



**Bernstein, Shur,
Sawyer & Nelson, P.A.**
100 Middle Street
PO Box 9729
Portland, ME 04104-5029

T (207) 774 - 1200
F (207) 774 - 1127

James G. Monteleone
Shareholder
207-228-7198
jmonteleone@bernsteinshur.com

Via In Hand Delivery

May 20, 2025

Shelley Sawyer, Clerk
Cumberland County Superior Court
205 Newbury Street, Ground Floor
Portland, ME 04101

Re: Alex Titcomb, et al. v. Shenna Bellows
Cumberland County Superior Court
Docket No. AP-25-0015

Dear Ms. Sawyer:

Enclosed for filing attendant to the above captioned matter, please find the following:

1. Motion to Intervene on Behalf of Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association;
2. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants' Motion for Admission of Counsel *Pro Hac Vice*;
3. Proposed Order on Proposed Intervenor-Defendants' Motion for Admission of Counsel *Pro Hac Vice*;
4. Check for \$2,100 for filing fee for *Pro Hac Vice* admissions.

Thank you for your kind assistance in this regard.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "James G. Monteleone".

James G. Monteleone

Enclosure

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**MOTION TO INTERVENE ON
BEHALF OF VICTORIA
KORNFIELD, LISA BUCK, DSCC,
DCCC, AND THE DEMOCRATIC
GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION**

Pursuant to 21-A M.R.S. §§ 905-A, 905(2) and, alternatively, Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 24, Victoria Kornfield and Lisa Buck, as well as DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association (“DGA”), through counsel, hereby move for intervention in the above-captioned matter. In support of the Motion, the Proposed Intervenors state the following:

INTRODUCTION

This case concerns a forthcoming ballot initiative that proposes to make far-ranging changes to Maine’s election laws. Among other changes, the initiative would restrict Maine’s cities and towns to using a single ballot drop box, eliminate the right to register for “ongoing absentee voter status,” ban prepaid postage on absentee return envelopes, restrict the methods and time period for requesting an absentee ballot, and impose new and restrictive Voter ID requirements on both in-person and absentee voting. *See* L.D. 1149 (132nd Legis. 2025). Each of these changes will make it harder for Mainers to vote by restricting or outright eliminating voter-friendly policies that thousands of Mainers rely upon to reliably cast their ballots.

Unsurprisingly, the initiative’s proponents wish to downplay its harmful effects. To that end, they filed this suit to force the Secretary of State to adopt their preferred ballot question language—hidden in a footnote at the bottom of their Petition—which sweeps most of the ballot initiative under the rug. While the Petition is meritless, it nonetheless poses a severe risk to Mainers. If successful, voters will be forced to consider making dramatic changes to Maine’s election rules based on ballot question language that purposefully obscures most of those changes.

Mainers deserve an accurate and complete description of the ballot initiative. To that end, Victoria Kornfield and Lisa Buck (“Voters”), alongside DSCC, DCCC, and DGA (“Democratic Committees”), seek to intervene in this action to defend their interests and the rights of Maine voters. Maine’s ballot initiative law expressly permits such intervention for parties with “an

interest relating to the subject matter of the petitions.” 21-A M.R.S. § 905(2). The Democratic Committees—each of whom will be supporting candidates in competitive elections in Maine in 2026—have a strong interest in Maine’s election rules and in preserving the ability of their supporters to vote. The Voters also have clear interests here. Each has relied upon election rules that the initiative seeks to roll back or eliminate and also plan to register for ongoing absentee voter status when it becomes available in 2026. Accordingly, Proposed Intervenors have a stark interest in ensuring Mainers are properly apprised of the contents of the disputed ballot question when they vote on it in November. Because the requirements for intervention are satisfied under § 905(2), as well as under Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 24, intervention should be granted.

BACKGROUND & PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 19, 2025, the Secretary of State certified a direct initiative titled “An Act to Require an Individual to Present Photographic Identification for the Purpose of Voting” for the November 2025 ballot. The initiative, proposes to make a host of changes to Maine’s election laws. Most notably, the law would: (1) eliminate the ability of voters to automatically receive absentee ballots; (2) narrow the window for absentee voting; (3) restrict how and when a person can request an absentee ballot; (4) ban prepaid postage on absentee ballot envelopes; (5) restrict towns to using a single ballot drop box; (6) adopt restrictive voter identification requirements for both in-person and absentee voting; and (7) implement new challenge and provisional ballot procedures for voters without photographic identification. *See* L.D. 1149 (132nd Legis. 2025).

After public comment, the Secretary released proposed ballot question language reading:

Do you want to change Maine election laws to eliminate two days of absentee voting, prohibit requests for absentee ballots by phone or family members, end ongoing absentee voter status for seniors and people with disabilities, ban prepaid postage on absentee ballot return envelopes, limit the number of drop boxes, require voters to show certain photo ID before voting, and make other changes to our elections?

This language accurately reflects the many changes included in the proposed initiative.

On May 12 Petitioners filed suit to challenge the Secretary's language. Petitioners' preferred ballot language, buried in a footnote toward the end their pleading, reads:

Do you want to require voters to show photo ID before voting in-person or by absentee ballot and limit the number of drop boxes?

See Pet. at 13 n.3. This language omits many consequential aspects of the ballot initiative, including most notably its many restrictions and limitations on absentee voting.

PROPOSED INTERVENORS

The Voters. Victoria Kornfield is a Maine voter residing in Bangor. Ms. Kornfield is a retired educator and state legislator who regularly votes by absentee ballot and who is interested in registering for ongoing absentee voter status when it becomes available. She is concerned that the changes the ballot measure would introduce will make it more difficult for her to vote in the future. Consequently, she opposes the measure and believes that the language that goes before Maine voters should accurately reflect the harmful changes it will enact. *See generally* **Exhibit A** ("Kornfield Decl."). Dr. Lisa Buck is a Maine voter residing in Orono. Dr. Buck typically votes by depositing her absentee ballot at a ballot drop box, of which Orono has several. She is concerned that the ballot measure, if enacted, will make it harder for her to vote by eliminating ongoing absentee voter status—which she intends to sign up for—and by limiting the number of available drop boxes accessible to her. As a result, she opposes the ballot measure and believes the language of the ballot question should accurately reflect the changes it threatens to impose. *See generally* **Exhibit B** ("Buck Decl.").

The Democratic Committees. DSCC is the Democratic Party's national senatorial committee. Its mission is to elect Democratic candidates to the U.S. Senate, including in Maine. DSCC works to accomplish its mission by coordinating with state parties and senatorial campaigns to encourage and support programs that assist voters in casting their ballots and preserving their

legal voting rights. DSCC opposes the ballot initiative, which it believes would make it more difficult for eligible Mainers to cast their ballots and thereby impair DSCC's mission of supporting Democratic candidates for the U.S. Senate. *See generally* **Exhibit C** ("DSCC Decl."). DCCC is the Democratic Party's national congressional committee. Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party from across the country to the U.S. House of Representatives, including in Maine. It works to achieve its mission in a manner similar to DSCC and therefore also opposes the ballot initiative. *See generally* **Exhibit D** ("DCCC Decl."). The Democratic Governors Association ("DGA") is a political organization dedicated to electing Democratic gubernatorial candidates across the United States. It works with Democratic gubernatorial candidates and campaigns to, among other things, encourage and support programs that assist Democratic voters with successfully casting ballots and to preserve the legal voting rights of its voters. DGA will expend resources to encourage Maine voters to support the Democratic candidate for governor in 2026. DGA also opposes the ballot measure and intends to commit its own financial resources towards efforts to defeat it at the ballot box. *See generally* **Exhibit E** ("DGA Decl.").

