LULAC's [1] |
| League [2] 140/11 142/7 | 1isted [3] 41/4 138/1 | 1unch [1] 135/4 |
| 7earn [1] 57/17 | 139/17 | Luncheon [1] 142/18 |
| 1east [15] 23/23 32/25 | 1isten [2] $39 / 17$ 135/18 | M |
| 47/21 $60 / 23$ 65/3 $101 / 4$ | 1ittle [15] 13/7 13/8 | M |
| 103/5 107/5 107/25 108/3 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 8 & 15 / 5 & 19 / 19 & 37 / 4\end{array}$ | ma'am [34] 7/16 8/22 9/1 |
| 108/6 113/14 124/22 | 57/19 83/23 88/20 106/7 | 9/20 $9 / 2510 / 17$ 11/1 $11 / 8$ |
| 129/22 134/8 | 106/7 108/21 115/7 125/7 | 11/21 12/1 13/6 13/12 |
| 1eave [5] 4/3 4/7 19/14 | 135/7 |  |
| 40/10 86/1 | Tive [3] 69/6 69/8 69/13 | 16/15 18/1 18/14 19/1 |
| Lee [2] 35/15 86/18 | 7ives [2] 18/12 19/22 | 22/20 25/21 26/10 26/19 |
| 1 eft [2] 20/3 97/16 | living [1] 35/7 | 28/23 31/5 32/7 33/3 |
| legal [28] 2/8 15/19 16/5 | LLP [2] 1/19 2/14 | 47/10 53/1 66/6 67/5 79/8 |
| 21/13 26/16 26/23 26/23 | localities [1] 95/17 | 82/4 |
| 27/16 27/17 48/3 48/24 | 1ocated [1] 59/10 | machine [1] 3/9 |
| 49/11 49/20 50/1 50/23 | logical [1] 9/12 | made [13] 10/14 15/24 |
| 51/4 52/5 73/9 81/22 | 1ong [6] 24/14 53/4 92/24 | 17/13 $34 / 17$ 48/19 55/17 |
| 85/13 85/17 85/19 85/21 | 118/10 129/22 129/25 | 73/16 80/6 80/10 97/6 |
| 87/17 87/25 111/17 124/20 | 1onger [5] 19/7 31/7 | 97/12 106/2 137/13 |
| 128/20 | 115/23 115/24 126/25 | mail [5] 41/5 41/7 44/10 |
| 1egality [1] 49/19 | 1ook [68] 9 9/8 10/20 16/2 | 70/11 72/9 |
| 1egislative [11] 5/14 | $\begin{array}{llll}16 / 11 & 20 / 24 & 21 / 2 & 22 / 1\end{array}$ | maintain [2] 50/8 83/9 |
| 36/7 76/16 76/17 76/19 | 22/10 22/16 25/4 28/25 | maintained [2] 15/13 |
| 76/20 77/3 77/4 77/18 | 32/22 36/19 37/11 37/18 | 51/22 |
| 137/10 138/12 | 40/4 48/12 $54 / 24$ 64/8 | major [1] 55/6 |
| 1egislature [5] 42/ | 64/13 64/19 64/22 64/25 | majority [37] 11/12 18/25 |
| 45/23 58/22 76/19 77/2 | 65/5 65/12 83/14 83/23 | 19/3 19/8 $21 / 181822 / 6$ |
| 1ength [3] 117/22 117/23 | 84/18 $91 / 8$ 97/3 $97 / 4 \quad 97 / 7$ | 23/23 28/12 $32 / 13$ 37/23 |
| 123/5 | 97/9 97/10 98/24 102/1 | 45/8 49/8 49/8 49/12 |
| 1ess [2] 113/19 113/24 | 102/2 103/9 103/25 104/4 | 49/14 49/17 51/14 52/3 |
| let [15] 6/9 12/18 19/6 | 107/10 107/24 108/17 | 52/5 57/5 57/24 68/21 |
| 21/20 28/2 38/14 54/22 | 108/24 109/12 113/12 | 77/15 89/18 97/14 107/21 |
| 54/24 67/17 87/3 92/4 | 113/12 115/7 115/20 116/2 | 115/23 128/25 129/2 |
| 104/24 112/25 117/20 | 116/4 116/9 116/15 116/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}129 / 10 & 130 / 1 & 130 / 2 & 130 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 131/14 | 116/19 120/16 126/14 | 130/14 130/22 132/9 |
| 1et's [23] 4/17 52/12 | 128/21 130/6 131/17 132/4 | 141/12 |
| 66/22 96/11 96/24 98/21 | 132/16 132/19 132/20 | majority/minority [2] |
| 98/23 98/24 98/25 102/23 | 133/19 134/1 134/5 134/7 | 89/18 132/9 |
| 108/17 115/7 115/8 115/9 | 1ooked [17] 5/16 12/3 | make [36] 4/7 9/15 10/20 |
| 115/10 115/11 120/13 |  |  |
| 124/14 133/18 $133 / 20$ | 13/20 21/14 $21 / 21 \quad 22 / 3$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 14 & 20 / 2 & 21 / 10 & 22 / 8\end{array}$ |
| 134/7 134/7 134/23 | 27/8 27/20 27/21 55/24 |  |
| 1etter [4] 59/3 75/7 | 85/7 96/24 101/18 | 84/7 $89 / 22$ 92/5 99/10 |
| 75/11 75/15 | 10oking [27] 17/15 31/7 | 100/18 103/23 104/25 |
| letting [2] 115/13 127/5 | 31/8 55/23 84/20 92/21 | 105/19 109/4 115/9 115/10 |
| 1evel [4] 43/15 112/3 | 97/15 103/17 108/4 108/9 | 115/11 115/11 115/12 |
| 129/21 129/22 | 108/14 109/6 109/7 111/9 | 116/15 $122 / 3$ 125/1 $125 / 3$ |
| 1evels [2] 83/10 129/18 | 112/5 112/15 $121 / 23$ 125/9 | 127/3 128/22 132/20 |
| 1 iberal [1] 96/3 | 126/4 129/16 $130 / 7130 / 9$ | makes [1] 107/17 |
| 1ieutenant [2] 42/23 | 130/12 131/9 134/4 $134 / 18$ | making [4] 10/2 22/4 |


| M | $\begin{array}{lllll} \hline 31 / 20 & 35 / 16 & 38 / 14 & 42 / 20 \\ 44 / 8 & 48 / 21 & 49 / 19 & 50 / 16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 15 & 17 / 24 & 22 / 25 & 28 / 24\end{array}$ 32/16 32/18 33/1 120/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| making... [2] 55/20 | 53/5 53/11 54/22 54/25 | minorities [13] 38/5 38/6 |
| 135/21 | 65/19 67/17 68/23 71/11 | 44/25 46/6 46/6 48/13 |
| MALC [1] 137/12 | 74/10 78/20 80/1 81/21 | 53/21 57/7 57/24 61/10 |
| man [1] 53/3 | 83/12 85/10 85/21 85/22 | 61/13 61/25 6 |
| many [7] 31/9 35/14 35/22 | 92/4 93/21 95/1 96/2 96/7 | minority [61] 26/13 27/3 |
| 35/23 77/8 77/13 138/13 | 104/24 105/13 108/13 | 27/7 $36 / 11 \quad 37 / 23$ 38/5 |
| map [97] 10/18 10/23 | 109/22 109/23 111/21 | 38/7 38/9 38/11 44/19 |
| 15/18 $16 / 7$ 18/20 19/2 | 112/21 112/25 113/21 | 45/8 45/14 48/5 48/8 |
| 20/1 $21 / 13$ 22/15 $25 / 2$ | 116/16 117/21 118/15 | 48/20 48/22 49/1 49/4 |
| 25/9 25/15 25/18 25/19 | 121/14 122/12 $123 / 7124 / 4$ | 49/12 $49 / 14$ 51/1 51/13 |
| 25/25 26/25 27/10 27/10 | 124/21 131/14 $132 / 25$ | 52/3 52/5 52/8 54/7 54/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll} & 28 / 2 & 28 / 25 & 29 / 5 & 29 / 9 & 30 / 1\end{array}$ | 133/9 134/24 136/6 139/9 | 56/21 56/25 58/22 59/12 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 13 & 30 / 14 & 30 / 14 & 33 / 19\end{array}$ | 144/4 | 60/6 62/15 62/20 63/1 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 33 / 25 & 34 / 2 & 35 / 2 & 36 / 6 & 36 / 8\end{array}$ | meager [1] 9/12 | 65/10 71/15 75/3 88/9 |
| 38/1 38/7 39/14 39/24 | mean [28] 5/6 6/12 15/8 | 89/18 89/18 89/21 90/17 |
| 54/16 59/24 61/22 61/25 | 23/9 38/6 38/6 50/13 | 101/15 101/17 109/8 |
| 62/5 62/5 62/14 62/17 | 50/25 53/10 61/3 76/1 | 109/13 128/15 128/18 |
| 68/1 68/4 68/7 68/7 68/11 | 98/23 98/24 100/20 102/17 | 129/17 130/14 131/24 |
| 68/15 68/25 73/19 73/19 | 102/20 102/21 104/9 | 132/9 $133 / 14134 / 10$ |
| 74/21 75/4 75/7 75/8 | 108/10 108/21 111/12 | 134/18 137/5 137/6 138/3 |
| 75/11 75/16 75/17 75/19 | 111/13 123/4 129/7 129/8 | 138/19 139/22 |
| 76/18 76/19 76/19 76/23 | 130/24 131/15 133/9 | minus [2] 47/12 47/13 |
| 76/23 76/25 77/1 77/5 | means [3] 72/15 104/17 | minute [9] 4/24 5/1 5/7 |
| 79/1 79/5 80/13 80/13 | 113/6 | 31/17 39/15 95/1 98/21 |
| 80/19 83/8 85/11 85/12 | meant [5] 32/18 46/16 | 103/18 136/7 |
| 85/13 85/16 85/19 85/21 | 111/24 123/5 130/1 | minutes [10] 4/2 4/6 82/3 |
| 86/16 86/19 88/3 88/8 | measure [2] 127/21 131/23 | 86/3 87/8 94/23 94/24 |
| 91/1 $92 / 7$ 94/4 $94 / 9$ 97/2 | measured [3] 126/8 126/11 | 117/8 117/11 135/16 |
| 97/2 97/5 98/12 112/19 | 127/17 | miss [1] 102/3 |
| 117/4 117/4 136/16 | measures [1] 127/19 | missed [3] 139/9 139/10 |
| maps [19] 26/3 27/11 | meet [3] 10/1 118/11 | 139/25 |
| 41/18 46/10 46/14 46/20 | 137/14 | missing [2] 133/6 133/12 |
| 46/20 65/15 67/22 68/14 | meeting [3] 17/14 73/3 | misspoke [1] 38/17 |
| 80/7 80/14 81/20 81/20 | 73/4 | misunderstanding [1] |
| 83/19 96/15 96/23 96/25 | MELLETT [1] 2/ | 107/6 |
| 97/24 | member [5] 81/11 81/15 | mobilize [1] 64/22 |
| margin [2] 16/20 16/21 | 98/20 109/7 111/6 | modern [1] 99/15 |
| Mario [1] 44/20 | members [11] 42/1 44/19 | moment [5] 4/12 20/10 |
| mark [1] 102/21 | 45/3 45/14 48/5 58/22 | 31/23 74/11 122 |
| marked [2] 34/14 60/10 | 61/22 77/10 80/23 81/9 | money [2] 64/19 65/17 |
| Maryland [1] 15/6 | 138/25 | monitor [1] 12/19 |
| match [1] 20/2 | mention [1] 142/6 | more [41] 15/25 20/22 |
| matched [1] 18/3 | mentioned [5] 6/18 32/8 | 25/8 25/9 25/11 25/11 |
| material [1] 122/20 | 125/17 133/2 138/14 | $31 / 15$ 31/23 32/2 33/5 |
| materials [2] 125/11 | merely [1] 86/23 | 55/17 55/20 57/1 63/16 |
| 125/20 | merits [1] 31/5 | 66/16 67/2 67/4 100/8 |
| matter [5] 4/5 24/14 | meshed [1] 125/19 | 101/9 101/14 103/9 106/8 |
| 103/21 139/14 144/6 | mess [2] 62/4 62/5 | 108/16 108/16 108/18 |
| matters [2] 43/16 128/6 | met [1] 27/17 | 109/25 110/2 110/3 110/8 |
| MATTHEW [1] 1/23 | methodology [4] 124/18 | 110/9 110/17 110/19 |
| Maverick [5] 13/7 13/11 | 125/25 126/3 126/7 | 110/22 114/2 116/11 |
| 13/13 13/15 15/12 | methods [1] 121/9 | 118/13 120/14 124/12 |
| may [25] 7/14 31/11 33/15 | Mexican [3] 2/8 5/14 | 125/18 125/22 139/11 |
| 34/8 38/17 45/15 46/18 | 137/9 | morning [16] 4/1 6/16 |
| 47/20 49/13 49/14 63/20 | Mexican-American [1] | 7/11 7/12 7/19 7/20 7/21 |
| 71/1 71/6 74/13 79/15 | 137/9 | 8/5 72/23 74/18 74/19 |
| 89/16 95/5 100/5 101/13 | Michae1 [1] 73/11 | 82/6 94/4 95/10 95/11 |
| 105/6 109/7 110/9 123/18 | Midland [1] 58/11 | 122/5 |
| 128/5 131/19 | might [24] 5/5 5/8 11/23 | Morrison [6] 73/11 91/23 |
| maybe [15] 44/5 67/1 | 13/17 15/23 15/24 26/21 | 92/3 92/8 93/9 93/11 |
| 86/24 87/23 92/19 94/25 | 32/9 38/20 39/2 60/24 | MORTARA [1] 1/17 |
| 101/25 102/4 112/25 | 78/2 78/11 96/8 98/8 | most [33] 5/21 25/1 |
| 124/22 131/15 $131 / 21$ | 103/23 104/7 105/12 | 25/19 50/2 $53 / 20$ 55/21 |
| 132/19 134/15 134/24 | 113/22 118/20 123/14 | 69/6 98/6 100/17 101/19 |
| me [73] $6 / 8$ 6/13 $8 / 6$ 8/9 | 126/16 131/9 132/7 | 101/20 102/1 102/6 106/4 |
| 8/23 $12 / 18$ 17/13 19/4 | miles [1] 57/1 | 106/12 106/20 108/18 |
| 19/6 19/9 19/18 20/7 | Military [1] 2/6 | 108/24 108/24 109/2 |
| 20/13 20/18 $21 / 20 \quad 23 / 3$ | miliion [2] $35 / 6 \quad 35 / 11$ | 109/12 109/14 112/13 |
| 23/19 26/21 27/9 28/2 | mind [10] 6/12 14/13 | 113/9 113/10 113/15 |


