

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

County Name	Elect page?	Easy to find?	Adeq elect info?	Adeq ID info?	SOS link?	Spanish a&b?	LWV link?	Total Points	% Points	Mean Score	Overall Evaluation
Anderson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Andrews	5-Yes	3-Good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Angelena	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	11	37	2	Fair
Aransas	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect
Archer	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	2-Fair	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Armstrong	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Atascosa	No official website										
Austin	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Bailey	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Bandera	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Bastrop	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	1-Bare	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	30	100	5	Perfect
Baylor	No official website										
Bee	5-Yes	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Bell	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Bexar	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	34	113	6	Perfect
Blanco	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Borden	5-Yes	3-Good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
Bosque	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Bowie	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Brazoria	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Brazos	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	30	100	5	Perfect
Brewster	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	5-Yes	5-Yes	23	77	4	Very good
Briscoe	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Brooks	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
Brown	5-Yes	4-Very good	3-Good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Burleson	5-Yes	4-Very good	3-Good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Burnet	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	23	77	4	Very good

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Caldwell	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Calhoun	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Callahan	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Cameron	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect
Camp	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Carson	5-Yes	3-Good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Cass	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	0-No	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Castro	<b>0-No</b>	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Chambers	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Cherokee	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Childress	No official website										
Clay	5-Yes	3-Good	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	12	40	2	Fair
Cochran	5-Yes	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Coke	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Coleman	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Collin	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Collingsworth	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Colorado	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Comal	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Comanche	No official website										
Concho	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Cooke	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Coryelle	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Cottle	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Crane	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	25	83	4	Very good
Crockett	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Crosby	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Culberson	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Dallam	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	0	0	0	Inadequate
Dallas	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	4-Very good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	33	110	6	Perfect

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Dawson	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Deaf-Smith	5-Yes	3-Good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Delta	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
Denton	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	33	110	6	Perfect
DeWitt	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Dickens	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Dimmit	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	0	0	0	Inadequate
Donley	5-Yes	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Duval	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Eastland	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
Ector	5-Yes	4-Very good	3-Good	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	25	83	4	Very good
Edwards	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
El Paso	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Ellis	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	5-Yes	28	93	5	Perfect
Erath	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	25	83	4	Very good
Falls	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	24	80	4	Very good
Fannin	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Fayette	5-Yes	5-Perfect	3-Good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	5-Yes	26	87	4	Very good
Fisher	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Floyd	5-Yes	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Foard	No official website										
Fort Bend	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Franklin	5-Yes	2-Fair	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Freestone	5-Yes	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Frio	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Gaines	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	25	83	4	Very good
Galveston	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	2-Fair	0-No	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Garza	5-Yes	5-Perfect	3-Good	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Gillespie	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Glasscock	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	24	80	4	Very good

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Goliad	5-Yes	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Gonzales	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Gray	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Grayson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Gregg	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	4-Very good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	33	110	6	Perfect
Grimes	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	33	110	6	Perfect
Guadalupe	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Hale	5-Yes	3-Good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
Hall	No official website										
Hamilton	5-Yes	5-Perfect	3-Good	4-Very good	0-No	0-No	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Hansford	<b>0-No</b>	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Hardeman	No official website										
Hardin	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	11	37	2	Fair
Harris	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect
Harrison	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	5-Yes	28	93	5	Perfect
Hartley	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	2-Fair	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Haskell	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Hays	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect
Hemphill	0-No	3-Good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Henderson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	25	83	4	Very good
Hidalgo	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	25	83	4	Very good
Hill	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	5-Yes	24	80	4	Very good
Hockley	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Hood	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Hopkins	5-Yes	3-Good	2-Fair	3-Good	0-No	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Houston	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	0	0	0	Inadequate
Howard	5-Yes	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Hudspeth	No official website										
Hunt	5-Yes	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Hutchinson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	23	77	4	Very good

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Irion	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Jack	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	0	0	0	Inadequate
Jackson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Jasper	5-Yes	3-Good	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	0-No	0-No	11	37	2	Fair
Jeff Davis	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Jefferson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	5-Yes	27	90	5	Perfect
Jim Hogg	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Jim Wells	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Johnson	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Jones	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Karnes	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Kaufman	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Kendall	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	33	110	6	Perfect
Kenedy	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Kent	No official website										
Kerr	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Kimble	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
King	No official website										
Kinney	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Kleberg	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Knox	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
La Salle	0-No	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Lamar	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Lamb	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Lampasas	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Lavaca	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	4-Very good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	24	80	4	Very good
Lee	5-Yes	5-Perfect	3-Good	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	5-Yes	23	77	4	Very good
Leon	5-Yes	4-Very good	3-Good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Liberty	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Limestone	5-Yes	4-Very good	3-Good	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	22	73	4	Very good