LEGAL STANDARD

Proposed Intervenorors have several means of intervention. First, Maine's ballot initiative law provides that "[u]pon timely application, anyone may intervene in [such an] action when the applicant claims an interest relating to the subject matter of the petitions, unless the applicant's interest is adequately represented by existing parties." 21-A M.R.S. § 905(2). The procedures set forth in Section 905(2) govern this action for judicial review of the Secretary of State's ballot question wording pursuant to 21-A M.R.S. § 905-A.

Second, Maine Rule 24(a)(2) separately provides for intervention as of right where the proposed intervenor satisfies three elements. *See* M.R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). Specifically, the proposed

intervenor: “(1) [] must claim an interest in the property or transaction that is the subject of the action; (2) [] must be so situated that the disposition of the action may impair or impede its ability to protect its interests; and (3) its interest must not be adequately represented by the existing parties to the action.” *Bangor Pub. Co. v. Town of Bucksport*, 682 A.2d 227, 231 (Me. 1996) (citing *Doe v. Roe*, 495 A.2d 1235, 1237 (Me. 1985)). The Maine rule is “virtually the same” as its federal equivalent. *Doe*, 495 A.2d at 1237 n.4.¹ The Maine rules also provide that, upon a timely application, “anyone may be permitted to intervene in an action when an applicant’s claim or defense and the main action have a question of law or fact in common.” M.R. Civ. P. 24(b).

ARGUMENT

I. The Voters and Democratic Committees are entitled to intervene as of right under either § 905(2) or Maine Rule 24(a)(2).

A. Proposed Intervenors have significant interests in an accurate description of the ballot question, and this action threatens to impair such interests.

Proposed Intervenors each have strong interests in Maine’s election rules and therefore an equally strong interest in ensuring that any ballot measure seeking to disrupt those rules is accurately presented to voters and the public. They also have a particularly strong interest in ensuring that the disputed ballot question does not downplay or obscure the harmful effects of proposed changes to voting, particularly where those changes will make it harder for people to vote and for the Democratic Committees’ candidates to compete. *See, e.g.*, Kornfield Decl. ¶¶ 3–5; Buck Decl. ¶¶ 3–4; DSCC Decl. ¶¶ 6–13; DCCC Decl. ¶¶ 6–13; DGA Decl. ¶¶ 9–15.

To wit, much of the initiative targets absentee voting, which is very popular in Maine. In 2024, for example, Maine voters cast over 370,000 absentee ballots—nearly half of all ballots cast

¹ As required by Rule 24, *see* M.R. Civ. P. 24(c), Proposed Intervenors include a proposed responsive pleading to the Petition. *See Exhibit F*. If granted intervention, Proposed Intervenors intend to file a response to the merits of the Petition on a schedule to be set by the Court.

in that year's general election.² “Democrats have consistently voted absentee at higher rates than other voters in Maine.”³ Accordingly, the Democratic Committees and their candidates in Maine encourage supporters to vote by absentee ballot and support programs that assist them in doing so. DSCC Decl. ¶¶ 7–8; DCCC Decl. ¶¶ 7–8; DGA Decl. ¶¶ 9–10. Petitioners’ proposed language obscures the many ways in which the initiative will restrict absentee voting. *See* Pet. at 13 n.3. Given the harmful effects these restrictions will have on the Democratic Committees and their voters, the committees have a strong interest in ensuring the public is made fully aware of these proposed changes when evaluating whether to adopt them. DSCC Decl. ¶¶ 12–13; DCCC Decl. ¶¶ 12–13; DGA Decl. ¶¶ 14–15. Otherwise, the Democratic Committees face the prospect of irreparable harm to the rights of their supporters and the competitiveness of their candidates.

Courts routinely find these interests suffice for intervention. For example, political parties and candidates are regularly permitted to intervene in cases that will impact “the legal landscape” of the electoral process. *See La Union del Pueblo Entero v. Abbott*, 29 F.4th 299, 306 (5th Cir. 2022) (holding committees had “substantial” and “direct” interest in case related to “election process in Texas”). That interest is acute where changes to the electoral process will force a political party to divert limited resources to sustain its voter outreach efforts. *Cf. Republican Nat’l Comm. v. N.C. State Bd. of Elections*, 120 F.4th 390, 397 (4th Cir. 2024). If Mainers are misled into adopting the proposed ballot measure, the Democratic Committees will have to make costly changes to their electoral strategies to help supporters who will have a harder time voting absentee. *See* DSCC Decl. ¶¶ 11–13; DCCC Decl. ¶¶ 11–13; DGA Decl. ¶¶ 13–16.

² Russ Reed, *Maine’s absentee voting levels for 2024 election second highest since 2008*, WMTW (Nov. 5, 2024), <https://perma.cc/K5PE-8K6A>.

³ Kevin Miller, *1 in 4 Maine voters have requested absentee ballots*, Maine Public (Oct. 22, 2024), <https://perma.cc/KSU8-6ET4>.

Similarly, courts have held that political organizations have a strong interest in preserving the voting rights of their supporters. *See Crawford v. Marion Cnty. Election Bd.*, 472 F.3d 949, 951 (7th Cir. 2007) (holding the “Democratic Party also has standing to assert the rights of those of its members who will be prevented from voting by the new [photo ID] law”). Here, the ballot initiative creates a serious risk that the Democratic Committees’ supporters will lose established voting rights—a risk that will grow more acute if the ballot question put to voters sweeps its most harmful provisions under the rug. *See* DSCC Decl. ¶ 12; DCCC Decl. ¶ 12; DGA Decl. ¶ 14.

Finally, the Democratic Committees have a stark interest in preserving “a competitive playing field for their candidates and conserving party resources.” *N.C. Green Party v. N.C. State Bd. of Elections*, 619 F. Supp. 3d 547, 562 (E.D.N.C. 2022) (granting intervention); *cf. Hollander v. McCain*, 566 F. Supp. 2d 63, 68 (D.N.H. 2008) (similar). The ballot measure at issue targets voting methods disproportionately relied upon by registered Democrats. The Democratic Committees have a competitive interest in ensuring voters are alerted to this fact before adopting changes to Maine’s election rules that disadvantage Democratic candidates, particularly given Maine’s history of close elections. *See* DSCC Decl. ¶ 12; DCCC Decl. ¶ 12; DGA Decl. ¶ 14.

