

**EXHIBIT 1 TO QUESADA PLAINTIFFS' PRE-TRIAL BENCH BRIEF**

**OUTLINE OF QUESADA PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS, STANDING, TRIAL TESTIMONY, KEY EXHIBITS, AND CITATIONS TO EXISTING RECORD FACT FINDINGS AND EXHIBITS**

**I. Statewide Claims Against Plan C235.**

Claims. Against Plan C235 as a whole, statewide, the Quesada Plaintiffs allege the following claims: (1) intentional discrimination/vote dilution under the Fourteenth Amendment, *see* Quesada 3d Am. Compl. ¶¶ 56-66, 80-83 (ECF No. 899) and (2) intentional discrimination/vote dilution under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act (“VRA”), *see id.* ¶¶ 56-66, 76-77. The Quesada Plaintiffs allege that the entire plan is infected by discriminatory purpose and is thus unlawful. That discrimination is manifested statewide, in the lack of anything close to proportionality of minority population to minority opportunity districts, and specifically in districts across the state, including in the DFW region, where African American and Latino neighborhoods remain cracked and their residents’ voting strength diluted, *see id.* ¶¶ 67-69; CD23, where the discriminatory intent and results this Court found with respect to the 2011 map remain, *see id.* ¶¶ 71-72; CD27, where the discriminatory intent and results this Court found with respect to the 2011 map remain, *id.* ¶ 70; and CD35, which resulted from the intentional destruction of a cross-over district and which was drawn to pack minority voters, *see id.* ¶ 73. These local violations underscore a statewide discriminatory goal that makes the plan as a whole invalid.

Standing. The Quesada Plaintiffs include Hispanic and African American citizens and registered voters, *see* Stipulation of Facts No. 2, ECF No. 1445, who are injured by Defendants’ intentional discrimination against minorities—a purpose that infected the entire statewide map—in enacting Plan C235. The legislature enacted Plan C235 with the intent to minimize the ability of minorities to elect their candidates of choice, and with the aim of having as few such candidates

elected from the Texas congressional delegation as possible. Plaintiffs have been injured because they are members of minority communities whose votes the legislature sought to dilute through its discriminatory actions. As such, they have been actually injured in a concrete and particularized manner. Indeed, every minority registered voter in Texas has been injured in this manner, regardless of their location of residence in Texas. Not only did the legislature's action result in fewer members of Congress preferred by minorities, but any time the legislature enacts a statewide redistricting plan with a discriminatory purpose, any registered voter of the targeted group experiences an actual, concrete dignitary harm in being excluded from the democratic process.

Moreover, Plaintiff Marc Veasey is the current Congressman from CD 33. In addition to the injury Congressman Veasey suffers as a minority voter in Texas (described in the paragraph above), he also suffers an additional injury as an officeholder. As an African American Congressman in the state's congressional delegation, he is injured by Defendants' intentional discrimination statewide because it resulted in fewer colleagues in the congressional delegation with whom he could work to advance and represent the needs of the State's minority population. That harm is concrete and particularized—Congressman Veasey's task of marshalling votes and resources to support his constituents is made more onerous by the Legislature's intent to limit the number of like-minded colleagues in the delegation. Plaintiffs Munoz and Jenkins experience additional concrete harm because they reside in minority neighborhoods in Plan C235 that are cracked from other minority areas and left stranded in districts represented by Anglo Republicans. Under Plan C235, Mr. Munoz resides in CD 24, while Mr. Jenkins resides in CD 6.

Lay Witness Testimony: The Quesada Plaintiffs intend to call **Representative Chris Turner** to testify about the legislative process by which Plan C235 was adopted and how that process reflected an intent to discriminate against African American and Hispanic citizens.

Specifically, Rep. Turner will testify about the legislature's failure to recognize or analyze the D.C. District Court's opinion denying preclearance to C185 and their failure to determine whether any of the infirmities identified by the D.C. Court persisted in interim Plan C235. He will testify about the willful blindness of the legislature to the D.C. Court's opinion and this Court's repeated warnings that (1) its legal analysis of Plan C235 was preliminary, (2) the Court was working under extreme pressure and short timelines, and (3) the fact that this Court had no time to review the D.C. Court's record but could only review the trial briefs. Moreover, Rep. Turner will testify as to the ordinary legislative process by which legislation is adopted, and will explain how the adoption of Plan C235 departed from that process.

