

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CHELAN

TIMOTHY BORDERS, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

KING COUNTY, et al.

Respondents.

No. 05-2-00027-3

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

ANDREA R. CARIÑO states as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to the within cause.

2. I am employed by the law firm of Davis Wright Tremaine LLP. My business and mailing addresses are 2600 Century Square, 1501 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101-1688.

3. On February 22, 2005, I caused the documents listed below to be served via U.S. Mail, with First Class postage thereon prepaid, on the parties listed below:

(1) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production to Petitioner Rossi-For-Governor Campaign;**

(2) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production to Petitioner Timothy Borders;**

(3) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production to Petitioner Thomas Canterbury;**

1 (4) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State**
2 **Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production**
3 **to Petitioner Paul Elvig;**

4 (5) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State**
5 **Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production**
6 **to Petitioner Margie Ferris;**

7 (6) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State**
8 **Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production**
9 **to Petitioner Tom Huff;**

10 (7) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State**
11 **Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production**
12 **to Petitioner Edward Monaghan;**

13 (8) **Objections, Answers and Responses to Washington State**
14 **Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production**
15 **to Petitioner Christopher Vance; and**

16 (9) **this Certificate of Service.**

17 **Kevin Hamilton, Esq.**
18 Perkins Coie LLP
19 Attorneys for Washington State Democratic
20 Central Committee
21 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
22 Seattle, WA 98101

Tim O'Neill
Klickitat County Prosecuting Attorney
205 South Columbus Ave., MS-CH18
Goldendale WA 98620

23 **Gary Riesen**
24 Chelan County Prosecuting Attorney
25 PO Box 2596
26 Wenatchee WA 98807-2596

L. Michael Golden
Lewis County Senior Dep. Prosec. Attorney
345 West Main Street
Chehalis WA 98532

27 **Barnett N. Kalikow, Esq.**
For: Klickitat County Auditor
Kalikow & Gusa PLLC
1405 Harrison Avenue NW, Suite 207
Olympia WA 98502

Jeffrey T. Even, Asst. Attorney General
For: Secretary of State Sam Reed
Attorney General's Office
PO Box 40100
Olympia WA 98504-0100

Gorden Sivley
Michael C. Held
Snohomish County Deputy Prosecuting
Attorneys
2918 Colby Avenue, Suite 203
Everett WA 98201-4011

Thomas Ahearne, Esq.
For: Secretary of State Sam Reed
Foster Pepper & Shefelman
1111 Third Avenue, Suite 3400
Seattle WA 98101

1 I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the
2 foregoing is true and correct.

3 DATED this 22nd day of February, 2005 at Seattle, Washington.
4
5

6 _____
7 Andrea R. Cariño
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CHELAN

TIMOTHY BORDERS et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

KING COUNTY et al.,

Respondents,

and

WASHINGTON STATE DEMOCRATIC
CENTRAL COMMITTEE,

Intervenor-Respondent.

No. 05-2-00027-3

**OBJECTIONS, ANSWERS,
AND RESPONSES TO
WASHINGTON STATE
DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL
COMMITTEE'S FIRST
INTERROGATORIES AND
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
TO PETITIONER ROSSI-FOR-
GOVERNOR CAMPAIGN**

Petitioner Rossi-for-Governor Campaign (the "Rossi Campaign") provides the following objections, answers, and responses to the Washington State Democratic Central Committee's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. The Rossi Campaign objects to Instruction No. 3 with regard to the instruction to "state all factual and legal justifications" supporting any objection or failure to answer as seeking to impose obligations beyond those required by the Civil Rules and as seeking work product. The Rossi Campaign will set forth its objections in compliance with the Civil Rules.

1 2. The Rossi Campaign objects to Instruction No. 4 as seeking to impose
2 obligations beyond those required under the Civil Rules; as burdensome; harassing; and
3 calling for information protected by the attorney client privilege or work product doctrine.

4 3. The Rossi Campaign objects to Instruction No. 5 as seeking to impose
5 obligations beyond those of the Civil Rules. The Rossi Campaign will answer and object
6 to interrogatories in accordance with the Civil Rules.