| M | Ms [2] $6 / 22 \quad 143 / 6$ | new [22] 13/25 13/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| most. .. [7] 113/20 114/13 |  |  |
| 116/7 116/10 116/10 | Ms. Perales [4] 24/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 22 / 6 & 25 / 3 & 28 / 8 & 32 / 17\end{array}$ |
| 125/21 127/8 | 82/16 125/13 141/24 | 37/23 41/15 $66 / 18 \quad 66 / 21$ |
| Mostly [1] 58/8 | Ms. White [1] 4/7 | 67/4 124/20 128/15 128/18 |
| motivated [1] 138/16 | much [17] 10/14 17/8 | news [1] 44/13 |
| motivation [7] 32/20 | 25/12 34/6 64/19 65/17 | next [12] 4/14 7/1 17/22 |
| 62/11 62/22 62/23 66/12 | 72/19 76/5 98/19 99/1 | 70/10 70/25 85/25 90/10 |
| 69/24 71/22 | 100/21 103/19 113/19 | 91/5 92/15 92/16 113/12 |
| motivator [1] 67/6 | 116/11 122/3 122/15 | 126/25 |
| Movant [1] 3/2 | 133/23 | nice [5] 4/21 73/3 73/4 |
| move [5] 104/20 107/3 | multi [2] 109/7 111/6 | 96/3 118/9 |
| 124/12 125/17 132/10 | multi-member [2] 109/7 | night [2] |
| moved [6] 33/19 56/20 | 111/6 | NINA [3] 2/7 7/13 140/24 |
| 66/16 66/16 67/2 79/1 | muster [1] 27/17 | nine [1] 116/6 |
| moving [5] 8/13 33/8 56/7 | my [55] 5/6 9/5 9/11 | Nineteen [1] 94/24 |
| 56/12 122/ | 22/21 22/25 23/14 23/18 | no [95] 1/4 7/22 13/8 |
| Mr [14] 16/16 26/5 30/12 | 24/8 25/11 $26 / 5 \quad 26 / 24$ | 14/6 14/7 16/3 18/17 19/7 |
| 41/12 73/5 73/9 81/6 | 33/23 36/22 39/17 41/1 | 20/7 20/24 22/20 23/7 |
| 87/23 139/25 143/6 143/7 |  | 25/13 26/19 28/18 31/5 |
| 143/7 143/10 143/10 | 50/1 53/21 53/24 54/23 |  |
| Mr. [63] 6/15 10/2 10/15 | 56/8 $73 / 13$ 74/11 83/7 | 36/23 38/6 38/20 38/22 |
| 11/10 $11 / 13$ 11/18 $11 / 23$ | 86/1 86/22 87/7 94/24 | 39/2 39/7 39/10 40/3 |
| 14/11 14/13 $15 / 1615 / 22$ | 101/4 101/6 101/11 103/7 | 41/24 42/4 42/10 42/11 |
| 16/16 16/19 16/24 17/16 | 103/15 104/25 105/4 | 43/23 45/20 46/16 48/23 |
| 18/12 $19 / 12$ 19/22 $39 / 23$ | 105/17 109/1 109/17 | 49/20 50/7 $53 / 1 \quad 53 / 11$ |
| 39/23 40/2 40/5 41/18 | 110/10 110/10 111/22 | 54/1 54/1 54/1 54/17 |
| 41/21 42/19 44/9 44/15 | 112/4 117/5 118/13 124/2 | 55/16 56/15 57/12 $59 / 14$ |
| 46/20 54/18 54/22 54/23 | 124/23 125/24 126/4 126/7 | 59/18 59/20 60/7 61/7 |
| 68/9 70/14 71/19 71/23 | 134/16 $135 / 13144 / 3$ | 64/11 64/15 64/18 64/21 |
| 72/3 72/9 72/21 73/13 | myself [2] 6/9 134/9 | 64/24 65/11 65/13 65/18 |
| 74/22 75/6 77/20 78/18 | N | 67/5 69/17 $69 / 19$ 70/4 |
| 79/19 80/2 80/6 80/22 | N | 70/14 71/17 72/13 73/25 |
| 80/25 82/8 85/25 87/12 | name [2] 121/16 135/10 | 80/21 84/8 85/22 87/21 |
| 92/3 93/9 93/11 109/21 | named [1] 42/7 | 88/7 88/16 88/24 89/7 |
| 117/14 118/7 121/25 | names [1] 91/8 | 94/11 94/12 94/14 94/14 |
| 122/17 122/19 123/15 | NAPIER [2] 1/22 41/9 | 111/18 111/18 113/3 |
| 123/21 135/3 | naturally [1] 139/22 | 115/23 115/24 117/25 |
| Mr. Canseco [9] 10/2 | near [1] 32/23 | 121/20 127/12 128/5 |
| 10/15 11/10 $11 / 1311 / 18$ | nearly [1] 52/22 | 131/16 $135 / 20 \quad 136 / 6$ |
| 11/23 14/11 $14 / 1315 / 22$ | necessarily [4] 27/15 | 136/12 139/3 139/3 |
| Mr. Canseco's [1] 15/16 | 100/14 100/14 130/6 | nobody [4] 14/2 68/4 |
| Mr. Davis [13] 40/2 41/21 | necessary [1] 95/1 | 93/16 130/23 |
| 42/19 44/15 46/20 54/18 | need [20] 4/2 5/2 6/3 | nominated [1] 15/17 |
| 54/22 54/23 68/9 71/23 | 6/10 6/11 15/1 24/14 | non [1] 33/1 |
| 73/13 80/2 80/6 | 30/13 31/3 39/17 47/22 | non-required [1] |
| Mr. Devaney [2] 6/15 | 53/9 53/18 77/8 97/9 | none [3] 35/25 71/6 71/14 |
| 72/21 | 109/10 112/4 116/18 | nonetheless [1] 40/24 |
| Mr. Doug [2] 41/18 44/9 | 117/21 136/17 | noon [2] 4/15 5/2 |
| Mr. Downton [1] 39/23 | needed [2] 23/15 131/15 | normal [1] 103 |
| Mr. Farenthold [6] 16/16 | needs [3] 4/16 6/11 69/10 | normally [2] 110/6 122/14 |
| 16/19 16/24 17/16 18/12 | negative [1] 127/14 | north [10] $15 / 4 \quad 15 / 6$ 15/7 |
| 19/22 | negotiated [1] 94/23 | 17/8 17/10 19/13 20/10 |
| Mr. Farenthold's [1] | neighborhood [4] 19/12 | 30/9 63/22 64/6 |
| 19/12 | 19/25 63/15 63/17 | northeast [1] 139 |
| Mr. Hanna [4] 70/14 71/19 | neighborhoods [7] 56/21 | northeastern [1] 140/7 |
| 72/3 72/9 | 63/1 63/7 63/8 63/23 67/1 | northern [3] 18/4 20/2 |
| Mr. Heath [1] 87/12 | 67/2 | 20/16 |
| Mr. Hebert [8] 74/22 75/6 | neighboring [1] 13/10 | northwest [2] 13/14 13/16 |
| 77/20 78/18 79/19 80/22 | neither [4] 50/10 50/19 | not [159] |
| 80/25 85/25 | 51/13 144/7 | note [4] 13/13 90/19 |
| Mr. Hughes [5] 82/8 | Ne1son [1] 67/22 | 105/7 138/18 |
| 109/21 122/17 122/19 | Nelson's [4] 47/1 47/3 | notes [2] 90 |
| 123/15 | 64/4 68/15 | nothing [5] 50/16 70/24 |
| $\underset{40 / 5}{\mathrm{Mr}} \mathrm{m}^{\text {In }}$ Interiano [2] 39/23 | net [2] 116/23 116/24 | 72/17 87/1 $112 / 11$ |
| 40/5 | nets [1] 110/23 | noticed [1] 34/16 |
| Mr. Morrison [3] 92/3 | never [15] 4/8 6/12 21/8 | noting [1] 90/15 |
| 93/9 93/11 | 21/14 21/21 26/18 41/16 | notion [2] 103/4 129/14 |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}\mathrm{Mr} & \text { Sells } & \text { [5] } & 117 / 14 \\ 118 / 7 & 121 / 25 & 123 / 21 & 135 / 3\end{array}$ | $42 / 9 \quad 43 / 15 \quad 56 / 10 \quad 69 / 18$ 70/1 70/22 94/4 120/2 | notwi thstanding [4] 69/25 75/16 90/24 91/1 |

offsets [2] 127/6 141/3 often [1] 109/4
oh [5] 13/8 13/19 60/16 94/24 135/22
okay [56] 4/6 9/7 9/9
$\begin{array}{llll}9 / 14 & 11 / 20 & 12 / 12 & 12 / 18\end{array}$
16/4 $17 / 23$ 19/21 $121 / 3$
24/2 24/15 29/25 31/2
33/8 40/14 40/17 42/5
43/24 46/19 53/23 60/16
63/12 68/14 75/24 76/2
$78 / 7$ 79/6 81/24 82/3 83/8
83/13 83/18 84/5 84/9
84/23 85/7 86/20 87/14 87/24 88/17 89/4 91/4
106/13 111/11 117/6
118/16 118/20 119/24
120/9 135/1 135/23 136/8 137/22 139/8
old [2] 37/2 109/18
once [3] 77/12 97/2 97/19
one [76] $4 / 18$ 5/8 8/19
$\begin{array}{llllll}11 / 4 & 12 / 25 & 14 / 4 & 14 / 7 & 16 / 9\end{array}$
20/8 25/23 27/21 28/15 33/14 36/3 41/15 43/4
43/7 44/5 46/10 46/21
46/23 47/5 47/21 47/21
49/5 55/6 55/20 59/10
60/23 63/10 63/13 63/14
67/21 69/5 69/8 69/20
69/22 74/10 81/14 82/20
86/11 91/21 93/11 93/25
$\begin{array}{llll}96 / 1 & 100 / 17 & 102 / 24 & 102 / 24\end{array}$
103/5 103/23 105/17
107/17 107/17 107/25
108/1 $108 / 3$ 108/6 $114 / 17$
116/14 116/17 120/14
123/21 127/19 129/4
129/15 129/15 130/14
131/9 131/10 132/4 133/1
133/7 134/8 134/9 137/14 137/14
ones [7] $4 / 23 \quad 26 / 5 \quad 48 / 5$
66/3 $97 / 16$ 111/12 $111 / 14$
on1y [29] $4 / 18 \quad 28 / 15 \quad 36 / 3$ 37/14 37/19 38/25 43/7 45/7 48/7 51/11 57/17 59/10 59/21 59/25 60/2 61/24 63/13 63/14 69/24 81/14 88/22 102/18 102/24 109/12 $110 / 1$ 110/18
130/10 137/2 140/17
000 [1] 142/19
Oops [1] 120/2
open [1] 117/21
operated [1] 44/15
operating [1] 62/3
opinion [3] 27/16 31/23 32/2
opponent [1] 52/22
opportunity [34] 7/6 8/8 $8 / 10 \quad 8 / 12 \quad 8 / 25 \quad 9 / 3 \quad 10 / 8$
$10 / 16 \quad 13 / 24 \quad 17 / 20 \quad 17 / 21$
17/24 18/9 30/24 31/10
$\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 11 & 32 / 17 & 33 / 1 & 39 / 18\end{array}$
51/22 65/10 90/17 93/17
129/3 129/6 129/14 129/16
131/3 131/6 131/7 131/8
131/11 134/4 134/6
oppose [1] 80/10
opposed [3] 61/11 76/9

97/16
order [6] $4 / 5$ 10/8 $47 / 22$ 49/4 49/8 77/9
organizationa1 [1] 45/8
Ortez [1] 16/17
other [33] 5/25 27/23
$33 / 23 \quad 37 / 8 \quad 40 / 18 \quad 44 / 25$
51/10 60/5 68/14 69/7
69/7 69/10 71/9 71/12
71/14 75/2 77/23 77/25
81/15 81/16 93/2 99/8
101/17 103/20 109/21
112/2 112/9 115/2 115/17 125/20 127/16 130/16 140/21
others [3] 56/20 125/14 138/14
otherwise [4] 73/21 73/23 73/24 144/10
our [20] 23/1 23/6 23/25
27/16 41/14 45/7 79/23
90/4 90/18 98/23 102/5
107/18 115/7 117/24 121/9
129/11 129/12 135/17
141/18 141/20
ourselves [1] 10/4
out [89] 4/2 4/4 4/9 5/5 5/7 8/2 8/15 8/16 8/17 $\begin{array}{lllll}8 / 18 & 9 / 4 & 9 / 15 & 9 / 17 & 14 / 4\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}15 / 1 & 17 / 9 & 18 / 10 & 19 / 6\end{array}$ 19/10 19/18 $23 / 21$ 28/13 $\begin{array}{lllll}28 / 15 & 28 / 21 & 29 / 14 & 29 / 18\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}31 / 25 & 32 / 3 & 32 / 10 & 39 / 2\end{array}$ 47/17 $50 / 18 \quad 52 / 20 \quad 54 / 5$ 55/21 55/23 55/24 55/25 56/12 56/20 59/2 59/17 64/1 64/6 64/16 65/6 $65 / 18$ 65/21 66/1 66/1 66/8 66/8 66/16 66/18 66/22 66/24 66/25 67/3 67/8 71/4 76/23 79/1 79/3 80/14 $86 / 25 \quad 97 / 16 \quad 98 / 17$ 101/21 104/16 104/21 $\begin{array}{llll}105 / 3 & 105 / 3 & 105 / 6 & 107 / 15\end{array}$ 107/21 111/23 115/21 122/11 122/13 123/12 125/23 129/22 130/24 132/13 132/24 132/24 135/7 140/18 140/20
outcome [5] 20/21 20/23 21/5 115/15 144/10
output [2] 83/15 84/9
outright [2] 128/25 130/1
outside [ 8 ] 80/24 81/2 81/8 81/13 86/21 86/25 87/18 93/11
over $[30] \quad 8 / 20 \quad 11 / 7 \quad 17 / 22$ 18/21 $27 / 10 \quad 32 / 23 \quad 33 / 8$ 38/19 38/24 39/4 $47 / 19$ 49/23 50/20 88/4 93/22 95/3 $96 / 13$ 100/13 102/23 103/1 105/4 108/14 109/18 110/18 113/23 117/8 121/23 125/10 132/11 134/11
overa11 [1] 31/9
overpopulated [1] 20/14 overpopulation [2] 47/1 138/18
overview [1] 96/12
own [8] 31/5 $45 / 5$ 57/23