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Lipscomb	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Live-Oak	5-Yes	3-Good	3-Good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Llano	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Loving	No official website										
Lubbock	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Lynn	<b>0-No</b>	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Madison	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	5-Perfect	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Marion	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Martin	No official website										
Mason	<b>0-No</b>	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Matagorda	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Maverick	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
McCulloch	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
McLennan	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	33	110	6	Perfect
McMullen	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	24	80	4	Very good
Medina	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Menard	<b>0-No</b>	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Midland	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Milam	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Mills	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Mitchell	No official website										
Montague	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Montgomery	5-Yes	3-Good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	31	103	5	Perfect
Moore	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	4-Very good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Morris	5-Yes	3-Good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Motley	No official website										
Nacogdoches	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Navarro	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Newton	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Nolan	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Nueces	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Ochiltree	5-Yes	3-Good	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Oldham	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Orange	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Palo-Pinto	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	5-Yes	24	80	4	Very good
Panola	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Parker	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	1-Bare	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Parmer	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Pecos	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	0	0	0	Inadequate
Polk	5-Yes	3-Good	3-Good	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	11	37	2	Fair
Potter	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Presidio	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	1-Bare minimum	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	17	57	3	Good
Rains	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Randall	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	0-No	0-No	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Reagan	No official website										
Real	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Red River	5-Yes	3-Good	1-Bare minimum	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Reeves	No official website										
Refugio	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect
Roberts	No official website										
Robertson	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Rockwall	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	4-Very good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Runnels	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Rusk	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Sabine	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
San Augustine	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	0-No	0-No	12	40	2	Fair
San Jacinto	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	24	80	4	Very good
San Patricio	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
San Saba	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Schleicher	No official website										

## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Scurry	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Shackelford	5-Yes	3-Good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Shelby	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Sherman	5-Yes	3-Good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	13	43	2	Fair
Smith	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Somervell	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Starr	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
Stephens	5-Yes	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	9	30	2	Fair
Sterling	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Stonewall	No official website										
Sutton	5-Yes	5-Perfect	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	14	47	2	Fair
Swisher	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	12	40	2	Fair
Tarrant	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Taylor	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Terrell	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Terry	5-Yes	5-Perfect	3-Good	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	26	87	4	Very good
Throckmorton	No official website										
Titus	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	1-Bare	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Tom Green	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Travis	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	2-Fair	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	31	103	5	Perfect
Trinity	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	0	0	0	Inadequate
Tyler	5-Yes	3-Good	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Upshur	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	20	67	3	Good
Upton	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	10	33	2	Fair
Uvalde	5-Yes	2-Fair	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	0-No	5-Yes	0-No	15	50	3	Good
Val Verde	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect
Van-Zandt	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	16	53	3	Good
Victoria	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	30	100	5	Perfect
Walker	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	21	70	4	Very good
Waller	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	2-Fair	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect



## Adequacy of Election and Voter ID Information on Official County Websites, Texas, October 2016

Ward	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Washington	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Webb	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	4-Very good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	27	90	5	Perfect
Wharton	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Wheeler	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Wichita	5-Yes	4-Very good	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Wilbarger	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-No	0-No	0-No	0	0	0	Inadequate
Willacy	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	22	73	4	Very good
Williamson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	5-Yes	31	103	5	Perfect
Wilson	5-Yes	5-Perfect	0-Inadequate	2-Fair	0-No	0-No	0-No	12	40	2	Fair
Winkler	0-No	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	5	17	1	Bare minimum
Wise	5-Yes	5-Perfect	5-Perfect	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	28	93	5	Perfect
Wood	5-Yes	4-Very good	4-Very good	0-Inadequate	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	18	60	3	Good
Yoakum	5-Yes	5-Perfect	2-Fair	1-Bare minimum	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	23	77	4	Very good
Young	5-Yes	4-Very good	2-Fair	3-Good	5-Yes	0-No	0-No	19	63	3	Good
Zapata	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	3-Good	5-Yes	5-Yes	0-No	24	80	4	Very good
Zavala	5-Yes	5-Perfect	1-Bare minimum	1-Bare minimum	0-No	0-No	0-No	12	40	2	Fair

### All Counties

#	%
33	14% Perfect
66	28% Very good
61	26% Good
44	19% Fair
23	9% Bare min.
7	3% Inadequate
234	