7 4. The Rossi Campaign objects to Instruction No. 6 as unduly burdensome;
8 overbroad; harassing; and to the extent that it would require disclosure of documents or
9 information protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

10 5. The Rossi Campaign objects to the definitions of "You," "your" or any
11 similar word or phrase," "Petitioners," "identify," and "state the factual basis" including
12 each of the multiple subparts of those definitions, as unreasonable, unduly burdensome,
13 and harassing. The Rossi Campaign will entertain reasonable requests for further
14 identifying information if there is genuine uncertainty as to the person, entity, or
15 communication to which the discovery responses refer. Furthermore, the inclusion of all
16 of the Rossi Campaign's agents, attorneys, and professional advisors or consultants within
17 the definitions is objectionable insofar as it is overbroad and would require disclosure of
18 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege or as work product.
19 The Rossi Campaign has received assistance from many in-house and outside attorneys
20 and consultants, both retained and volunteer, throughout this election and in the course of
21 the post-election litigation and continues to receive assistance from such people. The
22 communications with them are either (1) protected by the attorney-client privileged, (2)
23 prepared in anticipation of or in the course of litigation, or (3) wholly unrelated to any of
24 the issues in this litigation. The Rossi Campaign has not asked these individuals to provide
25 responsive documents and is not producing correspondence with these individuals that is in
26 its possession. The Rossi Campaign further objects to providing a privilege log for such
27

1 documents, as the log would amount to a running report of the timing and subject matter of
2 all of its communications with its attorneys and consultants. Further, given the enormous
3 burden of producing such documents or even identifying them and preparing a privilege
4 log and the lack of any relevance of the actual communications themselves to the subject
5 matter of this case (as opposed to the factual information and documents that are being
6 provided with these answers and responses), the request for these documents is unduly
7 burdensome. The Rossi Campaign offers to schedule a CR 26(i) conference to discuss
8 further this objection and the request further and ways to accommodate any specific,
9 legitimate needs to discover some of the nonprivileged communications

10 6. The Rossi Campaign objects to the definitions and instructions generally to
11 the extent that they seek to impose obligations beyond those imposed by the Civil Rules.
12 The Rossi Campaign will provide answers and responses consistent with the obligations
13 imposed by the Civil Rules.

14 7. The Rossi Campaign objects to the disclosure or production of its
15 confidential information or documents.

16 8. The Rossi Campaign objects to the production of, and will not produce,
17 copies of the papers and pleadings on file in this action or of the communications between
18 its attorneys and the WSDCC's attorneys. The WSDCC already has copies of such
19 documents.

20 9. The Rossi Campaign notes that WSDCC and some counties opposed
21 Petitioners efforts to obtain expedited discovery. Petitioners discovery efforts continue
22 and are on-going. Much of the information sought herein currently is being obtained from
23 other parties through discovery. Thus, these answers and responses will be supplemented
24 as required under CR 26(e).

25 10. The requests for a list of illegal votes that will be the subject of this election
26 contest appear to be premature, as the timing of the disclosure of this information is
27

1 governed by RCW 29A.68.100. In an effort to expedite the discovery process, however,
2 the Rossi Campaign is willing to discuss and agree to a mutual exchange of such lists, to
3 the extent the parties possess the information, in advance of the statutory deadline. In any
4 event, the final list of illegal votes that will be the subject of this election contest shall be
5 produced in accordance with RCW29A.68.100.

6 INTERROGATORIES

7 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:** Identify any Challenge you made to any person's
8 right to vote in the 2004 General Election or Gubernatorial Election on or before Election
9 Day.

10 **ANSWER:** The Rossi Campaign did not make any such challenges.

11
12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:** For any Challenge identified in response to
13 Interrogatory No. 1, identify the person whose right to vote you Challenged.