| 0 | past $[11]$ $30 / 1$ $44 / 5 \quad 57 / 1$ <br> $76 / 5$ $93 / 18$ $97 / 25$ <br> $102 / 23$   | $\begin{array}{lllll} 27 / 3 & 27 / 4 & 27 / 4 & 28 / 8 & 28 / 20 \\ 29 / 3 & 29 / 12 & 29 / 14 & 33 / 11 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Own..: [5] 76/1 76/2 | 105/4 106/10 109/3 120/21 | 33/13 $35 / 22 \quad 35 / 23$ 41/14 |
| 80/24 87/3 130/23 | patterns [2] 12/4 12/13 | 44/12 $48 / 1.51 / 7 \quad 60 / 9$ |
| P | pause [3] $4 / 12$ 74/6 74/12 | 60/21 60/21 61/5 62/23 |
|  |  | 62/24 62/24 70/15 71/4 |
| P.C [1] 2/17 | 20/11 30/9 | 84/2 $84 / 4 \quad 84 / 2188 / 1$ |
| p.m [1] 142/18 | Pennsylvania [1] 2/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}89 / 2 & 89 / 2 & 89 / 24 & 90 / 3 & 90 / 3\end{array}$ |
| P. 0 [1] 1/24 | people [13] 4/9 6/9 28/4 | 92/4 92/9 104/14 106/9 |
| page [37] 9/8 12/6 12/8 | 53/8 55/5 61/4 62/12 | 111/8 112/6 112/8 112/22 |
| 12/9 17/22 17/22 19/20 | 64/14 69/6 87/16 114/7 | 112/25 113/17 113/17 |
| 20/24 32/23 32/23 32/23 | 122/7 126/24 | 113/19 113/23 114/16 |
| 34/16 60/9 70/6 83/25 | PERALES [8] 2/7 7/13 | 114/16 $114 / 17$ 115/4 |
| 84/2 84/20 89/6 89/7 89/8 | 24/23 82/16 $125 / 13$ 140/24 | 116/16 116/17 116/18 |
| 90/10 90/10 91/5 91/25 | 141/24 143/6 | 116/19 127/6 127/10 |
| 92/13 92/15 92/16 92/16 | percent [34] 18/22 18/22 | 128/14 $133 / 19$ 133/21 |
| 119/4 119/25 120/1 120/13 | 23/18 $23 / 23$ 30/6 $37 / 14$ | 134/7 $136 / 12 \quad 136 / 15$ |
| 120/14 120/20 123/7 | 37/15 $37 / 19$ 37/20 38/25 | 136/22 136/23 136/24 |
| 123/24 128/10 | 39/6 39/9 47/12 47/13 | 136/25 137/3 $137 / 7137 / 11$ |
| pages [1] 144/3 |  | 137/20 $138 / 3138 / 17$ |
| pair [4] 19/13 102/1 | 50/20 $50 / 21 \quad 50 / 25 \quad 50 / 25$ | 138/23 $139 / 24140 / 4140 / 6$ |
| 102/6 113/9 | 51/1 51/1 $51 / 11$ 51/11 | 140/7 |
| pairs [1] 114/12 | 52/8 57/12 $57 / 15$ 57/15 | plans [7] 93/17 97/22 |
| Palenchar [1] 1/19 | 57/17 130/10 130/15 | 98/1 101/6 101/8 104/4 |
| pane1 [2] 39/25 40/20 | 132/11 | 111/1 |
| panhandle [2] 58/7 58/8 | percentage [14] 23/15 | play [1] 103 |
| paper [1] 70/16 | 23/17 37/6 $37 / 7$ 37/7 37/7 | played [1] 104/21 |
| paragraph [10] 34/17 40/6 |  | plays [1] 101/21 |
| 40/16 60/11 89/11 89/16 | 57/13 65/6 102/24 128/15 | please [25] 7/9 10/19 |
| 89/17 90/13 123/12 123/13 | Perfect [1] $81 / 25$ | 14/25 21/19 $34 / 9$ 35/3 |
| Pardon [1] 71/11 | perform [5] 97/21 112/2 | 36/19 39/15 43/25 54/23 |
| parenthetical [1] 40/25 | 112/3 112/7 117/3 | 70/5 74/14 89/6 90/9 |
| parliamentarian [8] 43/1 | performance [4] 104/10 | 92/14 92/15 95/2 95/12 |
| 43/7 43/8 43/9 71/18 | 112/1 112/7 113/24 | 118/23 119/12 120/12 |
| 71/20 71/21 71/24 | performed [1] 73/18 | 120/14 123/19 124/12 |
| parliamentarian's [1] | performing [1] 129/7 | 133/3 |
| 43/3 | performs [2] 121/10 131/4 | pleased [1] 103/7 |
| parliamentary [1] 43/16 | perhaps [1] 31/23 | plenty [1] 142/9 |
| part [14] 19/6 22/2 63/11 | period [3] 40/22 46/18 | plugs [1] 114/21 |
| 65/22 75/22 78/25 88/19 | 110/6 [3] 40/22 46/18 | plus [3] 47/11 47/13 |
| 105/5 110/20 114/6 121/21 | Perkins [1] 2/14 | 142/10 |
| 123/6 137/15 140/4 | permitted [2] 80/24 80/24 | point [23] 5/13 19/6 |
| partially [1] 92/22 | Perry [2] 12/23 89/3 | 19/18 46/23 52/10 56/16 |
| particular [13] 37/5 | person [6] 47/21 123/3 | 56/24 63/18 63/25 65/6 |
| 55/25 81/17 99/19 104/8 | 123/6 123/10 124/4 137/14 | 67/22 84/14 85/4 103/20 |
| 105/9 109/25 123/12 | person/one [1] 137/14 | $\begin{array}{lll}114 / 9 & 126 / 18 & 132 / 23\end{array}$ |
| 123/13 125/12 $132 / 2$ | persons [3] 35/7 52/25 | 134/21 134/22 134/25 |
| 137/17 137/19 | 139/13 | 135/2 137/12 141/3 |
| particularized [1] 69/10 | phrased [1] 127/13 | pointed [2] 39/2 54/5 |
| particularly [11] 11/20 | pick [1] 123/12 | points [2] 86/10 103/9 |
| 27/14 54/24 59/15 79/12 | picking [1] 102/16 | polarization [1] 109/13 |
| 109/18 109/19 113/15 | picture [1] 105/20 | polarized [1] 129/19 |
| 116/9 138/19 139/6 | piece [2] 10/9 117/1 | political [5] ${ }^{\text {prell }}$ |
| parties [1] 144/8 | PILGRIM [2] 3/6 144/12 | 54/3 64/8 95/22 |
| partner [1] 135/13 | place [11] 1/20 53/13 | politically [3] 10/2 |
| parts [4] 90/4 123/2 | 88/15 93/25 98/9 98/14 | 55/17 55/20 |
| 123/9 124/4 | 99/3 99/19 122/16 134/15 | politicians [1] 53/9 |
| party [3] 38/3 78/13 | 134/16 | polls [1] 99/15 |
| 95/23 | placed [2] 17/7 122/24 | popular [1] 104/8 |
| Paso [4] 8/14 21/23 | placing [1] 19/10 | populated [1] 25/12 |
| 104/23 141/9 | Plains [1] 58/8 | population [47] 18/23 |
| pass [7] 34/6 61/5 71/7 | Plaintiff [5] 1/4 1/17 | 19/15 20/4 $22 / 13$ 23/16 |
| 76/19 76/25 77/5 78/10 | 7/10 95/4 143/3 |  |
| passage [7] 60/24 61/18 | Plaintiff's [6] 34/13 | 47/7 49/24 $50 / 12$ 52/4 |
| 77/9 77/13 89/13 90/1 | 60/10 83/25 84/19 89/5 | 52/7 52/8 54/7 57/23 |
| 90/1 | 106/17 | 64/25 65/2 71/16 83/4 |
| passed [9] 11/5 30/17 | plaintiffs [1] 95/19 | 101/23 106/2 107/22 |
| 39/24 60/9 60/21 60/21 | plan [94] $81318 / 2411 / 4$ | 108/13 108/16 108/20 |
| 61/20 80/16 88/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 10 & 13 / 23 & 13 / 25 & 13 / 25\end{array}$ | 108/23 110/23 128/19 |
| passing [4] $29 / 14 \quad 33 / 20$ | $14 / 3$ 15/12 $16 / 111^{17 / 3}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}130 / 2 & 130 / 4 & 130 / 10 & 130 / 11\end{array}$ |
| 80/12 80/14 |  | $\begin{array}{lllll}132 / 5 & 132 / 6 & 132 / 7 & 132 / 8\end{array}$ |
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really [37] 10/4 10/7 $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 10 & 31 / 2 & 40 / 19 & 46 / 10\end{array}$
46/21 56/8 56/10 66/10
81/14 88/24 93/13 94/4
96/20 99/6 102/2 103/11 104/18 $105 / 7 \quad 107 / 19 \quad 108 / 7$ $111 / 2$ 111/5 $111 / 19$ 112/13 114/9 114/15 114/15 114/24 122/15 132/12 132/24 133/10 133/16 135/3 136/17
reason [7] 30/22 38/21 39/12 53/11 65/22 87/22 103/16
reasons [3] 54/5 132/4

132/11 132/12 132/13
132/14 137/6 137/13
137/18 137/20
60/6 134/18 134/19
populous [2] 25/2 25/11
posed [1] 78/22
position [1] 128/20
possibility [3] 21/9 40/2
possible [16] 11/14 11/22
$\begin{array}{llll}19 / 11 & 19 / 25 & 20 / 3 & 20 / 14\end{array}$
65/10 70/19 124/23 125/2
125/4 127
115/11 115/12
110/21 131/20 134/19
practice [1] 90/2
practices [1] 62/4
44/11 44/11 70/12 72/4
120/9 120/16 124/19 126/2
44/3 44/4 44/11 44/11
pre-filed [4] 120/9
120/16 124/19 126/2
precincts [8] 98/13 98/14 140/19 140/20
precise [1] 100/23
preclearance [1] 70/18
precook 71124
predicted [2] 14/3 65/9
preferred [8] 9/4 11/11
14/4 14/11 21/17 22/5
prefile [1] 26/8
prepared [1] 124/19
present [2] 77/10 77/10
presented [1] 98/10
presenting [1] 100/2
presidentia1 [2] 67/9
presumption [1] 53/22
previously [3] 15/13
141/19 144/6
primarily [2] 95/19 96/14
primary [4] 15/17 15/24 15/25 16/2
prior [8] 7/15 42/9 44/13 $\begin{array}{llll}45 / 18 & 80 / 3 & 86 / 10 & 101 / 8\end{array}$ 116/5
probably [3] 4/6 62/13 96/4
problems [3] 18/18 46/25 104/20
procedura1 [1] 80/13