Ms. Kornfield and Dr. Buck also have clear interests at stake. Each of them plans to register for ongoing absentee voter status when it becomes available, unless that option is eliminated by the proposed measure. Kornfield Decl. ¶ 4; Buck Decl. ¶ 3. Each also relies upon voting options that the ballot initiative seeks to restrict or eliminate, including the ability to request an absentee ballot by telephone or to deposit their absentee ballot in one of several available drop boxes. Kornfield Decl. ¶¶ 3–5; Buck Decl. ¶¶ 3–4. These voters have a strong interest in preserving their own voting rights and ability to effectively cast ballots. *See League of United Latin Am. Citizens, Dist. 19 v. City of Boerne*, 659 F.3d 421, 434–35 (5th Cir. 2011) (collecting cases); *Democracy*

N.C. v. N.C. State Bd. of Elections, 476 F. Supp. 3d 158, 180 (M.D.N.C. 2020) (“In the voting context, ‘voters who allege facts showing disadvantage to themselves as individuals have standing to sue.’” (quoting *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 206 (1962))).

Finally, while Proposed Intervenors are not required to make such a showing, the interests above are at risk of being impaired by the outcome of this case. Section 905(2) imposes no impairment requirement for intervention—it merely requires “an interest relating to the subject matter of the petitions,” which both the Democratic Committees and Voters have amply shown. Even so, they also satisfy Rule 24(a)(2)’s requirement that “the disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the applicant’s ability to protect [their] interest[s].” M.R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). Here, the Petitioners urge the Court to impose proposed ballot language that would downplay the contents of the ballot initiative—an attempted wolf in sheep’s clothing. *See* Pet. at 13 n.3. Forcing the Secretary to adopt such misleading language would “impair” the ability of Proposed Intervenors to preserve their interest in accurate ballot question language.

B. Existing parties do not adequately represent Proposed Intervenors’ interests.

The existing parties do not adequately represent the unique interests at stake for the Voters and the Democratic Committees. Petitioners plainly oppose those interests, seeking to foist a misleading description of the proposed measure on voters. *See* Pet. at 13 n.3. And while the Secretary opposes the Petition, she also does not adequately represent the discrete interests of Proposed Intervenors here. Under Maine law, the Secretary has a statutory duty to craft ballot question language in a neutral fashion. *See* 21-A M.R.S. § 905(2). As Petitioners themselves put it, “the law requires her to put aside personal biases and draft a concise question” in an even-handed manner. *See* Pet. at 2. Proposed Intervenors, in contrast, do not bear such duties; their interests are more partisan and personal in nature. *See, e.g.*, 21-A M.R.S. §§ 901-905 (describing various duties of the Secretary). In other words, as political committees and private citizens, they

“have a position and interests that are separate from and independent of the position of other parties to the litigation.” *Francis v. Dana-Cummings*, 2007 ME 16, ¶ 24, 915 A.2d 412, 417.

These distinct interests have consistently been found to satisfy the “minimal” burden of showing inadequate representation. *Trbovich v. United Mine Workers of Am.*, 404 U.S. 528, 538 n.10 (1972). Federal courts have “often concluded that governmental entities do not adequately represent the interests of aspiring intervenors,” *Fund for Animals, Inc. v. Norton*, 322 F.3d 728, 736 (D.C. Cir. 2003), because their interests are “necessarily colored by [their] view of the public welfare rather than the more parochial views of a proposed intervenor whose interest is personal to it,” *Kleissler v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 157 F.3d 964, 972 (3d Cir. 1998) (explaining that the burden in these circumstances is “comparatively light”). That interest gap is heightened in election law cases: “While [the Secretary’s] arguments turn on [her] inherent authority as [a] state executive[] and [her] responsibility to properly administer election laws, the Proposed Intervenors are concerned with ensuring their . . . members [and supporters] . . . have the opportunity to vote” in “allocating their limited resources to inform voters about the election procedures.” *Issa v. Newsom*, No. 220-CV-01044-MCE-CKD, 2020 WL 3074351, at *3 (E.D. Cal. June 10, 2020).

The Supreme Court recently emphasized these discrete interests in *Berger v. N.C. State Conference of the NAACP* where it noted that public officials must “bear in mind broader public-policy implications,” whereas private litigants—like Proposed Intervenors—seek to vindicate their own rights “full stop.” 597 U.S. 179, 195–96 (2022) (quoting *Trbovich*, 404 U.S. at 538 n.10). Because state officials do not share “identical” interests with private parties, the Court reiterated that private parties bear only a “minimal” burden in showing inadequate representation. *Id.* That burden is met here, where Proposed Intervenors have starkly different interests than the Secretary.

C. The Motion is timely.

Proposed Intervenor promptly moved only eight days after the Petition was filed and no substantive activity has yet occurred in the case. *See Fiandaca v. Cunningham*, 827 F.2d 825, 834 (1st Cir. 1987) (motion timely where filed “days” after “learning that their interests may be affected”). Proposed Intervenor—who agree to abide any schedule set by the Court—have also not acted in a manner likely to cause “undu[e] delay or prejudice.” *In re N.W.*, 2013 ME 64, ¶ 11, 70 A.3d 1219, 1222; *see also Garrity v. Gallen*, 697 F.2d 452, 455 (1st Cir. 1983).

II. Alternatively, the Court should grant permissive intervention.

The Court also has broad discretion to grant permissive intervention, which permits intervention so long as “an applicant's claim or defense and the main action have a question of law or fact in common.” M.R. Civ. P. 24(b). As the attached pleading shows, Proposed Intervenor’s defenses raise common questions of law with those at issue in the action. *See Exhibit F*.

Federal courts have advised that Rule 24(b) “should be construed liberally.” *Animal Prot. Inst. v. Martin*, 241 F.R.D. 66, 68 (D. Me. 2007) (quotation and citation omitted), and therefore often grant permissive intervention to individuals and groups—including political committees—advocating for the voting rights of their members. *E.g., RNC v. Aguilar*, No. 2:24-CV-00518-CDS-MDC, 2024 WL 3409860, at *3 (D. Nev. July 12, 2024); *RNC v. Chapman*, 447 M.D. 2022 (Pa. Common. Ct. Sept. 29, 2022); *Pub. Int. Legal Found., Inc. v. Winfrey*, 463 F. Supp. 3d 795, 802 (E.D. Mich. 2020); *Kobach v. U.S. Election Assistance Comm’n*, No. 13-CV-4095-EFMDJW, 2013 WL 6511874, at *4 (D. Kan. Dec. 12, 2013). This Court should follow suit given Proposed Intervenor’s clear interests and the lack of any prejudice or delay.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Proposed Intervenor should be granted intervention.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 20, 2025

/s/ James G. Monteleone

BERNSTEIN, SHUR, SAWYER & NELSON, P.A.

James G. Monteleone (Maine Bar # 5827)
100 Middle Street, PO Box 9729
Portland, ME 04104
T: (207) 774-1200
F: (207) 774-1127
jmonteleone@bernsteinshur.com

Katherine R. Knox (Maine Bar # 9720)

45 Memorial Circle, PO Box 5057
Augusta, ME 04332
T: (207) 623-1596
F: (207) 626-0200
kknox@bernsteinshur.com

ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP

Aria C. Branch* (DC Bar # 1014541)
Christopher D. Dodge* (DC Bar # 90011587)
Omeed Alerasool* (DC Bar # 90006578)
250 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20001
T: (202) 968-4490
F: (202) 968-4498
abbranch@elias.law
cdodge@elias.law
oalerasool@elias.law

*Motion for *pro hac vice* admission
forthcoming

*Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor-Defendants Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck,
DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association*

NOTICE

Pursuant to Rule 7(c) of the Maine Rules of Civil Procedure, any matter in opposition to this motion must be filed not later than twenty-one (21) days after the filing of this motion unless another time is provided by the rules or set by the Court. Failure to file timely opposition to this motion will be deemed a waiver of all objections to this motion, which may be granted without further notice or hearing.