14 **ANSWER:** Please see answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

15
16 **INTERROGATORY NO.3:** Do you contend any felon voted in the 2004 General
17 Election. If so, state the basis for that contention and identify the following:

- 18 a. The felon;
- 19 b. The date that the county in which the felon voted learned of the
20 felon's conviction;
- 21 c. Any facts indicating whether the felon has had his or her rights
22 restored and, if they have been, the date the rights were restored;
- 23 d. What steps you took, if any, to determine if the person's rights had
24 been restored;
- 25 e. Any facts indicating that the felon voted in the Gubernatorial
26 Election; and
- 27 f. Any facts indicating which candidate the felon voted for in the
Gubernatorial Election.

1 **ANSWER:** Yes. The Rossi Campaign contends that at least 1108 felons who
2 were not eligible to vote voted in the 2004 General Election. All felony-conviction records
3 obtained by the Rossi Campaign regarding felons ineligible to vote who voted in the
4 Gubernatorial Election are available for inspection in response to Request for Production
5 No. 2. Alternatively, the Rossi Campaign is willing to make copies of such documents and
6 provide them at the WSDCC's expense. Additional information identifying each felon is
7 contained in the electronic voter databases maintained by the counties (hereinafter "Voter
8 Files").

9 Subpart (b) is more appropriately directed to counties. If a felon was convicted in a
10 particular county, then that county had notice of the conviction immediately.

11 Answering subparts (c) and (d), in searching the court records from which
12 information regarding felony convictions was obtained, the Rossi Campaign searched for
13 records indicating that the person's rights had been restored. From the Washington State
14 Office of the Administrator of the Courts, the Rossi Campaign also obtained a list of all
15 felons whose rights had been restored in King County. The list provided by King County
16 is being made available in response to Request for Production No. 2

17 The Rossi Campaign objects to subparts (e) and (f) as vague and ambiguous in their
18 reference to "any facts indicating" whether the person voted in the Gubernatorial Election
19 or for which candidate the person voted. The Rossi Campaign's belief and contention that
20 at least 1108 felons, who were ineligible to vote, voted is based on a comparison of
21 information contained in conviction records with information contained in voter files.
22 There are many facts that may "indicate" for whom these felons voted and that they cast
23 votes in the Gubernatorial Election, including the particular ballots cast by a felon. If those
24 ballots cannot be identified, a proportional analysis of for whom votes were cast in a
25 particular precinct provides circumstantial evidence of the races in which and the
26 candidates for whom felons voted in a particular precinct. The Rossi Campaign is also
27

1 generally aware of media reports in which some felons purportedly indicated for whom
2 they claim to have voted.

3 The Rossi Campaign is continuing to identify information regarding felons who
4 voted illegally. The final list of illegal votes that will be the subject of this election contest
5 will be produced in accordance with RCW29A.68.100.

6
7 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:** Identify any communications you have had with
8 any felon identified in response to Interrogatory No. 3.

9 **ANSWER:** The Rossi Campaign objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, unduly
10 burdensome, and seeking information not likely to lead to admissible evidence. It would
11 be unreasonably burdensome for the Rossi Campaign to attempt to determine if any
12 campaign literature or fund-raising solicitations were directed to any of the felons who
13 voted. Although some felons may have contacted the Rossi Campaign in connection with
14 the election, the Rossi Campaign did not make a record of any such contacts and does not
15 recall any specific communications with anyone known at the time of the communication
16 to be a felon. The Rossi Campaign has not knowingly approached or communicated
17 regarding the election with individuals it knew were felons. It is not aware of any
18 communications with any particular felon as to whether that particular felon voted or for
19 whom that felon claims to have voted.

20
21 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:** Do you contend that any votes were cast in the
22 name of a deceased person in the 2004 General Election? If so, state the basis for that
23 contention, and identify the following:

- 24 a. The deceased person;
- 25 b. The date of death of the deceased person;
- 26 c. The date that the county in which the deceased person was
27 registered learned of the deceased person's death;

- 1 d. The person who voted in the name of the deceased person;
2 e. Any facts indicating that a vote was cast in the name of the deceased
3 person in the Gubernatorial Election; and
4 f. Any facts indicating the candidate for which such a vote was cast in
the Gubernatorial Election.