104/3 108/10 111/23 115/7

| R |  | 126/13 127/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reasons... [1] 138/24 | referring [2] 84/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { represent } \\ & 75 / 3 \text { [7] } 99 / 17 \\ & 90 / 17 / 2068 / 21 \\ & 106 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| reassurance [1] 33/24 | Regan [1] 15/9 | 106/24 |
| reassured [1] 115/3 | regard [14] 38/23 51/25 | Representativ |
| REBECCA [1] 2/8 | 59/25 61/4 71/13 71/15 | 49/6 62/14 135/11 135/12 |
| recall [22] 9/5 15/15 | 88/13 91/23 97/8 109/19 | represented [5] 48/5 |
| 19/17 24/11 $25 / 7$ 29/7 | 111/7 132/2 137/12 137/16 | 48/13 48/21 49/1 49/3 |
| 29/8 30/19 46/8 47/3 | regarding [7] 14/14 43/17 | representing [1] 90/20 |
| 52/11 58/24 59/9 59/10 | 44/10 136/9 136/15 136/20 | represents [2] 107/7 |
| 62/2 73/7 74/25 78/4 | 136/21 | 107/16 |
| 80/25 82/17 $82 / 24$ 119/20 | regardless [1] 129/21 | republican [11 |
| recent [21] 101/19 101/20 | region [2] 25/8 142/1 | 15/17 15/24 $31 / 20 \quad 31 / 24$ |
| 102/1 102/6 106/4 106/12 | registered [2] 129/1 | 32/13 61/25 81/8 90/25 |
| 106/20 108/18 108/18 | 130/22 | 114/11 114/1 |
| 108/25 109/2 109/12 | registration [10] 21/11 | republicans [7] 17/14 |
| 109/14 113/9 113/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 21/25 } & 22 / 9 & 22 / 13 & 22 / 16\end{array}$ | 31/18 31/24 32/3 55/6 |
| 113/16 113/21 114/2 116/7 | 22/18 25/5 27/22 28/22 | 114/15 114/16 |
| 116/9 116/10 | 30/6 | request [3] $5 / 4$ 60/1 72/4 |
| recess [3] 24/17 82/6 | regretted [1] 96/5 | requested [1] 58/21 |
| 142/18 | regular [5] 33/11 33/12 | requests [1] 60 |
| recognize [6] 98/6 119/1 | 33/13 33/19 76/24 | require [1] 4/23 |
| 119/15 120/19 120/20 | rejected [2] 38/1 45/11 | required [8] 14/17 18/9 |
| 139/22 | rejoined [1] 62/21 | $31 / 1$ 31/5 31/14 32/17 |
| recognized [1] 50/7 | related [3] 32/8 45/20 | 33/1 77/13 |
| recollection [1] 126/5 | 144/7 | requirement [1] 47/23 |
| recommended [1] 42/20 | relationship [3] 79/20 | residents [1] 69 |
| reconfigured [1] 11/24 | 79/22 80/1 | resolving [1] 46/25 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { reconfiguring [1] } & \text { 90/15 }\end{array}$ | relative [1] 108/7 | respect [12] 9/2 10/1 |
| reconstituted [18] 97/23 | relatively [1] 125/7 | 13/23 18/2 19/22 50/2 |
| 98/3 98/5 98/7 99/24 | relevant [5] 97/20 105/10 | 69/22 137/25 138/4 141/1 |
| 101/5 102/10 102/21 103/2 | 105/11 108/17 108/24 | 141/6 141/ |
| 103/4 103/24 105/2 105/5 | reliable [3] 11/18 22/25 | responding [2] 72/3 72/10 |
| 105/15 106/18 107/7 126/5 | 55/21 | response [1] 9/5 |
| 127/5 | relied [6] 25/15 25/20 | responsibility [1] 89/21 |
| record [8] 13/14 34/12 | 26/1 26/3 41/17 73/9 | responsive [1] 5/5 |
| 75/8 75/23 88/22 90/7 | relies [1] 126/5 | rest [4] 2/12 45/3 79/22 |
| 118/21 142/9 | remainder [2] 19/14 20/3 | 111/14 |
| recorded [1] 3/9 | remember [31] 4/3 24/5 | restore [1] 62 |
| recross [5] 86/2 86/3 | 29/11 29/15 30/16 45/3 | restored [1] 59/16 |
| 87/7 87/9 143/4 | 45/15 $47 / 2 \quad 58 / 25 \quad 59 / 5$ | result [12] 26/23 28/14 |
| RECROSS-EXAMINATION [1] | 59/12 $59 / 15$ 59/19 59/21 | 101/5 103/17 103/18 |
| 87/9 | 60/11 61/1 67/24 70/8 | 105/22 105/23 113/1 $115 / 5$ |
| Red [1] 8/6 | 90/6 90/22 93/19 93/25 | 115/14 115/16 115/18 |
| RedApp 1 [6] 27/9 27/12 | 107/20 114/10 114/13 | resulted [1] 113/23 |
| 70/14 83/14 $83 / 18$ 84/9 | 119/10 119/11 119/11 | resulting [1] 28/18 |
| redirect [6] 74/7 74/16 | 121/1 122/9 122/11 | results [10] 99/18 99/20 |
| 82/10 86/22 95/8 143/4 | remind [2] 93/21 135/5 | 99/21 101/5 102/9 102/18 |
| redistricting [59] 7/24 | removal [1] 140/15 | 102/19 105/19 105/20 |
| 7/25 8/3 9/16 33/10 33/11 | removed [2] 63/7 63/15 | 106/18 |
| 34/20 41/25 42/10 42/10 | repeating [1] 138/13 | resumed [2] 24/18 82/7 |
| 43/13 $43 / 15$ 43/19 43/22 | replacement [1] 136/12 | resumes [1] 24/19 |
| 44/6 44/12 44/16 44/19 | report [44] 70/13 72/5 | retained [1] 42/22 |
| 44/25 45/6 45/18 46/3 | 102/22 106/16 106/18 | retrogress [2] 112/22 |
| 46/9 49/21 55/1 55/6 | 117/5 $119 / 2$ 119/3 119/6 | 136/20 |
| 55/13 58/14 64/13 65/11 | 119/16 119/18 120/7 | retrogression [27] 5/16 |
| 69/16 76/16 76/18 76/21 | 120/14 120/25 121/20 | 30/21 31/7 48/2 96/21 |
| 77/3 77/4 77/18 79/21 | 122/11 $123 / 2 \quad 123 / 9 \quad 123 / 11$ | 126/8 126/12 126/17 |
| 80/3 80/4 80/7 80/9 80/23 | 124/3 124/14 124/17 | 126/24 127/17 127/19 |
| 81/2 81/3 81/11 81/13 | 124/19 125/6 $125 / 7 \quad 125 / 15$ | 127/21 127/25 133/10 |
| 88/14 88/14 89/1 93/17 | 125/16 125/20 126/1 126/2 | 136/10 136/25 137/11 |
| 95/15 95/16 95/24 96/6 | 126/4 126/5 126/9 126/10 | 137/25 138/15 138/17 |
| 97/25 98/2 101/3 109/2 | 126/14 126/18 $127 / 12$ | 138/20 139/19 140/14 |
| redrawing [2] 25/9 65/15 | 127/15 127/16 127/18 | 140/17 $141 / 1141 / 21$ |
| reduced [1] 90/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}127 / 20 & 127 / 22 & 128 / 9\end{array}$ | 141/22 |
| reduction [2] 136/14 | 128/11 | retrogressive [3] 90/18 |
| 141/4 | reported [1] 112/16 | 106/10 138/15 |
| REED [1] 1/17 | reporter [3] 3/6 3/6 6/13 | return [1] 4/6 |
| reelected [2] 62/18 62/19 | reports [10] 6/13 105/1 | review [1] 65/8 |
| refer [1] 83/2 | 105/14 108/12 118/17 | Reyes [1] 8/14 |
| referenced [1] 86/9 | 118/21 121/16 125/23 | Rice [3] 95/13 121/8 |


| R | 91/12 91/23 92/9 93/21 | $83 / 1483 / 2084 / 184 / 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R Rice... [1] 122/10 |  | 84/6 84/8 84/12 84/15 84/20 84/23 84/24 85/9 |
| rid [ij 55/7 | $\begin{array}{cccl}\text { same [24] } & 10 / 18 & 12 / 6 & 36 / 4\end{array}$ |  |
| right [84] 7/1 9/21 14/9 | 75/6 84/18 84/20 87/16 | 93/24 97/7 98/25 100/21 |
|  | 87/17 88/13 90/10 90/19 | 100/23 102/12 102/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}24 / 1 & 24 / 5 & 27 / 24 & 32 / 22\end{array}$ | 92/9 97/14 97/23 98/10 | 103/20 104/24 105/15 |
| 34/9 $34 / 23$ 35/3 $36 / 5 \quad 37 / 6$ | 99/11 99/11 113/6 113/18 | 105/16 105/22 106/3 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}37 / 12 & 37 / 18 & 37 / 25 & 39 / 20\end{array}$ | 114/18 115/14 115/16 | 106/11 107/24 107/25 |
| 40/4 $42 / 22 \quad 46 / 13 \quad 61 / 24$ | 129/7 132/15 | 109/18 $110 / 2$ 110/8 110/9 |
| 62/16 $64 / 4 \quad 66 / 14 \quad 69 / 8$ | san [10] 2/10 $2 / 12$ 3/4 | 110/24 111/14 112/24 |
| 69/20 71/13 71/13 72/14 | 8/16 78/25 105/12 124/24 | 113/13 113/16 113/25 |
| 72/16 74/14 74/24 75/4 | 127/24 135/9 140/6 | 118/9 118/22 119/8 123/24 |
|  | sat [3] 22/22 23/5 45/19 | $\begin{array}{lllll}124 / 2 & 126 / 14 & 128 / 16\end{array}$ |
| 81/1 82/19 83/16 84/11 | satisfy [1] 10/4 | 130/13 132/7 133/19 |
| 84/21 87/15 88/12 90/11 | Saturday [1] 119/18 | 133/20 135/25 |
| 92/11 92/12 93/20 94/6 | savvy [1] 74/11 | seeing [1] 101/25 |
|  | saw [6] 62/17 65/6 65/11 | seem [2] $85 / 10118 / 15$ |
| 96/25 114/4 $114 / 21 \quad 115 / 9$ | 92/8 92/9 94/4 | seemed [2] 22/25 42/1 |
| 115/10 115/25 117/14 | say [57] 4/14 5/3 5/10 | seems [4] 105/1 108/12 |
| 119/19 119/22 119/23 | 6/12 12/8 20/22 23/23 | 108/21 116/16 |
| 121/5 123/20 124/15 125/9 | 23/23 $25 / 1 \quad 27 / 19 \quad 28 / 2$ | seen [1] 118/13 |
| 125/9 128/14 128/24 | 28/10 $29 / 3 \quad 29 / 22 \quad 32 / 25$ | select [7] 7/24 29/4 33/9 |
| 129/13 131/2 131/15 133/7 | 33/4 33/7 33/9 34/1 45/13 | 99/25 100/1 100/11 100/12 |
| 133/14 135/23 139/8 142/5 | 50/25 53/2 60/8 61/19 | selected [3] 97/19 101/1 |
| 142/14 142/16 | 61/20 65/22 66/22 98/19 | 106/19 |
| Rights [25] 14/14 14/20 | 98/21 98/21 98/22 100/6 | self [1] 130/18 |
| 26/9 $26 / 14$ 26/17 $31 / 9$ | 100/7 100/9 100/9 102/23 | Seliger [14] 7/4 7/8 7/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}32 / 18 & 34 / 1 & 34 / 3 & 34 / 21\end{array}$ | 104/6 104/10 105/20 | 25/14 $34 / 15$ 35/4 44/1 |
| 45/17 48/2 48/9 49/4 49/9 | 108/17 109/1 109/11 | 67/13 74/20 80/22 82/12 |
| 49/25 50/14 50/22 51/3 | 111/24 111/24 113/1 | 84/1 94/15 143/5 |
| 51/18 73/14 75/12 75/18 | 114/13 $114 / 25115 / 7$ | SELLS [8] 2/3 117/14 |
| 88/10 134/17 | 117/16 117/21 122/2 | 118/7 118/8 121/25 123/21 |
| Rios [1] 45/9 | 124/16 125/25 129/9 | 135/3 143/10 |
| rise [1] 142/17 | 132/21 133/16 133/23 | Senate [119] 4/16 4/17 |
| River $[5]$ <br> $15 / 4$ $15 / 5$ | saying [9] 5/7 61/10 93/5 | 4/18 7/24 7/25 10/1 10/3 |
| 20/11 30/9 | 128/21 128/24 131/16 | 10/22 12/2 27/4 29/3 |
| Riverview [1] 3/3 | 133/10 133/17 140/3 | 29/12 12/14 30/17 33/9 |
| Road [1] 2/6 | says [13] 34/19 34/21 | 33/21 38/1 $38 / 5 \quad 40 / 12$ |
| Robert [1] 73/12 | 40/5 40/6 40/18 40/23 | 41/18 41/24 43/1 43/5 |
| ROBERTO [1] 3/2 | 70/14 84/6 89/17 89/21 | 43/6 43/14 43/18 44/6 |
| Robertovera [1] 3/3 | 90/13 93/22 134/21 | 44/11 44/15 44/19 44/25 |
| Robin [1] 2/12 | scale [1] 115/7 | 45/14 $45 / 1846 / 7 \quad 47 / 7$ |
| Rolando [1] 45/9 | schedule [2] 6/4 130/17 | 48/1 $48 / 1749 / 21 \quad 51 / 7$ |
| role [2] 81/17 103/1 | scheduled [2] 33/14 33/15 | 51/25 52/2 $52 / 14 \quad 53 / 8$ |
| ROSEMARY [1] 1/13 | scope [1] 86/22 | 54/4 54/16 55/1 55/2 |
| roughly [3] 28/7 36/3 | score [3] 113/17 115/8 | 56/12 56/24 57/3 58/18 |
| 36/4 | 115/8 | 59/16 59/24 60/9 60/21 |
| round [1] 42/9 | Scott [1] 1/19 | 60/22 61/6 61/8 61/10 |
| RPR [2] 3/6 144/12 | screen [5] 83/16 102/12 | 61/11 61/22 62/5 62/10 |
| Ruben [1] 8/17 | 106/15 112/12 112/16 | 62/12 62/15 62/20 62/25 |
| rude [1] 132/25 | scroll [3] 36/12 90/9 | 63/1 63/8 63/13 64/1 64/2 |
| rule [1] 77/7 | 91/5 | 68/24 69/11 69/15 69/21 |
| rules [2] 43/6 89/23 | scrub [1] 134/7 | 70/3 71/14 71/20 71/21 |
| run [6] 4/3 24/13 52/22 | SD10 [2] 133/4 133/6 | 73/19 74/21 74/21 75/4 |
| 62/12 65/23 99/24 | seat [2] 9/18 137/5 | 75/7 75/8 76/18 76/23 |
| running [4] 67/7 82/1 | seated [2] 41/9 95/5 | 77/5 77/5 77/7 77/16 |
| 99/7 114/8 | seats [1] 137/6 | 79/21 80/7 80/9 80/12 |
| runs [2] 19/15 124/23 | second [4] 65/20 90/14 | 80/15 80/23 81/2 81/11 |
| Ryan [1] 26/4 | 102/14 135/6 | 83/3 86/16 88/4 88/8 |
| S | secondly [1] 134/ | 89/12 89/16 89/24 91/1 |
|  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{cccl}\text { safer } & {[6]} & 10 / 2 & 11 / 13 \\ 11 / 15 & 14 / 12 & 19 / 14 & 20 / 2\end{array}$ | 31/8 31/8 $31 / 14$ 98/20 | 132/8 138/14 139/14 |
| 11/15 14/12 19/14 20/2 | 131/13 131/14 142/9 | 140/15 141/22 141/23 |
| said [39] 8/23 9/11 9/11 | sectionfied [1] 129/15 | 142/2 |
| 12/20 $13 / 19$ 13/19 17/24 | secure [1] 116/11 | Senator [106] |
| 18/8 19/24 $23 / 5 \quad 23 / 6 \quad 24 / 4$ | security [1] 116/11 | 7/10 7/19 14/23 15/3 20/8 |
| 24/6 24/6 32/25 41/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { see } & {\left[\begin{array}{llll}70]\end{array}\right.} & 12 / 5 & 12 / 14 & 12 / 18\end{array}$ | 24/2 $25 / 14 \quad 28 / 2 \quad 29 / 5$ |
| 55/5 55/9 60/20 61/18 | $17 / 3 \quad 28 / 20 \quad 34 / 2 \quad 37 / 9$ | 29/10 $29 / 11 \quad 29 / 11 \quad 29 / 11$ |
| 69/21 71/18 73/9 77/22 | 17/16 37/19 37/21 40/5 | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 30 / 17 & 31 / 16 & 34 / 6 & 34 / 15\end{array}$ |
| 79/9 79/11 79/11 87/11 | 41/7 $43 / 5 \quad 55 / 9$ 70/19 72/6 | $35 / 4 \quad 36 / 7{ }^{36 / 24} 37 / 941 / 1$ |