Rep. Turner and **Tarrant County Commissioner Roy Brooks** will also testify specifically about the discriminatory intent and effects with respect to the DFW region; that testimony is summarized below in Part II.

Expert Witness Testimony: The Quesada Plaintiffs intend to call **Dr. Allan J. Lichtman** to testify about Defendant's discriminatory intent in enacting Plan C235. Dr. Lichtman will testify that Plan C235 was enacted with a discriminatory purpose, and that it had the intended discriminatory effect. He will testify about the demographic changes Texas experienced since 2001 and how the growth in the African American and Latino population resulted in Texas being allocated four additional congressional seats following the 2010 Census; he will testify about how Plan C235 is inconsistent with those demographic changes in that African Americans and Latinos are underrepresented in the congressional delegation on a statewide basis. This lack of proportionality is evidence of discriminatory intent. Dr. Lichtman will testify about how historians and political scientists review legislative intent and the *Arlington Heights* factors for ascertaining discriminatory intent. He will then testify about the new evidence of discriminatory intent that he

has found significant since he submitted an expert report and testified regarding the Plan C185. This includes more recent examples of discriminatory statements and actions by legislators and their political associates and the irregular and discriminatory process by which Plan C235 was adopted during the 2013 special session. In that discussion, Dr. Lichtman will testify about the legislature's awareness, yet willful blindness, of the D.C. district court's decision denying preclearance to Plan C185 and their willful failure to recognize the discriminatory features identified by that Court that persisted in Plan C235. He will testify about the Legislature's pretextual reliance upon this Court's March 2012 order imposing Plan C235 on an interim basis after conducting a speedy and preliminary analysis, and how the legislature purposefully used this Court's order as a shield against its duty to conduct a legislative process that analyzed the legal flaws in Plan C235 and responded to the concerns of minority citizens and legislators.

Dr. Lichtman will also testify more specifically about the discriminatory intent and effects with respect to DFW; that testimony is summarized in Section II below.

Key Exhibits: The chart below identifies the key exhibits supporting the Quesada Plaintiffs' statewide discriminatory intent claim against Plan C235, along with citations of key portions of those exhibits and a description of the relevant content.

<b>Evidence of Discriminatory Intent</b>	<b>Supporting Exhibits/Citations</b>
Expert Report of Dr. Allan Lichtman	<b>Quesada-2017-1</b>
Testimony and floor statements demonstrating legislature's awareness that Plan C235 incorporated legal flaws identified by D.C. Court.	<b>JX 10.4</b> at 11, 34, 36, 37, 53, 60-61, 63; <b>JX 11.4</b> at 30-31; <b>JX 12.4</b> at 30-31, 163-64, 248, 254; <b>JX 13.4</b> at 32; <b>JX 14.4</b> at 14-15; <b>JX 17.3</b> at 61-62; <b>JX 20.4</b> at § II, p. 21; <b>JX 22.4</b> at § 1, p. 13; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 35-36
Hearing testimony and floor statements demonstrating legislature's awareness of the inability to rely upon this Court's interim plan order as legal guidance.	<b>JX 10.4</b> at 11, 36, 53, 60-61; <b>JX 12.4</b> at 80, 82, 253-254; <b>JX 14.4</b> at 11-19; <b>JX 15.3</b> at 49, 52, 56, 52-59; <b>JX 22.4</b> at § I, p. 13; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 26
Hearing testimony of Jeff Archer, Chief Legislative Counsel, Texas Legislative Council—	<b>JX 14.4</b> at 11-19; <b>JX 15.3</b> at 49-59; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 26.