5 **ANSWER:** Yes. The Rossi Campaign contends that at least 45 ballots were cast
6 in the names of deceased persons in the 2004 General Election. All death certificates
7 obtained by the Rossi Campaign for persons identified in the Voter Files as having voted in
8 the Gubernatorial Election are available for inspection in response to Request for
9 Production No. 2. Alternatively, the Rossi Campaign is willing to make copies of such
10 documents and provide them at the WSDCC's expense. Additional information
11 identifying these persons is contained in the Voter Files.

12 Subpart (c) is more appropriately directed to counties. If the deceased person was
13 registered in the county in which he or she died, then that county had notice of the voter's
14 death on or before the date the county issued the death certificate or the report to the state
15 Department of Health of deaths in that county.

16 Answering subpart (d), the Rossi Campaign is generally aware of media reports
17 identifying some individuals who apparently cast ballots in the name of deceased
18 individuals, but the Rossi Campaign does not have any personal knowledge as to the
19 identity of any of the people who submitted ballots in the name of the deceased persons.

20 The Rossi Campaign objects to subparts (e) and (f) as vague and ambiguous in their
21 reference to "any facts indicating" whether the person voted in the Gubernatorial Election
22 or for which candidate the person voted. The Rossi Campaign's belief and contention that
23 at least 45 ballots were submitted in the names of deceased persons and were counted is
24 based on a comparison of information from death certificates with information from voter
25 files. There are many facts that may "indicate" that these ballots contained votes in the
26 Gubernatorial Election and for whom the votes were cast and counted including the
27

1 particular ballots cast in the names of deceased individuals. If those ballots cannot be
2 identified, a proportional analysis of for whom votes were cast in a particular precinct
3 provides circumstantial evidence of the candidates for whom ballots on behalf of deceased
4 persons were cast in that precinct. The Rossi Campaign is also generally aware of media
5 reports identifying some individuals who purportedly cast ballots in the name of deceased
6 individuals and the candidates for whom they claim to have voted.

7 The Rossi Campaign is continuing to identify information regarding ballots cast in
8 the name of deceased individuals. The final list of illegal votes that will be the subject of
9 this election contest will be produced in accordance with RCW29A.68.100.

10
11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:** Identify any communications you have had with
12 any person who cast a vote in the name of any deceased person identified in Interrogatory
13 No. 5.

14 **ANSWER:**

15 The Rossi Campaign objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, unduly
16 burdensome, and seeking information not likely to lead to admissible evidence. It would
17 be unreasonably burdensome for the Rossi Campaign to attempt to determine if any
18 campaign literature or fund-raising solicitations were directed to unknown persons casting
19 ballots in the name of deceased persons or any individuals identified in media reports as
20 having purportedly voted in the name of a deceased person. Although some such
21 individuals may have contacted the Rossi Campaign in connection with the election, the
22 Rossi Campaign did not make a record of any such contacts and does not recall any
23 specific communications with anyone known at the time of the communication to have cast
24 a ballot in the name of a deceased person. The Rossi Campaign has not approached or
25 communicated regarding the election with individuals it knew cast ballots in the name of a
26 deceased person.

1
2 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:** Do you contend that any person cast a vote in the
3 2004 General Election and in an election held in any other state on Election Day? If so,
4 state the basis for that content and identify the following:

- 5 a. The person;
- 6 b. The county or municipality in which the person was registered in
7 any other state;
- 8 c. The date on which the county in Washington that issued a ballot to
9 the person learned of the person's registration in any other state.
- 10 d. Any facts indicating that the person voted in the Gubernatorial
11 Election; and
- 12 e. Any facts indicating which candidate the person voted for in the
13 Gubernatorial Election.

14 **ANSWER:** Yes. The Rossi Campaign contends that at least 5 persons cast ballots
15 in the 2004 General Election and an election held in another state on Election Day. The
16 information requested in subparts (a) and (b) is provided in the attached Exhibit A. Subpart
17 (c) is more appropriately directed to counties. The Rossi Campaign does not know the
18 date on which Washington counties may have learned of a person's registration or voting
19 in another state.