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**ORDER ON MOTION TO INTERVENE
ON BEHALF OF VICTORIA
KORNFIELD, LISA BUCK, DSCC,
DCCC, AND THE DEMOCRATIC
GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION**

Upon review of the Motion to Intervene on Behalf of Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association, the parties' responses to the Motion, and the entire record herein, the Motion is hereby GRANTED; it is further

ORDERED that Intervenors' proposed responsive pleading shall be deemed filed and noted on the Docket pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 79(a).

Date

Justice, Superior Court

Exhibit A

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**DECLARATION OF VICTORIA
KORNFIELD IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

I, Victoria P. Kornfield, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify, and have personal knowledge of the facts and information set forth in this declaration.

2. I am a retired educator who lives in Bangor. Before retiring, I spent three decades as an educator at Bangor High School. After retiring from teaching, I served four terms as a legislator in the Maine House of Representatives. I am currently spending my retirement engaged in other public service efforts and enjoying time traveling abroad.

3. I consider voting to be an important civic duty and have long made a habit of voting in every election. To ensure that my ballot is counted, I nearly always vote by absentee ballot. I typically cast my ballot in person during the early voting period, though I also sometimes mail in my ballot, particularly if I am traveling around election day. I have requested an absentee ballot by telephone from my local election official on at least one occasion.

4. Being able to vote by absentee ballot is extremely important to me, particularly as a retired 79-year-old who is concerned about my future ability to drive to the polls. Accordingly, I plan to sign up for ongoing absentee voter status when it becomes available. That will ensure that

I routinely receive an absentee ballot that I can cast either during early voting or by mail.

5. If enacted, the ballot measure at issue in this lawsuit would make it more difficult for me to vote by absentee ballot. To start, it would eliminate my ability to register for ongoing absentee voter status, meaning I will have to apply for an absentee ballot for every election in the future, even though I already know I wish to routinely vote by absentee ballot. The measure will also make absentee voting more difficult by eliminating the ability to request a ballot by telephone, a method I have used previously. It will also further restrict when and how I can request an absentee ballot. I am concerned that these changes will make it more difficult for me to vote in future elections, particularly as it becomes more difficult for me to drive to the polls or to wait in long lines at the polls.

6. Accordingly, I strongly believe the ballot question language that goes before Maine voters this November should accurately reflect the changes the ballot measure will enact. For example, voters deserve to know that this ballot measure would eliminate the option to sign up for ongoing absentee voter status, which is a registration option that will be extremely valuable to voters like me. In my view, any ballot question language that fails to mention such a change would not accurately inform voters about what they are voting on.

I swear under penalty of perjury that the above statements are true and correct.

Executed on: 5/19/2025

VK

Victoria P. Kornfield

Exhibit B

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**DECLARATION OF LISA BUCK
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
INTERVENE**

I, Lisa Buck, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify, and have personal knowledge of the facts and information set forth in this declaration.
2. I live in Orono and am 65 years old. Orono is one of the municipalities in Maine that has multiple ballot drop box locations.
3. I view voting as an important civic duty and do my best to vote in every single election. In recent years, I have usually voted by delivering my absentee ballot to a drop box in Orono. I prefer voting early via a drop box because physically depositing the ballot in the drop box gives me confidence that my vote will be counted and not lost or delayed in the mail, particularly if there is bad weather. Accordingly, I am very interested in signing up for ongoing absentee voter status when that option becomes available in Maine later this year.
4. I am deeply concerned that the ballot measure at issue in this lawsuit, if it is adopted, will make it harder for me to vote. If it is enacted, towns like Orono will have to eliminate their use of multiple drop box locations, an offering that currently makes it more convenient for me to drop off my ballot. It will also eliminate my ability to register for ongoing absentee voter status,


which is something I otherwise intend to immediately do when it becomes available. In other words, enacting the measure will make it harder for me to reliably request and cast an absentee ballot.

5. Maine voters deserve to know what changes this ballot measure will make to Maine's election rules when they vote on the ballot measure later this year. For example, voters should be aware that voting for this measure would eliminate the option for ongoing absentee voter status for people like me. I am worried that, if this lawsuit is successful, this information will be buried, and voters will not be fully informed of the scope and impact of the ballot measure. And I am further worried that casting a ballot in Orono will become more difficult if people lose access to drop box locations they previously relied upon.

I swear under penalty of perjury that the above statements are true and correct.

5/19/2025

Executed on: _____



Lisa Buck

Exhibit C

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**DECLARATION OF LILLIE
SNYDER BOSS IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

I, Lillie Snyder Boss, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify, and have personal knowledge of the facts and information set forth in this declaration.

2. I am the Chief Operating Officer of DSCC, which is also known as the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. I have served in this role since March 2021.

3. DSCC is the Democratic Party's national senatorial committee. Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party across the country to the U.S. Senate. In support of this mission, DSCC seeks to register new voters as Democratic Party members and constituents; to preserve the lawful registration status of Democratic Party members and other Democratic Party supporters; to encourage and assist Democratic Party members and constituents in casting ballots and having those ballots count; to protect registered Democratic Party members and constituents from unlawful retaliation or intimidation; and to preserve the legal rights of our voters.

4. In my role as Chief Operating Officer, I oversee DSCC's day-to-day operations. This includes managing the Committee's staff and processes, budget, operations, and initiatives, as well as engaging with all of DSCC's activities as needed. I interact with DSCC's officers and

employees at all levels. I also help campaigns from time to time on their compliance and budget needs.

5. DSCC is actively planning, preparing, budgeting, and strategizing for the 2026 midterm elections. In Maine, DSCC will support the Democratic nominee vying for the U.S. Senate seat currently held by Senator Susan Collins.

6. Electing a Democrat to the seat currently held by Republican incumbent Susan Collins is critical to DSCC's goal of retaking the majority in the Senate, where the Republican Party presently has a narrow three-seat majority plus the tie-breaking vote of the Vice President. Senator Collins's seat is widely seen as one of the Democratic Party's best pickup opportunities in the upcoming 2026 elections. Ensuring that Democrats and Democratic-leaning voters across Maine are able to reliably cast absentee ballots is thus crucial to DSCC's goals for 2026.

7. As election day approaches, DSCC heavily focuses on encouraging Democrats and Democratic-leaning voters to vote, including by absentee ballot, and making sure they have the knowledge and resources to do so effectively. Particularly since the pandemic, DSCC has expended significant resources to encourage voters to vote by mail and absentee ballot because that method is often the most convenient or accessible way for voters to participate. DSCC's efforts in Maine have been successful, and absentee voting is now extremely popular in the state. In fact, during the 2024 election, nearly half of Maine voters cast an absentee ballot and statistics showed that registered Democrats were more likely than other voters to vote absentee.