| S | $59 / 3$ $59 / 12$ $59 / 15$ $65 / 23$ <br> $65 / 25$ $66 / 24$ $68 / 8$ $78 / 25$ | $89 / 15$ $89 / 25$ $91 / 18$ $91 / 20$ <br> $91 / 24$ $93 / 12$ $93 / 15$ $94 / 11$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senator... [82] 44/1 | 79/1 79/2 82/16 91/19 |  |
| 44/20 45/2 45/2 45/2 45/7 | 97/13 97/13 98/17 100/16 | 137/8 |
| 45/13 46/23 46/25 47/3 | she's [1] 41/9 | sit [1] 7/6 |
|  | Sheila [1] 35/15 | sitting [1] 4/ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}52 / 20 & 53 / 2 & 53 / 3 & 53 / 21\end{array}$ | shift [1] 82/15 | situation [2] 20/20 21/4 |
| 56/3 57/18 $59 / 1159 / 24$ | Shore [2] 19/12 19/23 |  |
| 59/25 61/12 61/12 62/17 | short [3] 4/5 119/9 | 116/1 116/6 140/5 |
| 64/4 64/9 64/9 64/22 | 135/17 | size [2] 28/7 28/13 |
| 65/23 67/13 67/22 67/22 | shorthand [1] 3/9 | skip [1] 20/8 |
| 67/23 68/10 68/12 68/15 | should [20] $\quad 5 / 16$ 6/2 7/21 | slightly [1] 116/5 |
| 68/16 68/17 68/18 71/7 | 24/9 $26 / 24 \quad 31 / 9 \quad 55 / 6 \quad 59 / 4$ | slower [1] 88/20 |
| 71/13 $72 / 18$ 72/20 74/18 | 84/7 90/2 96/2 97/15 | sma11 [5] 16/22 16/23 |
| 74/20 75/7 76/15 77/21 | 105/22 108/3 111/16 | 78/25 84/7 84/24 |
| 78/1 78/4 78/7 78/11 | 131/21 133/23 134/4 134/5 | smaller [1] 103/22 |
| 78/12 78/22 78/24 79/3 | 134/17 | smart [1] 53/3 |
| 79/4 79/12 79/12 80/22 | shouldn't [1] 132/22 | smoothest [1] 6/8 |
| 81/16 82/2 82/12 84/1 | show [10] 16/6 27/9 46/24 | so [190] |
| 85/24 86/18 $90 / 14$ 91/12 | 106/18 115/16 118/23 | sobeit [1] 51/5 |
| 91/15 91/17 91/19 92/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}119 / 12 & 120 / 1 & 120 / 12\end{array}$ | sole [1] 134/18 |
| 92/8 93/21 94/2 94/3 | 128/10 | Soledad [1] 3/4 |
| 94/15 96/1 140/15 143/5 | showed [3] 26/21 38/18 | solely [1] 129/14 |
| Senator's [1] 34/12 |  | solid [1] 99/9 |
| senators [16] 38/6 43/8 | showing [7] 18/7 18/15 | Solomon [1] 16/17 |
| 43/9 68/14 75/1 75/2 | 19/2 22/8 $36 / 6$ 110/18 | Solomons [1] 33/24 |
| 75/16 75/19 78/13 78/15 | 123/21 | solve [1] 104/19 |
| 86/13 89/12 90/15 90/16 | shown [1] 101/5 | some [37] 4/20 11/24 |
| 90/20 91/9 | shows [7] 27/10 37/12 | 14/24 $15 / 3$ 15/7 $20 / 2 \quad 20 / 9$ |
| send [1] 40/12 | 37/13 39/11 57/20 140/18 | 27/23 32/8 52/10 56/16 |
| sense [10] 54/3 62/25 | 140/20 | 63/18 63/25 65/6 66/25 |
| 99/17 99/18 107/3 129/3 | shut [1] 86/24 | 69/5 70/16 75/8 78/16 |
| 130/12 131/2 131/11 | sic [3] 70/18 123/16 | 81/5 83/15 92/20 92/20 |
| 134/15 | 129/15 | 98/3 101/7 101/17 101/25 |
| sensible [1] 53/11 | side [12] 10/3 10/3 12/3 | 103/6 105/11 109/9 112/3 |
| sent [3] 33/25 41/5 72/8 | 16/11 16/11 26/3 43/7 | 116/11 123/4 132/19 |
| sentence [6] 40/18 43/4 | 63/22 64/6 91/1 93/2 99/8 | 133/12 134/1 134/15 |
| 90/14 123/12 123/13 | signed [5] 91/6 91/13 | somebody [2] 14/18 135/9 |
| 128/13 | 91/15 91/17 91/19 | somehow [1] 96/6 |
| separate [2] 5/20 134/2 | significantly [3] 21/11 | someone [1] 112/10 |
| separately [1] 121/12 | 21/24 25/6 | Somervelle [1] 2/17 |
| September [1] 9/6 | similar [3] 62/24 100/21 | something [14] 10/20 77/8 |
| series [1] 118/21 | 117/3 | 92/21 102/3 110/2 110/3 |
| serious [1] 40/20 | simple [2] 34/22 77/15 | 110/8 110/9 110/9 113/22 |
| seriously [1] 127/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { simply } & \text { [10] } & 16 / 3 & 18 / 21\end{array}$ | 123/16 124/12 $139 / 9$ 139/9 |
| served [1] 10/9 | 20/14 99/5 105/5 110/25 | sometimes [5] 102/20 |
| session [20] 1/12 33/11 | 128/5 128/24 132/15 | 109/6 129/7 129/7 131/3 |
| $33 / 12$ 33/18 $33 / 19$ 33/20 | 134/13 | somewhat [2] 113/24 |
| 36/7 40/1 42/3 42/4 42/6 | since [5] 4/22 25/9 67/16 | 139/19 |
| 45/22 45/24 46/10 46/15 | 75/24 85/25 | somewhere [5] 5/11 57/14 |
| 46/16 56/17 60/1 76/24 | single [4] 77/16 81/11 | 77/1 106/6 116/17 |
| 80/19 | 98/20 100/12 | soon [1] 132/10 |
| set [20] $4 / 8$ 9/15 22/23 | Singles [1] 131/13 | sorry $\left[\begin{array}{lllll}39] & 4 / 1 & 6 / 15 & 13 / 20\end{array}\right.$ |
| 22/24 23/8 23/13 24/8 | sir [86] $5 / 12$ 6/15 6/25 | 19/17 $23 / 3$ 23/19 $24 / 11$ |
| 98/13 98/14 100/15 100/20 | 7/5 23/24 34/9 34/24 35/9 | 24/13 27/25 28/18 29/9 |
| 100/23 100/25 101/21 | 35/13 37/22 38/2 38/10 | 29/16 36/2 40/14 41/6 |
| 114/18 130/16 130/19 | 38/12 38/20 39/10 39/21 | 43/25 50/16 $51 / 12$ 58/10 |
| 130/21 130/22 132/18 | 40/3 40/9 41/20 42/11 | 58/24 60/13 $60 / 14 \quad 60 / 16$ |
| sets [3] 104/1 112/17 | 42/18 43/23 44/18 45/20 | 66/19 69/13 73/22 78/20 |
| 132/15 | 45/25 46/12 $46 / 17$ 46/22 | 89/7 90/10 90/10 91/25 |
| setting [2] 110/22 132/18 | 48/23 49/16 51/21 51/24 | 100/6 111/10 115/10 135/3 |
| several [2] 118/12 127/8 | 54/9 54/17 55/4 55/8 | 135/22 136/2 139/1 139/25 |
| shaded [1] 37/13 | 55/11 55/19 56/2 56/15 | sort [18] 4/12 17/10 |
| shades [1] 18/21 | 56/18 57/2 57/16 58/20 | 76/11 79/5 79/25 87/1 |
| Shal1 [1] 6/21 | 59/14 59/18 59/20 59/23 | 98/7 $102 / 5$ 102/22 102/24 |
| Shapiro [2] 67/22 68/16 | 60/7 60/11 60/14 61/23 | 103/5 106/9 125/19 127/3 |
| share [2] 18/17 21/11 | 62/6 62/8 63/4 64/7 64/11 | 129/5 130/21 131/10 |
| she [31] 4/11 41/11 43/11 | 64/15 64/18 64/21 68/23 | 142/15 |
| 43/12 $43 / 13$ 43/14 48/20 | 69/17 $71 / 5 \quad 73 / 3 \quad 74 / 14$ | sorting [1] 115/13 |
| 52/23 $53 / 17 \quad 54 / 6$ 54/6 | 80/5 81/6 81/24 83/7 | sought [1] 94/7 |
|  | 84/22 85/18 87/6 88/16 | sound [1] 119/22 |

sounds [1] 119/23
south [15] $19 / 3$ 19/7
19/10 20/4 21/9 21/15 21/22 22/17 25/2 28/11 29/2 31/12 $58 / 8 \quad 141 / 10$ 141/11
Southeast [2] 55/24 55/25
Southern [1] 13/1
Spanish [9] $\quad 21 / 24 \quad 22 / 8$ 22/12 $22 / 15$ 25/4 $27 / 22$ 28/21 30/5 129/1
sparsely [1] 25/12
speak [2] 117/22 117/23
speakers [2] 140/12 140/21
speaks [1] 75/22
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { special } & {[5]} & 33 / 18 & 33 / 20\end{array}$ 40/1 40/22 80/19
specific [2] 29/15 108/22
specifical1y [6] 29/8 54/17 61/10 140/12 141/3 141/19
spending [1] 122/3
spent [3] 64/19 65/17 93/24
spirit [1] 98/19
split [2] 12/22 106/4
splitting [3] 12/17 12/20 13/10
spoke [5] 26/5 43/15
43/18 43/20 43/21
spring [1] 42/7
squeaked [1] 16/19
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { SSVR } & {[5]} & 83 / 5 & 83 / 20 & 84 / 15\end{array}$ 85/5 130/20
stable [2] 104/1 104/2 STACEY [2] 1/22 41/9 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { staff }[6] \quad 21 / 8 & 21 / 13 & 26 / 6\end{array}$ 31/13 39/20 44/15
stage [4] 45/8 107/20 133/16 134/3
stamp [2] 88/6 119/6
stamps [1] 70/15
stand [1] 24/19
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { standard }[14] \quad 62 / 3 & 110 / 22\end{array}$ 116/14 128/22 128/23 129/13 130/6 130/15 130/17 131/8 131/15 131/15 131/16 132/15
start [7] 34/15 54/22 109/2 109/14 133/9 134/15 134/17
started [4] 24/15 42/3 42/4 42/6
starting [3] 134/21 134/21 134/25
starts [1] 6/7
state [41] $1 / 3 \quad 6 / 1 \quad 7 / 3$ $\begin{array}{lllll}8 / 11 & 18 / 17 & 20 / 18 & 28 / 11\end{array}$ $32 / 16 \quad 35 / 22 \quad 36 / 4 \quad 41 / 3$ 41/10 $43 / 13$ 53/3 $54 / 3$ 56/11 59/3 65/8 72/8 74/4 76/20 88/13 90/4 93/23 95/25 $96 / 5 \quad 96 / 6 \quad 96 / 8 \quad 96 / 9$ 97/9 98/11 99/4 104/21 108/22 109/19 109/22 111/23 114/21 121/12 121/14 121/22
state's [2] 16/11 128/19
stated [2] 138/8 144/6 statement [15] 22/21 34/16 59/21 60/8 60/10 60/12 60/15 60/20 61/9 73/16 86/12 89/11 90/6 90/22 93/8
statements [1] 75/11 states [11] $1 / 1 \quad 1 / 5 \quad 1 / 7$ 1/14 3/7 88/18 95/17 118/8 136/9 137/10 144/4 statewide [6] 76/21 98/9 98/16 107/14 108/15 141/2 static [2] 105/2 105/21 statistic [3] 27/6 27/13 27/16
statistics [6] 27/9 27/23 36/18 39/11 51/12 121/9 status [1] 10/15
stay [1] 105/21
stayed [1] 103/15
staying [1] 125/18
stenographic [1] 144/4
steps [1] 14/12
Stevenson [5] 121/5 121/7 121/8 122/20 123/15
Stevenson's [1] 121/12 stick [1] 39/14
sti11 [12] 21/16 21/24 40/6 60/2 76/25 76/25 77/17 101/12 115/14 116/21 125/9 129/20
Stockyards [1] 63/23
stop [5] 38/14 65/20
102/14 130/23 131/12
story [1] 100/8
straightforward [1]
101/14
strange [1] 122/3
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Street [3] } & 1 / 20 & 2 / 14 & 2 / 17\end{array}$
strength [1] 105/10
strict [1] 117/15
stringent [2] 129/2 130/3
strong [2] 22/8 115/11
stronger [1] 116/5
struck [2] 88/18 89/2
struggle [2] $122 / 13$ 128/7
struggled [3] 125/1 125/2 134/9
struggling [1] 128/6
study [1] 93/17
stuff [1] 65/12
subject [1] 142/8
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { submission [2] 65/8 } & 102 / 9\end{array}$
submitted [4] 94/22
118/17 118/22 120/9
subset [2] 97/4 97/9
substance [1] 95/21
substantial [2] 52/19 116/8
substantially [2] 124/17 126/1
subtract [2] 104/16
114/23
success [2] 99/20 113/20
successes [3] 99/21
$112 / 16$ 115/22
successfu1 [2]
134/22
such [5] 32/9 49/20 49/24 50/21 103/11
sufficiently [1] 129/17
suggested [1] 45/7
suggestion [1] 123/14
suggests [1] 131/6
suit [1] 140/13
Suite [5] 2/9 2/15 2/18 2/21 3/4
sum [2] 113/13 128/4
summary [1] 113/1
summer [1] 42/7
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Sunday [2] } & \text { 120/21 } & 122 / 5\end{array}$
supplemental [8] 119/16
120/6 120/25 122/11 123/2 123/9 124/18 126/2
support [2] 89/23 140/21
supported [2] 61/5 61/11
suppose [1] 43/7
supposed7y [1] 75/17
Supreme [4] 12/22 25/10 88/18 89/3
sure [28] $4 / 7$ 10/14 10/20 $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 18 & 22 / 4 & 22 / 8 & 27 / 23\end{array}$ 29/20 $31 / 3$ 44/2 $45 / 3$ 52/10 65/6 65/7 70/21 80/17 85/22 86/5 91/14 $\begin{array}{lllll}92 / 5 & 92 / 18 & 92 / 21 & 109 / 21\end{array}$ 124/5 125/1 125/3 127/14 128/22
sure7y [1] 21/1
surname [9] 21/24 22/9 $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 12 & 22 / 15 & 22 / 18 & 25 / 4\end{array}$ 27/22 28/21 30/5
surnames [1] 129/1
surprised [2] 57/17 57/19
surprisingly [2] 104/1 104/2
suspend [1] 89/23
swamps [1] 79/7
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { swapping } \\ \text { swarth } & \text { [1] } \\ \text { 140/18 }\end{array}$
sworn [5] 7/10 34/12 34/16 60/15 95/4
Sylvester [1] 8/14