20 The Rossi Campaign objects to subparts (d) and (e) as vague and ambiguous in
21 their reference to "any facts indicating" whether the person voted in the Gubernatorial
22 Election or for which candidate the person voted. The Rossi Campaign's belief and
23 contention that at least 5 people cast votes in the Gubernatorial Election in Washington and
24 in an election in another state is based on a comparison of information in the voter files
25 with information contained in similar records from other states. There are many facts that
26 may "indicate" that these voters voted in the Gubernatorial Election and for whom they
27 voted, including the particular ballots cast by such double voters. If those ballots cannot be
identified, a proportional analysis of for whom votes were cast in a particular precinct

1 provides circumstantial evidence of the candidates for whom the double voters in that
2 precinct voted. The Rossi Campaign is continuing to identify information regarding
3 ballots cast by double voters. The final list of illegal votes that will be the subject of this
4 election contest will be produced in accordance with RCW29A.68.100.

5
6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:** Identify any communications you have had with
7 any person identified in response to Interrogatory No. 7.

8 **ANSWER:**

9 The Rossi Campaign objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, unduly
10 burdensome, and seeking information not likely to lead to admissible evidence. It would
11 be unreasonably burdensome for the Rossi Campaign to attempt to determine if any
12 campaign literature or fund-raising solicitations were directed to anyone now identified as
13 a double voter. Although some such individuals may have contacted the Rossi Campaign
14 in connection with the election, the Rossi Campaign did not make a record of any such
15 contacts and does not recall any specific communications with anyone known at the time
16 of the communication to have cast multiple votes. The Rossi Campaign has not
17 approached or communicated regarding the election with individuals it knew cast multiple
18 ballots.

19
20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:** Do you contend that any person cast more than one
21 vote in the 2004 General Election? If so, state the basis for that contention and identify the
22 following:

- 23 a. The person;
- 24 b. The date that the county in which the person voted learned that the
25 person cast more than one vote;
- 26 c. Any facts indicating that the person voted in the Gubernatorial
27 Election; and

1 d. Any facts indicating which candidate the person voted for in the
2 Gubernatorial Election.

3 ANSWER: Yes. The Rossi Campaign contends that at least 10 people cast more
4 than one vote in the 2004 General Election. This belief and contention is based on the
5 Rossi Campaign's review and comparisons of information contained in Voter Files. The
6 people who voted more than once are identified, by registered address rather than last
7 known address, in the attached Exhibit B.

8 Subpart (b) is more appropriately directed to the counties. The Rossi Campaign
9 does not know the date on which the county or counties in Washington that issued a ballot
10 or ballots to the persons identified in Exhibit B learned that those persons cast more than
11 one vote.

12 The Rossi Campaign objects to subparts (c) and (d) as vague and ambiguous in
13 their reference to "any facts indicating" whether the person voted in the Gubernatorial
14 Election or for which candidate the person voted. The Rossi Campaign's belief and
15 contention that at least 10 people cast more than one vote in the Gubernatorial Election is
16 based on a review of information in voter files indicating that at least 10 people maintained
17 and voted under two registration records. There are many facts that may "indicate" that
18 these voters voted in the Gubernatorial Election and for whom they voted, including the
19 particular ballots cast by such double voters. If those ballots cannot be identified, a
20 proportional analysis of for whom votes were cast in a particular precinct provides
21 circumstantial evidence of the candidates for whom the double voters in that precinct
22 voted.

23 The Rossi Campaign is continuing to identify information regarding ballots cast by
24 double voters. The final list of illegal votes that will be the subject of this election contest
25 will be produced in accordance with RCW29A.68.100.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:** Identify any communications you have had with
2 any person identified in response to Interrogatory No. 9.

3 **ANSWER:** The Rossi Campaign objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, unduly
4 burdensome, and seeking information not likely to lead to admissible evidence. It would
5 be unreasonably burdensome for the Rossi Campaign to attempt to determine if any
6 campaign literature or fund-raising solicitations were directed to persons now identified as
7 double voters. Although some such individuals may have contacted the Rossi Campaign
8 in connection with the election, the Rossi Campaign did not make a record of any such
9 contacts and does not recall any specific communications with anyone known at the time
10 of the communication to have cast multiple votes. The Rossi Campaign has not
11 approached or communicated regarding the election with individuals it knew cast multiple
12 ballots.