Evidence of Discriminatory Intent	Supporting Exhibits/Citations
who was serving as legal advisor to House Select Redistricting Committee—warning legislature about legal risk of enacting interim plans.	
Chair of the Senate Select Redistricting Committee, Sen. Seliger, says on Senate Floor that, as a rule, he would not support the creation of a district that “allowed for minority underrepresented groups to elect a candidate of choice” “unless it is required by the law,” while at the same time adopting the most restrictive interpretation of the VRA (rejecting coalition districts, for example, and interpreting Section 5 as being based upon numerical targets alone)	<b>JX 26.2</b> at 10; <i>id.</i> at 7, 9; <b>JX 15.3</b> at 14; <b>JX 17.3</b> at 61-62; <b>JX 24.4</b> at § II, pp. 4-5
Hearing testimony by legislators and public about inadequate hearing notice and rushed process of special session, including disparate effect on minorities	<b>JX 10.4</b> at 47-48, 136; <b>JX 11.4</b> at 7-8, 19, 24-25, 34-35, 59; <b>JX 12.4</b> at 251; <b>JX 17.3</b> at 8-9 <b>JX 20.4</b> at § I, pp. 17-18, 25
Procedural irregularity whereby House Select Redistricting Chair Darby provided legal counsel, but committee members not, and general lack of legal and technical resources for committee	<b>JX 12.4</b> at 9-13; <b>JX 13.4</b> at 65; <b>JX 14.4</b> at 24-26, 29-30; <b>JX 17.3</b> at 8-9, 31
Procedural irregularity that Attorney General or staff would not appear at committee hearings, Chairman Darby would not compel their appearance; normally affected agencies appear before committees, and staff from Attorney General’s office only attended House Republican caucus meeting	<b>JX 13.4</b> at 67; <b>JX 17.3</b> at 8-9, 31, 36, 38-41
Sen. Seliger asserts that attorneys from Attorney General’s Office and TLC have advised him on legality of map and proposed amendments, refuses to share any of those discussions, citing attorney-client privilege, admits counsel is for committee as a whole as well, yet acknowledges there had been no committee meetings attended by that counsel	<b>JX 26.2</b> at 8, 12, 21
Sen. Seliger refuses to answer whether he thinks Plan C235 is legal under Voting Rights Act and Constitution, saying he’s not a lawyer and that the State’s lawyers will assert that it’s legal.	<b>JX 26.2</b> at 8, 22
Legislature rejects Sen. Zaffirini’s amendments to eliminate Legislative Findings regarding legality of maps for the House and Congressional plans, yet accepts Zaffirini amendment as to uncontested senate plan; Sen. Seliger states that	<b>JX 24.4</b> at § 1, p. 13; <b>JX 26.1</b> at 24, 27; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 26

<b>Evidence of Discriminatory Intent</b>	<b>Supporting Exhibits/Citations</b>
Zaffirini amendment would “gut” legislation (despite refusing to state whether he thought the plans complied with the VRA when asked on the floor)	
Testimony from David Hanna of TLC regarding Zaffirini amendment, refusing to disclose who asked him to write the Section 2 legislative findings and acknowledging he was unaware of other redistricting bills in the past that had included such findings	<b>JX 24.4</b> at § I, pp. 11-12
Procedural irregularity of considering redistricting legislation during special session: minority senators lack the usual tool of the blocker-bill and the two-thirds rule, and House proceedings not governed by a Calendar Rule	<b>JX 17.3</b> at 13-14, 16-17; <b>JX 19.3</b> at § II, pp. 6-7; <b>JX 20.4</b> at § II, p. 3; <b>JX 21.4</b> at § I, p. 34; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 23
Procedural irregularity of Governor’s special session call limiting process and substance of redistricting legislation	<b>JX 11.4</b> at 24-25; <b>JX 17.3</b> at 17; <b>JX 20.4</b> at § I, pp. 17-18
Testimony and evidence that hearing and amendment processes were pretext and never intended for real opportunity for input or modification, and testimony from Mr. Archer that failure to adopt any of proposed amendments will be issue considered by Court	<b>JX 13.4</b> at 37, 54; <b>JX 15.3</b> at 58-59; <b>JX 20.4</b> at 15; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 14, 37
Evidence of extreme population growth of minorities versus Anglos in Texas	<b>Quesada-2017-27; Quesada-2017-28; Quesada-2017-29; Quesada-2017-30; Quesada-2017-3</b>
Response to Quesada Plaintiffs’ Request for Admission regarding rejection of modifications offered by minority legislators	<b>Quesada-2017-5</b>

## II. DFW Claims Against Plan C235.

Claims. The Quesada Plaintiffs allege the following claims against Plan C235 in the DFW region: (1) intentional discrimination/vote dilution under the Fourteenth Amendment, *see* Quesada 3d Am. Compl. ¶¶ 67-69, 80-83; (2) intentional discrimination/vote dilution under Section 2 of the