## T

tab7e [16] 41/9 102/8
102/12 106/15 106/17
106/23 107/20 107/24
111/9 112/12 112/15
112/16 115/20 117/24
122/24 130/8
tables [1] 107/2
tabular [2] 122/20 122/23
take [21] 4/11 9/8 19/12
19/25 20/24 21/2 28/25
50/18 $53 / 10 \quad 55 / 21 \quad 55 / 25$
66/8 97/7 98/8 101/11
$\begin{array}{lllll}115 / 6 & 116 / 14 & 117 / 25 & 132 / 1\end{array}$ 134/3 134/10
taken [6] 59/17 64/6
107/21 $112 / 21$ 144/5 144/9
takes [1] 7/2
taking [9] 14/12 19/9
55/23 $55 / 24$ 99/3 $\quad 99 / 19$
125/10 134/13 135/9
talk [16] 4/17 25/22
31/17 $34 / 25$ 39/19 40/2
68/6 69/5 74/20 77/24
81/12 86/12 89/20 112/13
116/16 124/14
ta1ked [22] 8/7 8/7 8/23
11/9 19/4 19/24 20/9

| T | $\begin{array}{llll} \hline 22 / 17 & 25 / 2 & 25 / 12 & 28 / 11 \end{array}$ | south [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ta7ked... [15] 20/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll}29 / 2 & 30 / 13 & 31 / 12 & 32 / 5 \\ 33 / 23 & 33 / 25 & 34 / 18 & 41 / 3\end{array}$ |  |
| 20/12 $22 / 23$ 23/5 40/6 |  | 66/9 66/10 66/18 66/18 |
| 40/16 74/22 75/6 78/18 | 54/4 61/10 61/20 65/8 | 67/3 68/1 69/11 76/10 |
| 79/19 80/1 82/21 83/13 | 69/8 69/8 $74 / 4$ 77/2 81/7 | 78/16 80/24 86/10 89/19 |
| 93/13 93/16 | 94/20 95/25 96/10 96/15 | 96/16 96/20 97/3 99/15 |
| talking [14] 5/25 65/15 | 97/2 99/13 99/13 101/4 | 106/25 112/19 115/19 |
| 70/14 80/12 $82 / 16$ 85/11 | 101/6 101/22 106/2 108/13 | 128/19 133/7 |
| 92/4 106/21 108/7 111/3 | 109/22 111/8 111/22 | them [34] 4/18 5/6 5/20 |
| 111/5 128/23 133/11 139/3 | 112/18 112/22 120/7 | 6/22 6/23 16/11 22/10 |
| TANNER [3] 2/5 138/12 | 121/13 121/15 121/22 | 25/22 25/23 26/11 26/16 |
| 139/25 | 124/19 126/25 131/23 | 27/8 29/15 45/4 47/5 |
| target [1] 26/13 | 132/1 134/12 137/11 | 56/12 62/13 68/1 69/5 |
| Tarrant [20] [13513 $35 / 24$ | 138/12 139/24 141/11 | 69/22 78/12 78/16 $79 / 6$ |
| 38/13 $38 / 13$ 38/23 38/24 | Texas' [1] 5/4 | 79/7 81/21 83/20 86/24 |
| 39/4 39/5 39/8 58/22 | text [3] 123/2 123/6 | 94/10 96/25 104/5 107/25 |
| 59/11 59/22 60/2 69/3 | 123/9 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 114/18 117/17 141/19 |
| 69/6 136/22 137/2 137/16 | than [24] 5/25 6/5 21/11 | themse7ves [2] 50/12 |
| 137/19 139/7 | 22/18 $24 / 3$ 33/23 57/1 | 50/20 |
| task [3] 7/13 132/17 | 63/16 69/7 75/2 100/8 | then [69] 4/12 8/19 10/15 |
| 140/24 | 104/9 104/22 105/20 106/8 | 13/20 17/9 17/22 $22 / 6$ |
| teaches [1] 121/9 | 110/1 110/19 113/5 113/21 | 25/1 32/16 32/25 33/15 |
| team [1] 124/20 | 113/24 116/5 118/13 | 33/18 34/21 37/11 37/18 |
| tech [1] 74/11 | 132/14 134/21 | 40/11 40/13 $40 / 23$ 48/16 |
| techees [1] 36/21 | thank [58] 6/25 10/12 | 49/12 50/10 50/20 51/4 |
| technically [1] 47/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 21 & 11 / 3 & 12 / 10 & 12 / 12\end{array}$ | 53/14 54/17 76/23 76/24 |
| te11 [19] 26/7 36/13 | 13/9 24/20 24/22 27/24 | 77/23 79/4 79/4 86/15 |
| 36/21 39/22 51/8 52/17 | $30 / 7$ 34/5 $34 / 6$ 34/7 47/14 | 89/21 91/21 95/25 96/6 |
| 52/19 62/22 73/24 77/25 | 54/9 58/5 67/19 70/10 | 98/12 $98 / 12$ 98/13 99/4 |
| 85/19 95/22 99/5 110/9 | 72/18 72/19 72/22 74/1 | 101/18 104/4 105/22 |
| 111/21 118/14 120/3 123/7 | 74/2 74/8 74/15 76/13 | 105/25 106/2 109/3 113/9 |
| 123/13 | 79/14 79/17 81/23 81/25 | 114/13 115/17 116/15 |
| telling [5] 47/2 47/3 | 82/9 82/13 85/24 87/5 | 116/19 119/9 120/9 127/6 |
| 93/19 102/4 122/11 | 87/6 90/11 94/15 94/17 | 128/5 129/3 129/3 130/2 |
| tel1s [3] 110/6 113/21 | 95/7 117/7 $118 / 1$ 118/3 | 130/23 $133 / 22 \quad 134 / 8$ |
| 116/24 | 121/25 $135 / 25 \quad 137 / 8$ | 134/12 134/23 135/18 |
| ten [15] 4/6 4/24 5/1 | 137/22 138/11 140/8 140/9 | 136/13 137/1 137/4 139/8 |
| 28/15 29/18 29/19 47/12 | 140/10 140/22 140/23 | 141/13 142/2 |
| 101/1 105/6 109/8 110/19 | 141/16 142/4 142/12 | theory [1] 106/6 |
| 110/25 113/4 113/5 126/25 | 142/13 142/14 | there [115] 5/10 6/2 9/17 |
| tend [1] 104/15 | that [906] | 11/20 $17 / 15$ 19/12 20/1 |
| tends [1] 106/7 | that's [106] 4/7 6/5 8/4 | 20/22 21/1 27/7 27/9 |
| term [1] 72/13 |  | 27/23 27/23 27/23 35/6 |
| terms [16] 5/15 9/18 17/2 | 15/11 15/14 17/1 18/11 | 35/10 35/14 35/16 35/24 |
| 26/12 31/2 80/20 83/4 |  | 38/4 $41 / 4$ 41/4 41/7 $47 / 4$ |
| 99/15 115/3 123/15 132/4 | 29/24 31/6 32/11 32/20 | 49/20 50/7 $51 / 13$ 53/8 |
| 136/3 136/10 136/17 | 33/7 33/14 33/22 34/22 | 56/20 62/12 63/10 63/12 |
| 136/24 137/14 |  | 63/14 64/25 65/2 66/1 |
| test [5] 74/11 129/2 | 42/13 $46 / 5$ 50/13 50/23 | 69/1 69/13 71/9 71/9 |
| 130/3 130/3 131/18 | 52/23 $47 / 3$ 57/20 $58 / 7$ | 71/12 76/22 76/22 77/23 |
| testified [29] 9/16 10/3 | 61/2 61/17 63/2 63/24 | 78/2 79/13 80/13 80/16 |
| 10/7 10/23 11/6 11/9 | 65/13 66/12 67/3 69/4 | 81/20 83/23 85/22 86/24 |
| 11/22 12/2 14/2 14/10 | 69/5 74/1 77/11 79/5 83/7 | 87/21 90/11 91/9 92/15 |
| 14/16 16/24 18/24 21/6 | 83/12 84/4 84/19 96/7 | 93/8 96/18 96/22 97/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 8 & 21 / 14 & 21 / 21 & 32 / 2\end{array}$ | 96/7 99/21 100/22 101/4 | 98/16 100/10 104/20 |
| 32/16 51/10 67/21 68/10 | 101/20 102/12 103/5 | 105/18 107/11 108/8 109/7 |
| 74/22 78/18 80/2 87/22 | 103/12 107/1 107/15 | 109/14 110/19 110/24 |
| 96/5 120/24 139/14 | 108/20 108/21 109/18 | 110/25 111/4 111/25 112/1 |
| testimony [28] 7/4 14/7 | 109/19 110/6 110/10 | 112/6 112/9 113/2 113/4 |
| 26/7 34/13 34/23 41/17 | 110/10 111/11 112/15 | 113/4 113/7 $113 / 10114 / 3$ |
| 49/15 50/10 56/13 57/22 | 114/9 115/25 116/2 116/24 | 114/7 115/25 116/3 116/8 |
| 63/9 66/23 67/24 68/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll}117 / 5 & 119 / 4 & 119 / 20 & 120 / 8\end{array}$ | 116/12 117/15 124/21 |
| 68/10 70/21 70/22 82/20 | 120/23 121/6 122/15 | 124/23 125/1 125/22 |
| 82/24 83/2 94/23 106/16 | 122/19 124/12 125/2 | 126/10 126/22 127/15 |
| 120/10 120/16 124/19 | 125/18 125/21 125/23 | 127/21 127/25 128/3 128/4 |
| 126/3 127/11 135/9 | 126/23 126/25 128/6 128/7 | 128/14 128/25 130/13 |
| TEXAS [72] 1/3 1/23 2/21 | 129/1 $130 / 3131 / 5 \quad 131 / 7$ | 131/10 131/10 131/11 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}6 / 1 & 7 / 3 & 8 / 14 & 13 / 1 \\ 14 / 24\end{array}$ | 132/17 134/10 134/23 | 131/11 131/12 131/16 |
| 15/3 19/3 19/7 19/10 20/4 | $\begin{array}{llll}135 / 8 & 136 / 16 & 136 / 23\end{array}$ | 131/19 131/19 133/24 |
| 20/10 21/9 21/15 21/22 | 142/14 142/15 | 133/24 136/13 141/2 |