8. In recent years, as absentee voting has become more critical to our electoral strategy, DSCC has developed education and assistance cure programs to ensure Democratic voters are able to successfully request and cast absentee ballots and have those ballots counted. And through ballot-cure programs, DSCC and others identify qualified voters whose absentee

ballots are slated for rejection due to a non-substantive defect, such as a missing signature on a ballot envelope, and work with those voters to correct the errors and timely return their ballots to be counted. Each cycle, the DSCC invests millions of dollars in these programs, including in the 2020 U.S. Senate election in Maine, the last time the DSCC had a chance to defeat Senator Collins.

9. The initiative at issue in this lawsuit, titled “An Act to Require an Individual to Present Photographic Identification for the Purpose of Voting” would significantly harm DSCC if adopted. The proposal would make many detrimental changes to Maine’s elections law, including by: (i) limiting the means by which absentee ballots may be requested; (ii) banning prepaid postage for absentee ballot return envelopes; (iii) limiting the number of drop boxes offered in each municipality; (iv) reducing the number of days Maine voters may cast and return their absentee ballots; and (v) requiring voters to provide photo identification to vote by absentee ballot. The proposal further requires that voters casting their ballots in person provide photo identification as well.

10. The changes, and particularly the changes to Maine’s absentee voting rules, will make it more difficult to request and cast an absentee ballot in Maine, undercutting a key method of voting relied on by DSCC’s supporters.

11. DSCC will therefore be harmed in a number of discrete ways if the ballot initiative passes. First, if it passes, DSCC will have to deploy scarce additional resources to Maine to help voters adjust to the new requirements. Accordingly, the initiative threatens to drain DSCC’s resources and to force us to retool our voter programs in Maine.

12. Second, because it is difficult to change voters’ habits, DSCC expects that, despite its best efforts and significant expenditure of resources, changes imposed by the ballot measure will inevitably lead to disenfranchisement and could cause the future Democratic candidates for

Senate to lose votes, harming their electoral competitiveness. Accordingly, enacting the measure will both burden the voting rights of DSCC's supporters and, relatedly, harm the competitiveness of DSCC's candidates. Given Maine's recent history of close elections, this harm could not only cost DSCC a competitive Senate seat in 2026, but could potentially even determine control of the U.S. Senate.

13. Given the harm the ballot measure will cause to voters, and the negative impact it will have on the competitiveness of Democratic candidates for Senate in future elections, DSCC opposes adoption of the measure and would urge its supporters in Maine to vote against it. However, in explaining to voters why the measure is harmful, it must be clear to voters what is actually in the proposal. The existing language proposed by the Secretary accurately captures the breadth of the ballot initiative and clearly explains the measure's contents to voters. The proponents of the measure, however, are asking the Court to impose their own preferred language, which would omit many of the harmful effects of the initiative. Doing so prejudices DSCC's ability to explain why the measure is harmful and also increases the likelihood that voters may support the measure, unaware of its full scope and harm.

I swear under penalty of perjury that the above statements are true and correct.

5/19/2025

Executed on: _____

Lillie Snyder Boss

Lillie Snyder Boss, Chief Operating Officer
DSCC

Exhibit D

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**DECLARATION OF ERIK
RUSELOWSKI IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

I, Erik Ruselowski, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify, and have personal knowledge of the facts and information set forth in this declaration.

2. I am the Chief Operating Officer of DCCC, which is also known as the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. I first joined DCCC in September 2016, and I have served as Chief Operating Officer since February 2022.

3. DCCC is the Democratic Party's national congressional committee. Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party from across the country to the U.S. House of Representatives. In support of this mission, DCCC seeks to encourage and assist Democratic Party members and constituents in casting ballots and having those ballots count; to register new voters as Democratic Party members and constituents; to preserve the lawful registration status of Democratic Party members and other Democratic Party constituents; to protect registered Democratic Party members and constituents from unlawful retaliation or intimidation; and to preserve the legal rights of our voters. DCCC's members and constituents are grassroots Democratic voters in all 50 states.

4. In my role as Chief Operating Officer, I support DCCC's day-to-day operations and manage committee-level initiatives, budgeting, technology, and administration. I engage on an as-needed basis with all of DCCC's activities, and I interact with DCCC's officers and employees at all levels.

5. DCCC is actively planning, preparing, budgeting, and strategizing for the upcoming 2026 midterm elections. Through its Frontline program, DCCC provides Democratic members from competitive seats with the resources and support needed to execute effective reelection campaigns. For the 2026 election, DCCC is currently supporting 26 candidates in 15 states, including Representative Jared Golden in Maine's Second Congressional District. DCCC is planning to spend resources to defeat Republicans in these competitive congressional districts, including Maine's Second Congressional District, and DCCC expects to compete in additional Republican-held districts as well.

6. Reelecting Representative Golden, along with Representative Chellie Pingree in Maine's First Congressional District, is critical to DCCC's goal of retaking the majority in the U.S. House of Representatives, where the Republican Party presently has a narrow three-seat majority. Representative Golden's district, in particular, has seen some of the closest election results in the country in recent years; he won reelection in 2024 by just 2,706 votes or about 0.7% of the vote. Ensuring that Democratic Party supporters across Maine are able to reliably cast absentee ballots is thus crucial to DCCC's goals for 2026.

7. As election day approaches, DCCC heavily focuses on encouraging Democratic-leaning voters to vote, including by absentee ballot, and making sure they have the knowledge and resources to do so effectively. Particularly since the pandemic, DCCC has expended significant resources to encourage voters to vote by mail and absentee ballot because that method is often the

most convenient or accessible way for voters to participate. Our efforts in Maine have been successful, and absentee voting is now extremely popular in the state. In fact, during the 2024 election, nearly half of Maine voters cast an absentee ballot and statistics showed that registered Democrats were more likely than other voters to vote absentee.

8. In recent years, as absentee voting has become more critical to our electoral strategy, DCCC has developed a comprehensive education and assistance cure program to ensure Democratic voters are able to successfully request and cast absentee ballots and have those ballots counted. And through ballot-cure programs, DCCC and others identify qualified voters whose absentee ballots are slated for rejection due to a non-substantive defect, such as a missing signature on a ballot envelope, and work with those voters to correct the errors and timely return their ballots to be counted. DCCC operates these programs in Maine.

9. The initiative at issue in this lawsuit, titled “An Act to Require an Individual to Present Photographic Identification for the Purpose of Voting” would significantly harm DCCC if adopted. The proposal would make many detrimental changes to Maine’s elections law, including by : (i) limiting the means by which absentee ballots may be requested; (ii) banning prepaid postage for absentee ballot return envelopes; (iii) limiting the number of drop boxes offered in each municipality; (iv) reducing the number of days Maine voters may cast and return their absentee ballots; and (v) requiring voters to provide photo identification to vote by absentee ballot. The proposal further requires that voters casting their ballots in person provide photo identification as well.

10. The changes, and particularly the changes to Maine’s absentee voting rules, will make it more difficult to request and cast an absentee ballot in Maine, undercutting a key method of voting relied on by DCCC’s supporters.