VRA, *see id.* ¶¶ 67-69, 76-77; and (3) discriminatory results under Section 2 of the VRA, *see id.* ¶¶ 67-69, 76-77.<sup>1</sup>

Standing. Several of the Quesada Plaintiffs reside in the DFW region and are injured, in a concrete and particularized way, by the discriminatory intent and effects of Plan C235's treatment of the region. In particular, plaintiff John Jenkins is an African American registered voter who lives in a neighborhood that was cracked from other minority neighborhoods in Plan C185, and whose residence remains cracked from adjoining minority areas in Plan C235. Under Plan C235, Mr. Jenkins resides in CD 6 in Tarrant County, which is represented by Anglo Republican Joe Barton, who is not responsive to the needs of the fractured minority neighborhoods included in his district. Under the Quesada Plaintiffs' Demonstration Plan C273, Mr. Jenkins would reside in CD 33, represented by African American candidate of choice Congressman Marc Veasey. *See* Stipulation No. 2, ¶ 6. In particular, Mr. Jenkins resides in the southeast Arlington minority community that the D.C. Court found was intentionally cracked in Plan C185 and that remains cracked in Plan C235. Similarly, plaintiff Romeo Munoz is a Hispanic registered voter who lives in a neighborhood that was cracked from other minority neighborhoods in Plan C185, and whose residence remains cracked from other minority neighborhoods in Plan C235. Under Plan C235, Mr. Munoz resides in CD 24 in Dallas County, which is represented by Anglo Republican Kenny Marchant, who is not responsive to the needs of the fractured minority neighborhoods in his district. Under the Quesada Plaintiffs' Demonstration Plan C273, Mr. Munoz would reside in CD 3, a newly formed district that would offer Hispanic voters an opportunity to elect their candidate of choice. *See id.* ¶ 2. Plaintiff Marc Veasey is an African American registered voter, and is the

---

<sup>1</sup> In light of the Court's directive that the parties share fact and expert witnesses, the Quesada Plaintiffs rely upon the Rodriguez Plaintiffs' expert testimony for their Section 2 results claim in the DFW region.

current congressman for CD 33. He has a concrete and particularized interest in the boundaries of his district. Finally, Plaintiffs Jane Hamilton and Lyman King are African American registered voters who reside in CD 30 under Plan C325, which elects African-American candidate of choice Eddie Bernice Johnson to Congress, and they therefore have a concrete and particularized interest in the boundaries of CD 30. *Id.* ¶¶ 4-5.

Lay Witness Testimony. The testimony described above regarding the evidence of statewide discriminatory intent in the enactment of Plan C235 applies as well to the DFW region. In addition to that general testimony, **Rep. Chris Turner** will testify about how Plan C235 cracks and packs African American voters in DFW, how the legislature rejected alternative proposals that would remedy that intentionally discriminatory cracking and packing, and how the Quesada Plaintiffs' Demonstration Plan C273 remedies those infirmities.

The Quesada Plaintiffs also will call **Tarrant County Commissioner Roy Brooks** to testify about the discriminatory effects that have resulted from the vote dilution in the DFW region caused by C235. Mr. Brooks will testify to the non-responsiveness of Anglo members of Congress to the needs of minorities whose cracked neighborhoods are in their districts. This testimony will demonstrate that Defendants' intentional cracking and packing in DFW has had its intended dilutive effect.

Expert Witness Testimony. In addition to his testimony of discriminatory intent and effects regarding Plan C235 as whole, **Dr. Lichtman** will testify about the DFW region specifically. Dr. Lichtman will testify about the demographic changes the DFW region has experienced since 2001 and how the growth in African American and Latino population in DFW is responsible for the area's population growth and resulting need for additional congressional representation. He will testify about how the failure of Plan C235 to include a third minority opportunity district in DFW—



a district in which Hispanic voters have the opportunity to elect their candidate of choice—is inconsistent with that population growth. This lack of proportionality is evidence of discriminatory purpose. Dr. Lichtman will testify about the new evidence he has found since the last time he issued a report and testified in this case, and how that testimony applies to the legislature’s drawing of districts in the DFW region. In addition to the general statewide testimony described above, Dr. Lichtman will testify in particular about the legislature’s failure to respond to—or even analyze—the D.C. Court’s statements about the lack of a Hispanic opportunity district in DFW. Dr. Lichtman will also testify as to the discriminatory effects of the legislature’s continued packing and cracking of minority neighborhoods in Plan C235, and how the Quesada Plaintiffs’ Demonstration Plan C273 remedies the intentional cracking.