| 1 | $65 / 2 \quad 66 / 7 \quad 66 / 9 \quad 66 / 12$ | $33 / 20 \quad 45 / 19 \quad 58 / 8 \quad 76 / 24$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| there... [1] 142/10 | $67 / 367 / 567 / 8 \quad 69 / 570 / 17$ |  |
| there's ${ }^{\text {c }}$ [24] ${ }^{\text {c }}$ [/18 $6 / 13$ | 73/9 74/21 77/22 77/24 | 126/21 |
| 17/9 35/15 36/3 77/7 | 80/20 80/22 85/12 86/4 | throughout [4] 60/1 128/7 |
| 80/18 93/8 96/20 100/8 | 86/21 88/23 94/23 96/7 | 128/7 129/4 |
| 101/12 101/22 101/25 | 98/6 100/15 100/17 101/9 | thumb [1] 115/7 |
| 103/3 $105 / 14$ 107/2 110/24 | 101/12 102/5 102/17 | Thursday [2] 70/15 71/1 |
| 113/3 125/16 129/16 130/8 | 103/10 103/12 $104 / 24$ | ticket [1] 104/9 |
| 131/24 136/12 136/21 | 104/24 105/11 105/17 | till [1] 92/1 |
| therefore [1] 51/1 | 107/1 107/5 107/17 107/19 | time $[46] \quad 4 / 5$ 16/9 $21 / 18$ |
| these [36] 10/13 14/24 | 110/1 $110 / 4 \quad 110 / 19110 / 23$ | 22/6 23/7 $23 / 12$ 29/13 |
|  | 111/17 112/25 113/14 | 42/22 44/5 44/7 $45 / 18$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 17 & 26 / 3 & 29 / 2 & 30 / 16\end{array}$ | 113/14 113/25 115/2 | 53/4 66/8 66/22 70/14 |
| 36/10 36/14 37/23 66/15 | 116/14 116/22 117/8 | 71/25 72/18 75/7 80/3 |
| 66/21 67/4 81/17 86/9 | 118/11 $122 / 15$ 122/22 | 82/1 87/4 87/4 87/23 |
| 88/12 90/15 91/1 91/23 | 124/11 124/21 125/15 | 90/19 92/9 93/14 96/18 |
| 99/7 99/9 99/17 100/11 | 125/16 125/21 125/24 | 103/1 103/10 103/13 108/6 |
| 104/9 108/12 108/24 | 126/13 127/8 129/4 130/1 | 109/23 113/23 117/24 |
| 110/25 111/1 111/12 | 130/16 $130 / 18$ 131/2 131/5 | 119/6 119/9 119/11 119/20 |
| 111/14 111/25 116/23 | 131/7 131/9 131/11 132/5 | 119/21 122/3 125/6 132/24 |
| they [100] $4 / 10$ 4/25 5/1 | 132/5 132/12 132/17 |  |
| $17 / 15$ 21/5 $21 / 6 \quad 21 / 11$ |  | times [4] 9/4 28/16 29/19 |
| 25/25 26/16 26/21 27/5 | 134/11 134/16 134/17 | 83/13 |
| 27/6 27/9 36/3 38/7 45/4 | 134/23 134/24 140/17 | TIMOTHY [1] 2/2 |
| 51/15 55/7 55/9 56/6 56/7 | thinking [1] 31/2 | tiny [1] 15/1 |
| 56/8 56/22 61/5 61/10 | third [2] 40/18 56/10 | today [4] 56/13 93/24 |
| 61/15 61/16 61/16 61/17 | thirds [1] 77/10 | 127/11 142/10 |
| 61/18 61/18 61/19 62/5 | Thirteenth [1] 2/14 | together [13] 10/9 22/4 |
| 62/10 65/9 66/8 66/9 68/5 | Thirty [1] 20/25 | 25/22 29/12 49/23 50/20 |
| 68/19 68/21 68/21 68/22 | Thirty-eight [1] 20/25 | 61/13 62/10 63/1 71/15 |
| 69/7 69/8 71/16 75/5 75/7 | this [183] | 122/3 125/19 133/13 |
| 75/11 75/17 80/11 80/16 | Thompson [3] 98/16 99/1 | told [25] 4/21 14/2 14/7 |
| 81/9 81/10 81/12 81/19 | 104/10 | 14/18 38/20 46/24 48/21 |
| 81/19 81/20 81/22 83/12 | those [66] 20/12 20/16 | 52/5 54/7 55/9 56/8 56/10 |
| 83/12 85/15 85/16 85/19 | 25/12 27/9 27/11 27/11 | 56/15 56/22 62/6 63/18 |
| 85/21 85/21 86/13 86/17 | 36/4 39/11 39/12 48/12 | 63/25 73/21 $73 / 23 \quad 83 / 12$ |
| 86/18 $86 / 1986 / 24 \quad 87 / 17$ | 48/14 $51 / 14$ 51/17 $51 / 22$ | 85/21 85/22 100/3 123/11 |
| 87/22 87/23 87/25 89/12 | 54/13 56/21 56/25 57/24 | 123/11 |
| 89/13 89/20 89/20 90/19 | 59/9 61/4 66/25 67/6 | too [7] 10/14 35/12 63/24 |
| 91/3 91/11 94/9 96/2 98/8 | 68/14 69/6 71/14 75/7 | 65/13 84/7 122/3 132/18 |
| 99/2 99/9 99/14 99/19 | 75/15 75/19 77/24 77/25 | took [9] 45/18 51/20 64/1 |
| 99/22 105/6 106/24 107/22 | 78/13 78/15 81/8 81/12 | 73/17 88/15 98/9 98/14 |
| 109/12 117/16 122/15 | 83/8 83/9 87/16 88/5 91/9 | 99/3 127/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}129 / 7 & 129 / 8 & 129 / 18 & 129 / 22\end{array}$ | 97/22 $99 / 10 \quad 99 / 1299 / 14$ | top [6] ${ }^{\text {l }}$ 16/10 $83 / 16$ 84/1 |
| 133/11 | 99/21 99/23 102/18 103/9 | 91/8 104/8 119/7 |
| they'd [1] 32/4 | 103/13 $104 / 4 \quad 106 / 2107 / 7$ | Torrey [1] 8/5 |
| they're [9] 4/11 50/7 | 107/10 107/12 107/14 | total [7] 27/2 52/3 52/7 |
| 66/9 68/19 69/1 78/14 | $\begin{array}{llll}112 / 11 & 116 / 22 & 121 / 5\end{array}$ | 52/8 62/11 98/13 110/23 |
| 99/17 99/18 117/16 | 125/19 125/20 134/2 134/7 | totaling [1] 107/9 |
| they've [2] 105/8 125/11 | 139/11 139/16 139/16 | towards [2] 20/15 21/4 |
| thing [21] 4/14 10/14 | 139/17 139/18 | Towers [1] 3/3 |
| 16/8 59/21 59/25 60/3 | though [6] 9/12 36/3 | track [2] 102/25 139/1 |
| 79/25 84/21 85/22 97/6 | 54/18 68/4 71/10 71/12 | tradition [2] 62/6 62/7 |
| 98/6 100/22 108/3 113/12 | thought [19] 10/24 11/16 | trail [1] 70/16 |
| 114/13 115/2 115/17 125/9 | 11/22 13/20 27/19 30/25 | transcript [4] 1/12 $3 / 9$ |
| 125/9 133/1 133/10 |  | 92/19 144/3 |
| things [23] 5/8 26/22 | 59/4 67/17 78/6 83/23 | transcription [1] 3/10 |
| 27/11 27/21 32/5 40/20 | 85/16 87/22 94/8 96/22 | Travis [1] 79/2 |
| 41/13 80/18 82/20 83/5 | 125/8 | treat [4] 99/21 109/25 |
| 100/18 102/4 107/17 114/8 | thread [3] 124/21 124/23 | 126/15 136/17 |
|  | 125/16 | trend [2] 105/9 110/10 |
| 129/8 $131 / 17$ 131/18 134/1 | three [19] 9/4 35/22 41/4 | trending [2] 102/22 |
| 134/9 | 68/14 78/12 79/5 79/6 | 102/25 |
| think [114] 4/16 4/19 | 88/13 96/24 107/12 107/15 | trends [4] 102/21 105/6 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}9 / 12 & 14 / 23 & 17 / 1 & 20 / 17\end{array}$ | 107/16 112/17 115/9 | 105/16 105/18 |
| 21/6 $22 / 11 \quad 24 / 3131 / 5$ | 115/21 116/1 116/6 117/15 | trial [4] 1/12 4/22 6/7 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 31 / 15 & 32 / 12 & 33 / 7 & 33 / 22\end{array}$ | 122/9 | 75/25 |
| 46/5 47/24 52/15 52/19 | threshold [1] 128/19 | Trials [1] 122 |
| 53/20 54/6 54/6 57/5 <br> 57/12 57/14 60/17 63/10 | through $[18]$ $9 / 10$ $12 / 11$ <br> $16 / 19$ $19 / 20$ $21 / 2$ $33 / 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tribune }[1] \quad 53 / 13 \\ & \text { Tried }[1] \quad 62 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |


| T | $73 / 1383 / 7 \text { 87/17 101/4 }$ | usual [1] 62/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| trouble [1] 127/13 |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \\ \text { utilized [1] } & 101 / 7\end{array}$ |
| true [15] 9/11 12/13 | undertook [1] 70/2 | V |
| 69/23 77/16 94/10 100/7 | unequivocal [1] 15/20 |  |
| 102/6 103/7 103/8 104/6 | unfortunate [1] 131/5 | VA [1] 2/18 |
| 104/12 114/18 126/8 | uniformly [1] 112/3 | valley [1] 18/ |
| 126/11 144/2 | UNITED [12] $1 / 11 / 51 / 7$ | valuable [1] 110/4 |
| truncated [1] 75/25 | 1/14 3/7 88/18 118/8 | value [4] 101/25 104/7 |
| trust [1] 6/24 | 136/9 137/10 140/11 142/7 | 104/18 104/19 |
| try [7] 40/21 65/16 69/15 | 144/4 | values [1] 69/10 |
| 84/7 88/20 126/21 127/3 | universe [1] 110/21 | VAP [4] 27/20 27/22 51/11 |
| trying [13] 4/2 5/4 5/7 | University [5] $81 / 5$ 81/7 | 51/11 |
| 23/21 76/3 83/12 86/5 | 95/13 121/8 122/10 | variance [1] 137/14 |
| 122/13 125/1 125/10 | un7ess [6] $33 / 5$ 51/4 | variances [2] 137/18 |
| 125/13 132/17 137/14 | 73/21 73/23 109/8 126/13 | 137/20 |
| Tuesday [4] 1/6 6/5 | unlikely [1] 40/24 | variety [3] 97/11 100/11 |
| 120/10 120/17 | unrecognized [1] 6/10 | 134/3 |
| turn [19] 16/12 20/7 | unti1 [9] $4 / 9$ 42/5 43/16 | various [3] 12/5 12/14 |
| 52/20 65/5 65/6 65/21 | 43/16 67/15 94/4 109/3 | 79/7 |
| 65/25 66/1 66/8 66/18 | 109/9 131/7 | vary [1] |
| 66/25 67/3 67/8 96/11 | unusually [1] 125/11 | Veasey [1] 62/14 |
| 110/18 117/8 129/22 | up [ 54$]$ 4/8 5/1 10/23 | VERA [3] 3/2 140/10 142/6 |
| 130/24 140/20 |  | version [1] 13/4 |
| turn-out [2] 130/24 | 19/10 20/2 30/20 32/4 | versus [1] 102/25 |
| 140/20 | 35/1 $35 / 2 \quad 36 / 19$ 37/4 | very [50] 4/5 5/6 6/20 |
| turned [1] 96/13 | 39/15 39/23 39/25 40/19 | 6/24 9/10 14/23 19/23 |
| turning [2] 66/22 66/24 | 41/13 41/14 43/17 44/6 |  |
| turnout [2] 129/21 130/25 | 54/12 59/13 63/17 63/20 | 26/8 31/25 32/3 |
| turns [1] 4/4 | 70/5 73/5 77/12 82/20 | 36/20 36/23 45/15 47/20 |
| Twenty [2] 57/15 140/5 | 86/6 86/14 89/5 89/14 | 49/13 $49 / 14$ 52/21 52/21 |
| Twenty-six [1] 140/5 | 92/1 93/9 95/24 98/13 | 53/2 53/4 53/10 67/7 |
| two [32] 4/4 6/23 9/4 | 99/5 103/16 104/15 107/5 | 72/19 76/1 86/12 89/11 |
| 33/21 35/5 35/7 36/4 | 107/9 107/18 108/11 | 98/4 98/19 99/9 99/9 |
| 36/14 37/23 43/4 47/19 | 114/19 114/23 115/23 | 100/20 101/12 103/20 |
| 74/25 77/10 84/17 95/1 | 128/5 $132 / 6 \quad 133 / 1133 / 4$ | 105/2 105/19 109/4 117/15 |
| 104/3 105/8 109/12 113/8 | 136/22 | 118/10 $122 / 1 \quad 125 / 14$ |
| 113/9 $114 / 10114 / 24116 / 1$ | upon [1] 9/11 | 126/23 129/1 131/8 136/7 |
| 116/7 118/13 131/19 | upper [2] 35/3 130/22 | 142/11 |
| 131/19 132/4 135/5 135/20 | Upton [1] 15/9 | vet [1] 81/20 |
| 135/25 142/16 | Uresti [7] 29/11 45/2 | vice [4] 29/5 30/17 44/20 |
| Two-thirds [1] | 78/12 79/3 79/5 79/12 | 91/12 |
| TX [4] 1/24 2/10 2/12 3/4 | 91/17 | victory |
| typically [3] 98/1 101/24 | us [22] 4/21 6/23 25/25 | view [13] 10/18 14/22 |
| 109/17 | 40/7 40/12 77/25 89/17 | 14/23 49/9 49/11 50/21 |
| typing [2] 122/18 122/19 | 89/23 95/22 99/5 100/3 | 50/23 61/16 105/17 110/5 |
| U | 102/4 105/19 105/22 110/6 | 110/10 112/4 134/16 |
|  | 112/24 115/16 127/5 | viewed [1] 49/2 |
| U.S [2] 2/3 75/12 | 130/15 130/18 140/12 | Viewer [1] 8/6 |
| Uh [1] 114/22 | 140/21 | views [1] 59 |
| Uh-huh [1] 114/22 | use [15] 87/3 97/19 98/23 | violated [2] 75/12 75/17 |
| ultimately [1] 107/4 | 99/25 100/23 101/25 | violation [2] 14/20 88/10 |
| under [31] 18/22 26/16 | 102/23 103/24 104/6 | visited [1] 68/1 |
| 27/10 $31 / 7131 / 8 \quad 31 / 8$ | 117/18 $127 / 11 \quad 131 / 5$ | vote [31] 15/18 31/20 |
| 31/14 34/21 35/22 44/16 | 131/24 $133 / 5 \quad 137 / 13$ | 31/24 38/3 46/8 47/21 |
| 48/2 48/8 $49 / 4$ 49/9 49/25 | used [24] 90/2 97/14 | 54/6 60/9 60/22 61/9 |
| 50/14 50/22 51/2 51/17 | 97/24 98/1 100/1 100/3 | 61/15 61/20 61/25 64/16 |
| 52/2 56/13 68/25 73/14 | 100/4 100/10 100/10 | 66/8 66/10 66/11 66/25 |
| 103/13 $113 / 2 \begin{array}{llll} & 113 / 3 & 113 / 18\end{array}$ | 100/25 101/3 101/11 | 74/21 74/23 77/7 77/12 |
| 113/18 115/8 118/12 138/3 | 101/15 $101 / 16$ 102/6 | 89/13 89/13 89/22 89/23 |
| understand [25] 6/7 23/4 | 104/12 $104 / 14107 / 4117 / 8$ | 99/15 129/18 130/24 |
| 23/12 $23 / 24 \quad 25 / 8 \quad 25 / 14$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 117 / 10 & 124 / 10 & 131 / 3\end{array}$ | 130/25 137/14 |
| 27/5 36/24 55/9 70/22 | 132/13 141/3 | voted [25] 8/2 38/7 46/6 |
| 76/4 76/7 76/8 84/4 84/9 | usefut [3] 99/10 113/15 | 46/7 $52 / 16$ 52/17 $52 / 20$ |
| 96/19 102/17 $112 / 5 \quad 116 / 13$ | 127/9 | 52/25 53/21 61/4 61/5 |
| 121/13 125/14 126/16 | uses [1] 137/20 | 61/22 63/3 64/14 66/4 |
| 126/24 127/6 128/4 | using [14] 27/5 72/12 | 66/4 66/5 71/3 75/3 75/7 |
| understanding [17] 14/16 | 87/4 96/24 97/2 101/5 | 75/16 77/17 86/13 91/1 |
| 23/14 48/4 48/6 48/7 | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 104 / 17 & 106 / 3 & 113 / 10\end{array}$ | 133/12 |
| 48/25 49/18 49/22 50/1 | 128/19 130/6 130/17 | voter [17] 21/11 21/24 |
| 50/3 50/15 57/23 63/13 | 130/19 134/20 | 22/9 22/12 22/15 22/18 |