11. DCCC will therefore be harmed in a number of discrete ways if the ballot initiative passes. First, if it passes, DCCC will have to deploy scarce additional resources to Maine to help voters adjust to the new requirements, which is a difficult task as voters—and particularly older voters who rely on absentee voting—often develop strong voting habits and get accustomed to voting a certain way by a certain deadline. Accordingly, the initiative threatens to force us to retool our absentee voter guidance and programming in Maine. The additional resources devoted to addressing the impact of this proposal, if it passes in the November 2025 election, would come at the expense of DCCC’s other investments and programming in Maine and in other states across the country. And once such resources are diverted toward unplanned programming, they cannot be used to persuade voters to elect and re-elect Democratic candidates, directly undermining DCCC’s mission as a result.

12. Second, because it is difficult to change voters’ habits, DCCC expects that, despite its best efforts and significant expenditure of resources, changes imposed by the ballot measure will inevitably lead to disenfranchisement and cause DCCC’s candidates to lose votes, harming their electoral competitiveness. Accordingly, enacting the measure will both burden the voting rights of DCCC’s supporters and, relatedly, harm the competitiveness of DCCC’s candidates. Given Maine’s recent history of extremely close elections, particularly in the Second Congressional District, this harm might not only cost DCCC a competitive House seat but could potentially even determine control of the U.S. House of Representatives.

13. Given the harm the ballot measure will cause to voters, and the negative impact it will have on the competitiveness of DCCC’s candidates in Maine, DCCC strongly opposes adoption of the measure and would urge its supporters in Maine to vote against it. However, in explaining to voters why the measure is harmful, it must be clear to voters what is actually in the

proposal. The existing language proposed by the Secretary accurately captures the breadth of the ballot initiative and clearly explains the measure's contents to voters. The proponents of the measure, however, are asking the Court to impose their own preferred language, which would omit many of the harmful effects of the initiative. Doing so prejudices DCCC's ability to explain why the measure is harmful and also increases the likelihood that voters may support the measure, unaware of its full scope and harm.

I swear under penalty of perjury that the above statements are true and correct.

5/19/2025

Executed on: _____

Erik Ruselowski

Erik Ruselowski, Chief Operating Officer
DCCC

Exhibit E

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**DECLARATION OF JILLIAN
EDELMAN IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

I, Jillian Edelman, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify, and have personal knowledge of the facts and information set forth in this declaration.
2. I am the Chief Operating Officer of the Democratic Governors Association, also known as DGA. I joined DGA in February 2022 in this role and have served in it ever since.
3. In my role as Chief Operating Officer, I support DGA's day-to-day operations and oversee its operations. In particular, I handle DGA's operational planning, meaning that I make strategic decisions regarding staffing, budgeting, contracts with vendors, expenditures, and more.
4. DGA is a political organization dedicated to supporting Democratic Governors and electing Democratic gubernatorial candidates across the United States. DGA currently provides support to sitting Governors in 23 states and 4 territories, as well as the Mayor of the District of Columbia, who together constitute DGA's formal membership.¹ DGA serves as a clearinghouse

¹ These members include Maine Governor Janet Mills, as well as Andy Beshear (Kentucky), Muriel Bowser (Washington, D.C.), Albert Bryan, Jr. (U.S. Virgin Islands), Tony Evers

for best practices and policies, including but not limited to policies regarding management, administration, and budgeting for federal, state, and local elections.

5. To advance its mission of supporting the election and reelection of Democratic candidates to governorships across the country, DGA provides funding used to educate and assist Democratic-leaning voters on how to vote and ensure that those votes are counted. Such programs include voter registration and turnout programs, programs aimed at protecting the registration statuses of Democratic-affiliated voters, voter education and outreach programs aimed at encouraging absentee voting, and ballot cure programs to help ensure that absentee ballots rejected by election officials for minor technicalities are still counted. In the last few years, DGA has grown significantly and expanded its support for these programs.

6. DGA invests heavily in campaigns and political parties, and those campaigns and parties in turn run these programs, along with voter registration and assistance programs to ensure that voters are able to register and cast ballots that will be counted.

7. DGA is actively planning, preparing, budgeting, and strategizing for imminent gubernatorial elections in New Jersey and Virginia in 2025, in addition to 36 more races in 2026, including in Maine where a Democratic nominee will aim to succeed term-limited incumbent Governor Janet Mills.

8. Electing a Democratic governor to succeed Governor Mills is crucial to DGA's mission of supporting the election and reelection of Democratic governors, especially during a

(Wisconsin), Bob Ferguson (Washington), Josh Green (Hawaii), Maura Healey (Massachusetts), Katie Hobbs (Arizona), Kathy Hochul (New York), Laura Kelly (Kansas), Tina Kotek (Oregon), Ned Lamont (Connecticut), Lou Leon Guerrero (Guam), Michelle Lujan Grisham (New Mexico), Dan McKee (Rhode Island), Matt Meyer (Delaware), Wes Moore (Maryland), Phil Murphy (New Jersey), Gavin Newsom (California), Jared Polis (Colorado), JB Pritzker (Illinois), Josh Shapiro (Pennsylvania), Josh Stein (North Carolina), Tim Walz (Minnesota), and Gretchen Whitmer (Michigan).

time where the aggressive, extreme, and unprecedented agenda of the Republican president in the White House heightens the urgency of maintaining as many Democratic governors across the country as possible to counteract and push back against that agenda.

9. As election day approaches, then, DGA will focus heavily on encouraging Democratic-leaning voters to vote, including by absentee ballot, and making sure they have the knowledge and resources to do so effectively. And absentee voting has become increasingly popular since the pandemic: during the 2024 election, nearly half of Maine voters cast an absentee ballot and statistics showed that registered Democrats were more likely than other voters to vote absentee.

10. Because absentee voting has become more critical to our electoral strategy, DGA has developed education and absentee ballot cure programming to help ensure Democratic voters are able to successfully request and cast absentee ballots and have those ballots counted. Absentee ballot cure programs involve identifying qualified voters whose absentee ballots are slated for rejection due to a non-substantive defect, such as a missing signature on a ballot envelope, and work with those voters to correct the errors and timely return their ballots to be counted. If this initiative is successful, DGA will need to spend more resources to encourage operation of ballot curing programs in Maine.

11. The initiative at issue in this lawsuit, titled “An Act to Require an Individual to Present Photographic Identification for the Purpose of Voting” would significantly harm DGA if adopted.

12. The changes made by the initiative, and particularly the changes to Maine’s absentee voting rules, will make it more difficult to request and cast an absentee ballot in Maine, undercutting a key method of voting relied on by DGA’s supporters.

13. DGA will therefore be harmed in a number of discrete ways if the ballot initiative passes. First, if it passes, DGA will have to deploy scarce additional resources to Maine to help voters adjust to the new requirements, which is a difficult task as voters—and particularly older voters who rely on absentee voting—often develop strong voting habits and get accustomed to voting a certain way by a certain deadline. Accordingly, the initiative threatens to drain DGA’s resources and to force us to retool our absentee voter program in Maine.

14. Second, because it is difficult to change voters’ habits, DGA expects that, despite its best efforts and significant expenditure of resources, changes imposed by the ballot measure will inevitably lead to disenfranchisement and cause DGA’s candidates to lose votes, harming their electoral competitiveness. Accordingly, enacting the measure will both burden the voting rights of DGA’s supporters and, relatedly, harm the competitiveness of DGA’s candidates. Given Maine’s recent history of close elections, this harm might cost DGA the governorship of Maine.