13
14 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:** Do you contend that any member of any Precinct
15 Election Board engaged in misconduct in relation to the 2004 General Election or the
16 Gubernatorial Election? If so, state the basis for that contention and identify each such
17 Precinct Election Board member.

18 **ANSWER:** Yes. Members of Precinct Election Boards, as well as other elections
19 officials, engaged in misconduct, were neglectful, and/or committed error by (1) allowing
20 provisional ballots to be placed in counting machines, (2) allowing to vote felons whose
21 civil rights were not restored, (3) allowing individuals to cast votes on behalf of deceased
22 voters, (4) failing to ensure that only lawfully registered voters cast ballots and that such
23 lawfully registered voters only did so once, (5) allowing provisional ballots to be counted
24 without first complying with Washington law regarding the verification and disposition of
25 provisional ballots; (6) apparently failing to maintain accurate poll books and logs of those
26 who cast ballots in a particular precinct and other records necessary to ensure that only
27

1 validly registered persons voted and voted only once and that only ballots validly cast were
2 counted, and (7) improperly enhancing and obscuring original voter marks on ballots. The
3 Rossi Campaign is awaiting discovery from counties that will identify the particular
4 precincts in which such misconduct, errors, and neglect occurred.

5
6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:** Do you contend that Illegal Votes were cast in the
7 2004 General Election? If so, state the basis for that contention and identify the following:

- 8 a. The person casting the Illegal Vote;
- 9 b. The date that the county in which the person voted learned of the
10 Illegal Vote;
- 11 c. Any facts indicating that the person voted in the Gubernatorial
12 Election;
- 13 d. Any facts indicating which candidate the person voted for in the
14 Gubernatorial Election; and
- 15 e. The precinct in which you contend the Illegal Vote was cast.

16 **ANSWER:** Yes. All votes cast other than in the manner required by law are
17 illegal votes. In its response to Petitioners' First Interrogatories and Requests for
18 Production, Pend Oreille County indicated that three (3) ballots were cast by Canadians.
19 Please also see Answers to Interrogatories No. 3, 5, 7, 9, and 16 regarding ballots cast by
20 ineligible felons, in the names of deceased persons, by double voters, and otherwise cast
21 other than as provided by law. The fact that some of these illegal votes were counted may
22 also constitute misconduct, errors, and/or neglect by Precinct Elections Boards and other
23 elections officials.

24 **INTERROGATORY NO. 13:** Identify any communications you have had with
25 any person identified in response to Interrogatory No. 12 or any person about the Illegal
26 Votes identified in response to Interrogatory No. 12.
27

1 **ANSWER:** Please see General Objection No. 3 and the Answers and objections to
2 Interrogatories No. 4, 6, 8, and 10. The Rossi Campaign also objects to this interrogatory
3 as vague in its reference to communications “about” illegal votes and overly broad and
4 unduly burdensome in its references to communications with “any person.” Such
5 communications add nothing of relevance to the information and documents already being
6 provided regarding the illegal votes; they have no tendency to make any fact at issue in this
7 action more or less likely; and the request is therefore not reasonably calculated to lead to
8 the discovery of admissible evidence. The request also seeks information protected by the
9 attorney-client privilege and the work-product doctrine. The Rossi Campaign has
10 communicated with the parties to this litigation, including many counties and auditors who
11 have been dismissed from the litigation, regarding illegal votes and has sought discovery
12 from each Washington County and their auditors and from the Secretary of State and
13 Washington State Democratic Central Committee regarding illegal votes. The Rossi
14 Campaign has also responded regularly to media questions regarding illegal votes and has
15 presented evidence and argument to the Chelan County Superior Court regarding illegal
16 votes. The Rossi Campaign has also communicated with consultants, such as the BIAW,
17 regarding illegal votes. The Rossi Campaign has also received hundreds, perhaps
18 thousands, of emails and other unsolicited communications regarding the problems with
19 the election, including possible illegal votes. These communications have not been
20 collected for production.