Key Exhibits. The exhibits cited above regarding the Quesada Plaintiffs’ statewide discrimination claim apply to their specific claims about the DFW region. In addition, the Quesada Plaintiffs chiefly rely upon the following evidence as it relates to DFW:

<b>Evidence of Discriminatory Intent</b>	<b>Supporting Exhibits/Citations</b>
Illustration of cracking and packing of minority neighborhoods in Plan C235, and how Quesada Plaintiffs’ Demonstration Plan C273 remedies infirmities	<b>Quesada-2017-12 through -20</b>
Hearing testimony of legislators and public, and floor statements of legislators, about intentional cracking of minority neighborhoods in DFW from Plan C185 that persist in Plan C235 and failure of C235 to include Latino opportunity district in DFW	<b>JX 12.4</b> at 26, 31; <b>JX 20.4</b> at § II, p. 8, <b>JX 21.4</b> at § I, p. 43; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 13-14, 25, 33-37
Written testimony about Plan C235 stranding 44,000 African-Americans outside CD 33’s borders resulting from intentional fracturing of minority communities and how alternative maps resolve issue	<b>JX 28</b> at 6.6.13 vol. I hearing, p. 17.
Letter from NAACP attaching ECF Nos. 739 and 744, which cite to D.C. Court’s findings	<b>JX 28</b> at 6.10.13 hearing, p. 10; <b>JX 29</b> “Other” File at p. 86; 48, 74-75

Evidence of Discriminatory Intent	Supporting Exhibits/Citations
of intentional discrimination in DFW region, and explain how they remained unresolved in Plan C235	
Hearing testimony and floor statements of legislators about failure of Senate Committee to hold any hearings in Dallas, and how that failure affects the legislature's failure to remedy the intentional cracking and packing in DFW	<b>JX 21.4</b> at § I, p. 43; <b>JX 24.4</b> at § II, p. 23; <b>JX 26.2</b> at 5-6, 13-14; <b>JX 29</b> (6/6/13 Hr'g) at 1
Procedural departure for Senate to rely upon House's Dallas hearing, and evidence that such reliance is pretext because Sen. Seliger never reviewed the House's Dallas hearing transcript.	<b>JX 26.2</b> at 13-14
Floor debate between Sen. Seliger and Sen. West regarding Sen. West's amendment that would create an additional minority opportunity district in DFW to remedy the intentional cracking and packing. Sen. Seliger relies on pretextual (and legally incorrect) assertion that amendment would cause retrogression in CD 30 by slightly reducing its African American population. Sen. Seliger refuses to answer when Sen. West explains that Section 5 is not about numerical comparisons but instead a functional analysis of ability to elect.	<b>JX 26.2</b> at 33-37.
Testimony of Mr. Archer (TLC attorney) that map proposed by Rep. Yvonne Davis, which adds an additional minority opportunity district in DFW, highlights the legal vulnerabilities the State would face if it enacted interim plans as permanent plans.	<b>JX 15.3</b> at 56.

### III. Evidence and Fact Findings in Existing Record

Pursuant to the Court's request, ECF No. 1389 at 4-5 n.7, the Quesada Plaintiffs identify below evidence and fact findings in the Court's existing record that support its claims of intentional discrimination in the enactment of Plan C235.