15. Given the harm the ballot measure will cause to voters, and the negative impact it will have on the competitiveness of DGA’s candidates in Maine, DGA strongly opposes adoption of the measure and would urge its supporters in Maine to vote against it. And DGA intends to spend resources specifically to defeat the initiative by persuading Mainers to reject it. However, to explain to voters why the initiative is harmful, the ballot question must clearly state what its adoption would mean. The existing language proposed by the Secretary accurately captures the breadth of the ballot initiative and clearly explains the measure’s contents to voters. The proponents of the measure, however, are asking the Court to impose their own preferred language, which would omit many of the harmful effects of the initiative. Doing so prejudices DGA’s ability to explain why the measure is harmful and also increases the likelihood that voters may support the measure, unaware of its full scope and harm.

16. As a result, DGA will be forced to divert significant resources away from other important priorities in the middle of two critical and competitive elections in 2025. Moreover, the additional resources that would need to be devoted to addressing the impact of this proposal, if it passes in the November 2025 election, would reduce the resources DGA has available for investments and programming in other states for gubernatorial elections in 2026.

I swear under penalty of perjury that the above statements are true and correct.

Executed on: 5/19/2025

Jillian Edelman

Jillian Edelman, Chief Operating Officer
Democratic Governors Association

Exhibit F

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant,

and

VICTORIA KORNFIELD, LISA BUCK,
DSCC, DCCC, and the DEMOCRATIC
GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,

Intervenor-Defendants.

**INTERVENORS' ANSWER TO
PETITION FOR REVIEW OF
FINAL AGENCY ACTION**

Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association (“DGA”) (collectively, “Intervenors”) answer the Petitioners’ Petition for Review of Final Agency Action (“Petition”) as follows:

The Petition contains an unnumbered introduction that consists of legal argument, to which no response is required. The introduction also includes factual assertions made elsewhere in the Petition, which Intervenors respond to below. To the extent a response is required, the Intervenors incorporate by reference the below paragraphs as their response, deny the allegations, and deny that Petitioners are entitled to any relief.¹

¹ Intervenors admit that, as noted in Footnote 1 and the corresponding bolded sentence in the unnumbered introduction, the Court is required to issue a written decision by June 16, 2025.

PARTIES

1. Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 1 and therefore deny them.

2. Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 2 and therefore deny them.

3. Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 3 and therefore deny them.

4. Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 4 and therefore deny them.

5. Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 5 and therefore deny them.

6. Paragraph 6 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations. Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remainder of Paragraph 6 and therefore deny them.

7. Intervenor lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 7 that “all Petitioners have been involved in bringing the Act to the ballot and support the election security measures included in the measure,” and therefore deny them. The remainder of Paragraph 7 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

8. Intervenor admit that Shenna Bellows is the Secretary of State for the State of Maine and is sued in her official capacity. The remainder of Paragraph 8 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a

response is required, Intervenor's admit only that the cited chapter of the Maine statutes governs direct petitions for initiated legislation and deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 8.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. Paragraph 9 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor's deny the allegations.

10. Paragraph 10 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor's deny the allegations.

11. Paragraph 11 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor's deny the allegations.

FACTUAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND

A. The Petition

12. Intervenor's admit that proponents of a direct initiative, titled "An Act to Require an Individual to Present Photographic Identification for the Purpose of Voting," sought to place the initiative on the November 2025 ballot. Intervenor's lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 12 and therefore deny them.

13. Intervenor's admit the allegations in Paragraph 13.

14. Intervenor's admit the allegations in Paragraph 14.

15. Intervenor's admit the allegations in Paragraph 15.

B. Submission to the Legislature

16. Intervenors admit that the Act was transmitted to the Maine Legislature, introduced on March 20, 2025, and “later referred to the Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs.” Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 16 and therefore deny them.

17. Intervenors admit that the regular session of the Maine Legislature adjourned on March 21, 2025. The remainder of Paragraph 17 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors deny the allegations.

C. The Proposed Ballot Question

18. Intervenors admit the allegations in Paragraph 18.

19. Intervenors admit the allegations in Paragraph 19.

20. Intervenors admit the allegations in Paragraph 20.

21. Intervenors admit that the Secretary testified before the Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs on May 2, 2025. Intervenors further admit that the Secretary, in responding to legislators’ questions, made the following statements during her testimony:

- a. “It is fair to say this is going to cause a huge budget deficit for us because it will require new tabulation systems and significant changing to the programming changes to the central voter registration system. On a very tight deadline.”
- b. “Voters would have a choice. They could vote for this measure, they could vote for the second measure, or they could vote no to both. If none of them receive 50% plus one, it would then go to a subsequent election. The other option is the legislature can choose not to do a competing measure. Send

this to the ballot as is, so it's a yes or no, up and down on this initiative. The legislature can, of course, next year make any amendments at that time once legislation has been passed by the voters should this pass. Should this pass, we would likely bring a bill forward to try to correct some of the challenges, but that's hypothetical in the future."

- c. "So driving is a privilege, not a constitutional right. And yes, you must have a driver's license, a lawful driver's license, in order to drive. You can provide your driver license number and a law enforcement officer can look that up to make sure that you're valid. But we're not arguing that this isn't something, you know, there are analogies and lots of other areas of life. What we're saying is that proof of identity in Maine is currently required at the point of registration. If you are creating a requirement at the point of voting, you are creating a requirement that volunteers at those sign-in tables are going to have to interpret and then you're potentially leading to some harmful disproportionate impact on people who've either forgotten their ID or don't have a current ID. Maybe they're not drivers. And potentially longer lines and inconvenience for everyone."

D. The Secretary's Decision

- 22. Intervenor's admit the allegations in Paragraph 22.
- 23. Paragraph 23 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor's deny the allegations.

24. Paragraph 24 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

25. Intervenor admit that the Secretary's language consists of 66 words. The remainder of Paragraph 25 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

26. Intervenor admit that L.D. 1701 was an initiative voted on in 2016, which comprised of about 30 pages involving the legalization of marijuana, and that the language reproduced in Paragraph 26 appears to reflect the ballot language approved by the Secretary for that initiative. Intervenor admit that L.D. 977 was an initiative voted on in 2009, which comprised of about 30 pages involving the repeal of school district consolidation laws, and that the language reproduced in Paragraph 26 appears to reflect the ballot language approved by the Secretary for that initiative. The remainder of Paragraph 26 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

27. Paragraph 27 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

28. Paragraph 28 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

29. Paragraph 29 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.²

30. Intervenor admit that the Secretary's May 5, 2025 "Decision Letter" contains the language reproduced in Paragraph 30. The remainder of Paragraph 30 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

31. Intervenor admit that the Secretary's May 5, 2025 "Decision Letter" contains the language reproduced in Paragraph 31. The remainder of Paragraph 31 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

32. Paragraph 32 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

33. Paragraph 33 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

² Intervenor admit that at least 5 sections of the Act relate to drop boxes, that at least 3 sections of the Act relate to rules governing when non-family members may deliver or assist someone in filling out a ballot, and that at least 4 sections of the Act relate to procedures governing aspects of the absentee voting process. However, Intervenor deny, as implied in Paragraph 29 and in Footnote 2, that sections of the Act only relate to one of these subjects or another: For example, a section relating to returning absentee ballots via ballot drop box inherently relates to procedures governing aspects of the absentee voting process as well.