| V | Washington $[5]$   <br> $2 / 6$ $2 / 15$ $3 / 8$ $2 / 4$ | $27 / 5$ $27 / 13$ $27 / 23$ $29 / 13$ <br> $29 / 17$ $30 / 16$ $30 / 17$ $30 / 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| voter... [11] 25/5 30/5 | wasn't [12] 16/21 27/17 | 31/1 $31 / 14$ 34/17 $36 / 10$ |
| 45/20 45/23 46/7 65/5 | 43/14 $54 / 18$ 54/20 $55 / 13$ | 46/25 $47 / 448 / 1248 / 16$ |
| 65/6 65/21 65/25 66/18 | 58/21 62/7 69/22 69/24 | 49/1 54/13 54/15 55/23 |
|  | 80/16 87/21 | 56/6 56/7 56/7 56/8 56/10 |
| voters [44] $11 / 11$ 20/20 | Watson [2] 78/12 79/4 |  |
| 21/4 $21 / 10 \quad 31 / 20 \quad 31 / 25$ | way [26] $4 / 10$ 6/8 8/20 | 56/22 57/24 $58 / 21 \quad 59 / 9$ |
| 54/14 55/21 55/23 56/6 | 9/17 11/24 17/15 21/20 | 60/3 61/17 61/25 63/8 |
| 56/25 64/23 66/4 66/5 | 21/23 22/10 22/14 48/11 | 63/22 63/24 64/6 65/3 |
| 66/8 66/13 66/15 66/21 | 50/6 55/20 58/8 79/5 98/9 | 65/15 65/22 66/21 66/21 |
| 66/21 66/24 67/1 67/6 | 103/11 105/17 114/14 | 67/17 71/9 71/9 71/12 |
| 69/11 75/3 88/9 89/21 | 124/25 125/19 125/21 | 71/14 71/16 71/18 73/19 |
| 96/16 98/10 99/5 99/12 | 126/21 127/9 131/9 142/2 | 74/25 75/12 77/20 77/22 |
| 99/14 101/21 101/21 | ways [4] 97/11 100/11 | 77/23 77/24 77/25 80/13 |
| 101/22 106/24 112/23 | 127/8 134/3 | 80/23 80/24 81/8 81/9 |
| 129/1 129/17 129/19 | we [238] | 81/10 81/19 81/20 81/22 |
| 129/23 130/23 133/6 | we'd [2] 25/24 138/21 | 82/16 83/1 83/12 85/11 |
| 133/11 133/13 | we'11 [10] 5/24 6/24 20/8 | 86/9 86/24 87/11 87/17 |
| voters' [4] 97/3 97/21 | 36/19 70/19 82/2 98/9 | 87/18 87/22 87/23 87/25 |
| 99/23 112/19 | 134/8 135/25 142/16 | 91/9 93/2 93/6 102/4 |
| votes [11] 16/20 60/23 | we're [38] $5 / 7$ 5/25 6/4 | 105/8 106/21 106/24 |
| 71/8 76/22 77/8 77/13 | 6/6 24/3 31/7 31/8 43/24 | 110/20 116/24 117/15 |
| 77/15 77/23 98/24 107/10 | 67/15 75/25 81/24 82/2 | 119/9 120/6 120/21 127/25 |
| 114/21 | 82/14 84/20 92/4 92/21 | 128/6 128/18 130/12 |
| voting [50] 12/3 12/13 | 97/7 99/10 103/13 104/17 | 130/12 139/3 139/18 $140 / 3$ |
| 14/14 14/20 18/22 22/13 | 104/18 105/1 108/4 108/6 | 140/4 |
| 23/16 26/9 26/14 26/17 | 108/13 111/3 114/17 | weren't [5] 18/18 31/2 |
| 27/22 28/21 31/9 32/18 | 114/17 $125 / 5$ 129/25 130/9 | 42/5 66/24 87/20 |
| $34 / 1 \quad 34 / 3 \quad 34 / 21 \quad 37 / 12$ | 131/13 132/24 132/24 | west [18] 1/20 $2 / 20$ 8/13 |
| 45/17 48/2 48/8 49/4 49/9 | 133/16 135/5 135/8 141/18 | 8/14 14/24 15/3 20/9 |
| 49/24 49/25 $50 / 14 \quad 50 / 22$ | we've [7] $31 / 3$ 86/4 91/21 | $30 / 12 \quad 36 / 7 \quad 45 / 2 \quad 51 / 6$ |
| 51/3 51/18 61/17 73/14 | 107/1 132/23 135/23 | 81/16 $91 / 15$ 92/3 $92 / 8$ |
| 75/12 75/12 75/18 83/4 | 137/13 | 93/21 94/3 99/13 |
| 88/10 97/14 99/23 105/10 | weak [1] 115/12 | Western [1] 5/3 |
| 107/22 110/23 130/2 130/4 | Webb [11] 12/17 12/19 | what [160] |
| 130/10 130/11 132/10 | 12/20 12/22 12/25 13/4 | what's [7] 43/3 44/1 |
| 132/14 134/17 140/19 | $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 17 & 13 / 18 & 13 / 19 & 13 / 19\end{array}$ | 71/19 100/25 102/1 113/19 |
| 140/20 | 13/19 | 115/22 |
| W | Wednesday | whatever [3] 76/23 99/20 |
| W-E-B-B [1] 13/18 | 122 | when [51] 8/7 9/15 11/9 |
| Waco [1] 57/1 | weeks [2] 33/21 118/13 | 19/4 19/24 20/9 20 |
| wait [6] 92/1 98/21 | weight [1] 106/7 | 25/22 $34 / 18 \quad 36 / 20 \quad 45 / 21$ |
| 103/18 111/10 111/10 | weighted [2] $103 / 5106 / 8$ |  |
| 111/10 | weights [1] 105/23 | 55/9 56/12 59/24 65/15 |
| waiting [4] 4/8 4/9 4/10 | welcome [5] 74/3 74/9 | 70/7 70/15 $79 / 1$ 79/4 79/4 |
| 4/11 | 82/12 111/21 122/1 | 80/16 82/15 83/8 85/11 |
| want [53] 4/14 4/23 5/9 | wel1 [42] 4/17 5/11 5/17 | 88/14 92/3 92/6 92/8 93/2 |
| 10/20 $11 / 12$ 12/9 $31 / 17$ | 6/3 28/2 $31 / 3$ 41/1 $45 / 15$ | 93/21 94/7 94/8 95/6 |
| $33 / 4$ 34/15 34/25 36/17 | 46/3 47/20 48/10 49/13 | 95/25 96/5 97/6 98/22 |
| 39/14 $39 / 15$ 39/16 40/4 | 49/14 $50 / 18$ 53/21 $57 / 20$ | 99/10 99/14 101/24 112/10 |
| 40/5 40/13 46/18 61/16 | 80/20 92/23 93/21 94/3 | 114/17 114/23 116/9 |
| 63/5 68/23 70/21 73/5 | 98/1 98/16 98/19 98/21 | $117 / 15 \quad 127 / 13130 / 24$ |
| 75/19 82/15 83/23 86/2 | 101/17 108/10 109/11 | whenever [1] 82/8 |
| 86/8 86/12 86/17 88/22 | 110/5 114/3 117/10 123/7 | where [29] 10/9 18/3 |
| 89/22 93/18 94/19 96/11 | 124/21 125/15 125/24 | 22/17 $36 / 18$ 40/5 40/14 |
| 98/12 $105 / 18$ 110/2 $110 / 6$ | 126/4 126/8 127/16 127/24 | 58/3 58/10 71/18 84/6 |
| 110/7 110/8 112/9 112/13 | 131/19 $132 / 8 \quad 136 / 8 \quad 136 / 19$ | 89/18 96/22 97/13 98/17 |
| 115/18 127/14 128/22 | Wells [2] 13/14 13/14 | 106/3 106/24 110/20 |
| 129/13 129/13 130/13 | Wendy [8] $1 / 946 / 23$ 48/16 | 113/13 113/14 115/18 |
| 130/14 134/9 136/5 136/6 | 54/4 55/7 $66 / 22 \quad 68 / 4$ | 116/25 116/25 124/2 |
| wanted [16] 10/10 11/15 | 140/15 | 132/23 133/6 $133 / 13$ |
| 25/25 26/22 $31 / 6 \quad 39 / 19$ | went [13] 56/25 63/11 | 134/22 135/7 $135 / 8$ |
| 45/9 59/22 62/12 77/21 | 68/6 78/3 78/6 93/22 94/7 | wherever [1] 100/21 |
| 79/2 79/3 81/12 94/8 |  | whether [30] 15/15 19/22 |
| 136/2 136/3 | 116/5 123/4 | 21/14 $21 / 21 \quad 22 / 3 \quad 25 / 4$ |
| Ward [2] 15/9 20/11 | were [119] $4 / 2$ 8/8 8/10 | 26/24 27/6 $27 / 16$ 34/2 |
| warn [1] 5/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}9 / 10 & 12 / 2 & 14 / 12 & 14 / 17\end{array}$ | 50/24 51/2 66/8 68/7 |
| warned [2] 117/20 117/21 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll} & 15 / 8 & 15 / 18 & 15 / 21 & 15 / 22\end{array}$ | 75/17 77/20 77/20 80/22 |
| was [300] | $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 9 & 25 / 1 & 26 / 4 & 26 / 8 & 26 / 13\end{array}$ | 81/21 85/13 85/16 85/19 |


| W | witness $[16]$ $7 / 10$ $7 / 14$ <br> $24 / 16$ $24 / 19$ $34 / 6$ $76 / 1$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} 74 / 3 & 74 / 9 & 82 / 8 & 83 / 5 & 83 / 18 \\ 83 / 20 & 89 / 1 & 94 / 16 & 95 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| whether... [8] 86/23 | 76/2 76/9 76/10 82/5 93/5 | 96/12 100/2 102/16 108/22 |
| 96/15 98/25 108/8 123/13 | 94/18 $95 / 4 \quad 118 / 23 \quad 119 / 12$ | 109/15 109/15 110/18 |
| 123/14 128/25 129/16 | 123/18 | 111/21 115/13 116/16 |
| which [75] 4/4 4/5 4/23 | witness' [1] 80/2 | 120/3 122/1 $130 / 22 \quad 130 / 24$ |
| 6/1 11/16 $17 / 819 / 219 / 6$ | WITNESSES [1] 143/2 | 131/16 133/5 133/11 |
| 20/1 21/10 22/15 27/13 | won [10] 16/14 53/17 | 133/12 |
| 28/12 28/25 29/8 31/16 | 65/23 99/1 99/2 105/2 | you've [3] 97/6 99/25 |
| 33/18 34/12 34/17 36/6 | 105/3 105/6 105/8 134/14 | 118/21 |
| 37/13 48/1 $48 / 3$ 49/23 | won't [1] 24/14 | your [182] |
| 60/10 61/9 64/2 65/9 | wonder [1] 100/19 | yourself [2] 95/12 112/10 |
| 76/21 86/13 $93 / 9$ 97/9 | word [4] 26/1 50/18 | Z |
| 97/23 101/1 101/9 101/11 | 123/14 131/6 |  |
| 101/16 103/16 105/24 | words [1] 123/16 | Zaffirini [7] 45/2 78/4 |
| 106/17 $107 / 8$ 108/1 108/18 | work [13] 25/24 26/2 | 78/7 78/23 79/12 91/19 |
| 111/4 111/25 112/6 113/7 | 73/18 80/6 86/10 95/19 | 94/2 |
| 113/21 113/22 116/14 | 95/25 103/11 103/12 | zaffirini's [2] 61/12 |
| 123/2 123/3 123/5 123/6 | 121/14 122/14 127/6 | 78/24 |
| 123/8 123/9 123/21 124/4 | 134/23 | zero [4] 115/22 116/1 |
| 124/4 125/19 128/11 | worked [6] 8/2 52/21 68/7 | 116/1 116/1 |
| 129/15 130/6 130/13 | 68/15 95/17 95/18 | zoom [3] 8/11 13/7 15/1 |
| 131/17 131/24 131/25 | working [5] 12/2 25/2 |  |
| 132/4 134/13 $135 / 2$ 135/6 | 42/23 83/8 85/11 |  |
| 138/5 139/13 140/4 144/8 | works [3] 12/18 41/24 |  |
| while [6] 12/2 15/12 | 121/14 |  |
| 15/21 $25 / 174 / 11$ 104/6 | worse [1] 98/18 |  |
| White [5] 4/7 6/22 104/7 | worst [1] 115/8 |  |
| 104/13 104/21 | Worth [13] 37/24 47/5 |  |
| White's [1] 104/8 | 54/8 54/14 $55 / 24$ 56/1 |  |
| who [35] 6/13 6/23 16/14 | 56/10 58/16 58/23 138/22 |  |
| 32/20 $41 / 142 / 2043 / 1$ | 139/6 141/13 142/1 |  |
| 44/25 51/9 $52 / 14$ 52/16 | would [151] |  |
| 52/17 52/25 53/6 53/8 | wouldn't [7] 41/6 55/21 |  |
| 61/4 61/5 66/3 66/4 66/5 | 69/13 71/8 100/14 106/10 |  |
| 66/21 66/21 66/24 74/25 | 109/11 |  |
| 80/6 81/6 81/16 87/16 | wraps [1] 17/10 |  |
| 90/16 91/6 91/9 94/19 | writing [1] 120/25 |  |
| 117/12 121/7 121/21 | written [5] 7/4 94/22 |  |
| who's [1] 135/9 | 106/16 139/4 139/24 |  |
| whole [12] 15/13 16/8 | wrote [2] 21/20 125/6 |  |
| 22/3 $53 / 13$ 64/12 85/13 | Y |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 85 / 17 \quad 85 / 20 \quad 112 / 22 \quad 117 / 17 \\ & 136 / 17137 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | yeah [9] 35/19 58/1 67/11 |  |
| whom [2] 41/5 53/6 | 67/11 71/9 90/11 93/22 |  |
| whose[3] 26/2 97/17 | 122/13 139/16 |  |
| 135/10 | year [18] 9/24 16/16 37/2 |  |
| why [17] 14/24 15/3 15/7 | 52/19 101/20 101/20 102/2 |  |
| 15/12 49/3 50/3 50/23 | 102/2 113/9 113/10 114/11 |  |
| 61/17 75/15 79/5 86/13 | 114/11 114/12 114/12 |  |
| 89/12 89/13 96/2 109/21 | 114/12 $114 / 12 \quad 114 / 15$ |  |
| 112/24 124/11 | 114/15 |  |
| wife [3] 43/10 43/20 | year/bad [1] 114/12 |  |
| 118/13 | year/off [4] 101/20 102/2 |  |
| wil1 [19] 4/11 5/3 5/10 | 113/9 114/12 |  |
| 18/20 30/12 76/6 85/25 | years [7] 95/16 100/13 |  |
| 87/7 91/21 112/4 114/19 | 105/8 105/8 109/8 109/9 |  |
| 117/25 126/24 129/11 | 126/25 |  |
| 134/13 135/5 135/14 | yellow [1] 17/8 |  |
| 135/16 135/17 | yes [179] |  |
| willingness [2] 117/22 | yesterday [1] 94/25 |  |
| 117/23 | yet [7] 39/17 51/13 51/17 |  |
| win [3] 15/25 129/20 | 62/7 69/25 70/25 86/4 |  |
| 130/25 | you [806] |  |
| Winkler [2] 15/9 20/11 | you'11 [13] 4/12 74/10 |  |
| wins [2] 113/2 116/6 | 91/8 102/12 103/20 106/3 |  |
| wisdom [1] 96/8 | 106/10 107/24 107/25 |  |
| within [7] 19/7 47/16 | 126/13 $126 / 14132 / 19$ |  |
| 68/24 69/11 69/15 70/2 | 134/12 |  |
| 103/10 | you're [34] $4 / 22$ 7/8 15/5 |  |
| without [2] 138/13 139/12 | 22/1 35/10 47/25 53/2 |  |