Evidence in the Existing Record	Citation
Population growth of minorities in Texas and DFW; decline of Anglo population	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 14-15, ¶¶ 30-33; 65-69, 219, ¶¶ 271-72, 403-04, ¶ 651-52, 410-11, ¶¶ 665-66, 412-16, ¶¶ 671-77
Racial shading, but not political data, is available at the block level in RedAppl	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 38, ¶ 79, 438, ¶ 72
Testimony from TLC Chief Legislative Counsel Jeff Archer that Section 5 is not just a mathematical analysis, but rather “a question of political reality.” “[DOJ] is going to look to see if the districts are, as some people say, performing or effective, as opposed to just a pure mathematical analysis.”	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 53, ¶ 96(F); 431, ¶ 714, 432-33, ¶ 718
Mapdrawers knew African-American districts did not need to be 50% BCVAP to be protected; “[D]istricts above 40% BVAP were treated as African-American districts rather than coalition districts.”	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 430, ¶ 712.
Sen. Seliger relies on David Hanna for redistricting advice; Mr. Hanna encourages election analysis, not pure demographic analysis, to determine whether districts are performing for minority voters	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 3, ¶ 89, 432-33, ¶ 718
Congressman Smith submitted proposal with a new “Voting Rights Act district in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area” – mapdrawers started with this plan and then subsequently dismantled the district by cracking minority populations apart into Anglo-dominated districts and packing minorities in CD 30.	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 64, ¶¶ 112-113; 126, ¶ 150, 128-30, ¶¶ 155-57, 130-31 ¶ 159; 135, ¶ 169, 219-20, ¶ 273, ¶ 279, 227-28, ¶¶ 286-87; 229-30, ¶¶ 289, 291, 243, ¶ 311, 243-44, ¶¶ 312-13, 245, ¶ 315, 251-52, ¶¶ 332-33; 403-04, ¶¶ 651-52  Amended Order, ECF No. 1390 at 132-34
Sen. Seliger cites “assimilation of Hispanics and blacks throughout the community in North Texas” as reason legislature could avoid drawing a new opportunity district in DFW.	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 194-95, ¶ 218(A)
Race was used as proxy for political party in drawing DFW districts in Plan C185—which formed basis for Plan C235—to harm minority voters	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 227-28 ¶¶ 286-87, 234-37, ¶¶ 297-99, 243-44, ¶¶ 312-13, 245, ¶ 315, 252, ¶ 334
Minority populations in Arlington were cracked from other minority populations and joined with Parker and Wise Counties in Plan C185’s CD 32	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 230, ¶ 291, 245-46, ¶ 316  2014 Trial Exhibit Quesada-46 & 47
Lake Como African American community split from other minority populations in Plan C185	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 243, ¶ 312

Evidence in the Existing Record	Citation
CD 30 packed with minorities, has performed reliably, and no evidence more minority populations were needed to maintain ability to elect	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 245, ¶ 314, 251, ¶ 331, 430, ¶ 712
Anglo members of Congress in DFW region are not responsive to needs of minority constituents, establishing discriminatory effect of cracking minority populations and stranding in Anglo-dominated districts	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 249-50, ¶¶ 324-26, 443, ¶ 742
“Home factor” is an issue in primary elections in Plan C235’s CD 33, which spans parts of Tarrant and Dallas Counties	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 250, ¶ 329
African-American and Latino voters are politically cohesive	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 417, ¶¶ 681-82, 418, ¶ 684
Minority candidates of choice in Texas are Democrats and Anglos tend to vote Republican	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 420, ¶ 688, 428, ¶ 708
Defendants have conceded that voting is racially polarized in Texas in all but Nueces and Kleberg Counties	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 421, ¶ 690
Voting is racially polarized in Texas	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 421-24, ¶¶ 691-95, 428, ¶ 708
General election is key test for racially polarized voting, and primary election results are skewed by low turnout and other factors	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 427-28, ¶¶ 700-02
Primary election results in Dallas and Tarrant Counties are poor indicator of polarization and cohesion	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 427-28, ¶ 701
African-American and Latino voters are cohesive in general election, regardless of candidate’s race	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 428, ¶ 706
Minority opportunity districts only created if Republican legislators thought they were required by law	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 429-30, ¶710
Texas has long history of discrimination against African-American and Hispanic residents, which has caused lingering effects	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 439-41, ¶¶ 733-41
Calendar Rules are typically used in the House redistricting process	Fact Findings, ECF No. 1340 at 57-59, ¶¶ 101-02
Additional Exhibits from 2014 Trial	Quesada-1 (Lichtman Report) Quesada-73 (Maps of Cracked Neighborhoods in C185 and C100) Quesada-74 (2/28/14 Lichtman Report) Quesada-75 (D.C. Court Decision) Quesada-357 (Key Ft. Worth Neighborhood Map)