34. Paragraph 34 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

COUNT I

35. Intervenor incorporate by reference each of their preceding admissions, denials, and statements as if fully set forth herein.

36. Paragraph 36 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

37. Paragraph 37 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

38. Paragraph 38 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

39. Paragraph 39 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

40. Paragraph 40 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

41. Paragraph 41 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

42. Paragraph 42 contains legal contentions, characterizations, conclusions, and opinions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor deny the allegations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Intervenor deny that Petitioners are entitled to any relief.

GENERAL DENIAL

Intervenor deny every allegation in the Petition that is not expressly admitted herein.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Petitioners' claims are barred because they seek relief inconsistent with state law.
2. Intervenor reserve the right to amend this Answer at a later time.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Petition, Intervenor pray for judgment as follows:

- A. That the Court dismiss Petitioners' Petition for Review of Final Agency Action;
- B. That judgment be entered in favor of Intervenor and against Petitioners on the Petition and that Petitioners take nothing thereby;
- C. That Intervenor be awarded reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under any applicable statute or equitable doctrine; and
- D. For such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 20, 2025

/s/ James G. Monteleone

BERNSTEIN, SHUR, SAWYER & NELSON, P.A.

James G. Monteleone (Maine Bar # 5827)
100 Middle Street, PO Box 9729
Portland, ME 04104
T: (207) 774-1200
F: (207) 774-1127
jmonteleone@bernsteinshur.com

Katherine R. Knox (Maine Bar # 9720)

45 Memorial Circle, PO Box 5057
Augusta, ME 04332
T: (207) 623-1596
F: (207) 626-0200
kknox@bernsteinshur.com

ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP

Aria C. Branch* (DC Bar # 1014541)
Christopher D. Dodge* (DC Bar # 90011587)
Omeed Alerasool* (DC Bar # 90006578)
250 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20001
T: (202) 968-4490
F: (202) 968-4498
abbranch@elias.law
cdodge@elias.law
oalerasool@elias.law

*Motion for *pro hac vice* admission
forthcoming

*Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC,
DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association*

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**PROPOSED INTERVENOR-
DEFENDANTS' MOTION
FOR ADMISSION OF COUNSEL
*PRO HAC VICE***

Pursuant to Maine Rule of Civil Procedure 89(b) and 4 M.R.S. § 802, Proposed Intervenor-Defendants Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association, through their undersigned counsel, hereby move for the admission *pro hac vice* of attorneys Aria C. Branch, Christopher D. Dodge, and Omeed Alerasool, of the firm Elias Law Group LLP, to appear in this action as co-counsel for Proposed Intervenor-Defendants.

Attorney Branch is known to undersigned counsel as a member of the bars of the District of Columbia (Bar No. 1014541) and the Commonwealth of Virginia (Bar No. 83682), in good standing, and not subject to disciplinary action by any bar.

Attorney Dodge is known to undersigned counsel as a member of the bars of the State of New York (Bar No. 5245907), the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Bar No. 696172), and the District of Columbia (Bar No. 90011587), in good standing and not subject to disciplinary action by any bar.

Attorney Alerasool is known to undersigned counsel as a member of the bars of the State of New Jersey (Bar No. 403712022), the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Bar No. 332873), and the District of Columbia (Bar No. 90006578), in good standing and not subject to disciplinary

action by any bar.

The aforementioned applicants, as *pro hac vice* counsel, intend to be associated with undersigned counsel throughout the proceeding. Undersigned counsel shall join in signing all papers filed with this Court.

WHEREFORE, Proposed Intervenor-Defendants Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association respectfully move this Court to permit Aria C. Branch, Esq., Christopher D. Dodge, Esq., and Omeed Alerasool, Esq., to appear as counsel on their behalf.

Dated at Portland, Maine this 20th day of May 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James G. Monteleone

BERNSTEIN, SHUR, SAWYER & NELSON, P.A.

James G. Monteleone (Maine Bar # 5827)

100 Middle Street, PO Box 9729

Portland, ME 04104

T: (207) 774-1200

F: (207) 774-1127

jmonteleone@bernsteinshur.com

*Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor-Defendants
Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC, DCCC, and
the Democratic Governors Association*

NOTICE

Matters in opposition to this Motion pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 7(c) must be filed not later than 21 days after the filing of this Motion unless another time is provided by the Maine Rules of Civil Procedure or by the Court. Failure to file timely opposition will be deemed a waiver of all objections to the Motion, which may be granted without further notice or hearing.

STATE OF MAINE
CUMBERLAND, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT
DOCKET NO. AP-25-0015

ALEX TITCOMB, HEATHER SIROCKI,
KEVIN MURPHY, GEORGE COLBY, and
RANDALL ADAM GREENWOOD,

Petitioners,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official
capacity as the Maine Secretary of State,

Defendant.

**ORDER ON PROPOSED
INTERVENOR-DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR ADMISSION OF
COUNSEL *PRO HAC VICE***

Upon review of Proposed Intervenor-Defendants' Motion for Admission of Counsel *Pro Hac Vice*, Plaintiffs' response thereto, and the entire record herein, the motion is hereby GRANTED; it is further

ORDERED that Aria C. Branch, Christopher D. Dodge, and Omeed Alerasool be admitted *pro hac vice* in the above-captioned matter, and that this Order constitutes their Entries of Appearance on behalf of Proposed Intervenor-Defendants Victoria Kornfield, Lisa Buck, DSCC, DCCC, and the Democratic Governors Association.

The Clerk shall incorporate this Order on the docket by reference pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 79(a).

Dated

Justice, Superior Court

Bernstein Shur

Payee # 5945 Payee Name Cumberland County Superior Court

Check Date 5/19/25

Check # 173219

Amount \$2,100.00

Voucher 90987 Invoice Date 05-19-2025 Invoice # 05192025

Invoice Description 064966-00001 Pro Hac Vice Admission Fees

Invoice Amt \$2,100.00

THIS CHECK IS PROTECTED BY A VOID PANTOGRAPH, MICROPRINT SIGNATURE LINE AND A HEAT SENSITIVE PADLOCK ICON. ADDITIONAL SECURITY FEATURES ARE LISTED ON BACK.

**BERN
STEIN
SHUR**

Bernstein Shur
100 Middle Street
PO Box 9729
Portland, ME 04101

52-7451
2112

NORWAY SAVINGS BANK
PORTLAND, MAINE

05/19/2025

173219

Amount

\$*****2,100.00

PAY

**Two Thousand One Hundred and 00/100 Dollar(s)

VOID AFTER 90 DAYS

TO THE
ORDER
OF:

Cumberland County Superior Court
205 Newbury Street
Portland, ME 04101

[Signature]
Authorized Signature

[Signature]
Authorized Signature

MADE TRADE WITH
RUB PADLOCK

⑈0173219⑈ ⑆211274515⑆ 870 212587 3⑈