

EXHIBIT A

Incorrect Citations in Gonzalez Plaintiffs Corrected Post-Trial Brief

Cite	Description
<p>Gage 01/10/08 Dep. 54:15-25</p> <p>Collins 01/10/08 Dep. 20:24-21:2</p>	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiff Corrected Post-Trial Memorandum page 9 states: That a Type F license does not show its designation on its face.</p> <p>Gage 01/10/08 Dep. 54: 15-25: This deposition testimony has not been designated and states: “Earlier we were talking to Anne Yanofsky from MVD and she was talking about how people come into the MVD when they are updating their status or there’s been a change in their status. For instance, somebody became married and now has to change their immigration status from one to the other. Those are people who actually walk in and try to make those updates.</p> <p>Is there any way that the Department of Homeland Security or any of the Federal Immigration Agencies can directly update the customer record in the MVD database themselves? A: Not that I’m aware of.” Q: So in the instance where and individual does have a”</p> <p>Collins 01/10/08 Dep. 19:24-20:2: The cite states: “Q: Do you have any Memorandum of Understanding between MVD and DHS with respect to verifying immigration information with DHS? A: Not that I’m aware of. Q: Are you aware of any system or process used by MVD to communicate with DHS to do routine updates on customer records with respect to immigration status? A: No, I’m not.”</p>
<p>Tr. 711:4- 712:17</p>	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiff Corrected Post-Trial Memorandum page 10 states: Service Arizona has rejected approximately 1300 voter applicant with Type F licenses or who posses licenses issued before January 1, 1996.</p> <p>Tr. 711:4-712:17 does not refer to Type F licenses, but for people attempting to register with licenses issued before October 1, 1996.</p>
<p>Altaha 01/14/08 Dep. 22:14-23</p> <p>Dean-Lytle 01/16/08 Dep. 37-8-38:10</p>	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiff Corrected Post-Trial Memorandum page 12 states: Contrary to Joe Kanefield testifying that the County Recorders “back date” voter registration applications after receiving proof of citizenship, the date of registration is the date the applicant provided new information even if it falls after election deadlines.</p> <p>Altaha 01/14/08 Dep. 22:14-23 states: That if they are waiting to run an A number through the VIS database, they just hold onto the application until they can get the number verified and the date of registration would be “The date they signed it” or “the date the registration drive occurred or the receive date.”</p> <p>Dean-Lytle 01/16/08 Dep. 37-8-38:10 speaks of sending out new registrations form to applicants when there is missing or incorrect information. It does not mention date of registration or “back dating.”</p>

**Incorrect Citations in Gonzalez Plaintiffs
Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda**

Cite	Description
Tr. 800:24-801:17	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda page 4 states: That Defendants claim that the "thousands of excluded registrants are unimportant."</p> <p>Tr. 800:24-801:17 is direct examination of Dr. Jeffrey Zax and states: "Q. And what is the -- what are those opinions, sir?"</p> <p>A. This difference is not nearly large enough, in my estimation, to be thought of as substantively important. He doesn't -- Dr. Lanier doesn't provide us with the statistical significance test, nor does he provide us with what we would need in order to precalculate that test. But recognizing, if nothing else, that his identification of Hispanic identity for each of these registrants is an estimate -- he uses the passive word "index" to identify who's Hispanic and who's not. My impression is that that's a pretty good estimate. But it's by no means infallible. So some of his identifications of who is Hispanic and who is not are clearly wrong. We don't know which ones."</p>
Table 9e Ex. 862	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda page 5, footnote 4 states: See Table 9e Ex. 862 (showing Latino citizen population growing at an average annual rate of 4.2% per year before Prop 200 and 4.6% in the year following Prop 200.)</p> <p>Plaintiffs are correct that there was a 4.6% growth rate for Hispanic CVAP from 2005-2006. However, the Hispanic CVAP growth rate from 2000 to 2005 is 26.8%, which averages out to a 5.4% annual rate, not 4.2% as plaintiffs claim.</p>
Ex. 1146	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda page 6 cite Ex. 1146, which has not been admitted into evidence.</p>
Tr. 82:9-89:11	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda page 6 states: Individuals such as Shirley Priess cannot obtain or afford documentary proof of citizenship.</p> <p>Tr. 82:9-89:11 is a citation to Ms. Priess' entire direct examination in which there is no mention of whether Ms. Priess could afford such documentation.</p>

Cite	Description
Tr. 227:45	Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda page 7 cites TR. 227:45, which is an improper citation.
Dkt. 816	Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda page 15 cites to declarations of Ann Fletchall, Caleb LaPorte, Karen Lewsader, Diedre Belle-Oudry, Dorothy Terraz, Kris Sorge, Sasra Dethloff and Sylvia Cotto, none have been admitted into evidence.
Ex. 138 and Dkt. 130 at 67-687	<p>Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Defendants' Post Trial Memoranda page 16 states: "Prop 200 did not notify voters that driver's licenses issued after October 1, 1996 do not prove U.S. citizenship."</p> <p>Ex. 138 and Dkt. 130 at 67-687 is an Attorney General Opinion which concludes that a driver's license or non-operating identification license issued in Arizona after October 1, 1996, is satisfactory evidence of U.S. citizenship for the purpose of registering to vote. It does not address notification to persons with licenses issued before October 1, 1996.</p>