21
22 **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:** For each Illegal Vote identified in response to
23 Interrogatory No. 12, do you contend that you can determine whether the Illegal Vote was
24 cast in favor of Governor Christine Gregoire or in favor of Dino Rossi? If so, state the
25 basis for that contention and identify that determination with respect to each such Illegal
26 Vote.

1 **ANSWER:** See objections and answers to Interrogatory Nos. 3, 5, 7, 9, and 16. If
2 Counties identify the specific ballots cast illegally, the Rossi Campaign can determine
3 whether the particular illegal votes were cast in favor of Ms. Gregoire or Mr. Rossi. If
4 such direct evidence is not available, circumstantial evidence will establish for whom each
5 illegal vote was cast. Such circumstantial evidence includes a proportional analysis of for
6 whom votes were cast in particular precincts. Further circumstantial evidence may
7 include testimony from the illegal voters (if obtainable) but this is likely to be less reliable
8 than the specific ballots or proportional allocation. The Rossi Campaign is currently
9 seeking discovery regarding such information and is undertaking analyses of the votes cast
10 illegally.

11
12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 15:** Do you contend that any Washington county failed
13 to issue absentee ballots to Military Voters pursuant to the time limits imposed by
14 Washington law? If so, state the basis for that contention and identify any such county.

15 **ANSWER:** Petitioners' investigation into these claims is on-going as discovery
16 from counties is not yet complete. In response to Petitioners' discovery requests, Island
17 County identified approximately 895 military and overseas ballots mailed on October 12,
18 2004.

19
20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 16:** Do you contend that during the 2004 General
21 Election Provisional Ballots were placed directly into a ballot box, ballot machine, or other
22 ballot storage or counting device prior to verification of whether those ballots should be
23 counted? If so, state the basis for that contention and identify the following:

- 24 a. The precinct or polling location at which this occurred;
- 25 b. All persons with Personal Knowledge of this occurring;
- 26 c. Any facts indicating that the Provisional Ballots included a vote in
27 the Gubernatorial Election;

- 1 d. Any facts indicating the candidate for whom the vote was cast in the
2 Gubernatorial Election; and
3 e. Any facts indicating whether the person who cast the ballot was
4 entitled to vote regardless of whether the ballot was verified.

5 **ANSWER:** Yes. A number of counties in the State of Washington have reported
6 that provisional ballots were counted prior to verification of whether those ballots should
7 have been counted. The 2004 Elections Report published by King County, which is
8 being produced in response to Request for Production No. 2, states that 348 provisional
9 ballots were counted before being verified. In addition, an email message from King
10 County Elections Superintendent Bill Huennekens dated November 5, 2004 (which is
11 being produced), confirms that provisional ballots were counted without being verified. A
12 media advisory from Pat McCarthy, Pierce County Auditor, dated January 7, 2005 (which
13 is being produced), states that 77 provisional ballots were counted without any voter
14 credited. In responses to Petitioners' First Interrogatories and Requests for Production,
15 Spokane County stated that 3 provisional ballots may have been counted by poll site
16 tabulators; Cowlitz County stated that 13 provisional ballots were placed in ballot boxes on
17 election day; and Stevens County stated that 11 provisional ballots were placed in ballot
18 boxes prior to verification. Furthermore, the Affidavit of Hilton Miller in Support of
19 Election Contest Petition, dated January 21, 2005 (which is being produced), states that
20 Mr. Miller witnessed at least 4 provisional ballots being placed in Island County ballot
21 boxes on election day.

22 Answering subpart (a), the Rossi Campaign is awaiting discovery from King
23 County with respect to precinct-level details.

24 Answering subpart (b), persons who are believed to have knowledge of such
25 practices include Hilton Miller, members of the responsible Precinct Elections Boards,
26 election day observers, voters who placed the provisional ballots directly into machines or
27

