Combac. Coursely, Mag. Vincol Filling Plant Ciry National Fast Deilding Conston, 1:xas 77002

sear Hr. Hedreary:

This is in reference to the reduction in polling places, from thirteen to one, for the Eurleson County compital District in Eurleson County, Texas, submitted to the Attorney General pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Lights Act of 1965, as awanded. Your submission was received on well 7, 1921.

In our consideration of your submission, we have considered carefully the information furnished by you, along with information and comments provided by other interested parties. Our review and analysis of this matter reveals the following facts: The Eurleson County Mospital District has boundaries coterminous with Eurleson County which has a population of 12,313, of whom twenty-two percent are black and ten percent are Mexican American. The number of polling places in the District was reduced from thirteen throughout the county to a single location in the City of Caldwell. One effect of this reduction in the number of polling places was a drop in voter participation from approximately 2,300 voters participating in the 1977 election to approximately 300 voters participating in 1979 and 1980 elections.

The bulk of the black population is concentrated in an area known as Clay Station, which is over thirty miles from the District's single polling place in the City of Caldwell. A large percentage of the county's Mexican-American population is found within the City of Somerville which is about nineteen miles from the City of Caldwell. Both of these areas had polling places that were climinated by the change to a single polling location.

We understand that for the April 4, 1981, election, minorities from the Clay Etation and Somerville areas were able to meet the burden placed on them by the use of a single polling place in Caldwell only through a concerted offert with other county voters with similar interests whereby they themselves successfully provided publicity for the election and transportation to the single poll. However, this additional burden imposed upon the minority voters to obtain access to the single poll was caused by the climination of polling places in areas which are centers of minority population. Thus, the removal of polling places in the minority areas had a disparate impact on minority voters.

Under Section 5, the Eurleson County Hospital District has the burden of proving that the reduction in the number of polling places from thirteen to one does not represent a retrogression in the position of minority voters in the district (see Heer v. United States, 425 U.S. 130 (1976)), and that the submitted change has no discriminatory purpose or effect. See, e.g., Ceorgia v. United States, 411 U.S. 526 (1973); see also Section 51.39(e) of the Procedures for the Administration of Section 5 (46 Fed. Reg. 878). In light of the considerations discussed above, I cannot conclude, as I must under the Voting Rights Act, that that burden has been sustained in this instance. Thus, on behalf of the Attorney General I must interpose an objection to the continued use of a single polling place in future elections held by the Eurleson County hospital District.

Of course, as provided by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, you have the right to seek a declaratory judgment from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia that this change has neither the purpose nor will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race, color or membership in a language minority group. In addition, the Procedures for the Administration of Section 5 (Section 51.44, 46 Fed. Reg. 878) permit you to request the Attorney Ceneral to reconsider the objection and in that connection we have noted your request for a conference "in the event clearance is not anticipated". Because insufficient time remains to grant such a conference during the 60-day period allowed by statute to object we are sending this nutification without affording such a conference. However, we would be pleased to hold a conference under the reconsideration procedures referred to above, if you desire and request it.

any event, until the objection is withdrawn or a judgment from the district of Columbia Court is obtained, the effect of the objection by the Attorney General is to make the use of a single polling place for elections held by the Burleson County nospital district legally unenforceable.

To enable this Department to meet its responsibility to enforce the Voting Rights Act, please inform us within eventy days of your receipt of this letter the course of action the Burleson County Hospital District plans to take with respect to this matter. If you have any questions concerning this letter, please feel free to call Carl W. Cabel (202-724-7439), Director of Section 5 Unit of the Voting Section.

Sincerely,

James P. Turner
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division