

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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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

